



PERMANENT INTERSTATE COMMITTEE FOR  
DROUGHT CONTROL IN THE SAHEL



MINISTRY OF HYDRAULICS, ENVIRONMENT AND  
DESERTIFICATION CONTROL  
DIRECTORATE OF ENVIRONMENT

# Capitalisation of the sahelian experience in natural forest management for wood energy production



**Proceedings of the regional workshop  
Niamey 27th -30th April 2004**



# **Capitalisation of the sahelian experience in natural forest management for wood energy production**

**Proceedings of the regional workshop  
Niamey 27th -30th April 2004**

# CONTENT

List of acronyms.....	3
Foreword .....	4
I - Opening speeches .....	5
II - Working document .....	13
III - Synthesis report.....	32
IV - Votes of thanks and closing speech.....	41
List of participants .....	44

## List of acronyms

In the document we have kept the French acronyms.  
Below are the main French acronyms with their translation into English.

Acronym	French	English
<b>AEDE</b>	Agence de l'Énergie Domestique et de l'Environnement	Agency for Household Energy and Environment
<b>AGRHYMET</b>	Centre Agro-Hydro Météorologique	Agro-Hydro Meteorological Centre
<b>AMADER</b>	Agence pour l'Énergie Domestique et l'Électrification Rurale	Malian Agency for Household Energy and Rural Electrification
<b>CILSS</b>	Comité Permanent Inter États de Lutte contre la Sécheresse au Sahel	Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel
<b>GELOSE</b>	Gestion locale sécurisée	Secured Local Management
<b>GGF</b>	Groupement de gestion forestière	Grouping of forest management
<b>GIE</b>	Groupement d'intérêts économiques	Interests Economic Grouping
<b>GTZ</b>	Agence de Coopération Technique Allemande	German Agency for Technical Cooperation
<b>ONG</b>	Organisation Non Gouvernementale	Non Governmental Organisation
<b>PAFN</b>	Projet d'Aménagement des Forêts Naturelles (Niger)	Natural Forest Management Project (Niger)
<b>PESED</b>	Réseau de professionnels Sahéliens sur les Énergies Domestiques et Alternatives	Network of Sahelian Professionals in Household Energy
<b>PLED</b>	Plan Énergie Domestique	Household Energy Plan
<b>PREDAS</b>	Programme Régional de Promotion des énergies Domestiques et Alternatives au Sahel	Regional Programme for the Promotion of Household and Alternative Energies in the Sahel
<b>SDA</b>	Schéma directeur d'approvisionnement	Supply master plan
<b>SED</b>	Stratégie énergie domestique	Household energy Strategy
<b>SITE</b>	Système d'Information Technologique sur l'Énergie	Technological Information System on Energy
<b>SLG</b>	Structure locale de gestion	Local Management Body
<b>SRGB</b>	Structure rurale de gestion du bois	Rural Body for Wood Market Management
<b>VERT</b>	Village Exploitant Rationnellement son Terroir (Village Vert)	Village that Rationally Exploit its Land (Green Village)

## FOREWORD

*The Regional Programme for the Promotion of Household and Alternative Energies in the Sahel (PREDAS) is one of the major Programme for natural resources management of the Executive Secretariat for Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS). It is implemented with the support of the European Union and the German Cooperation.*

*The object of PREDAS is to assist CILSS member States to organise in a sustainable way the rational supply and use of household energies by sahelian populations without prejudice to the environment. In this respect, it aims at three specific objectives: (i) assist CILSS member countries in developing, adopting and implementing their Household Energy Plan (PLED); (ii) establishing a professional network of Sahelian experts in household energy (PESED) and initiating a technological information system on energy (SITE); and (iii) assisting CILSS member countries in developing and promoting the ecological monitoring of available woody resources in the supply basins of wood-energy for the sahel major towns.*

*Within the framework of the second specific objective, it appeared necessary to capitalise the Sahelian experience in natural forest development in the production of wood energy. Although forest resources are limited, wood energy plays an essential role in the daily life of Sahelians and in the economies of their countries. It is therefore important to carefully manage these resources so that they may satisfy the needs as long as possible and as necessary without danger for the environment. The Sahelian experience in this area is important, diversified and internationally acknowledged. The Sahel is thus considered as a pioneer in the development of dried forest participatory management for the supply of wood energy.*

*This regional workshop fits within this context. It should enable to take stock of the state of the art in the Sahel in this domain, to reach a consensus regarding the methods and tools and, afterwards, lead to publishing methodological guidelines and the organisation of training modules.*

*Finally, it should be noted that for some CILSS member states namely Cape Verde, Mauritania, but also for a more or less vast territory of most other states, natural forests have almost disappeared and for a long time, the available wood resources cannot satisfy local populations' demand in household fuels. For these states and territories, the development of natural forests is therefore an environmental requirement although it is a partial response to the issue of local wood energy. On the other hand, efforts were or should be made or strengthened in the area of the demand control, the substitution by other combustibles and reforestation. These themes are also part of the reflections and works conducted by PREDAS.*

*These proceedings of the regional workshop are also available in CD-ROM version, published and disseminated by PREDAS. The CD-ROM also includes the reports made by the Sahelian experts in preparation of this workshop.*

**ELHADJI MAHAMANE M. Lawali**

**PREDAS Regional Coordinator**

## **I. OPENING SPEECHES**

Niamey, Regional AGRHYMET Centre , 27<sup>th</sup> April 2004

**Speech delivered by Mr SAGNIA Sankung,  
representing the CILSS Executive Secretary**

Your Excellency the honourable Minister of Mining and Energy;

Your Excellency the honourable Secretary of State in charge of Environment and Desertification Control,

Honourable representative of the European Union

Honourable Director of the GTZ Office in Niger;

Dear participants at the workshop.

On behalf of the CILSS Executive Secretary, I would like first to thank the authorities of the Republic of Niger who accepted to host this workshop of capitalisation of Sahelian experiences in natural forest development for the production of wood energy. I would also like to thank them for the warm reception extended to the participants from other countries and for all the facilities made available to us within the framework of the organisation of this meeting.

To the participants whose presence at this workshop is an evidence of their interest for the topic to be addressed: “development of natural forest for the production of wood energy”, I extend the gratitude of CILSS to them and welcome them to the Regional AGRHYMET Centre.

Honourable Ministers,  
Ladies and gentlemen,

The issue of supplying Sahelian population with household energies is of capital importance for the CILSS and the member states. Indeed, in the Sahel countries, several attempts were made to promote the use of wood substitutes to prevent forests degradation. However, despite these efforts, it has to be noted that wood and charcoal remain the main source of household energy. This situation is giving cause for concern as the exploitation of forest is conducted following modes that have consequences on the environment and on the populations' daily life. These populations are poorly involved in the exploitation and development of woody resources.

However, diversified and encouraging experiences in participatory and decentralised management of forests exist in some countries of the Sahel which is considered as a pioneer in the development of the participatory management of dried forests for wood energy supply.

To make these experiences become visible, it was agreed to organise the workshop that gathers us today and which aim is to disseminate these experiences and make them better known. Thus, this regional workshop on the capitalisation of the Sahelian experience in natural forest development for the production of wood energy has three major objectives:

- first, to share experiences among Sahelian actors involved in the implementation of projects for household energy strategy and sustainable production of wood energy from natural forests, in order to compare the choices made, the methods and techniques used in different ecological, socio-economic and institutional settings, to reflect together on the conditions of success and to promote future synergies;
- then, to draw lessons from these Sahelian experiences on participatory management of natural forests for the production of wood energy, particularly in terms of results achieved regarding poverty control, deforestation control and the learning of good governance;
- finally, to identify topics, options, methods and/or techniques based on a regional consensus leading to the production of methodological handbooks and training modules within the framework of PREDAS. These tools will have large dissemination in CILSS member states.

Given the origin, qualification and personal commitment of each participant, I am convinced that these objectives will be fully achieved.

Honourable Ministers,  
Ladies and gentlemen,

This is the right place to reiterate the gratitude of CILSS to the financial partners within the framework of the implementation of the PREDAS programme: they are the European Commission, and the Federal Republic of Germany. This is also the right place to recall that this meeting was organised with the collaboration of the Directorate for Environment of Niger through its Programme for Natural Forests Development that I wish to thank on behalf of all the CILSS member states.

Finally, I extend once again the gratitude of CILSS to the authorities of Niger and I wish an enjoyable stay and a good workshop to the participants.

Thank you for your attention.



**Speech delivered by  
Mr Alain DARTHENUQ,  
rural development adviser at the Delegation of  
the European Commission in Niger.**

Your Excellency the honourable Minister of Mining and Energy;

Your Excellency the honourable Secretary of State in charge of Environment and Desertification Control,

Honourable Director of the GTZ Office in Niger;

Invited guest, dear participants;

Honourable Regional Coordinator of PREDAS.

It is with great pleasure that I take the floor on behalf of the Heads of Delegation of the European Commission in Burkina Faso and Niger, Mrs Sari SUOMALAINEN and Mrs Irène HOREJS on the occasion of this workshop on the “capitalisation of Sahelian experiences in natural forest development for the production of wood energy”.

The analysis of the household energies sector in the Sahel shows the predominant place of biomass and particularly “firewood”. In Niger for instance, the household energy needs are satisfied up to 90% by the use of biomass. Because of a high population growth rate, (3.2% in Niger), the wood needs are widely higher than production. They were estimated at 2.98 millions tons per year in 2000, representing 292% of the annual production (growth) of forest biomass. Consequence: Niger has an annual forest formation regression rate of 2.4%! The reforestation rhythm (5,000 ha per year on average) varies depending on the years and cannot satisfy the demand.

With all these figures, the question is therefore: How to achieve a sustainable management of forest resources where annual samplings do not exceed annual production (growth), without compromising the populations energetic needs?

The answer to this question is not simple, because it necessarily requires taking simultaneously into account:

- a more rational use of energies (by trying to avoid useless losses of energy)

- an extension of forest resources
- a better development and sustainable management of forest resources,
- other energetic sources which are economically viable, socially acceptable and preferably renewable.

The Regional Programme for the Promotion of Household and Alternative Energies in the Sahel (PREDAS), funded by the European Development Fund and the Federal Republic of Germany, aims at helping the 9 CILSS member states to organise in a sustainable way, the supply and the rational use of household energies for their populations without prejudice to the environment.

Thus, Household Energies Strategies are currently under formulation in the CILSS 9 member countries. These strategies recommend a decentralised and participatory management of forest resources (by local communities) based on the diversified experiences of the various countries such as the forest exploitation through rural wood markets and the legislative reform that goes with it (Niger, Mali and Chad).

Despite the non-negligible problems often related to the passage from a centralised to a decentralised management of resources, these experiences have made undeniable achievements such as:

- the empowerment of local communities via an effective transfer of forest resources or even the collection of taxes by state services towards local populations,
- the development of land management technical capacities and financial resources management,
- the establishment of local development fund to enable the financing of village self development.

Besides, a number of these experiences have demonstrated that it is possible to produce wood energy in a sustainable way in the Sahel, including for urban populations. But it has also been demonstrated that to achieve this objective:

- rural populations should fully be involved in the management of their land
- new incomes should be distributed transparently and according to clear regulations jointly established by all the partners

the objective of this workshop is:

- to capitalise and valorise the various experiences for a more effective application in the future
- to put in evidence the success conditions and the choices available to decision makers and actors of the household energy and forest resources management.

I therefore welcome this initiative by PREDAS and I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the people in charge of the Project for Natural Forests Development (PAFN) for the co organisation of this workshop

Ladies and gentlemen, allow finally me to wish you a successful working session. I hope the outcomes will have sustainable repercussions on the ground.

**Speech delivered by His Excellency  
Mr CHAIBOU MAHAMAN,  
Secretary of State in charge of Environment  
and Desertification Control of Niger.**

Your Excellency the honourable Minister of Mining and Energy;

Your Excellency the representative of the CILSS Executive Secretary;

Honourable representative of the European Union in Niger;

Honourable Director of the GTZ Office in Niger;

Honourable Director General of AGRHYMET;

Honourable experts of the CILSS member States;

Invited guests;

Ladies and gentlemen,

It is a real pleasure for me to open this important regional meeting jointly organised by the Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS) and my ministerial department, in order to capitalise the long and rich experiences of Sahelian countries in the area of participatory management of natural forest.

Please allow me on behalf of the government of Niger and my own, to warmly welcome the participants who came from brotherly and friendly countries and to tell you how we are proud and glad to host this regional workshop on the “capitalisation of Sahelian experiences in natural forest development for the production of wood energy”.

This is also the right place to reiterate our sincere thanks to CILSS for its support and the choice made on our country to host this high significance meeting for all the countries of the sub region, which are all committed as we all know in the noble and unrelenting struggle against desertification.

Indeed, this workshop gathering experts from all the CILSS member states is organised thanks to the financial support of the Regional Programme for the Promotion of Household and Alternative Energies

in the Sahel (PREDAS) assisted by the Project for Natural Project Development (PAFN) of Niger that. We also extend our gratitude to the African Development Bank, which is effectively working by our sides through the funding of the Project for Natural Project Development.

In the same vein, I pay tribute to the European Union and the German Cooperation for their support to CILSS member states through the financing of the PREDAS programme that contributes on the one hand to finding solutions for a sustainable management of natural resources, and on the other hand, to the national efforts of poverty control in the Sahel.

Ladies and gentlemen,

You will undoubtedly agree with me that the interest of this meeting needs not be demonstrated for our countries, which are facing permanent challenges including: the harshness of the climatic conditions, the high population growth and the extreme poverty of rural populations and the consequences on ecosystems.

Indeed, the high population growth, which characterises all our countries, induces incompressible needs in various products and services that the forest has to assure. It is the case for the regular supply of wood energy for rural and urban households, the woody resources that remain the main not to say the only truly accessible household combustible.

For my country in particular, forest resources made up of spotted bushes and lowland forests, despite their advanced state of degradation continue to play an inestimable strategic role for populations. Indeed, beyond their recognised ecological role, forests significantly contribute in the satisfaction of the multiple socio-economic needs of the population of Niger, particularly those of the poorest.

Thus, more than 98% of households needs in wood energy are satisfied by the biomass for which wood alone accounts for more than 86%. Unfortunately, considering the situation of poverty that characterises the majority of the population, and subsequently the poor penetration rate of substitution products and equipments, woody resources will still remain for a long time the main combustible used by the households in Niger.

Ladies and gentlemen,

The implementation of the Household Energies Strategy (SED) based on the postulate that wood is and will remain for a long time, the only affordable and easily accessible household combustible for rural and urban populations, has given the evidence that rural forests development constitutes an effective way of satisfying household needs, a tool against forest degradation and a tried and tested means for reducing the poverty of the most deprived social segments of the population.

The results recorded are evidences of the relevance of the strategy and efforts made in this domain. To illustrate this, more than 500,000 hectares of natural forest were secured and managed by villages organised in local management bodies for wood energy rural markets. These markets for wood energy constitute a tool for making forests sustainable, a powerful means of poverty control in rural areas and for the promotion of local development.

It is by recognising the success of the SED and the irreplaceable role of forest massifs for the satisfaction of our populations energetic needs that a meeting on the "Operation and Management of Contracted Sahelian Forest Ecosystems" was organised here in Niamey from 20<sup>th</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> November 1995 to share views on the issue of the management of natural forests. This meeting, as many others organised at the national level, further strengthened our commitment in the participatory development of forests.

Thus, the authorities of Niger, including His Excellency Mister TANDJA MAMADOU, President of the Republic, made of the need of promoting the sustainable and equitable provisions for the participatory management of village forest resources, a major option of our environment policy.

Within this framework, the national parliament of Niger has recently adopted a new Forestry Code, which consecrates among others, the empowerment of local communities in the management of forest resources, to assure their durability while providing additional incomes to poor populations.

Ladies and gentlemen,

It is obvious that most Sahel countries have developed other experiences and initiatives in forestry development, the capitalisation and dissemination of which constitute a real need or even an imperative for our sub region. That is why we believe that this workshop which objective is to share and capitalise the experiences of the various countries in this area, is a source of hope for our Sahelian populations as well as for all the concerned actors.

Therefore, considering our rich personal experiences and the high level of responsibility of each of you, I have no doubt that the outcomes of your deliberations will live up to the legitimate aspirations of our courageous populations.

It is on this note of hope and while wishing full success to your deliberations, that I declare open the regional workshop on the "capitalisation of Sahelian experiences in natural forest development for the production of wood energy".

Thank you for your attention.



## II. WORKING DOCUMENT

---

*This document was circulated to all the participants at this workshop before the opening session. Chapter 1 is a reminder of the objective of the workshop. Chapter 2 presents the major principles and programmes selected for the workshop. Chapter 3 gives a brief background of recent developments in participatory management of natural forests in the Sahel. Chapter 4 presents the seven topics of discussion selected and suggests for each of them the major issues to be discussed.*

## 1. REMINDER OF THE WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

Since the mid 80s and following the repeated failures of numerous reforestation projects, the forestry response to the “ firewood crisis” was oriented towards the development of natural forests. Based on classical techniques of forestry management practised by state forestry services on classified forests, the approach implemented has rapidly evolved towards an increasingly participatory approach using simplified techniques.

Many experiences were conducted in this area in the CILSS countries with mixed success, but which all contributed to push forward the development and working out of methods adapted to local contexts. Today, we can say that there are major achievements and it was demonstrated that in most cases, it is possible to produce wood energy in the Sahel in a sustainable way in order to cover the supply of urban populations. It was also demonstrated that to this end, a number of conditions should be gathered and that some options, methods and techniques are more performing, sustainable and / or replicable than others.

To improve the efficiency of future actions and to avoid repeating past errors, the PREDAS deemed it necessary to capitalise and valorise the achievements and to put in evidence conditions for success and choices available to decision-makers and actors of household energy and forest resources management. Thus, this regional workshop on the capitalisation of the Sahelian experience in natural forest management for wood energy production has three major objectives:

- to share experiences among Sahelian actors involved in the implementation of household energy strategy projects and sustainable production of wood energy from natural forests, in order to compare the choices made, the methods and techniques used in different ecological, socio-economic and institutional settings, to reflect together on the conditions for success and to promote future synergies;
- to draw lessons from these Sahelian experiences on participatory management of natural forests for the production of wood energy, particularly in terms of results achieved regarding poverty control, deforestation control and the learning of good governance;

- to identify topics, options, methods and/or techniques based on a regional consensus leading to the production of methodological handbooks and training modules within the framework of PREDAS. These tools will have large dissemination in CILSS member states.

## 2. ORGANISATION OF THE WORKSHOP

### 2.1 MAJOR PRINCIPLES

The organisation of the workshop was guided by three major principles :

- Organise the workshop entirely in plenary session, to enable all the participants to listen to all presentations and to make inputs in all the discussions;
- Favour the maximum of exchanges among participants, leaving sufficient time for discussions and debates, through voluntary limitation of the time devoted to presentations and inputs of the various speakers;
- Respect time and duration set for each session to ensure a fair coverage of the various topics planned during this workshop.

### 2.2 PROGRAMME

#### 2.2.1 Day 1: presentation and discussions of national contributions

The first day of the workshop was devoted to the presentation and discussions on the 8 national inputs. Each session covered one member state except Cape Verde and was organised in two parts:

- A summary presentation of the national experience focusing on the major achievements, the problems encountered, the way forward and the main interrogations on the future in the following areas:
  - ⇒ Procedures for setting up forests and / or rural markets development for the production of wood energy mainly in: choice of zones to be developed; roles of the various public and private actors; training and supervision of field interventions; preliminary studies, stages and

duration of the procedure; populations' participation; taking decentralisation into consideration; how to introduce agreement applications for forest management and/or rural markets; legal/land status of the development management structures and/or rural markets;

- ⇒ Methods used to conduct simplified inventories of wood resources;
- ⇒ Methods used to define simplified village forests development plans;
- ⇒ Concrete results achieved in terms of poverty control: level of incomes and tax income generated from the exploitation of wood energy; distribution of income and fiscal receipts; forests investments ; collective interest investments;
- ⇒ Concrete results achieved in terms of local good governance learning;
- ⇒ Organisation of forest control at the local level;
- ⇒ Results achieved regarding environment: impact on natural production of wood and fodder, biodiversity, soils, water regime, fauna...

- Discussion under the form of questions/answers relating to the presentation, which only aims at clarifying some points of the presentation, bearing in mind that the subsequent debates could be dealt with in the thematic sessions to be held in the following day; some questions raised on essential aspects will probably justify more detailed answers and will require additional work from the contributor: these questions will be carefully noted and dealt with during the synthesis session at the end of the day.

The day ended by a short synthesis session aimed at putting in evidence the salient points of national contributions and the session of question/answers that followed them and more particularly:

- Similarities and differences in the experiences of countries,
- main achievements,
- questions raised following the presentations and justifying more detailed answers that could well illustrate/complete one or the other 7 topics selected for the thematic sessions,
- main questions which still remain unanswered and justify additional research.

These different points will be taken again as an introduction to the thematic sessions and will be used to start/feed the discussions of the following day. The contributors in particular, who have presented the national contributions will be requested to prepare accurate and concise answers for the questions likely to provide a good illustration of one of the 7 topics to be discussed.

### 2.2.2 Day 2: thematic sessions

The second day will be devoted to discussions. Seven topics were selected based on the written<sup>1</sup> national contributions received by the PREDAS Regional Coordination Unit and the personal experiences of the members of the unit and its international technical assistance. These are the main questions raised on the technical and institutional levels in order to set up sustainable management of forest resources for the production of wood energy, namely:

<sup>1</sup> Burkina Faso, The Gambia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Chad.



<b>Topic 1</b>	<i>What are the types of participatory forest management that proved to be worthy in the Sahel and what are the respective processes for the implementation?</i>
<b>Topic 2</b>	<i>What legal and land status are desirable for i) forest zones being developed in a participatory development and ii) for the structures in charge of the management?</i>
<b>Topic 3</b>	<i>How to consider decentralisation and to foster local good governance?</i>
<b>Topic 4</b>	<i>What are the simplified inventory methods of wood energy resources?</i>
<b>Topic 5</b>	<i>What are the methods for elaborating simplified village forest development plans?</i>
<b>Topic 6</b>	<i>How to monitor developed zones and what could be the role of professional organisations in this respect.</i>
<b>Topic 7</b>	<i>What are the institutional organisations to be put in place to ensure the monitoring of participatory forests development for the production of wood energy and what could be the respective roles of forestry services and private service providers?</i>

**Each thematic session will last for one hour** and will be organised in two steps:

- An introduction of the topic which objective is to tally with the discussion that will follow. It will include:
  - ⇒ A general presentation of the topic, justifying its choice and indicating the main questions raised, and referring as much as possible to the national contributions presented the day before;
  - ⇒ An illustration of the topic by one or two short presentations on the concrete answers provided to these questions at the national level, selected after the first day (see below);
- A discussion on the topic that will try to answer the various questions presented hereafter for each topic.

For each thematic session a short report will be drafted by the rapporteur(s) after the session. These reports should clearly put in evidence:

- The issues for which a sound regional consensus has been reached, particularly those justifying complementary investigation work and the elaboration of methodological handbooks and training modules to be widely disseminated in the region;

- The unanswered questions and the points of divergence particularly those justifying additional reflections and/or research that could lead to field projects likely to be financed within the PREDAS framework.

### **2.2.3. Day 3: field visit, evaluation of the thematic sessions and discussion on the workshop next steps.**

The objective of the field visit will be first and foremost to see concretely an operational<sup>2</sup> rural wood energy market and to learn about the main difficulties that the villagers and the managers of this market encountered during its setting up, and/or encounter today in the implementation of the development plan, in selling their products, managing the incomes generated and the relations they have with the services in charge of forests. The visit will also be an opportunity for participants to informally share views, to possibly obtain clarifications on particular points and to continue a discussion started during the sessions.

<sup>2</sup> Some wood-energy rural markets set up in Niger are more than ten year old; this allows to draw significant lessons.

The field visit will be followed in the afternoon by two feedback sessions of the discussions on the seven topics dealt with the day before. The feedback of each topic will include:

- A short presentation by the session rapporteur(s) (see § 2.2.2. above),
- Followed by a debate aiming at clarifying, completing and then validating the main conclusions on the topic.

The afternoon will end with a synthesis session aiming at putting in evidence the next steps of the workshop for PREDAS namely in terms of elaborating methodological guides, training modules, dissemination of these guides, organisation of trainings, working out and implementation of field projects.

### **3. SHORT BACKGROUND OF RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE AREA OF PARTICIPATORY DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL FORESTS IN THE SAHEL**

#### **3.1 Comparison between various types of participatory development of natural forests implemented in some CILSS countries for the production of wood-energy**

The following table presents a comparison between various types of participatory development of natural forests for the production of wood-energy, implemented in five CILSS member states (Burkina Faso, the Gambia, Mali, Niger, Chad). It is based on written national contributions conducted by Sahelian experts in preparation of the workshop and is limited to a synthesis comparison of the choices made by the concerned countries. Therefore the comparison is not comprehensive since it does not include the experiences of other countries and that will be presented by the representatives of these countries during the sessions of the first day. The objective here is to put in evidence the similarities but also the differences between these approaches that can be used as starting points for the thematic discussions.

## Comparison between various types of participatory development of natural forests implemented in some CILSS countries

Criteria	Burkina Faso	The Gambia	Mali	Niger	Chad
Name	Worksite and forest development	Community forest	Rural wood market	Rural wood energy market	Green village
Selection of zones to be developed	- Decision of the government (most frequent case) on the demarcation of the zone and the objectives of the development. It is namely the case of classified forests. - Local initiative by populations; in general near zones where the development is already in practice.		-Prior establishment of development to supply urban zones in wood energy (7 SDA elaborated, SDA is the French acronym for schéma directeur d'approvisionnement which is the supply master plan) identifying priority zones - Agreed selection of the priority zones, upon proposal by local populations and assuming that the volume of uncut green wood is higher than 10m <sup>3</sup> /ha for firewood and 15m <sup>3</sup> /ha for charcoal	- Prior establishment of development plan to supply urban zones in wood energy (3 SDA elaborated) identifying priority zones - Agreed selection of the priority zones, upon proposal by local populations and after verification of resources conditions and social cohesion.	- Prior establishment of development scheme for wood energy. - Conditions to be fulfilled in terms of forest resources, social cohesion and existence of an agreed local management body (SLG is the French acronym for structure locale de gestion)
Stages of the implementation of participatory forests development	2 phases: 1) <u>Development stage</u> (2-3 years sometimes up to 5 years): definition of the zone, information/sensitisation, organisation and training, prior studies (inventories, choices of development units, socio-economic surveys...) elaboration and adoption of a development and management plan. Financing from external resources to the forest 2) <u>Forest management</u> (Decomposed in periods which duration is equivalent to that of the cycle adopted for the forest): execution/implementation of the development and management plan. Financing on the forest own resources through the forestry development fund fed by the contribution of the members of the forest management grouping (GGF is the French Acronym for Groupement de gestion)	3 major phases: 1) <u>Starting</u> (2-6 months). Sensitisation of local populations, establishment of a management committee, demarcation of the community forest establishment of a first management plan on 3 years, conclusion of the preliminary Agreements of community forest, management between Forestry service (FS) and the communities. The community is authorised to sell only the wood coming from the creation of fire-breaks. 2) <u>Preliminary phase</u> (2-3 years): implementation of the management plan on 3 years, final agreement on the demarcation of the forest, finalising of the community forest management agreement, approval of detailed five-year management plan by FS. The community is authorised to sell only wood coming from managed schemes.	2 stages: 1) <u>Setting up</u> (2-6 months): Information, sensitisation, demarcation of the zone to be developed, prior surveys (socio economic surveys, simplified inventories) establishment of the rural structure for wood management (Structure rurale de gestion du bois SRGB), elaboration of the simplified development plan, negotiation of the quota, constitution and submission of the application for approval and issuance of the management contract. 2) <u>Accompanied implementation</u> (18 months): execution of the development plan with periodic technical assistance (additional training, adjustment, follow up...). The two phases are organised by specialised private service providers (consultancy bureau, NGO, Interests Economic Grouping: IEG) under contract with the projects financed with external aid.	6 stages: 1) <u>Information and sensitisation</u> of rural populations on rural markets, formulation and submission of applications to the FS for the creation of a market by villages. 2) <u>Verification</u> of required conditions and validation of the village application. 3) <u>Socio-economic and biophysical diagnosis</u> of the land; socio-economic survey, demarcation of the zone and inventory, elaboration of the development and management plan 4) <u>Feedback, finalisation and adoption of the plan</u> of development with the various parties: populations, NGO, state technical services 5) <u>Support in the setting up of the local management structure</u> (SLG): organisation, support in the organisation, training, and elaboration of statutes and rules	3 Major phases: 1) <u>Setting up</u> : village diagnosis, elaboration of the forest management plan, institutional organisation and training, reception of setting up. 2) <u>Assisted operation</u> ; implementation of the forest management plan, forest control and commercial strategy, training, self programming of SLG activities, investment of local tax income in the forest and local development. 3) <u>Effective autonomy</u> : creation of the union of SLG, access to rural concession, access to banking system, consultation, follow up monitoring, self-evaluation and self-programming.

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Burkina Faso</i>	<i>The Gambia</i>	<i>Mali</i>	<i>Niger</i>	<i>Chad</i>
	forestière) taken from the income generated from the sale of the forest products	3) Implementation: effective transfer to the concerned community of the community forest property, training and strengthening of the management committee, updating of the management plan every five years. The community can sell the wood from the management implementation plan (see breakdown below)		of procedures, preparation of the approval application. 6) Making the rural market official: Handing over by FS of transport vouchers to the SLG and official launching of the market activities. The overall duration of the process is between 1 and 2 years.	
Breakdown of income tax and operating revenue	Variable according to forests, since it was negotiated between the GGF members and the promoters of the development. Planned allocations: - Remuneration for farmer - Forest management fund - Licence for cutting (non negotiable amount) - Village investment fund.	only from phase 3: - 85% of incomes generated from sales go to the community including 40% that should be reinvested in the forest and 60% that could be allocated to community interest projects. - 15% paid to the national forest fund.	Distribution variable according to the origin of the wood (uncontrolled, oriented rural market, controlled rural market). Distribution planned between: - State budget - Forest management and care works - Forestry control - Rural city councils - Regional Agriculture Chambers - Income handing over to forestry agents.	Breakdown according to the origin of the wood (uncontrolled, oriented rural market, controlled rural market). Distribution planned between: - State budget - Local authorities budgets - SLG including forest management and care works - Forestry control	- 50% for the SLG - 40% for the rural city council - 10% for the treasury department.
Level of development	800,000 ha developed in a participatory way, half of which is managed in a conservatory way.	250 villages 20,000 ha over an objective of 200,000 ha	Over 200 rural markets	170 rural markets 620,000 ha by the end of 2002	55 operational green villages 316,700 ha by the end of 2003 45 planned in 2004 and 575,000 ha.
Regulation framework	- Agriculture and land reorganisation law of 1984 revised in 1991 and 1994. - Environment Code - Forestry Code of 1997 - Decentralisation Orientation Texts of 1998, which provides for the transfer of competences of natural resources management to local communities.	- Revised forestry legislation to legalise participatory management - 2001 decentralisation, law that provided for the possible transfer of forest resources management competence to local communities.	- 1995 law on the organisation, exploitation, trade and transportation of wood energy - Numerous texts on decentralisation since 1996, particularly those establishing forest domains for local communities and the transfer of the competence in the field of forest resources management to local communities. Management of forest resources.	- 1992 Ordinance on the organisation of the exploitation, trade and transportation of wood energy - Rural Code orientation Text - New Forestry Code in the process of being adopted	- Forestry legislation revised in 1999, instituting Green Villages - Creation of the Agency for Household Energy and Environment (AEDE) which is autonomous but bound to the state through a Convention.

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Burkina Faso</i>	<i>The Gambia</i>	<i>Mali</i>	<i>Niger</i>	<i>Chad</i>
Statute of developed zones	Remain property of the state.	Exclusive property to the community involved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Currently: management contract between FS and the rural structure for wood management</li> <li>- Awaiting an enforcement Decree of texts on decentralisation instituting forest domains of communities and the transfer of competence in forest management.</li> </ul>	Theoretically, rural concession, but no concession has officially been attributed.	Rural concession.
Statute of the management structures.	Forestry management grouping	Members of management committees democratically elected.	Association approved by the administrative district head (préfet) upon presentation of an application.	Rather of the associative type although no clearly established statute.	Non lucrative grouping recognised as the emanation of the village by a local committee of approval.
Simplified inventory method.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planimetry of the surface</li> <li>- Horizontal sampling by line for the development and by circular plots for the management</li> <li>- Targeted accuracy 10-15%</li> <li>- Rectangular mesh</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transects and counting</li> <li>- Observations.</li> </ul>	One degree inventory, based on units of four trees placed along the transects.	No clearly established official method.	Systematic sampling with concentric plots disposed according to square mesh size.
Method/type of simplified management plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Simplified method of development as from 1997</li> <li>- Farmers' participation a from the definition of objectives allowing a true consensus</li> <li>- Current cost: 25 EUROS/ha.</li> </ul>	Development plan established in a participatory way (AFOM analysis to select the best management options).	Set by a national workshop in 1996.	No clearly established official method.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 15-year plan revised every 5 years</li> <li>- selection coppice</li> <li>- Plots with 15-year rotation</li> <li>- 2 periods of cut/year</li> <li>- Conservation of 2 seeds/species/ha</li> <li>- Assisted regeneration per seedling and plantation</li> <li>- Negotiated quota.</li> </ul>
Organisation of the forest control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Control post for the commercialisation on each worksite</li> <li>- Less effective control today compared to the past mainly at the entry of towns.</li> </ul>		No effective operational mechanism for forestry control	No effective operational mechanism for forestry control.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Control at the entrance of towns and on the river by fixed check points and mobile brigades</li> <li>- Control of the control and recovery of taxes conducted by AEDE.</li> <li>- Control in the Green Villages by farmers and under the responsibility of SLG, with the support if need be of FS and customary authorities</li> <li>- Control rate: 50-60% in 2002 in N'djamena,</li> <li>- About 500 millions Cfa/year paid to the Treasury Department (Ten times than before)</li> </ul>

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Burkina Faso</i>	<i>The Gambia</i>	<i>Mali</i>	<i>Niger</i>	<i>Chad</i>
Poverty control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noticeable significant increase (surveys in 1998 and 2000) of GGF members' incomes.</li> <li>- Improvement of infrastructures thanks to the village investment fund.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impact on the income deemed positive but no reliable data.</li> <li>- Important role of women</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No quantitative data on income generated.</li> <li>- Noticeable improvement of populations livelihood through the architecture of houses and the level of equipment of households (increased number of carts, ploughs, motor cycles etc)</li> <li>- Implementation of collective interest investments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Significant improvement of incomes in villages: 2 millions Cfa / year / village on average and around 200,000 Cfa / year / village of locally rebated fiscal receipts.</li> <li>- Implementation of numerous collective interest investments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Income generated from wood not known</li> </ul>
Local governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Positive evolution on the empowerment, the flow of information, the execution of community interest investments.</li> <li>- Social valorisation of GGF members.</li> <li>- Strengthened negotiation power vis-à-vis wholesalers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The participatory management of forests played a pioneering role in decentralisation</li> <li>- Management committees democratically elected</li> <li>- Training in simplified accountability to ensure transparent management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concrete results in terms of consultation between administrative authorities, the elected representatives of the city council and the SRGB (3<sup>rd</sup> Region)</li> <li>- Not sufficient distance on the learning of governance within SRGB.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evolution of customary practices towards a more collegial management, particularly for the licences for land clearance.</li> <li>- Learning of the democratic operation within SLG (election...)</li> <li>- Learning of concerted management through village assemblies and the elaboration of activities programmes</li> <li>- Reduction of intra and inter-community conflicts</li> <li>- Compliance with regulations</li> <li>- Improvement of relations with FS.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sensitisation of populations</li> <li>- Training of managers</li> </ul>
Deforestation control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noticeable return and improvement of fauna and flora.</li> <li>- Noticeable increase of productivity.</li> <li>- Reduction of conflicts between farmers and breeders.</li> <li>- No operation follow up system despite several projects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- According to FAO, the forest surface has increased.</li> <li>- An impact survey conducted in 2003 put in evidence an increase of local species of trees near villages and an increased awareness of populations.</li> <li>- Reduction of bushfires.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not sufficient data available on environment monitoring.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Observations between 1995 and 2003 on managed sites:</li> <li>- No major change noted in the operation forest formations</li> <li>- Significant reduction of clearances for agriculture</li> <li>- General compliance with cutting regulations by lumberjacks</li> <li>- Increase of forest productivity estimated between 30 and 50%.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No sufficient length time to draw conclusion.</li> </ul>

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Burkina Faso</i>	<i>The Gambia</i>	<i>Mali</i>	<i>Niger</i>	<i>Chad</i>
Main constraints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The model of development worksite cannot be applied everywhere.</li> <li>- Persistent debates on the choices of inventories.</li> <li>- High cost of participatory development limiting the possibilities for self financing by populations.</li> <li>- Illiteracy of rural partners.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Administrative slowness notably in the approval of forest demarcations.</li> <li>- Persistence of fraud.</li> <li>- Lack of skilled staff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inadequate legal framework.</li> <li>- Absence of follow up and monitoring in the execution of development plan.</li> <li>- Lack of motivation of FS in the transfer of competences.</li> <li>- Inefficiency of control on the origin of wood by FS.</li> <li>- Proliferation of informal sale points along roadsides.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Absence of legal entity of SLG.</li> <li>- Complexity of the procedure for rural markets setting up.</li> <li>- Non operational procedures for the administrative approval of markets and SLG.</li> <li>- Non operational procedure for the attribution of rural concessions.</li> <li>- Absence of sustainable accompaniment monitoring of rural markets.</li> <li>- Still little investments in forests from local tax income.</li> <li>- Still insufficient participation of women in SLG decisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Misunderstanding of the approach by some FS agents.</li> <li>- Ambiguity of the notion of property.</li> <li>- Non application of the development plan.</li> <li>- Interference of local and administrative authorities.</li> <li>- Insufficient human resources for the monitoring.</li> <li>- Illiteracy of rural partners.</li> <li>- Some regulatory texts outdated.</li> </ul>

### 3.2 Major steps of the concept of the development of wood-energy rural market (Niger, Madagascar, Mali, Chad)

In view of the various Sahelian experiences, the concept of rural wood-energy market appears clearly today as the most widespread, the most developed and probably the most promising. Rural markets are places where organized structures, outside the cities, are established to exploit wood-energy for commercial purposes.

In order to help understand this concept, it appeared useful to briefly recall a few stages in its development :

- 1986 : The concept “wood-energy rural market” was first introduced during the preparation of the household energy strategy in Niger in 1986<sup>3</sup> then confirmed by the household energy assessment by Energy Project II in Niger, which had to implement this strategy. It followed the forest cooperatives experiences developed as from the 1980’s (Guesselbodi Faira, Boyanga, Doro-bobo, Baban Rafi), which showed some limitation in terms of cost and required technical training. It was conceived as a simple and evolving tool, enabling the rapid and sustainable transfer of forest resource management and control to the bordering populations, and the achievement of self-funding of the required investment in the long run.
- 1989 –1994 : The Energy Project II – Household Energy Component – Supply Section<sup>4</sup> in Niger enabled to move from concept to implementation between 1989 and 1994, in two major domains :
  - ⇒ first, the setting up of a relevant and incentive regulatory tax framework, which was translated into the 1992 reform of the forest regulations and tax system after a

long period of reflection and inter-ministerial consultation. This new regulatory and tax device has three major characteristics : (i) it authorizes, for the transitory period, the co-existence of oriented and controlled exploitation<sup>5</sup> in the framework of rural markets, and uncontrolled exploitation outside rural market ; (ii) it transfers to the rural markets level the recovery of the tax on wood-energy and provides for transfer on part of this tax to the villagers ; and (iii) it establishes a differential taxation, meant to dissuade uncontrolled exploitation ;

⇒ then, with the development of the first technical tools enabling to make the concept of rural wood-energy market operational : master plan of wood-energy urban supply, simplified forest management methods drawing lessons from the experience of forest cooperatives, zones and villages selection procedures, animation procedures ...

- 1996 – 2000 : The experience acquired as from 1994 in Niger was considerable : it demonstrated on the field the technical and economic feasibility of the rural market concept. But it also revealed that it was necessary to move more rapidly so as to take up as quickly as possible the space of the urban supply areas in order to make uncontrolled exploitation more and more difficult. In order to increase the capacity of creating rural markets and due to forest administration inadequate human resources, it appeared necessary to resort to private service providers (consultancy firms, Economic Interest Grouping, NGOs) who will be previously trained to this end and technically monitored by the forestry services. This option was implemented in Niger in 1995 with the creation of the Technical Support Group (GTA) and above all from 1996 in Mali within the household energy project<sup>6</sup>. The service providers were recruited on the basis of a restricted invitation to tender after

<sup>3</sup> Funded by ESMAP : Joint UNDP-World Bank Programme

<sup>4</sup> World Bank funding

<sup>5</sup> The rural market is said to be controlled when it is supplied from the delimited and developed areas ; it is said to be oriented when it is supplied from the delimited but non developed zones.

<sup>6</sup> World Bank/ World Environmental Fund/Netherlands funding



pre-qualification. The outcome was edifying : more than 150 rural markets were established in less than two years. But if the efficiency of this option in terms of rapidity was thus demonstrated, the experience of the household energy project also clearly demonstrated the need to ensure permanent training and efficient follow-up of the service providers. It also appears necessary to include in their contract, rural markets support on the technical and organizational plans for a period sufficiently long after the creation.

- 1999- 2001 : The Mahajanga<sup>7</sup> Integrated Pilot Project in Madagascar, implemented in close collaboration with the local communities within the process of decentralization, has enabled, thanks to proximity, better training of the service providers, who did a rapid and good quality work, demonstrating the relevance of this approach. Moreover, the Project has experienced successfully the integration of the concept of wood-energy rural market to a wider process of consulted management of the various renewable natural resources, referred to as Secured Local Management, (Gelose). The Madagascar experience has thus clearly showed that the rural markets of wood-energy constituted a first step, simple to implement but efficient in the learning of the sustainable management of resources. More than some twenty Gelose contracts have thus been signed in one year between the towns and the grassroots communities of the Mahajanga region, that is more than twice in 5 years in the whole country. This dynamic has unfortunately been interrupted after by the deep political crisis that Madagascar experienced from 2002.
- 2000 - 2004 : The local communities involvement, notably the towns, was further reinforced within the ongoing Project on sustainable management in the 3<sup>rd</sup> region<sup>8</sup> of Mali, perfectly integrated into the decentralization process. The communities were thus associated to the various decision-making from the elaboration of the supply master plan and during the selection of priority towns for the development of rural markets. Later on, the towns

intervened directly in the development of rural markets, notably in the delimitation of areas to be developed and by following closely the interventions of the private service providers contracted for their establishment. This project is also an opportunity of extending the concept of rural market of wood-energy to timber and to favour the emergence of small processing companies. Finally, it can be also distinguished by the setting up of forest investment funds managed by the local communities, meant to finance small projects (development of the sale site, construction of a meeting room for the rural Structure for wood markets management (SRGB), equipment of village forest guards, improvement of forest access, ...) initiated by the SRGB and validated by the town to which the market is related.

- 2000 – 2003 : Finally, one of the most recent important innovations was the successful implementation in Chad with the creation and delegation to an autonomous agency (Household Energy and Environment Agency – AEDE) for the development of “green villages” as well as the forest control at the town entries and in the recovery of taxes on wood-energy, within the Household Energy Project<sup>9</sup>. This innovation efficiently compensated the inadequacies observed in the other projects, notably as far as control is concerned. AEDE achieved self-funding in late 2003 and the fiscal forest revenue were multiplied 10 times, reaching more than 500 millions of CFA francs per annum for the only town of N’djamena. This project was also innovative in setting up a permanent information and assessment system operating under Geographic Information System (SIG), which also enables the geo-referenced follow-up of forest revenues.
- The institutional innovation decisively tested in Chad has just been resumed in Mali, with the recent creation of the Mali Agency for Household Energy and Rural Electrification (AMADER). AMADER should soon launch a second phase of implementation of the household strategy which is designed based on lessons from the past, particularly those acquired within the first phase and the project of the 3<sup>rd</sup> region.

<sup>7</sup> World Bank funding

<sup>8</sup> French Development Agency/French Funds For World Environment funding

<sup>9</sup> World Bank funding

This brief “background” of the rural market concept shows how the achievements and difficulties encountered on the ground have enabled to improve gradually the technical and institutional choices. It still remains to evolve and to perfect this concept taking into account the other experiences conducted in Sahel, so that it may better fit to the needs of the sub-region and, more generally, the sustainable management of dry forest for the production of wood-energy. This is the subject of the thematic sessions that are presented below.

## 4. THEMATIC SESSIONS

### 4.1 Theme 1 : Main types of participatory forest management and setting-up process

The comparative table presented in the previous chapter as well as the national presentations show the richness and the diversity of Sahel experiences which share a lot of common items. However some countries seem to generate better results than others, and that perhaps they do not all apply to the specific contexts of the various member states.

The main subject of this first thematic session is to characterize the major possible types of management schemes and their respective implementation processes. For this, the debates should notably bear on the following major questions :

- What are the major types of participatory forest management conceivable for the production of wood-energy in the Sahel ?
- Can the concept of rural wood-energy market be selected as the regional model, which should then be adapted and made available in each country depending on the national context? If the answer is positive, should we maintain the distinction between “oriented” and “controlled” rural market?

- How to choose the areas to be developed : should one work at the level of the forest as a whole as in the case of the Burkina Faso work sites, or favour the village forest lands as with the rural market, ...?
- What other public or private stakeholders must be involved in the creation of forest management schemes , particularly what are the conditions for resorting to the private service providers ?
- What are the steps and the preliminary studies required for the implementation of the participatory forest management ?
- How effective participation of the concerned population may be conducted and assured ?
- What are the constitutive elements of a good participatory forest management project file?
- How (instruction procedures : by who, on which criteria, what delay) must be validated the management / rural market bids?



*Participatory Management: working session between villagers and technicians.*

## 4.2 Theme 2 : Legal and land status of rural markets, managed zones and their managers

One of the major constraints identified which weakens the existing participatory forest management schemes established is the fact they generally don't have clear status on the legal and land issues, even if prescriptions are sometimes provided in the regulatory texts. This woolly situation sometimes results from the reluctance of the services in charge of forests to move to action as far as the definition of local communities forest areas and the transfer of competence are concerned. Currently, only the Gambia has included in its texts the total transfer of properties to the local communities after the first two phases of the development setting up.

The major subject of this session is to try to remove this constraint by suggesting simple and efficient solutions, taking into account both the legitimate prudence of forestry services and the need to offer effective guarantees to the populations and the local communities. These solutions should probably be evolutionary in time. For this, it is suggested to debate the following issues :

- What legal and land status should be given to managed zones : registration in "forest village", rural concessions, leasing under management contract, ...? What possible stages must be planned to achieve this ?
- What legal status to be given to the development management structures : associations, cooperative, economic interest grouping, company, ...? What possible stages must be planned to achieve this ?
- What relationship and legal links must be established between the local communities and the management structures ?
- What relationship and possible legal links must be established between the management structures and the village representatives (traditional authorities, village assembly, ...)?

## 4.3 Theme 3 : Consideration of decentralization and local governance

Decentralization is well advanced or still at its infancy, depending on the country, but it is resolutely in progress and irreversible. It constitutes a formidable opportunity for the development of participatory forest management, since, on the one hand, it enables to guarantee some proximity in the area of follow-up of the implementation, but above all, on the other hand, the forest management schemes may become one of the main source of income of many rural towns, and constitute an excellent learning of local governance. The Sahel experiences however show that there is still a lot to do and that one must resolutely move towards the effective participation of the populations and communities at all stages of the process of participatory setting up of forest management.

The subject of this session is to find simple and clear responses for better consideration of decentralization and for learning local governance. To this effect, it has been suggested to discuss on the various following items:

- How the local populations must be associated, particularly the other users of the forest (shepherds, exploiters of other non woody products, ...) in the definition and establishment of management schemes ? What consultation mechanisms should be set up ?
- How decentralization, if it exists in the country, must be taken into account? How to associate local communities ?
- What types of forest management should be planned at the town level?
- What types of forest management should be planned at the level of a town supply area ?
- What types of forest management should be planned at the other levels of decentralization : circle, provinces, regions, ...?

#### 4.4 Theme 4 : Simplified inventory methods for wood-energy resources within a management plan

The simplified inventory of wood-energy resources is an indispensable tool for the definition of the forest development and management plans. However, the methods vary from one country to another and the debate persists on the desirable level of precision.



The main object of this session is to try and reach a consensus on the simplified inventory method to be used and the steps of its implementation. To this effect, the discussions should relate to the following issues :

- what simplified inventory method(s) for Sahelian countries, depending on the main forest ecosystems met ?
- How to establish in a simplified and consultative way, a theoretical exploitable quota for wood-energy? What should be the role of local population in this area ?
- How to take into account the other forest products ?
- What savings of means (imagery, mapping, ...) can be realized while working at the town level, the forest, the supply area ?
- What are the possible role(s) for a regional institution (CILSS Executive Secretariat, Agrhymet, ...) ?

#### 4.5 Theme 5 : Method for the elaboration of simplified village forest management schemes

The elaboration of management schemes and participatory forest management for the production of wood-energy is at the core of the concerns. The management scheme is the indispensable instrument to ensure sustainable exploitation of forest formation without compromising environment. However, just like the simplified forest inventory, the methods vary from one country to another and the debate persists on the level of desirable complexity.

The main objective of this session is to try and reach a consensus on the simplified inventory method to be used and the various steps of its implementation. To this effect, the discussions should relate to the following issues :

- what must be the main lines of the content of forest management in the Sahelian context : exploitation, rehabilitation, enrichment ?
- What method(s) should be retained for the Sahel, depending on the major types of forest ecosystems met ?
- Should there be an exploitation quota and if yes, why ? How to establish this quota and then adjust it regularly in a participatory way ?



- How to consider pastoral activities ? How to associate shepherds to the elaboration and the implementation of a management scheme ?
- How to take into account the other forest products, notably timber but also the non-woody products ?

- How must be conducted, at the local level, the follow-up of the implementation and execution of a management scheme ? self-assessment, village forest guards / village surveillance teams, possible participation of forestry services, ...?
- Who are the various stakeholders of the elaboration of management schemes and what are their respective roles ?
- What savings of means (satellite imageries, air photographs, SIG mapping, ...) are possible while working first at the town level, the forest massif, the supply basin ?
- What are the possible role(s) for a regional institution (CILSS Executive Secretariat, Agrhymet, ...) ?
- What environmental follow-up is required : what is the priority, who must do it (local population, research institutes, private service providers, ...), in which framework (contracts, ...), how and how long after the creation of the development ?
- What are the possible roles of professional organizations (local unions / federations of development management structures, ...) particularly as far as support, follow-up and training are concerned ?
- How to (self) finance the various follow-ups ?

#### 4.6 Theme 6 : Follow-up of managed zones and professional organizations

Undoubtedly, the participatory forest management set up in the Sahel suffer from follow-up deficit, be it in terms of technical support, administrative or environmental follow-up. This inadequate follow-up is translated by the progressive blunting of the efficiency of the management structures and by the absence of reliable data series enabling to analyse the economic, social and environmental impact and to carry out possible required adjustments.

The main objective of this session is to characterize as precisely as possible the needs in support and follow-up and make concrete proposals to meet them. To this effect, the discussion will notably focus on the following questions :

- What support and technical follow-up must be provided to the development management structures: who must do it (public services, private service providers), in which framework (contracts,...) how (periodical visits, support according to the demand, training, ...) and for how long after the creation of the scheme ?
- What administrative follow-up should be ensured ? what should be priorities related to ? what are the respective roles of central and decentralized services in charge of forests ? the role of local communities ? what are the possible utilisations of Geographical information system (GIS) ?

#### 4.7 Theme 7 : Institutional aspects, respective roles of public services in charge of forests, local communities and specialized private service providers

The institutional aspects are undoubtedly an important theme in the discussion, which is sometimes conflicting. However, some major principles should be clearly accepted, notably :

- a) Technical and financial autonomy favours efficiency and rapidity,
- b) The State must focus efforts on the definition of policies and the development of tools and standards,
- c) Guarantee equity and respect of regulations, and
- d) Delegate field interventions as much as possible to the civil society.

But it is sometimes difficult to find the balance between the respective roles of public bodies and private service providers, and there is high risk of frustration. However, each stakeholder has his/her own role and it is the pursuit of the same objective that will enable to make progress.

The main objective of this session is to consider the institutional aspect in order to improve the efficiency of public intervention and local initiative. To this effect, it is suggested to discuss the following issues :

- Should we set up a specific structure to develop and follow-up participatory forest management? If yes, what should be its missions, organization and positions profiles, status and institutional relations, required training,...? How will this structure integrate decentralization?

- What capacity building should be planned ?
- What is the role of forest control of wood-energy entries into town to ensure the success of the forest management ? How to organize and who must deal with this forest control and what lessons can be drawn from the Chad experience ?
- Who must train private service providers and how ?
- How to self finance in the long run, the expansion of forest management and their control?



### **III. SYNTHESIS REPORT**

---

This synthesis report has been prepared by the Regional Coordination Unit of PREDAS. It takes up the final communiqué adopted by the workshop's participants and notes have been added by the Regional Coordination of PREDAS namely:

point 3 which presents the synthesis of the contributions to the internet forum,  
point 4 which summarizes discussions that followed national contributions at the workshop, the texts framed by the Regional Coordination Unit of PREDAS.

Points 5, 6 and 7 are the workshop's final communiqué as adopted by the participants.





From Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> to Friday 30<sup>th</sup> 2004, was held at the AGRHYMET regional centre of Niamey, the regional workshop on the “Capitalization of the Sahelian experience in the area of natural forest managements for the production of wood-energy”.

The workshop was held in accordance with the work programme proposed by the PREDAS and adopted by the participants from the CILSS eight (8) member countries except Cape Verde.

## 1. Official opening ceremony

It was marked by three short speeches pronounced successively by their Excellencies :

- the Director General of AGRHYMET (Niamey), representing the CILSS Executive Secretary,
- Mister Alain Darthenucq, Rural Development Adviser at the European Community Delegation in Niger,
- Mister Chaibou Mahaman, State Secretary in charge of Environment and Desertification control of the Republic of Niger.

The presence of Mister Rüdiger Wehr, representing the Niger GTZ bureau could be noted.

After having all underlined that wood and charcoal still constitute today the major household energy sources for the Sahelian populations and that it is possible to manage forests in a sustainable way while supplying towns with wood-energy, the three allocutions invited the participants to turn to account this workshop, to share their various experiences in the area of forest development and natural forest management, on the one hand, and on the other hand, to agree on the methods and tools leading to the publication of methodological guides and the organization of training modules.

## 2. Presidium of the workshop

The following session bureau was established :

- Chairman : Mamadou Mamane , Niger
- 1st Vice President : Rouamba Tenga, Burkina Faso
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President : Amadou Diallo, Mali
- Rapporteurs (3):
  - Ibrahima Ndiaye, Senegal
  - Babakar Matar Brémé, Chad
  - El Hadj Saley Gambo, Niger
- Facilitators (2) :
  - El Hadji Mahamane Lawali, PREDAS Regional coordinator
  - Gérard Madon, International technical assistance coordinator at PREDAS

## 3. Presentation of the synthesis of the Internet forum contributions

After the internet forum organized by PREDAS, seven (7) contributions were recorded (Burkina : 2 ; Niger :1 ; Chad : 1 ; PREDAS Regional Coordination : 2 ; PREDAS technical Assistance : 1). It stems from this forum the existence of a diversity of experiences in the area of natural forest management and the need to harmonize approaches.

Although the site is relatively recent, the level of participation is encouraging. While urging experts to join the site, the workshop encouraged PREDAS to continue these sharing through electronic fora.

## 4. Presentation of national contributions

*1.* Eight contributions (Burkina Faso, the Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Chad) on the national experiences in natural forest management for the production of wood-energy were presented by participants during the workshop. This synthesis points out the similarities and divergences in these experiences.

*2.* The presentations were very rich and good quality, confirming the depth and the quality of the Sahel experience in this area.

3. A first major observation has to be made : two major approaches are implemented in the various countries :

- a forest level approach, used mainly in Burkina Faso and in Senegal, which presents strengths like coherence with the forest resource ; possible pooling of means (cartography works, technical directorate);
- a village or local community-based approach, used in most other countries, which also presents strengths and weaknesses :
  - strengths : closer to customary / traditional authorities ; greater proximity and application of the principle of subsidiarity ; favours grass-roots learning of good governance ; favourable to local initiative ;
  - weaknesses : may lack coherence vis-à-vis the forest resource; lack of village administrative legitimacy, which weakens it notably with regard to State services.

4. These two approaches are different, but they share common essential points :

- they both intervene at the village level, which is the operational level of the implementation of management plans, but
- they also suggest /stimulate forms of coordination, of coherence at a larger scale : management and development inter-village committee (CIVGD) gathering the village committees concerned by the same area in Senegal ; technical directorate of development work sites in Burkina Faso, which gathers forest management units established at the village level ; the federations, unions of local structures for the management of rural market in Mali and in Niger ;
- they rely on consultation and negotiation with the population : negotiation of the distribution of revenues in Burkina Faso, quotas negotiation in the Gambia, but
- some are however cautious about the capacity of local populations to adequately manage forest resources.

5. The status of developed zones is different, depending on the countries. Two examples illustrate this : the Gambia provides for transfer of exclusive ownership after a period of 2 – 3 years training sanctioned by an evaluation whereas the ownership of the forest resource rests on the State in Burkina Faso or Mali.

6. Some papers stressed the problems of status / legitimacy of resource management structures. For example, in Senegal, the village management and development committees responsible for implementing the management plans for the rural councils are not recognized by the State as forest exploiters according to the current provisions of the forest law. However, the committees should shortly obtain the status of economic interest grouping and comply thus with the condition of the law.

7. Different methods are used for the evaluations, depending on countries. For instance, the method of the 4<sup>th</sup> tree developed and used in Mali and successfully tested in some East Africa countries is not yet widespread in other CILSS member-countries. Burkina Faso, Niger and Senegal are each using other methods.

8. All papers unanimously recognize the positive impacts of the various types of natural forest management in terms of poverty alleviation, good governance and environment. Such positive impacts are effectively noted by studies or evaluation in Burkina Faso and Niger. But in general there is lack of reliable monitoring data regarding the dynamic of natural forest management.

9. Several papers stressed the inadequacy of human resources at the level of forestry services and of their training like in Niger and in the Gambia.

10. Women play an important role in the wood-energy sectors of countries and this role seems to develop with the increasing marketing of wood or non-wood forest resources like branches in the Gambia.

11. The results achieved in terms of areas developed are still well below the initial objectives in almost all the countries. However, these results are estimated at several hundreds thousands of hectares in countries like Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger or Chad.

12. Two countries are to be particularly mentioned :

- Mauritania which is a reminder of the hard natural conditions in the Sahel, with the existence of desert zones covering most of the territory : the answer to the wood-energy problem is necessarily different there and emphasis should be put on the forest plantations.
- Guinea Bissau which reminds us how it is difficult to work and achieve results in a context of political instability.

## 5. Presentation of the thematic sessions

Seven (7) themes were presented and discussed in plenary sessions including some forty questions to be answered :

### 5.1 Theme 1 : Major types of approaches of participatory forest management and establishment process

Two approaches are developed in CILSS countries : one is based on the forest whole (from the forest to the village) generally in the classified area ; the other one is based on the village (from the village to the forest) in the protected area.

- Either approach takes into account :
  - ♦ the types of forest formations,
  - ♦ the major activities in the zone (livestock, agriculture, various forest products, woody or not),
  - ♦ legal status of the forest formations (classified, protected),
  - ♦ land,
  - ♦ etc.
- Both approaches are not incompatible. They help :
  - ♦ to protect the environment,
  - ♦ to combat poverty,
  - ♦ to transfer competences to decentralized territorial communities,
  - ♦ to achieve sustainable development.

They require :

- ♦ adapted legal frameworks,
- ♦ capacity building,
- ♦ the establishment of a consultation framework between local communities when the forest covers several communities.

- There is a need to integrate both approaches to the development of the territory as part of the elaboration of guidelines to supply the cities.

- The oriented rural markets are considered as a modern stage between an uncontrolled exploitation of wood areas to be managed. One may choose to create them in order to control cuttings (dead wood, health cutting , clearings, pruning, lopping, etc. ) by the populations.

#### Note from the PREDAS regional coordination Unit :

*Most of the questions asked under this theme were discussed in national papers and answers are synthesized in the comparative table (see Point 3-1 above). The questions relating to the effective participation of the population and the fields for agreement will be dealt with in the guide for the establishment of participatory forest management schemes to be eventually published .*

### 5.2 Theme 2 : Legal status and land status of rural markets, developed zones and their managers

- In all CLSS member-countries, laws provide for land security in the managed zones. Pending their implementation, transitory formulas are adopted according to the countries.
- The expected solutions will have to be adapted to the land institutions and tools (land book, land commission ...) which will be set up with decentralization in countries where it is not yet effective.
- Need to formally recognize village structures for management by:
  - ♦ Villagers
  - ♦ the State and its departments
  - ♦ The decentralized territorial communities
  - ♦ All development partners (NGOs, donors, etc..)
- Taking into account all users, products and services of the forest.
- Taking into account the slow process of establishing the regulatory and fiscal texts.

### 5.3 Theme 3 : Taking into account the decentralization and local governance

- The decentralization of the forest resource management is achieved through the creation of a forestry area for the decentralized territorial communities. But the content of such an area is not generally defined clearly. For example, if it is not explicitly said that it is the protected area of the State which is transferred to the communities, the effectiveness of the transfer of forestry management competences may slow down.
- The transfer of resource management competences to decentralized territorial communities must not question existing village management schemes.
- Setting up mechanisms / tools for inter-community consultation on the forest and supply areas which cover several decentralized territorial communities.
- Need to ensure an effective representation of the various forest users in the management structures and in the consultation frameworks at the level of the decentralized territorial communities.
- Need to carry on reflection on the transfer of the area and competences in forest resource management as part of decentralisation.
- The State, through its administration, fulfils its rightful functions and must play a role of support-advice to decentralized territorial communities.

### 5.4 Theme 4 : Methods of simplified inventory of wood-energy resources in the framework of a management plan.

- Need to simplify the methods in order to achieve manageable mechanisms statistically valid at a cost acceptable and which may be implemented within a short time.
- Need to establish methods for associating local communities and management structures, particularly for negotiating quotas.

- Several methods are currently used in terms of areas and/or countries. One method cannot be generalized. The methods mentioned are the following :
  - ♦ method of the umpteenth tree from transects for savannah growing formations,
  - ♦ Method of random stratified inventory by track of the contracted plateau formation,
  - ♦ Method of systematic sampling at 2 degrees,
  - ♦ Method of systematic sampling at 3 degrees,
  - ♦ Method of horizontal sampling per row.
- Two methods have been identified as deserving to be disseminated in the region for trial. These include (i) the method of the umpteenth tree from transects for the savannah growing formations and (ii) the method of random stratified inventory of plateau contracted formation.

#### Note from PREDAS Regional Coordination

##### Units :

*Guidelines are expected to be produced on these methods. They will also deal with the participatory determination of quota.*

### 5.5 Theme 5 : Method for elaborating village simplified forestry management plans.

- Need to simplify village management plans in order to enable the beneficiaries to take ownership and apply them ;
- The most common and recommended exploitation technique is the coppice system ;
- The development cost depends on the level of complexity and the degree of inclusion of other activities and products ;
- Need to make an inventory of what exists in terms of mapping and imageries with national agencies (national geographic institutes).
- The CILSS must continue to play its role as an information channel like it does with PREDAS .

**Note from PREDAS Regional Coordination Unit :**

These matters will be further dealt in the guidelines to be elaborated on the village forestry management plans.

**5.6 Theme 6 : Follow-up of the developed zones and possible roles of professional organizations**

- The follow-up is needed but is not currently adequately carried out even if it is effectively provided for in the management plans.
- Need to be more concise in the sustainable forest management criteria and indicators in the dry zones :
  - ♦ technique : evolution of established stock, volume taken, composition and structure of the population,
  - ♦ economic : revenue, village investment,
  - ♦ administrative : respect of the prescriptions of the management plan, etc,
  - ♦ control in the field : contentious revenues,
  - ♦ ecological : biodiversity, ...
- Need to adapt the forest formation nomenclature to the CILSS member States;
- Need to involve research institutions in the follow-up ;
- Need to strengthen unions / structures management capacities because they play an important role in the area of :
  - ♦ conflict settlement among structure
  - ♦ lobbying towards wood-energy traders carriers.
- Need to ensure self-financing and follow-up.

**5.7 Theme 7 : Institutional aspects, respective roles of public services in charge**

- *indispensable role of forest control on forest woody and non woody products from the production zones (developed and non developed) to :*
  - ♦ ensure success of the developments,
  - ♦ generate the planned tax revenues,
  - ♦ have reliable data on the spatial and quantitative evolution of the wood-energy exploitation;
- need to strengthen the capacities of forest institutions in charge of forest control and the development of incentive measures for the agents involved in the legal and regulatory provisions. To this effect, the Chad experience, which showed the possibility of self-financing the follow-up and forest control could be an example. PREDAS must study the possibilities of helping the member countries to have this experience;
- need to create follow-up and support units for the rural market and to provide the means for making them operational;
- need to strengthen the capacities of structures in charge of forest managements;
- need to generalize the creation of forest funds easy to mobilize in order to fund the control and the capacities of forest service at all levels;
- need to strengthen the capacities of the local structures in the area of forest control.

**6. Field visit**

It related to the rural market of Bango, located at some sixty kilometres from Niamey. The participants had interviews with the Members of the Local Management Structures and carried out several visits : wood-energy selling sites, exploitation and re-generation plots.

## 7. Recommendations

- PREDAS must help CILSS countries to conduct studies on the cost of the forest managements.
- PREDAS must play its role of information vector through relevant channels such as its website, the newspaper “Flamboyant”, ...
- PREDAS must organize reflection days on wood energy taxation system.
- PREDAS must ensure implementation of a capacity building programme notably focused on :
  - trainers training,
  - organization of study trips for stakeholders,
  - creation of farmers training centres.
- Strengthening the means of the national technical teams.
- The CILSS member countries technical teams must better optimise the available means in order to assume the roles assigned to them.
- PREDAS must enable the member countries to test the relevance of the two inventory methods retained by this workshop.
- PREDAS must continue to initiate other electronic fora.

## IV. VOTE OF THANKS AND CLOSING SPEECH

### VOTE OF THANKS N°1

The participants to the regional workshop on the capitalisation of the Sahelian experience in natural forest management for energy-wood production, held from 27<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> April 2004 at the AGRHRYMET Centre of Niamey (Niger) thank the authorities of the Republic of Niger and through them the Ministry in charge of Environment and Desertification Control, the Natural Forest Management Project of the Directorate of Environment, the populations of the village of Bango, for their warm reception, their constant availability as well as all the facilities extended to them during their stay.

FOR THE REGIONAL WORKSHOP

The participants

### VOTE OF THANKS N°2

The participants to the regional workshop on the capitalisation of the Sahelian experience in natural forest management for energy-wood production, held in from 27<sup>th</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> April 2004 at the AGRHRYMET Centre of Niamey (Niger) thank the CILSS as well as the donors of PREDAS and the PAFN (EU, GTZ, ADB) for having permitted the organisation of this important workshop. Besides, they commend and encourage the PREDAS officials for their effort in the quest of the coherence of policies and strategies in the field of household energies in the Sahel.

FOR THE REGIONAL WORKSHOP

The participants

**Closing speech delivered by  
Mr Ouseïni Salifou,  
Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of  
Hydraulics, Environment and Desertification  
control of Niger.**

Honourable representative of the European Union,  
Honourable Director General of Agrhymet, representing the CILSS executive secretary,  
Honourable representative of GTZ,  
Ladies and gentlemen,  
Dear participants,

We are now at the end of the regional workshop on the capitalisation of the sahelian experience in natural forest management for energy-wood production.

For four days, and in accordance with the objectives of the workshop, you conducted large and fruitful exchanges on your respective experiences in the area of participatory management of forest resources in the sahel sub region.

These exchanges covered important and varied topics including: the types of participatory forest management developed in our respective countries, the legal and land statutes of markets and developed zones, the elaboration of simplified village forests management plans, the consideration of decentralisation and local governance, institutional aspects to name but a few.

Dear participants,

These exchanges and discussions allowed you to share once again the rich and long experiences of our various countries in the field of village forests management as a tool for the sustainable management of forest resources, poverty control and local development.

From your deliberations, it also emerges that important progress was made here and there in this domain; however, additional efforts should be made on aspects relating to forest inventories methods, legal statutes of developed spaces and, organisation of rural producers and the evaluation of development costs.

Thus, as one would expect, considering the commitment of each of you, your deliberations were sanctioned by a number of recommendations including the two that I will quote. These are:

- Recommendation relating to the execution of surveys on forests management:
- Recommendation relating to the actors' capacity building, namely in the area of training and dissemination of the information.

I hope that the CILSS through the PREDAS will provide the necessary support to be up to these expectations.

Before I conclude my speech, I would like to reiterate once again on behalf of the government, our sincere thanks to CILSS for this commendable initiative of gathering the experts of member countries on such an important topic of natural forest management.

Our thanks also go to the European Union, the German Technical Cooperation and the African Development Bank for their sustained support in favour of the sustainable development and management of forest resources in favour of sahelian populations.

On this note, while wishing a safe journey back in your respective countries, I declare closed the deliberations of the regional workshop on the capitalisation of the sahelian experience in natural forest management for energy-wood production.

Thank you for your kind attention.



<b>NAME</b>	<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>ORGANISATION</b>	<b>CONTACT</b>
<i>Pakode Issa</i>	<i>BURKINA FASO</i>	<i>Direction de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie / Centre Ouest / Directeur Régional</i>	<i>Tél. : +226 50 44 07 72 e-mail : issapacode@yahoo.fr</i>
<i>Kaboré Sibiri</i>	<i>BURKINA FASO</i>	<i>Direction de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie / Centre Nord / Directeur Régional</i>	<i>Tél. : +226 40 45 32 34</i>
<i>Guissé Dramane</i>	<i>BURKINA FASO</i>	<i>UC- RPTES / Chef Service Technique</i>	<i>Tél. : +226 50 31 28 51/55 e-mail : rptes@fasonet.bf</i>
<i>Rouamba Tenga</i>	<i>BURKINA FASO</i>	<i>Direction des Aménagements Forestiers</i>	<i>Tél. +226 50 35 74 58 e-mail : rouamba_tenga@yahoo.fr</i>
<i>Elhadji Mahamane Lawali</i>	<i>BURKINA FASO</i>	<i>CILSS-PREDAS / Coordonnateur Régional du PREDAS</i>	<i>03 BP : 7049 Ouagadougou Tél. : +226 50 37 41 25/26 Fax : +226 50 37 41 32 E-mail : mahamane.lawali@cilss.bf</i>
<i>Assita Heubi-Traoré</i>	<i>BURKINA FASO</i>	<i>CILSS-PREDAS / Secrétaire de Direction</i>	<i>03 BP : 7049 Ouagadougou Tél. : +226 50 37 41 25/26 e-mail : assita.traore@cilss.bf assitat@hotmail.com</i>
<i>Idrissa Barmou</i>	<i>BURKINA FASO</i>	<i>CILSS-PREDAS / Ingénieur en documentation</i>	<i>03 BP : 7049 Ouagadougou Tél. : +226 50 37 41 25/26 Fax : +226 50 37 41 32 e-mail : idrissa.barmou@cilss.bf</i>
<i>Kougbila Ouédraogo</i>	<i>BURKINA FASO</i>	<i>CILSS-PREDAS / comptable-gestionnaire</i>	<i>03 BP : 7049 Ouagadougou Tél. : +226 50 37 41 25/26 Fax : +226 50 37 41 32 e-mail : kougbila.ouedraogo@cilss.bf</i>

<b>NAME</b>	<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>ORGANISATION</b>	<b>CONTACT</b>
<i>Nobila Sorgho</i>	<i>BURKINA FASO</i>	<i>CILSS-SE / Interprète</i>	<i>03 BP : 7049 Ouagadougou Tél. : +226 50 37 41 25/26 Fax : +226 50 37 41 32</i>
<i>Smail Khennas</i>	<i>BURKINA FASO</i>	<i>CILSS-PREDAS / Assistant Technique</i>	<i>03 BP 7049 Ouagadougou Tél. : +226 50 37 41 25/26 e-mail : <a href="mailto:smail.khennas@cilss.bf">smail.khennas@cilss.bf</a></i>
<i>Hamadi Konandji</i>	<i>BURKINA FASO</i>	<i>CILSS-PREDAS / Expert Energie Domestique</i>	<i>03 BP 7049 Ouagadougou Tél. : +226 50 37 41 25/26 e-mail : <a href="mailto:hamadi.konandji@cilss.bf">hamadi.konandji@cilss.bf</a> ko-nandz@yahoo.fr</i>
<i>Kaboré Cyrille</i>	<i>BURKINA FASO</i>	<i>MECV / Ingénieur des Eaux et Forêts</i>	<i>09 BP 226 Ouagadougou Tél. : +226 50 36 46 63 e-mail : <a href="mailto:cyrillekabore@yahoo.fr">cyrillekabore@yahoo.fr</a></i>
<i>Ouédraogo Kimsé</i>	<i>BURKINA FASO</i>	<i>DGE - MECV / Consultant national</i>	<i>BP 1607 Ouagadougou Tél. : +226 50 32 40 80 Cel. : +226 70 25 33 14</i>
<i>Jorez Jean philippe</i>	<i>BURKINA FASO</i>	<i>Consultant COWI au GF/RPTES CTP du projet MECV/GTZ " Gestion forestière Intégré de GONSE "</i>	<i>Tél. : +226 76 62 46 00 e-mail : <a href="mailto:gf.rptes@cowi.bf">gf.rptes@cowi.bf</a> <a href="mailto:projet.gonse@lptinfor.bf">projet.gonse@lptinfor.bf</a></i>
<i>Gérard Madon</i>	<i>FRANCE</i>	<i>MARGE-ECO-CIRAD / Coordinateur Assis-tance Technique Internationale au PREDAS</i>	<i>46240 Labastide-Murat Franc Tél. : (33) 5 65 31 15 00 e-mail : <a href="mailto:gmadon@marge.fr">gmadon@marge.fr</a></i>
<i>Pierre Montagne</i>	<i>FRANCE</i>	<i>Département forêts CIRAD / AT PAFN Niger</i>	<i>e-mail : <a href="mailto:pierre.montagne@cirad.fr">pierre.montagne@cirad.fr</a></i>
<i>Kanimang Camara</i>	<i>GAMBIE</i>	<i>Head of Naco</i>	<i>Tél. : +220 20 12 03 Cel. : +220 99 02 140 e-mail : <a href="mailto:mad@gamtel.gm">mad@gamtel.gm</a></i>

<b>NAME</b>	<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>ORGANISATION</b>	<b>CONTACT</b>
<i>Almami Dampha</i>	<i>GAMBIE</i>	<i>Head of Participatory Forest Management Unit</i>	<i>Tél. : +220 422 75 37 / 422 73 07 Dom. : +220 437 08 89 e-mail : dampha2004@yahoo.com</i>
<i>Barreto Dionisio</i>	<i>GUINEE BISSAU</i>	<i>Direction Générale / des Forêts et Chasse</i>	<i>Tél. +245 22 30 43 e-mail : dionisiobareto@yahoo.com</i>
<i>Amadou Diallo</i>	<i>MALI</i>	<i>AMADER / Chef service Gestion durable des ressources en bois-énergie</i>	<i>BP : 715 Bamako Tél. : (+223) 223 82 39 e-mail : amadje2001@yahoo.fr</i>
<i>Abdoul Madjidji Sanogo</i>	<i>MALI</i>	<i>Direction Nationale de la conservation de la Nature / Ingénieur des Eaux et Forêts - ETN PREDAS</i>	<i>Tél. : (+223) 223 36 96 / 97 Fax : (+223) 223 36 96 Cel. : (+223) 637 67 62 e-mail : conservationnature@DATATECH.net.ml</i>
<i>Malick Ladji Sylla</i>	<i>MALI</i>	<i>IPR de Katibougou / Ingénieur Forestier - Consultant Agrée</i>	<i>Tél. : +223 226 22 58 Cel. : +223 678 12 14 / 601 72 22 e-mail : malicksylla@nomade.fr</i>
<i>Mohamed Elhacen Ould Khouna</i>	<i>MAURITANIE</i>	<i>MDRE-DEAR / Animateur National PREDAS</i>	<i>BP : 170 Nouakchott Tél. : +222 632 81 21 / 680 17 28 529 25 57 / 529 32 38 e-mail : predasrim@yahoo.fr</i>
<i>Moussa Abdou</i>	<i>NIGER</i>	<i>Ministère de la Justice / Directeur des études et de la programmation</i>	<i>BP : 466 Niamey Tél. : +227 72 39 69 Cel. : +227 87 06 32</i>
<i>Touraoua Y. Ibrahim</i>	<i>NIGER</i>	<i>Direction Production Animale / Chef de division développement Pastoral</i>	<i>BP : 12091 Niamey Tél. : +227 73 31 84 Cel. : +227 99 04 11</i>

NAME	COUNTRY	ORGANISATION	CONTACT
<i>Garba Hamissou</i>	NIGER	<i>Cellule d'appui à la mise en place et au suivi des marchés ruraux</i>	<i>BP : 12860 Niamey Tél. : +227 73 33 29 e-mail : Direnv@intnet.net</i>
<i>Ibro Adamou</i>	NIGER	<i>Direction de l'Environnement, Chef de division des peuplements naturels et gestion de terroirs</i>	<i>BP : 578, Niamey Tél. : +227 73 33 29 Cel. : +227 96 59 10</i>
<i>Bachard Aboubachar</i>	NIGER	<i>Point Focal - PREDAS</i>	<i>BP : 11700 Niamey Tél. : +227 73 91 90 e-mail : bachard_ab@yahoo.fr</i>
<i>Boubacar Nalabo</i>	NIGER	<i>MME / DN ETN - PREDAS</i>	<i>BP : 11700 Niamey</i>
<i>Alhou Bassirou</i>	NIGER	<i>DEP/MHE/LCD/Programmation</i>	<i>Tél. : +227 96 14 22 e-mail : alhou-bassirou@Fundp.ac.be</i>
<i>Amadou Oumarou Sabo</i>	NIGER	<i>C/S Environnement Madarounfa</i>	<i>Tél. : +227 410 427 e-mail : sabo_a2000@yahoo.fr</i>
<i>Maman Ibrahim</i>	NIGER	<i>Division Protection de la Nature</i>	<i>BP : 578 Niamey Tél. : +227 73 33 29 Cel. : +227 92 31 33</i>
<i>Maman Sani Abdou</i>	NIGER	<i>PAFN / Comptable</i>	<i>BP : 12677 Niamey Tél. : +227 72 37 53 Cel. : +227 97 51 45 e-mail mamansaniabdou@yahoo.fr</i>
<i>Mai Moussa Katiella Abdou</i>	NIGER	<i>PNUD / GEF / SGP</i>	<i>BP : 13413 Niamey Tél. : +227 75 41 81 e-mail : Katiella.mai.moussa@undp.org</i>

NAME	COUNTRY	ORGANISATION	CONTACT
<i>Magagi Ibrahim</i>	NIGER	SP / CONACILSS	Tél. : +227 73 25 70
<i>Eh Mahamane Abdou</i>	NIGER	CNPPF	Tél. : +227 73 23 52
<i>Oumarou Boubacar</i>	NIGER	PAFN / Reprographe	Tél. : +227 72 37 53
<i>Maman Mahaman Rabiou</i>	NIGER Tél. : +227 92 61 34	GTA / CR : Coordonnateur IF	BP : 12860 Niamey e-mail : <a href="mailto:gtacr@yahoo.fr">gtacr@yahoo.fr</a>
<i>Mamadou Mamane</i>	NIGER	Direction de l'Environnement	BP : 10416 Niamey Tél. : +227 96 38 61
<i>Reiland Rol</i>	NIGER	Délégation de la Commission Européenne	BP : 10388 Niamey Tél. : +227 73 23 60 Cel. : +227 96 60 72 e-mail : <a href="mailto:rol.reiland@cec.eu.int">rol.reiland@cec.eu.int</a>
<i>Hamadou Mamoudou</i>	NIGER	Directeur PAFN	BP : 12677 Niamey Tél. : +227 72 37 53/63 Fax : +227 72 37 55 e-mail : <a href="mailto:pafn@intnet.ne">pafn@intnet.ne</a>
<i>Guy Roulette</i>	NIGER	CT / PAFN / AT-CIRAD-FORET	BP : 577 Niamey - 8001 - Niger e-mail : <a href="mailto:roulette@intnet.ne">roulette@intnet.ne</a>
<i>Zada Hamani</i>	NIGER	DER / LCD / T	Tél. : +227 71 12 11

NAME	COUNTRY	ORGANISATION	CONTACT
<i>Elhadji Zakaria Ibrahim Ousseini</i>	NIGER	<i>PAFN / Ingénieur en foresterie et gestion de l'environnement</i>	<i>BP : 145 Niamey Tél. : +227 72 50 10 Cel. : +227 88 03 64 e-mail : zack_ostar@yahoo.com</i>
<i>Elhadji Saley Gambo</i>	NIGER	<i>PAFN / Expert en aménagement forestier</i>	<i>BP : 12677 Niamey Tél. : +227 72 37 53 Cel. : +227 98 24 61</i>
<i>Aboubacar Ichaou</i>	NIGER	<i>INRAN / PAFN / Coordonnateur Volet recherche d'accompagnement</i>	<i>BP : 11416 Niamey Tél. : +227 92 73 89 e-mail : ichaoua@yahoo.fr</i>
<i>Bertrand Alain</i>	NIGER	<i>Département forêts - CIRAD / Socio-économiste forestier / AT PAFN Niger</i>	<i>e-mail : alain.bertrand@cirad.fr</i>
<i>Mahaman Laminou Attaou</i>	NIGER	<i>Directeur de l'Environnement</i>	<i>BP : 578 Niamey Tél. : +227 73 33 29 e-mail : direnv@intnet.ne</i>
<i>Jean Ludovic Diasso</i>	NIGER	<i>Centre AGRHYMET / Interprète</i>	<i>Tél. : +227 73 31 16 e-mail : j.diasso@agrhytmet.ne</i>
<i>Ibrhima Ndiaye</i>	SENEGAL	<i>DEFCCS / DAPF</i>	<i>BP : 1831 Tél. : +221 831 01 01 e-mail : ibasndiaye@yahoo.fr</i>
<i>Mamadou Lamine Bodian</i>	SENEGAL	<i>PERACOD / Ingénieur forestier</i>	<i>Tél. : +221 832 64 71 / 546 52 10 / 941 52 93 e-mail : mlbodian@yahoo.fr</i>
<i>Babakar Matar Bremé</i>	TCHAD	<i>AEDE</i>	<i>Tél. : +235 52 52 34 Cel. : +235 28 18 50</i>

## **ORGANIZERS**

Programme Régional de promotion des Energies Domestiques et Alternatives au Sahel (PREDAS)  
du Secrétariat Exécutif du Comité permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte contre la Sécheresse dans  
Sahel (CILSS)

BP 03 7049 Ouagadougou 03 - Burkina Faso

Téléphone : (226) 50 37 41 25 / 26

Télécopie : (226) 50 37 41 32

Email : [predas@cilss.bf](mailto:predas@cilss.bf)

Site web : [www.cilss.bf/predas](http://www.cilss.bf/predas)

et

Projet d'Aménagement des Forêts Naturelles de la Direction de l'environnement du Ministère de  
l'Hydraulique, de l'Environnement et de la lutte contre la Désertification

BP 578 Niamey - Niger

Téléphone : (227) 72 37 53 / 63 - 73 33 29

Télécopie : (227) 72 37 55

Email : [direnv@intnet.ne](mailto:direnv@intnet.ne) ou [pafn@intnet.ne](mailto:pafn@intnet.ne)