1. Background, Objective of the paper

As a follow up of the FSSP, Result Area 8, this WS is organized by ICD/QPD/FDD with financial and active support of SDC, the Dutch Embassy and GTZ and the involvement of individuals from major projects in the sector. The WS provides a basis for donors currently involved in project design (i.e. esp. SDC and Dutch) to allocate their resources.

This paper is a "paper from a donor perspective" focusing on the last of the three objectives of the WS, i.e. on "developing and defining working mechanisms (and roles) for forestry training and extension support". "Working mechanisms" would include alternative options/ideas for linking Government structures and actors in the forestry training and education sector (central and provincial level) with donor initiatives. At the same time the interrelation of forestry training and extension are kept in mind.

2. Summary of Status Quo of forestry training and extension

A more detailed analysis of the 'status quo' is presented in the WS paper No. 1 however, some main issues in the forestry sector with regard to training and extension may be highlighted as follows:

- The forestry situation is changing from a focus on forest exploitation to forest renovation (afforestation, natural regeneration) in the 90s, to forest management at a variety of scales and for a variety of purposes – often even within the same geographical area
- Forest ownership is diversifying from pure state forest to communal and individual forest ownership, as well as private enterprises (SME's)
- Technical packages for forest management exist only in rudimentary form for the new range of stakeholders
- Organisational adaptations in the provision of "forestry extension" (defined as forestry-related guidance and consultation service) are currently being defined and tested
- Requirements as well as implementation measures in the forestry sector are diversified in different provinces – a diversity that is clearly an asset, not a disadvantage.

3. Future (10 yr) vision of forestry training and extension demand

When looking at the future of the forestry sector, three main developments can be summarized:

- Diversity of demand: Forestry training and extension have to serve a geographically diversified demand, as well as demand from a range of stakeholders (commercial forestry, state forestry/community/private forest owners, conservation/protection agencies, industrial sector)
- Expanded "grass-root level" personnel requirements: Decentralization of responsibilities in combination with diversification of stakeholders in forestry will require more and better-trained personnel at commune level
- Limited overall personnel capacities: The overall number of personnel in the forest sector is likely to decrease with ongoing public administration reform (PAR) requirements. Agencies are likely to have to combine duties and responsibilities to increase service delivery efficiency – especially at the lower levels.

With these two factors in mind, it is again important to define the demand for services by forest owners (see Box 1). Based on a demand from forest owners, the future forestry extension structure at field level could cover the following tasks and combinations of tasks:

a. combining forest protection (state management function) and forest extension
b. combining agriculture and forestry extension
c. linking extension with forest product processing
d. linking extension to industrial production/processing (out-grower schemes)
e. a combination of all of the above – especially where the forest estate is very mixed i.e. encompassing households/groups of
households/villages/commune which may have a range of forest land types under allocation/contract. Forest management may be combined with local NTFP/timber processing. Forest land management could include e.g. fodder production for livestock.

In addition to the above combinations, tasks for field level staff could change seasonally (i) between agriculture and forestry (e.g. agriculture in summer, forest management in winter) or (ii) between extension and teaching at Vocational level Schools (e.g. as in German extension system) or (iii) through part-time employment in seasonal contracts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 1: What kind of &quot;forestry-related guidance and consulting service&quot; (forestry extension) do forest owners need?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What is the legal situation? What are my rights and obligations (e.g. regarding forest protection)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are the technical options for forest renovation? How can we define, or else test and develop them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are the technical options for forest management? How can we define, or else test and develop them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are financially viable marketing and processing options?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How can forest management be integrated efficiently into a farm household system?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Current gaps in forestry training and extension that need to be addressed within the next 10 years

When comparing the current situation in the forestry sector with the situation anticipated for the future, some gaps obviously need to be addressed. In order to meet changing demand, forestry extension (forestry related guidance and consulting service for forest owners) needs to perform different and additional tasks from the ones they are familiar with at the moment.

Likewise forestry training institutions have to anticipate preparing their students (i.e. future forestry extensionists or teachers of forest extensionists) for a substantial part of the above demand and the potential combinations of tasks within a range of job opportunities.

By focusing on training of "forestry extensionists" at field level and in the district and provincial administration, some main gaps can be identified. Issues that need to be addressed by the training system for "Forestry extensionists" and foresters in the administration are:

- Basic improvement in technical training and management: Differentiation of technical issues particularly with regard to effective/efficient forest management with a wider range of stakeholders
- Use of participatory methods in working with smallholders and communities for development of organisational and technical options
- Understanding the needs of commercial forestry (e.g. cost efficiency (CBR) of investment options), including input (e.g. credit access) and output options
- Applying "participatory" M&E systems (e.g. large scale M&E of forest sector development at Province/District levels, micro-M&E on stand quality in communal forest protection areas)

Furthermore, a structured approach to training both for current staff (further training, on-the-job training, exposure to alternative options) and for new job entrants (future forestry staff) is currently lacking.

5. Potential coordination mechanisms within the forestry training and extension sector and potential donor contribution

Looking at the forestry training and extension sector in different countries, a number of coordination mechanisms are in place. Especially in times of substantial changes, these coordination mechanisms are important. Analyzing existing commonly used exchange and coordination mechanisms assists in defining more clearly those mechanisms that are now most urgently needed in Vietnam. Need for change is the basis for defining potential donor involvement. The involvement of many actors will require coordination of the activities.

5.1 Theoretical need for interaction/coordination within forestry training and extension

The main actors in the forestry training and extension sector may be categorized into 5 groups: (A) the farmers and forest owners define the demand for services, the (B) "forestry extension" supplies these services. At the same time "forestry extension" are formulating the demand for the (C) Vocational Schools which are training the required personnel. These schools in turn define the demand for (D) the teacher training institutions involved in trainer qualification and (E) the state management/regulatory institutions.

Diagram 1 gives an overview of the 5 groups of actors and the main interfaces between them.

In addition to the links and interfaces between the actors Diagram 1 also shows the coordination needs among actors. Thus, seven different interactions are outlined as follows:

1. between farmers/forest owners (A) and "forestry extensionists/service providers" (B)
2. among "forestry extension" services (B)
3. between "forestry extension services" (B) and the institutions training their staff (C)
4. among the institutions training the forestry extension staff (C)
5. between the institutions training the forestry extension staff (C) and those teaching their trainers (D)
6. Among the institutions teaching the trainers (D)
7. Between state regulatory institutions (E) and the different actors in the forestry training and extension system (7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6)

Diagram 1: Potential cooperation mechanisms within the Forestry Training and Extension Sector
Three kinds of interactions can be differentiated:

i. Demand-supply interactions (1,3,5)
ii. Same-level actors interaction (2,4,6)
iii. State management/regulatory interaction and intervention (7)

Typical objectives and tools of these three kinds of interactions can be defined as follows:

Ad (i) Demand-supply interactions (1), (3), (5)

- **Objectives:** identify “customer compliance”, find out and anticipate changes in demand and determine needs for changes in supply, i.e. the provided service
- **Potential tools used:** reviews, surveys, opinion polls, direct feedback from users on the ground; meetings of representatives, coached internships, trainings
- **Typical questions:** (1) How does “forestry extension” need to change to meet the demand from farmers? (3) How does vocational training need to change to meet the demand from “forestry extension”? (5) How does teacher qualification have to change to meet the demand from vocational training institutions?

Ad (ii) Same-level actors interaction (2,4,6)

- **Objectives:** Exchange experience, define common needs and share tasks in meeting those needs.
- **Potential tools:** information exchange (newsletter, website), teacher exchange, information meetings, working taskforces with common workplans; mechanisms for joint studies and working arrangements.
- **Typical questions:** What are the most urgent problems in your work? Where have you concluded/started good solutions? How can we share the remaining tasks?

Ad (iii) State management/regulatory interaction and intervention (7)

- **Objectives:** Assure that services are transparent and comparable for the different customers, facilitate effective allocation of Government resources (avoiding duplication and gaps), facilitate efficient budget allocation into most urgent tasks
- **Potential tools:** Set/revise/update minimum standards (e.g. for training contents and teacher qualification, i.e. accreditation, certification, framework curriculum), facilitate information exchange mechanisms, define and assign budget lines, evaluate reviews/surveys/opinion polls
- **Typical questions:** What steps are necessary to ensure having sufficiently trained personnel? Are graduates from all same-level institutions comparably qualified for their jobs? Can all graduates apply the training contents in their job environment?

Some of the seven categorized exchange mechanisms are currently existing in the Vietnamese forestry training and extension sector. Some are supported by donors on aggregated or pilot level.

Integration of exchange mechanisms: Different interaction needs may be integrated into one common exchange mechanism. A very interesting approach for integrating several exchange mechanisms in an official setting is the Multilevel Extension Approach (MEA) practiced in Chile (see Box 2).
Timing and formality of exchange mechanisms may differ: It is important to note that these mechanisms can be temporary (for initiating and managing change) or may be expected to become ongoing activities. Exchange mechanisms can be both informal or on a formalized level with a regulatory mandate (see also Diagram 2).

Diagram 2: Potential degree of formality in interaction mechanisms

Source: Pierre-Yves Suter, SFSP

5.2 Potential donor interventions and project types related to forestry training and extension

This chapter provides a short simplified summary to those not familiar with different project types. It is not to become subject of discussion!

A need for changes and interventions by different actors in the forestry training and extension sector has led to a number of donor activities. What potential contributions can donors make in the area of forestry training and extension particularly with regard to transfer/coordination mechanisms? In order to reflect on this question, in this chapter four different project types are stylized as four basic intervention options. They are then added into the overview presented in Diagram 1.

a. Projects which support national level decision makers (MARD: OPD, FDD, FPD, DAFE; MOET/MOLISA ...)
b. Projects providing area-based support to field level implementation in one or few provinces (together with PPC/DPC, Provincial Vocational Schools, Provincial FDD, FPD,...)
c. Projects providing institution-based support to field level implementation of one or few institutions in several provinces (i.e. linking all forest training issues in Universities, operating within FDD/FPD or within DAFE)
d. Projects providing a mix of services (a) and (b) or (a) and (c)

All four project types can currently be found in the forestry sector and are – to various extent – covering forestry training and extension issues. Each of these project types can contribute very distinctive elements to the forestry extension and training sector.

A discussion of strong points and shortcomings of each project type in Annex 1 is used to highlight the potential contributions, it does not attempt to provide an all-inclusive picture.

Conclusion: In view of the diversity of demand in the forestry training and extension sector, a pluralistic approach is likely to be a suitable means for finding viable solutions. Different project types can suitably assist in parts of the tasks ahead (Diagram 3). In addition to the horizontal and vertical institutional gaps depicted in Diagram 3, there area also geographical gaps in meeting the needs of the forestry training and extension sector.

Diagram 3: Current donor contributions (selected) within the Forestry Training and Extension Sector

Source: Elke Föerster, SFDP

Box 2: Multilevel Extension Approach (MEA) in Chilean Forestry Sector

Objectives:
1. introduce the philosophy of participatory extension work into an administrative system and to
2. assure through it, the implementation of forestry activities on grass root level

Instruments:
- Extension Training Modules for decision-makers (planning level)
- Extension Training Modules for extension team leaders (grass root level)
- Strategic Extension Workshops for national levels (national planning level)

Assessment:
Multilevel Extension Approach assured a “natural” institutionalisation of extension, with a true commitment on both implementation and decision-maker levels. It is a successful approach, if the required flexible environment is available.

Source: Laslo Pancel, CTA GTZ/REFAS (adapted)
5.3 Exchange and coordination mechanisms under the FSSP (R8)

The coordination mechanisms to be developed under the FSSP (R8) depend on the existing coordination mechanisms and the perceived need for intervention and further coordination. Out of the many segregated and aggregated ("MEA" see Box 2) options discussed above, **three potential options** are outlined as a basis for discussion in the workshop, and for review and amendment only:

**Option 1: Forestry training market (Pierre-Yves)**

A light coordination forum between projects involved in the forestry training and extension sector

**Mandate / Objective:** Share (and update) information on best practices so that all actors know what best practices are already available. Share (and update) training requests so that all training suppliers can propose their support.

**Duration:** One year. Process should then shift towards a more structured coordination mechanism.

**Participants:** All projects involved in extension and/or training who are willing to collaborate on a voluntary basis.

**Meeting frequency / exchange mechanisms:** No formal (or very few) meeting to be organised. Information should only be circulated. Communication through e-mail. Later on, training proposals and training requests could be centralized on a (FSSP ???) web-site or newsletter, accessible to all concerned partners. Once the "training seeker" has identified a "training provider", direct contact should go on without additional coordination.

**Financial support requirement:** Very limited (only for circulating information).

**Option 2: Experience and documentation exchange forum for forestry training and extension sector agents (Sheelagh)**

Set up a sub-taskforce under the proposed Technical Executive Committee. This could initially be an ad-hoc group, but could be solidified if found to work. It may be set up from the current WS with a basic idea of developing the coordination mechanisms, a workplan (including commissioning a short study on this specific topic from a small group of people).

**Mandate/Objective:** Primarily to bring together stakeholders working in this area and provide a forum for sharing of experiences and documentation.

**Expected Output:** Work towards the production of FSSP 'best practices', training guideline/process development etc. Not in a rigid sense but as part of a 'developing document'

**Duration:** 1 year, then reassessed to look at effectiveness and ongoing suitability.

**Participants:** Representatives from donors, relevant agencies and provinces. In the spirit of FSSP not all donors and not all agencies should be represented as this becomes unwieldy. What is required are a few key people with results/minutes widely circulated and commented upon.

**Exchange mechanisms:** meetings, best-practice library, common workplan, results/minutes for circulation, website

**Meeting frequency:** 1 time/quarter ?? (to be discussed)
Financial support requirements: from 10-250 Thsd. USD/p.a.. Amount depends on province representation, workplan (e.g. how much work is put into synthesising documentation to produce for the 'Forest Manual'), and on activities under other FSSP results.

Option 3: Support Vocational Training Network for forestry training and extension (Elke)

Setting up of a network of all forestry related teachers/sections within the Vocational training system (Vocational Schools and Vocational technical schools). Initially an ad-hoc group (interaction mechanism 4), it could later be solidified into a network with clear mandates. (See also experience GTZ: China on Vocational Training Network, and SFSP: VN on University Network).

Mandate/Objective: Same-level exchange. Bring together vocational schools and vocational technical schools (C) working in forestry and provide a forum for sharing of experiences and documentation.

Expected Output: Work towards improvement of training material and training, methodology, based on field implementation experience and demand

Duration: 2-3 years, reassessment and formalization/resolution after year 2.

Participants: (Representatives) teachers from Vocational Schools, (temporary) resource persons for defined tasks

Exchange mechanisms: meetings, common workplan, results/minutes for circulation, best-practice library, newsletter, website, coached internships, ...

Meeting frequency: 2 times/year ?? (to be discussed)

Financial support requirements: from 50 Thsd. USD/p.a.. Amount depends on meeting frequency, workplan (surveys conducted, materials elaborated, materials standardized and disseminated …)

6. Summarizing questions for the WS discussion

Is there a need for a rationalization of the forestry training and extension beyond the existing VN government structures to avoid excessive bureaucracy and overlapped misused opportunities?

If yes, how should this coordination mechanism look like now? What should it cover? What should be its future contribution to training management mechanisms?

Annex 1: Discussion of selected examples of different project types in the Forestry training and extension sector.

The analysis is used for defining potential contributions to coordination mechanisms.

ad (a): Support (mainly) to national level decision makers

Example: REFAS, PROFOR

Strong Points (<+offer) with regard to forest training and extension:

- (Could) add conceptual approaches (e.g. from other countries, or other sectors) to the discussion of decision makers
- (Could) contribute to using experience from ongoing province-based work for review and refinement of approaches
- (Could) get involved in scaling up provincial/district/institutional developments
- (Could) assist in learning from area/institutional based projects and putting this into the GOVN strategy.

Potential weaknesses with regard to forest training and extension:

- Can be biased towards a single institutional stakeholder i.e. MARD
- Strong donor orientation
- Linkages to field level developments often too shallow

ad (b): Support (mainly) to field level implementation

Example: multi-sector (rural development) projects in 1-5 provinces, e.g. EU-SL&LC, ADB-For., SFDP, ...

Strong Points (<+offer) with regard to forest training and extension:

- implementation ideas for forestry extension developed and tested in the field
- forest training materials developed as consecutive training modules and tested long-term
- trainer training mechanisms established to facilitate dissemination (in longer-duration projects)

Potential weaknesses with regard to forest training and extension:

- developed forest extension approaches cannot be transferred into existing structures at end of project without central level support
- well developed forest training approaches and materials developed with lots of time input but not further disseminated (duplication of efforts in different locations)
- forestry issues have no standardized certified qualification
- often failure to build capacity within existing institutions mandated to provide training (instead self-serving, ad-hoc approach within most projects)
- applicability of training/extension in limited area and often within project specific context (administration and financing standards)
- transfer mechanism not inherent part of project structures, therefore national review/exchange/coordination mechanism needed
- requires structured and coached process of adaptation that needs to be supported (national or international funds)

ad (c): Institution-based support for forestry training to a number of institutions

Example: SFSP (working with 5 universities, one research center and one provincial extension center)

Strong Points (<+offer) with regard to forestry training and extension:
Developing methodological approaches parallel in several similar institutions increases refinement speed and dissemination
- Possibility of networking, useful for sharing experiences and fine tuning approaches
- Possibility to work simultaneously in different AEZ
- Wider impact across the country
- Greater flexibility and possibility of developing synergies

Weaknesses with regard to forest training and extension:
- Field implementation capacities limited due to the limited time availability of university staff
- Different ministries involved (MARD and MOET)
- Strong need for coordination
- Transfer mechanisms and dissemination depend of the willingness and availability of other partners (mainly extension institutions)

ad (d) Central level policy support/institutional capacity building/ together with pilot application (mix a and b)

Example: MRDP

Strong Points(→offer) with regard to forestry training and extension:
- (Could) integrate field experience and central level (policy) making
- Lessons learned can be more easily institutionalized as they have been created by and within the system
- Existing norms can be adapted more realistically to existing realities

Weaknesses with regard to forest training and extension:
- High complexity leads to spreading project capacities too thinly
- Lack of transparency (into details and invisible linkages)