



Pro-poor Rewards for Environmental Services in Africa (PRESA)



Final Stakeholder's workshop on PRESA Project- Completion: stakeholder consultation

By Judith Nzyoka

March 23rd, 2012
Nairobi, Kenya

Table of Contents

List of acronyms and abbreviations.....	3
1. Background and workshop objectives.....	4
2. Opening session and welcoming address.....	4
3. Presentation during the workshop.....	5
<i>Presentation: Pro-poor Rewards for Ecosystems Services in Africa: project approaches and achievements by Dr Sara Namirembe</i>	5
4. Group discussions and plenary work.....	7
5. Conclusions.....	11
6. Annexes.....	11
I. Workshop program and agenda.....	11
II. List of participants.....	13

List of acronyms and abbreviations

BESSA	Building Ecosystem Services Capacity for semi-Arid Africa
DriLUC	Drivers of Land Use Change
ECOTRUST	Environmental Conservation Trust
ES	Ecosystem Services
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
MOU	Memorandum of understanding
NAHI	Nature Harness Initiative
NCWSC	Nairobi City Water and Sewerage Company
NEMA	National Environmental Authority
NGO	Non-Governmental Organizations
PES	Payments for Environmental Services
PRESA	Pro-poor Rewards for Environmental Services in Africa
RES	Rewards for Environmental Services
SCMP	Sub-catchment Management Plan
WOCAT	World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies
WRMA	Water Resources Management Authority
WRUA	Water Resource Users Association
WSTF	Water Service Trust Fund
WWF	World Wide Fund

1. Background and workshop objectives

PRESA - Pro poor Rewards for Environmental Services in Africa - aims at improving the livelihoods of smallholders living in the highlands of Eastern and Western Africa by enhancing fair and effective environmental service rewards. Its activities were designed in the form of action research and practical experience to directly influence and engage key stakeholders in active learning on payments or rewards for environmental services. The approach has been aimed at catalyzing policy support and private sector participation in environmental service agreements.

PRESA began in 2008 and has been implemented in collaboration with national partners, research institutions, universities and non-governmental organizations in four countries, namely: Guinea, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. Through these links, PRESA generated and shared evidence to support payments for ecosystem services (PES) in Africa and beyond. This has been done by building a community of practice across Africa to share lessons, tools and experience, advice local stakeholders and provide training.

A Final stakeholder's workshop was held to provide feedback on the innovative features and success factors of the project, lessons learnt on project design and implementation and the project likelihood of sustainability.

The objectives of the one-day workshop on March 23, 2012 were:

- i) To reflect on PRESA approaches and achievements during the IFAD funding cycle of 2008 – 2011
- ii) To get feedback from stakeholders on efficiency and effectiveness of project strategies and approaches
- iii) To identify areas for improving approaches and emerging focus areas
- iv) To identify mechanisms for achieving sustainability of actions

The workshop was organized by PRESA ICRAF.

2. Opening session and welcoming address

The workshop was opened by Dr. Oluyede Ajayi and Dr. Sara Namirembe from the World Agroforestry Centre.

Dr Namirembe reported that, PRESA began in 2008 and has been implemented in collaboration with national partners, research institutions, universities and non-governmental organizations in four countries, namely: Guinea, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. A final stakeholder's workshop had to take place as required by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), at the end of the funding cycle of PRESA's work. Though the IFAD funding ended on 31st December 2011, that did not signify the end of PRESA but rather its work will still continue in collaboration with other partners. She urged participants to reflect on what the project started to do, what should have been done better and

thanked everyone for accepting the invitation to the consultative workshop which aimed at trying to make things better for future works.

Dr Ajayi gave the opening address by welcoming everyone to the PRESA stakeholder workshop and emphasized on noting that PRESA program was not winding down, rather, the workshop aimed at refining approach at the end of one funding cycle as required by IFAD which is a major funder.

He outlined the aims of the workshop which included:

- i) To reflect on PRESA approaches and achievements during the IFAD funding cycle of 2008 – 2011
- ii) To get feedback from stakeholders on efficiency and effectiveness of project strategies and approaches
- iii) To identify areas for improving approaches and emerging focus areas
- iv) To identify mechanisms for achieving sustainability of actions

Furthermore, he stated that given that all participants had been part of the program in different ways, therefore, only one presentation was to be made and the rest of the day would be spent in form of groups and plenary discussions to inform on future work. The focus included a review of the project in terms of: performance and achievements (efficiency and effectiveness), impact, and scaling up and sustainability. This was to be addressed by looking at:

- ‘What do we know?’
- ‘What have we tried and not proven?’
- ‘What do we don’t know?’

3. Presentation during the workshop

Only one presentation was made by a scientist involved in the PRESA program. Dr Namirembe discussed the Pro-poor Rewards for Ecosystems Services in Africa, the project approaches and achievements. Following the presentation, participants had time to provide feedback on the innovative features and success factors of the project, lessons learnt on project design and implementation and the project likelihood of sustainability.

Presentation: Pro-poor Rewards for Ecosystems Services in Africa: project approaches and achievements by Dr Sara Namirembe

She outlined the PRESA project overview of which the goal of PRESA was to benefit hundreds of thousands of smallholder farmers in the highlands of East and West Africa from fair and effective ecosystem services agreements. The objectives of the project were to *Foster the development, implementation and assessment of environmental service agreements by environmental service agreements that provide fair rewards to ecosystem stewards; Catalyse policy support and private-sector participation in environmental service agreements by involving private companies in ecosystem management and policy dialogue*

with public agencies; and Provide proactive and responsive support to the dissemination and application of tools and information through improved quality and increased number of environmental service reward mechanisms in place.

She continued on further to describe main approaches used in the achievement of the objectives including: Site or landscape level through partnerships for structuring RES on the ground while researching underlying issues; Engagement with policy makers and private sector stakeholders through partnerships and informed by site-level experience and research findings; and Community of practice by sharing of tools and information among RES practitioners and discussion of issues beyond sites.

The **Landscape level actions** included the structuring of RES mechanisms by facilitating negotiation between sellers and buyers and engaging policy makers to support field actions and to inform decision-making, prototype payment mechanisms and biophysical and socio-economic research to establish: baselines; drivers of land use change; attributes of land uses to actual ES delivery; negotiation approaches; trade-offs and payment mechanisms.

The **Policy and private sector engagement** was achieved through the sharing of tools and project findings and experiences through dialogue and meetings, stakeholder workshops and policy briefs; Negotiation for changes to institutional provisions; and Negotiation for investment in RES to recognise ES provision by upland communities.

Community practise approaches involved cation of website, quarterly newsletter, local awareness materials, and research publications, publishing PRESA stories in newspapers and other media and convening workshops and sharing PRESA experiences in other forums.

The various achievements of the project were also outlined in the presentation that included the **site level achievements** through: delineation of landscapes of five sites and identification hotspots; Baseline information was established for all the 7 PRESA sites: Drivers of land degradation identified in the Ulugurus and Fouta Djallon Mountains; Partnerships developed with NGOs, governments, universities and research institutions; Prototype payments established in the Ulugurus and Fouta Djallon sites and about 300 farmers provided with inputs and advisory support on tree planting; Community groups made aware of PES and facilitated to negotiate with potential private sector buyers of ES in six sites; and Partners advocate for development of RES agreements in recognition of ES stewardship

In *Albertine rift* the site level achievements included: secured agreements for more farmers to receive payments for carbon sequestration from trees on their farms under the Trees for Carbon Benefits program, conducting the cost-benefit analysis to assess the impact of RES on households and investigations of rewards through enterprises including ecolabelling of honey and basketry though not yet successful. Additionally, the community group in Rushebeya-Kanyabaha wetland is in negotiation with Kisiizi hydrodam for financing of a catchment management plan.

In *Sasumua*, hydrological modeling was used to relate different land use actions to the actual service delivered, a business case for engaging in RES was developed and presented

to Nairobi Water Company (NCWSC), mobilized WRUAs to engage in RES, developed a multi-stakeholder platform discussions held with WRMA, WSTF, NCWSC, developed a policy brief and a policy position paper that was communicated to Kenya Land Commission discussions.

Policy and private sector engagements were achieved by identifying policy frameworks that hinder RES and dialogue with policy makers in Kenya; informing policy makers of RES potential impact and effectiveness in all the 7 sites; analyzing policy institutional frameworks of Tanzania and Kenya for enabling RES; developing two policy briefs and shared on the importance of boundary organisations and institutional barriers to RES implementation in Kenya; holding consultative stakeholder workshops and developing a policy position paper for the Kenya Land Commission.

The **Community of practice achievements** included a technology targeting tool describing 18 soil and water conservation technologies (WOCAT format) drafted for Mount Kenya East site; tools for RES structuring refined and adapted for Africa through reverse auctions, conjoint analysis, trade-off studies, landscape delineation, hydrological models and DriLUC – (Local Ecological Knowledge, Policy Ecological Knowledge); Website, newsletters and other electronic media used to share findings; PRESA research findings published in reputable journals; Academic theses published on targeted RES studies; PRESA stories published in other media; Findings presented in international forums; and Working relations developed with Katoomba Group

She concluded that the **way forward** was to integrate PES contribution to achieving national development objectives; clarify property rights and benefit-sharing; Enhance participation of RES ‘buyers’ and exploring other financing mechanisms; Link RES to food security and climate change; build capacities through partnerships, information dissemination and advocacy.

4. Group discussions and plenary work

Participants split into 2 groups to discuss various areas of the project including:

1. Identification of a) Innovative features, key success factors and b) Shortcomings and causes
2. Lessons learned on project design and implementation to enhance efficiency; effectiveness; impact at household, landscape, national and regional scales
3. Identification of factors and responsibilities to increase the likelihood of sustainability: site partners, policy makers and private sector business

Group 1 (Question 1): Identification of a) innovative features, key success factors b) shortcomings and causes- presented by Biryahwaho Byamukama

1. Success factors
 - i) Ability to link ecosystem services benefits for business and community to be able to see where their money is going
 - ii) PES has been able to bring out conservation issues and involve the private sector more
 - iii) The program looked at different institutions within the landscape of where PRESA sites were operating
 - iv) The project generalized information to bring out a business case
 - v) It helped to bring livelihood benefits
 - vi) It built capacities of local institutions
 - vii) Helped communities realize new ways and changed their mind-sets on conservation with incentives
2. Negatives
 - i) Site identification where these work has been done wasn't the best e.g. Sasumua. Target would have been Chania River whose watershed is more relevant to private sector.
 - ii) Institutional constraints in communication with the private sector and appreciate this concept
 - iii) The work aimed at engaging the private sector rather than involving the private sector (lacked participatory assessment)
3. Suggestions:
 - a) Balancing between generating PES studies between pilot and action
 - b) Education of environment from a young age
 - c) The private sector doesn't see sense/fringe benefits, therefore the need to disseminate information.
 - d) Sasumua intensification of land cover and threats is higher on the watershed area. Half of the water from the catchments in Kenya is lost and cannot be accounted for because of governance problems stated Gathenya.

Group 2 (Question 1): Identification of a) innovative features, key success factors b) shortcomings and causes- presented by Leah Onyango

What was the criterion to determine success?

- a) Development and assessment of ES agreements (Guinea/medium; Kenya/high; Uganda/medium; Tanzania/high)
 - b) Catalyzing policy support and private sector participation in ES (Kenya/high; Uganda/high/ Guinea/high; Tanzania/high)
 - c) Providing support to disseminate (Uganda/high; Kenya/medium; Guinea/high)
1. *What was set out to be done:* Innovative features of the project (Partnerships)
 - Partnerships have been successful especially in Tanzania through CARE; in Kenya through NWSC and in Uganda through NGOs such as ECOTRUST and NAHI.
 - In Guinea that creating linkages were was not so easy but finally there is a link with the water bottling company and the University Conakry
 - Local institutions and the links are present in all the sites, through farmers groups which were represented in the consultative workshop.
 - Whereas in Nyando, PRESA initiated a very good idea on the stakeholder's forum, though it has not been able to carry it through. It was picked up by partners and implemented but downscaled to restore degraded ecosystems and created a platform that can be used to share information on PES
 - MOU between 100 farmers is still pending for implementation in order to reduce siltation of Sasumua
 - Ministry of Water and Irrigation (Kenya) have participated and included them in their policy. There is

- a water conference where PRESA is invited to deliberate on how PES can be included in the legislation
- The information generated used in training and creation of awareness at all levels eg. community
- The information generated is used
- It is a new way of looking at institutional arrangements and how this contributes to linking science and action thereby, linking knowledge to action
- A study on boundary organizations in natural resource management was conducted in Nyando

2. Where could have be done better

- Transition could be managed differently to ensure a continuous flow in activities
- Policy contribution was limited and advocacy could be enhanced for policy matters. More effort should have been done to encourage different levels of institutions to take the baton and ran with it to convince more policy players including nonscientists `the science is the ammunition for the advocacy guns.
- Expansion of the activities related to PES eg. Eco labling thus increasing the package.

3. What could have been done differently

- Combine both bottom up and top down approach
- There was no well laid out way of bringing partners on board-scientific evidence is required earlier in the project much earlier
- Site selection should have been more representative: In this case Kenya and East Africa was over represented and thus examples can be drawn only from these African sites.

Group 2 (Question 2): Lessons learned on project design and implementation to enhance efficiency; effectiveness; impact at household, landscape, national and regional scales- presented by Leah Onyango

1. *What is known*

- The project design: Core sites and associates sites of PRESA were working in areas where there was already some work going on. It had an International advisory committee and borrowed from similar projects such as RUPES in South East Asia, where the secretariat was housed by ICRAF to leveraging resources.
- It was efficient in meeting the project objectives in leveraging resources by using existing institutions to reduce cost of establishing new systems, building on existing work such as RUPES and linking with ongoing projects such as BESSA who came in with their resource. Thereby, the total cost of the investment was higher than the money provided by IFAD
- It enhanced effectiveness by working where there was already some work done through linkages with partners who have clout and helped the project cover a lot of mileage
- It made an impact at; household and land landscape level, by involving community groups which in resulted high level of community awareness, strengthening of local groups and community organizations; national level, by working with partners with clout helped the project get the attention of the policy makers and at regional level.

2. *What was tried and still do not have an answer*

- MOU/Agreements have been reached but whether they will culminate in actual PES payment is not known e.g. WRUAs in Sasumua have an agreement signed, ECO-Trust have agreements signed on behalf of the buyers but efficiency/effectiveness/impact is still not clear
- Policy Briefs have been prepared but have not reached a point where they are taken up in public

policy and legislation

- Modeling: are the water boards in a position where they appreciate the scientific quantification of the benefits of PES?
- MOUs are time specific but life is dynamic and sons take over from fathers, will they be bound by the same agreement?
- How to monitor indicators of the impact of PES in communities that is acceptable to both parties. In this case, where the activities are measured by the majority measure as opposed impact.
- Sustainability issues; it is not known what will be the case in the next 50 years
- What will change when the farmers get the payment?

3. *What is not known*

- The impact not clear
- Impact on livelihoods has not yet been assessed.
- The risks/negative impacts have not been assessed e.g. 'what is the effect of elite capture and perverse incentives?'

4. *Where there were quick wins*

- Piloting of PES at community level pick the ones who have moved to the level of MOU and move them to the next level.
- Economic evaluations should be available to entice/convince the private sector.
- Change of mindset on environmental conservation

Group 2 (Question 3): Identification of factors and responsibilities to increase the likelihood of sustainability: site partners, policy makers and private sector business- presented by Biryahwaho Byamukama

Impacts, scaling up (time, space)

- Engage the private sector and policy makers clean business case- to engage the private sector more
- Identification of stakeholders and their interests
- Identify quick win to bring in PES into the policy framework
- Adequate incentives
- Establish business case from farmers perspectives
- Diversify approaches through continuous payments, addressing barriers at establishment stage (and in all stages)
- Broadening the scale of PES participants for example to even include schools
- Identify more players to lobby for policy by designing agreements, monitor and invest in activities
- Handover to local governments/ NGO's with resources and support them with information
- Conduct intelligence of upcoming projects (government, private sector)
- Avoid duplication of activities
- Feed information to WRUAs for putting in SCMP
- Transfer technical information to lead agencies to support RES
- Incorporate PES in natural resource curriculum
- Public financing- based on performance
- Engage advocants media (lobby groups)

5. Conclusions

- Members suggested ways on how PES can help in governance which included: the need for dialogue between communities and efficiency in allocation of water in the catchment areas and not only in the urban areas. Communities need to demand the proper governance of water;
- It is important to have representative sites. The criteria for site selection should be clarified and spread the sites widely so that results can be generalized;
- Identify clearly what needs to be addressed in each site as opposed to generalizations;
- There were conscious efforts to spread PRESA widely;
- There were different school of thoughts regarding the site selections have raised different perceptions of the project work, thus, information is required to bring the perceptions in agreement;
- The private sector has bigger problems to address (especially in regards to governance) other than rewards/payments for environmental services, therefore, there is a need to improve communication to public and proper information dissemination;
- There should be equal/ fair functionality of sites to enable comparison of results obtained from the different sites.
- The research was more science driven rather than covering private sector interests and involving the governments

6. Annexes

1. Workshop program and agenda

- *Agenda*

The stakeholder workshop was held with a broad spectrum of stakeholders to reflect on the performance of the PRESA project. Specifically to:

1. Assess the achievements and identify areas where performance was less than satisfactory.
2. Identify innovative features, key success factors and shortcomings of the project
3. Elicit lessons learned
4. Identify factors and responsibilities to increase the likelihood of sustainability of the project

- *Program*

Time	Event	Leader
0845 – 0900	Registration	Catherine Kimengu
0900 – 0930	Welcome Remarks Overview of meeting rationale and objectives Participant introduction	Olu Ajayi
0930 – 1000	Presentation of project implementation methods and achievements	Sara Namirembe
1000 – 1040	Site level, policy and private sector inputs to project implementation methods and achievements	Plenary discussion
1040 – 1100	Tea/Coffee	
1100 – 1130	Identification of a) innovative features, key success factors b) shortcoming and causes	Group work
1130 – 1200	Group presentations	Plenary
1200-13.00	Lessons learned on project design and implementation to enhance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency • Effectiveness • Impact at household, landscape, national and regional scales 	Groups
1300 – 1400	Lunch	
Time	Event	Leader
1400 – 1430	Group presentations	Plenary
1430 – 1530	Identify factors and responsibilities to increase the likelihood of sustainability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site partners • Policy makers • Private sector businesses 	Partners/ Sara
1530 – 1600	Tea/Coffee	
1600 – 1630	Way forward & Closing	

Workshop Rapporteurs: Judith Nzyoka and Catherine Kimengu

II. List of participants

	Name	Organization	Country	Email
1	Serge Ngendakumana		Burundi	S.ngendakumana@cgiar.org
2	Haidara Cherif Mohamed	Compagnie deEaux Minerals de Guinee (CEG)	Guinea	cherifsogecile@gmail.com
3	Leah Onyango	Maseno University	Kenya	leahonyango@gmail.com
4	John Kimani Mwangi	Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture & Technology (JKUAT)/ICRAF	Kenya	joymwa86@yahoo.com
5	Gilbert Omweri Ochoki	Nairobi City Water and Sewerage Company (NCWSC)	Kenya	Gochoki@nairobiwater.co.ke
6	Patrick M. Githinji	Nairobi City Water and Sewerage Company (NCWSC)	Kenya	pgithinji@nairobiwater.co.ke
7	Isaac Karanja Muraguri	Sasumua Water Resource Users Association (WRUA)	Kenya	ismack58@yahoo.com
8	Fred Nyongesa	Water Resources Management Authority (WRMA), Murang'a office	Kenya	Fnyongesa05@yahoo.com
9	Robert Ndetei	WWF Eastern Africa Reginal Programme Office (EARPO)	Kenya	rndetei@wffesarpo.org
10	John Gathenya. Mwangi	The Rockefeller Foundation, Africa Regional Office	Kenya	j.m.gathenya@reading.ac.uk
11	Antony Kimaro	ICRAF-Ulugurus	Tanzania	a.kimaro@cgiar.org
12	Bomoa Rajabu	ICRAF-Ulugurus	Tanzania	
13	Annet Ssempala	Environmental Conservation Trust of Uganda (ECOTRUST)	Uganda	a.ssempala@ecotrust.or.ug/ annet_ssempala@yahoo.co.uk
14	Biryahwaho Byamukama	Nature Harness Initiative (NAHI)	Uganda	bbyamukama@natureharness.or.ug
15	Charlotte Kalanzi	NEMA-Government/policy	Uganda	charlotte.kalanzi@gmail.com
16	Dezi Kamugyeragyeri	Rushebeya/ Kanyabaha Wetland Management Committee	Uganda	
17	Gibson Mwangi Kiragu	Ministry of water and irrigation	Kenya	gkiragu@yahoo.com/ gibson.kiragu@gmail.com
18	Sam Mugisha	Kisiizi Hospital Power Limited	Uganda	sam.mugisha@ymail.com
19	Olu Ajai	ICRAF	Kenya	o.c.ajayi@CGIAR.ORG
20	Sara Namirembe	ICRAF	Kenya	s.namirembe@cgiar.org
21	Judith Nzyoka	ICRAF	Kenya	j.nzyoka@cgiar.org
22	Catherine Kimengu	ICRAF	Kenya	ckimengu@cgiar.org