Report on the

Pre-Conference Training Workshop

Science-Policy Interfacing:

"Enhancing Contributions of Forest Science and Traditional Forest-related Knowledge (TFRK) to the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Forest Resources in Africa"

Jointly organised by
Forestry Research Network of Sub-Saharan Africa (FORNESSA) and
IUFRO's Special Programme for Developing Countries (IUFRO-SPDC)

Supported by
SIDA (Sweden), USDA Forest Service, FORMIN (Finland),
Austrian Federal Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management,
and Korea Forest Research Institute

With contributions by
BMZ/GTZ (Germany), FORIG (Ghana), and NFP Facility (FAO)

Accra, Ghana, 13 – 14 October 2008

Table of Contents

Annex:

1.	Workshop Programme

2.	List of Participants

Presentations and supporting documents as well as detailed results of group work are provided separately in electronic version.

Abbreviations

AFF	African Forest Forum
AFORNET	African Forest Research Network
AFWC	African Forest and Wildlife Commission
BMZ	German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CIFOR	Centre for International Forestry Research
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CPF	Collaborative Partnership on Forests
CSIR	Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Ghana
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FORIG	Forestry Research Institute of Ghana
FORMIN	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland
FORNESSA	Forestry Research Network of Sub-Saharan Africa
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
GTZ/IWP	GTZ/International Forest Policy (sectoral project)
IAF	International Arrangement on Forests
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre (former International Centre for Research on Agroforestry)
IFF	Intergovernmental Forum on Forests
IPF	Intergovernmental Panel on Forests
ITTA	International Tropical Timber Agreement
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organization
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature – The World Conservation Union
IUFRO	International Union of Forest Research Organisations
IUFRO-SPDC	IUFRO's Special Programme for Developing Countries
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
nfp	National forest programme
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
TFAP	Tropical Forestry Action Plan / Tropical Forests Action Programme
UN	United Nations
UNCCD	United Nations Convention on Combating Desertification
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNCHE	United Nations Conference on the Human Environment
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests
WB	World Bank
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development

1. Background and Introduction

1.1. Background and rationale

The need for sound scientific information in the development of public forest policies at the local, national and international levels has grown significantly in recent years. So too has the need for such information within the private forestry sector and among non-governmental organizations, whose role in the development, sustainable management and conservation of forest resources in all regions of the world is steadily increasing in importance. Despite rapid advances in information technology that has, in theory, the potential to significantly improve the flow of research findings to policy-makers and forest managers, communication and interaction often is inadequate between the research community and the users of the information they generate.

Also, often research is planned and conducted before giving adequate thought to exactly how the results will be transformed into usable information. In order to generate value for society, research results should be used by someone – policy-makers, forestry practitioners, landowners, educators and other researchers. The science-policy interface is all about utilising scientific knowledge more effectively.

1.2. Objectives and target groups

The IUFRO Training Workshop "Science-Policy Interfacing: Enhancing Contributions of Forest Science and Traditional Forest-related Knowledge (TFRK) to the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Forest Resources in Africa" took place in conjunction with the "International Conference on Traditional Forest-related Knowledge and Sustainable Forest Management in Africa" at ERATA Hotel, Accra, Ghana, 13 – 14 October 2008.

The Workshop was jointly organised by IUFRO's Special Programme for Developing Countries (IUFRO-SPDC) and the Forestry Research Network of Sub-Saharan Africa (FORNESSA), with support by SIDA (Sweden), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland (FORMIN), the US Forest Service, the Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, and the Korea Forest Research Institute. Contributions in kind were provided by the German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) through the International Forest Policy Project of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), by the Forestry Research Institute of Ghana (FORIG), and by the National Forest Programme Facility hosted by FAO.

The training workshop aimed at:

- Providing concepts and methods to researchers on how to plan, conduct, and organise research activities so that research results can more quickly and easily be transformed into usable information for problem-solving and policy-making;

- Explaining key aspects of science-policy interactions, and best practices for work at the science-policy interface in the context of international, national and local policy processes with special emphasis on the incorporation of traditional forest knowledge.
- Presenting a wide range of case studies mainly dealing with forest-related forest management issues in Africa, but also from other regions.
- Conducting hands-on exercises in working groups with focus on the formulation of research processes that adequately incorporate elements of science-policy interfacing.

Although not all research is specifically focused on policy-relevant questions, best practices in transforming research results into usable information can increase the impact of science on forest policy and improve the practice of forestry, thereby creating more value for society from forest and tree-related research. Towards this end, the training workshop specifically aimed at improving the understanding of policy- and decision-making and the roles scientists can play in informing such processes.

The training workshop brought together scientists from developing countries in Sub-Saharan Africa who wished to increase the impact of their scientific work (i.e. research, advocacy, supervision etc.) on policy-making through adequate contribution of research results and scientific knowledge to policy-making processes, addressing broader environmental and socio-economic issues.

1.3. Contents and methodology

The two-day training workshop was designed to provide latest thinking on concepts and tools for the improvement of the interface of forest science and policy. The workshop content is built on a "best practices guide" for working effectively at the interface of forest science and forest policy. These guidelines have been developed and published by the IUFRO Task Force on Science Policy Interface (IUFRO Occasional Paper No. 17, 2005) and is available online at http://www.iufro.org/publications/series/occasional-papers/en/).

The course specifically focused on the following issues:

- Selecting research questions that are relevant to policy issues;
- Conducting research in a communicative and collaborative manner;
- Understanding, serving and engaging in policy processes;
- Creating organisational capacity and culture that enables and encourages work at the science-policy interface; and
- Demonstrating – with the help of case studies – the interaction between scientists and policy makers.

Science-policy interactions and best practices were explained against various backgrounds and contexts. These included (a) international policy processes, (b) national forest programmes; and (c) policies and management practices at the local levels.

Resource persons from national forest research institutions and other expert organisations presented a wide spectrum of case studies from Sub-Saharan Africa that demonstrated successes and challenges of working at the science-policy interface.

Emphasis in the training workshop was placed on interactive sessions and group work so that participants could obtain significant insights in the complex nature of issues to be addressed in the science-policy interface. Towards this end, participants provided examples of research work from their own countries with linkages to policy- and decision-making, serving as basis for analysis and discussions.

The workshop programme is presented in Annex 1. All presentations given during the workshop by trainers and resource persons together with the results of group work and supporting material have been provided to the participants in electronic version at the end of the workshop.

1.4. Participants

The workshop brought together a number of 22 participants and resource persons from 8 African countries, namely Benin, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Togo and Uganda. The training was facilitated by trainers/resource persons from GTZ and IUFRO. The list of participants is presented in Annex 2.

2. Day 1: International and National Forest Policy Processes

2.1. Introduction: IUFRO-SPDC Initiative on Science and Policy Interface

The training workshop was opened by Prof. Albert Oteng-Yeboah, University of Ghana, Regional Coordinator of IUFRO Task Force on Traditional Forest Knowledge and Dr. Joe Cobbinah, Forestry Research Institute of Ghana, Chairman of FORNESSA. After introduction of participants and presentation of the workshop objectives and the programme, Michael Kleine, Coordinator IUFRO-SPDC, gave an overview on IUFRO and the IUFRO-SPDC Training Initiative on the Science-Policy Interface. In his presentation he outlined the specific tasks and challenges of linking science to policy.

During the subsequent discussions participants were interested on how to become a IUFRO member. It was clarified that usually research organisations and institutions become members. However, there is also the possibility for individuals to register as Associate member of IUFRO. Participants were encouraged to get their institutions to register as IUFRO members. Information on registration can be obtained from IUFRO through iufro@iufro.org.

2.2. International forest policy processes and agreements – challenges for science and research

As a starting point for discussions on the science-policy interface in international forest policy Bernd-Markus Liss, AGEG Consultants eG on behalf of the GTZ International Forest Policy Project IWP, presented an overview on international forest-related policy processes and agreements and the involvement of research and science. He outlined processes on sustainable development, the forest policy dialogue under the Intergovernmental Panel and Forum on Forests IPF and IFF, and the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) and highlighted the commitments and obligations that derive from the so-called international forest regime, including the non-legally binding instrument (NLBI) on all types of forests adopted under UNFF-7 in April 2007 and also the forest-related commitments from multilateral environmental conventions such as the CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC. Finally his presentation made reference on how traditional knowledge is addressed in the forest policy processes and in different multilateral environmental agreements.

The discussion focussed on questions with regard to the international forest policy processes and the role of the science community, with the following contributions by participants:

- There is a gap between international policy and its implementation at national level. Science could play a role to influence the international forest policy discussion and also to foster implementation of agreements and commitments at the local level. Specific ways have to be defined and used, e.g. by involving scientists in country delegations to communicate national concerns to international forest-related policy processes.

- National sovereignty for the use of natural resources should be respected. However, nations have an obligation to use their resources in a way that does not harm the neighbouring countries and takes into account responsibility for maintaining forests as global common goods. The Rio conference has defined the shared but differentiated responsibility of countries for sustainable development, globally.

- Traditional knowledge should be integrated into science and made available for international policy processes. Finally, it is the local people who implement sustainable forest management, so their knowledge should be used.

2.3. CPF Joint Initiative on Science and Technology

As an additional input to the discussion, Michael Kleine presented the IUFRO-led CPF Joint Initiative on Science and Technology as an effort to provide scientifically sound information to the UNFF process. UNFF members had chosen 'Adaptation of forests to climate change' as the priority topic to be elaborated under this initiative. The process includes the review of existing research by an Expert Panel and the elaboration of a report for policy-makers until UNFF-8 in April 2009.

The discussion during the subsequent interactive session clarified that UNFF members as policy-makers at the international level had chosen the topic of adaptation as a vital input to forest policy discussions. Because the CPF is part of the International Arrangement on Forests (IAF) it is ensured that the results of the initiative are being picked up in the policy process under UNFF. The results of the initiative would also be useful for national, regional and local levels.

It was emphasised that the local context and knowledge should be taken into account. With regard to climate change there are many indigenous adaptive strategies which could be documented and mobilised for a learning process. The Initiative, however, has focused on a few typical ecosystems (mangroves, mountain forests, Sahel environment) to present adaptation strategies in a generic way, including the impact on human well-being. The international experience has to be tailored to the local environment in order to make it applicable. The composition of the Expert Panel takes into account representation from all regions, but it is also complicated to get balanced representation. Research networks like FORNESSA could help to make grey literature and publications from sub-Saharan Africa available to such CPF initiative.

Participants complained that research is not a priority in most African countries, and that it is difficult to convince policy makers of the necessity of research. The training will identify ways and means how to stimulate the science-policy interface and provide tools for better integration of research results in policy processes. It would be important for scientists to get involved in national forest programmes and related policy processes to build adequate linkages and always to start with a policy question, based on the demand of policy makers.

2.4. National forest programmes

In his presentation on national forest programmes (nfp) Bernd-Markus Liss outlined the concept of national forest programmes as an inclusive country-specific process for forest policy formulation and implementation towards sustainable forest management, based on multi-stakeholder consultation, communication and capacity building. He highlighted the nfp principles and the approach, and emphasised that nfp processes should be embedded in sustainable development policies and address a wide range of issues at the micro- and macro-levels, taking into account cross-sectoral linkages. He further explained that nfps do not confine to central policy planning but also include sub-national and local level policy-making and implementation. Beside, nfps include also the positioning towards the international forest policy dialogue and integrate the implementation of international forest-related agreements and commitments according to country priorities and specific conditions. They can provide an effective framework for collaboration and partnership at all levels and for donor coordination. The role of different actors was explained with specific focus on the role of science and research and related challenges.

The following discussion included questions on how scientists can be involved in nfps by participating in sector analysis and in stakeholder fora towards policy formulation. Partici-

pants claimed that nfps can help to tap opportunities from the international level, e.g. deriving from the climate change discussion, and science needs to back up nfp processes by providing their knowledge but also by picking up policy questions.

As a next step Atse Yapi, Coordinator of the National Forest Programme Facility at the FAO Regional Office in Accra, presented an overview on the status of nfp processes in West and Central African countries and the support that is being provided by the NFP-Facility hosted by FAO. He reminded participants that science and research inputs can provide significant contributions with regard to forest policy formulation and implementation. He quoted examples from Nigeria, Ghana, Senegal and Democratic Republic of Congo, where involvement of science in nfp processes has helped to shape policies towards community based forest management, revision of forest laws, and improved stakeholder involvement in forest policy discussions.

He concluded that scientific information is important for the nfp process, but that it is not the only input to policy discussions. One also has to bear in mind that research is not for free, so it should be sought on a cost-benefit basis.

In the discussion, participants emphasised that the nfp process should not be based on a project approach with limited time frame and funding, but should become a continuous process built into regular policy discussions to be sustainable. An example was mentioned from Ghana, where the nfp process is based on an institutionalised consultation process with regional and national fora involving traditional leaders. It was explained that support by the NFP Facility is only catalytic and can not replace the commitment of governments for the nfp process.

2.5. Example of best practices for work at the science-policy interface: Science-policy interactions in Ghana

In the following session, Joe Cobbinah, on behalf of Forestry Research Institute of Ghana, provided a few examples on how scientific research was incorporated into policy in Ghana. Along the practical cases of forest fire management, felling limits, protection of biodiversity hotspots, the modified Taungya system, identification of species for plantation development, and felling intensity he illustrated how research results were relevant to policy and had an impact on the decision-making in the forest sector.

He concluded that the lessons learnt from these cases show that there is a need for improved communication and cooperation, mutual understanding of policy makers and scientists, strengthening the organisational structure for science policy interaction, and to reinforce capacities. Scientists therefore have to get engaged in policy processes. The nfp process is the appropriate framework to be used for science policy interaction.

Participants embarked on a lively discussion with the following points:

- It was questioned why research is mostly funded by external donors but national governments do not fund policy related research. The problem often lies in the credibility and accountability of science, and in setting of priorities.

- The private sector has also specific interests that challenge research, e.g. the need for seeds for plantation development.

- Research results should be transferred and used for poverty alleviation. An example was mentioned in demonstrating the long-term economic benefits of conservation versus short term economic gains from exploitation of protected areas: The conservation of a forest reserve in Uganda to protect the Gorilla population there had resulted in exclusion of population from extracting and collecting forest products worth several hundred thousand US Dollars per year. However, the protection of Gorillas and the development of eco-tourism now generate more than three million US Dollars per year. Scientific research had succeeded in demonstrating this economic advantage of conservation and its contribution to poverty alleviation which was an important argument to protect the forest area.

- "Foresighting" of science, i.e. keeping abreast with important topics that may require research in future, is difficult in Africa, because governments in the region generally do not support research. But strategic decisions on use of existing budgets can be made by science and research institutions. Thus, they have the opportunity to maintain core areas of research that at the moment do not get high attention of the public / policy makers, but may be of importance in future.

- Effective communication structures and tools are needed to ensure access to policy makers. Sometimes, according to Einstein "imagination is more important that knowledge", so scientists have to be creative and imaginative to redesign research.

2.6. IUFRO Guidelines on science-policy interface

As a last point on the agenda, Michael Kleine presented the "IUFRO Guidelines for Working Effectively at the Interface of Forest Science and Forest Policy - Guidance for Scientists and Research Organizations" that had been elaborated by the IUFRO Task Force on the Forest Science-Policy Interface.

Michael Kleine highlighted the process how the Guidelines were elaborated and key aspects of the Guidelines with regard to the involvement of scientists in policy processes and how to conduct research in this regard. In this context it is important to formulate research questions that are of relevance to policymakers, to communicate results adequately and to build partnerships. Further he emphasised the need to build organisational capacity that allows proper interaction of researchers with policy makers, and the importance for science to get engaged in policy processes, but still to maintain independence which is a precondition for credibility.

The following discussion triggered many remarks of participants on the relevance of research to policy, on the involvement of stakeholders at various levels, the inter-linkage of

scientists with policy-makers and the best way to engage in policy processes. Communication and packaging research projects and results adequately to meet the demand of policy-makers are important preconditions that science can provide targeted input into policy processes at all levels based on factual information. Policy concerns should be addressed by scientists in all research projects; they should be relevant to policy-makers and take into account their demands. Societal needs are the key starting point for research, and emerging issues such as climate change should be picked up to raise awareness at the policy level. Only in this way, research can attract attention of policy-makers and adequate funding. As an important output the policy implications of research results should be effectively communicated. The objective of research should be to influence policy but also to influence management and implementation at the local level. It was highlighted, that therefore the concerns and interests of the local population should be taken into account, because they are the ultimate managers and users of the forests. In this context it was stated, that policies are made and applied at all levels.

3. Day 2: Working on the science policy interface

The day started with a summary on the previous day by Bernd-Markus Liss, highlighting the key issues discussed with regard to international policy processes and national implementation, and summarising the contributions of participants concerning the practical application of the science-policy interface.

3.1. Communication in the science-policy interface: some lessons from a study in the forestry sector of Ghana

In this session, Emmanuel Marfo from the Forestry Research Institute of Ghana presented some lessons learned from a study in the forestry sector of Ghana on institutional arrangements and information flow in the science-policy interfaces. He concluded that the communicative interaction between policy actors and scientists cannot be taken for granted. Scientific communication channels need a shift from technical to popular styles, whereby face-to-face meetings and informal networking are crucial, especially in disintegrated institutional arrangement of the 'science' and 'policy' sub-systems. Communication channels should be institutionalised rather than physically integrating institutions. For example, the shifting of research institutions from the Ministry of Science to the Ministry of Forestry would not per se guarantee better communication between scientists and policy makers, while the regular participation of policy makers in science board meetings or colloquia could enhance interaction. Capacity building in design and implementation of programmes for effective interfacing is crucial for both sides.

In the discussion participants expressed their experience with work at the science policy interface highlighting the following issues:

- There are various categories of policy-makers that need to be addressed specifically: legislators, policy advisors, administrators, technocrats.
- Effectiveness of institutional arrangements depends more on linkages than on structures. The place of an institution is not so important as long as communication works well. Stakeholder meetings are important channels for communication.
- Funding is crucial, since interaction has its costs.
- Capacity building in a wider sense includes also feedback to resource persons involved in research. Research outcomes should be shared with those who participated in research projects. Stakeholder involvement can help to strengthen communication links.
- Sometimes it is difficult for policy makers to use research results, because they are old and not updated on new developments. But, on the contrary, there are also young and competent policy makers, some of them being former scientists, who understand quite well.
- Communication of research results follows formal channels, e.g. by submitting an annual report of a research institution. But these reports are hardly read by policy makers, therefore informal communication is often more important.
- Universities and research institutions have different mandates. Nevertheless interaction of both is important for knowledge transfer and effective education. Linkages to universities can be informal, but also based on MoU.

Participants also recommended that policy makers should participate in such training workshops to make them more aware and to stimulate interaction and mutual understanding. They called upon IUFRO to organise such joint events.

3.2. Group work on science-policy interface

The participants then split into four groups to work on improved science-policy interface on the basis of concrete examples of their own research projects. For this purpose the groups were asked to fulfil the following tasks:

- Evaluate specific research projects against the IUFRO best practices guidelines;
- Present research projects to the group members explaining the process on how the research has been conducted;
- Discuss the project based on the following guiding questions:
    – Which of the elements in the best practices guide have been implemented?
    – Have these practices helped to make the project more useful for policy-making? If yes, how?
    – Should additional elements given in the best practices guide be included into the project? If yes, which ones?
- Select one project and develop the research process explaining the elements of the best practices guide that you would apply to make this particular project a role model for science-policy interfacing.

3.3. Presentation of group work: Model research projects and science-policy interface

In the afternoon participants presented and discussed the results of the group work on research projects with regard to the application of the IUFRO guidelines on science-policy interfacing.

Group 1 had chosen a project on underutilised food crops and tree species in Togo. The relevance to policy issues was to avoid local knowledge erosion and local food resources extinction. To this end the group recommended to involve local people, policy makers and scientists in the project formulation, to conduct interdisciplinary research including social scientists, botanists, biochemist, foresters and agronomists and to arrange the research process in three phases: (1) stakeholders meetings and data collection, (2) implementation of research outputs, and (3) evaluation of the impact on local people's livelihood improvement and phytodiversity conservation, and on policy makers' decisions. Capacity building at all levels should be integrated in the project.

Group 2 worked on a project called Traditional Knowledge and Natural Forests Management in Kenya: Policy & Legal Perspectives on Customary Laws. In order to make this project a role model for policy-science interface, the group recommended to complement the methodology by adding analyses of policy documents, economic and ecological assessments, institutional analysis, and by conducting stakeholder meetings and specific workshops. The group further recommended building partnerships among scientists, policy makers and stakeholders for effective communication, to engage in policy processes and to timely disseminate research findings to stakeholders to facilitate future interactions.

Group 3 dealt with a project on application of indigenous knowledge for evaluation, propagation and conservation of indigenous multipurpose fodder trees in Ethiopia. The project focused on values and future needs of local people which can be integrated in the science-policy interface. The research was conducted in a communicative and collaborative manner involving the local community and other researchers but excluded policy makers. There was room for more partnership development with policy makers, farmers and other disciplines of sciences. The group recommended linkages to policy processes right from the beginning, and to strengthen the linkages between the scientist, communities, and policy makers using all the available communication channels through policy briefs, networking with extension and field workers.

Group 4 chose a project on redesigning of the indigenous knowledge and conservation attitudes on biodiversity outside protected area systems in Uganda. The original research process was based on a needs assessment and current conservation issues in Uganda. The project was not incorporating the policy perspective but only advanced recommendations towards policy formulation. There was only passive participation of stakeholders. The group recommended the identification of policy relevant issues by starting with policy problems, building on traditional needs, and involving a wide range of stakeholders for an interdisciplinary approach. Research should be conducted in a communicative and collaborative way, by using informal channels and discussing and disseminating the findings

with a wide range of stakeholders. Improving capacity and culture for research at policy science interface requires a paradigm shift in approaching and addressing research problems, and also improving the capacity of policy makers to use research results. Feedback can be continuously obtained in policy makers are member of the research group. At the same time scientists should stay objective and neutral at all times.

The discussion highlighted the importance of understanding policy processes as a precondition for formulating research questions according to needs of policy makers. The involvement of policy makers also includes local authorities and traditional leaders, who know about farmers' needs and are also those who are concerned about implementation of local regulations. Traditional knowledge, customs and rules should be incorporated in research. Participants stated that keeping independence of research is not always easy when participatory approaches are being applied, that engage the researchers in a different way. It is important to acknowledge that human beings are part of the (eco-)system, and their management needs need to be incorporated into research. Therefore active participation of local stakeholders is of key importance.

3.4. Closing

The workshop was concluded by Prof. Albert Oteng-Yeboah by commending all participants for their active contribution and thanking IUFRO-SPDC for arranging the event, which was found to be very useful for scientists in the region. Michael Kleine thanked the organisers for the excellent arrangements for the workshop. In a special note on behalf of IUFRO he honoured Atse Yapi for his long-term engagement as a IUFRO-SPDC Regional Coordinator for Africa and handed over to him a certificate of appreciation of IUFRO. Participants then received their certificates of attendance along with the documentation of the workshop on a IUFRO/GFIS memory stick.

ANNEX 1

IUFRO-SPDC/FORNESSA Pre-Conference Training Workshop

Science-Policy Interfacing: Enhancing Contributions of Forest Science and Traditional Forest-related Knowledge (TFRK) to the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Forest Resources in Africa"
Accra, Ghana, 13 to 14 October 2008

<u>Workshop Programme</u>

Date	Time	Subject (Description)	Responsible
Sunday, 12 October	**Whole day** **19:00**	Arrival of participants Dinner and Icebreaker	Local Workshop Organisation
Monday **13 October**	**08:30 – 09:00**	Registration	M. Kleine
	09:00 – 09:10	Welcome address and opening of the workshop	A. Oteng-Yeboah, J. Cobbinah
	09:10 - 09:30	Introduction of participants: experiences and expectations Workshop objectives and programme	M. Kleine, B. Liss Participants
	09:30 – 10:00	What is the Science-Policy Interface? • IUFRO's Task Force • IUFRO-SPDC Training	M. Kleine
	10:00 – 10:30	International Policy Frameworks and Agreements (UNFF, UNFCCC, CBD, UNCCD)	B. Liss
	10:30 – 11:00	Tea Break	
	11:00 – 11:30	CPF Joint Initiative on Science and Technology "The Climate Change Adaptation Panel"	M. Kleine
	11:30 – 12:30	Interactive Session: Science contributions to international forest policy processes: challenges and opportunities	B. Liss
	12:30 – 13:30	Lunch	
	13:30 – 14:30	National forest programmes • processes, issues and challenges • science contributions Discussion	B. Liss
	14:30 – 15:30	Policy Advisory Services at the national level: • Science contributions to national forest programmes in West and Central Africa Discussion	A. Yapi, FAO/NFP-Facility

Table continued

Date	Time	Subject (Description)	Responsible
Monday	**15:30 – 16:00**	Tea Break	
13 October	**16:00 – 16:30**	Examples of best practices for work at the science policy interface: • Science-policy interactions in Ghana • Other case studies from Africa Discussion	J. Cobbinah
	16:30- 17:30	Best Practices Guide: Working Effectively at the Interface of Forest Science and Forest Policy Discussion	M. Kleine
Tuesday	**08:30 – 08:45**	Summary of results obtained on previous day	B. Liss
14 October	**08:45 – 09:45**	Examples of best practices for work at the science policy interface: • Communication in the science-policy interface: some lessons from a study in the forestry sector of Ghana	E. Marfo
	09:45 – 10:30	Preparations for Group Work: (Tasks and expected results)	B. Liss
	10:30 – 11:00	Tea Break	
	11:00 – 12:30	Group Work: Evaluation of research projects based on best practices guide • Groups discuss individual case studies • Developing a role model for science-policy interfacing	Participants B. Liss
	12:30 – 13:30	Lunch	
	13:30 – 15:00	Group Work continues: • Describing the role model for science-policy interfacing • Compilation of a group presentation	Participants B. Liss
	15:00 – 15:30	Tea Break	
	15:30 – 17:30	Presentation of group work Discussions	Participants B. Liss
	17:30 – 18:00	Closing of Workshop and Handing-over of Certificates	A. Oteng-Yeboah, J. Cobbinah, J. Parotta, M. Kleine