

Community Forestry and Development

Wil de Jong

Keywords: community forestry, development cooperation, poverty alleviation, forest governance

Abstract: Forests and forestry were first seriously considered as a vehicle to reach development objectives in the 1970s, leading to the recognition of community forestry as a focal point for international development cooperation. The exact opportunities for cooperation, and how to realize them, have changed as international development thinking has evolved. In recent decades, traditional academic analyses of communal forestry and development practices have been complemented by trends that focus on specific aspects of forests and local people, including non-timber forest products, forest devolution, decentralization, and collaborative management. The perceived role of community forestry in development cooperation, as well as the type of assistance that is needed and provided, continues to evolve with changing international development agendas, priorities, and objectives.

1. Introduction

Community forestry, or communal forest management (CFM), refers to community practices that are traditionally related to forests. The term has been part of development experts' vocabulary since the 1970s. Since then, it has been widely recognized that forests and trees play an important role in the subsistence activities of rural communities and that supporting CFM contributes to rural community development.

In recent years, CFM has received renewed attention from international donors and development agencies, national governments and their forestry agencies, and conservation NGOs. This renewed attention, like the attention CFM has received in

recent decades, is driven by two main objectives. First, it is widely accepted that supporting CFM provides benefits that go directly to improving the well being of the practicing communities. Second, it is assumed that supporting CFM contributes to the conservation of forests, thereby assuring various ecosystem services that may not be directly consumed, but are important to rural communities. In the latter case, strengthening CFM positively impacts the practicing communities themselves and downriver residents who benefit from the regulating effects of communally managed forests. The same holds true for people beyond the watersheds in which CFM is practiced, individuals who benefit from the carbon sequestration, conservation of biodiversity, or preservation of scenic values provided by CFM.

As awareness has grown that CFM contributes to rural community development and conservation of forest resources, development agencies, donors, and the academic world have adopted CFM as an area of interest. In Latin America, successful examples of CFM in Mexico and Central America have spawned new programs in other countries of South America. Likewise, CFM has become a regular component of university education programs and training centers like RECOFT in Thailand, CATIE in Costa Rica, and the FAO in Rome. Since the mid-1990s, many forest agencies in tropical countries have considered CFM to be one of their core responsibilities and CFM has achieved a prominent place in national policies and forestry-related legislation.

This paper provides an historical overview and explores the renewed interest in CFM observed over the last few years. We assume CFM is a key component of development cooperation programs found in many national and international agencies. We try on the one hand to capture the growth of CFM as a development cooperation activity, and on the other hand, to locate CFM within the trends and ideals that have guided development cooperation over the last 40 years. To achieve our objectives, section two will review the terminology used in the CFM literature. A discussion of CFM requires clarification of key concepts and definitions because CFM and related terminology is often used in a variety of different contexts. The CFM concept has changed since the 1970s, when it was first introduced by

development agencies and social forestry research centers. The exact meaning of CFM and related terminology influences how forestry development cooperation projects and research efforts are planned and implemented. It also has an important impact on the discussion of policies and legal matters related to CFM. Section three reflects on the growth of CFM as a development cooperation strategy and clarifies how communal forestry has appeared as a term, idea, and practice of development cooperation since the 1970s. Section four discusses how development models that have dominated international development cooperation since the 1980s coincide with the logic behind CFM as a development cooperation strategy. Section five summarizes the new emphasis given to CFM in the 1980s and 1990s. We conclude with section six.

2. Defining Community Forestry

The term “communal forest management” is frequently used in many different contexts; as a result, it does not have the same meaning for all those who use it. Unfortunately, many forestry and development experts fail to reach a clear consensus on the meaning of CFM, resulting in development cooperation projects that adopt mistaken assumptions, leading to poorly directed efforts that do not have the desired impact.

The term “community forestry” was first introduced by the FAO in 1970 when it launched the “Forestry for Communal Development” program (Wiersum, 1999). The program’s objectives were to ensure the provision of firewood and other forest products that rural populations in poor tropical countries depend on for subsistence activities or sell to generate income. In his analysis, however, Wiersum proposes the term “social forestry” to describe activities that specifically focus on development assistance, as related to communal forestry. He argues that to derive coherent definitions of “community forestry” and “social forestry,” one must make a distinction between the key players and their activities. Considering these elements, he proposes that *communal forest management* encompasses forest management activities undertaken by communities as part of a comprehensive set of subsistence

activities. *Social forestry* encompasses the strategies of the professional development assistance sector to promote communal forest management in an effort to improve the condition of local populations (Wiersum, 1999, p.81). The distinction proposed by Wiersum has not been widely adopted. To mention it here, however, underscores the broad meaning of the term “communal forest management,” as applied by professional foresters and CFM experts.

The term “community,” as applied to the *communal* forest management concept, must be clearly defined. Rural settlers who benefit from tropical forests can be categorized into many groups. In Latin America, they include not only indigenous forest communities such as the Ribereños in Peru, Caboclos in Brazil, and other quasi-ethnic groups (c.s. Chibnik, 1991), but also settlers who recently migrated to forest regions, including those from the Andean highlands. In the Kalimantan provinces of Indonesia, they include indigenous Dayak groups, as well as people who have migrated to the region from other islands (e.g., Mayer, 1996). In Vietnam, they include indigenous mountain groups and Kin people who have migrated from the lowlands (Tran Van Con, 2006). The following attributes help to define various groups practicing CFM: (1) the type of benefits they obtain from forests, (2) their purpose for using forests, (3) their relation with markets and the political-legal and regulatory frameworks that grant different rights to each group, and (4) the level of internal organization and the type of formal and non-formal property rights they exercise over forests and forestlands. Although it would make sense to systematically categorize the forest management practices and attributes of the different groups that practice CFM, the forest management practices of all these groups can cumulatively be considered communal forest management because supporting these practices can contribute to development objectives. There is no doubt, however, that assistance provided by support organizations must be adapted to each group’s specific needs and circumstances.

An alternative approach to developing a definition of communal forest management is to explicitly exclude forest activities that are not part of CFM. In our definition, CFM excludes forest activities conducted by corporations or similar

enterprises in public or private forests. Additionally, CFM excludes forest activities conducted by private owners when they are not part of a collective or communal activity. From our perspective, CFM need not be restricted to the management of forestland held under some common property, or used as a common pool resource. In the cases we consider, CFM is often linked to various types of formally or informally held property (e.g., customary or temporary rights that allow individuals or families exclusive access to forests, as well as rights shared by entire communities).

The second part of communal forest management, forest management, refers to a wide range of forest types and a variety of uses within these forests (Wiersum, 1999, p.82). In this context, Wiersum defines management as a process of making and implementing decisions that are related to forest resources (*Ibid.*). As the section below suggests, from about 1980 onward, development cooperation related to CFM has focused on natural forests. Previous to this date, CFM was mainly concerned with communal management practices of non-forest tree vegetation. Many of the activities previously linked with CFM have, in later years, been grouped as agroforestry. The management of plantations by the groups or communities described earlier in this section generally falls outside the scope of CFM.

We assert that forest management becomes communal when the activity is of a collective nature; we interpret “collective” in a broad sense. Collective implies that a communal forest territory is recognized and defended in such a way that access is granted only to community members or third parties who have been granted permission by the community.

In summary, it is important to distinguish between two different activities: (1) forest management activities carried out by rural communities and (2) programs that assist groups who engage in some kind of forest management. In practice, both are often called CFM, but it is important to make a distinction between these activities. Communal forest management has become a generalized term among forestry, conservation, and rural development specialists. Thus, it is often necessary to

provide a clear definition of the type and specific aspects of CFM to be discussed before proceeding with an assumed understanding of the term.

3. Emergence of CFM Development Cooperation

The definition of communal forest management has much to do with its evolution as a mechanism that development cooperation agencies have increasingly used to provide development assistance to rural communities. German foresters first proposed the concept of “sustainability” in the 18th Century (Wiersum, 1999, p.40; see Neumann, 2006 for a different interpretation). Foresters have recognized the importance of forests for many sectors of society, including agricultural communities, long before the advent of international development cooperation. In the United States, for example, forest policies mandated that state agencies provide assistance to rural communities as early as the 1930s (Wiersum, 1999). In 19th Century Switzerland, different parties held discussions to determine whether communities had priority to benefit from common use forest reserves (Colfer and Capistrano, 2005).

Throughout the 19th and into the early 20th Centuries, European countries controlled a vast majority of tropical forest areas in their Asian and African colonies. The interest in forest resources, and efforts to administrate and manage them, increased as forest sciences advanced through forestry research in Europe (Potter, 2004). Although some colonial governments considered aboriginal forest uses, most set priorities according to the economic interests of their own countries. Wiersum (1999) mentions some cases where the colonial forest agencies considered and implemented CFM policies; however, these policies were always in combination with a forest management program that prioritized economic income of the national government. These policies often severely restricted aboriginal forest use and colonial governments frequently relocated people to ensure exclusive forest use (Potter, 2004; Bradley, 2006).

Many of the forest policies and laws governing ownership of forestlands under postcolonial governments were carried over from the old colonial regimes. This

phenomenon, however, is not because postcolonial governments maintained the same policies and practices of their predecessors. Instead, the dominant international development theories of the post-World War II period - which coincided with a worldwide decolonization period - held that the economic growth of a country required growth of the industrial sector. Later, national economic development theories argued that economic growth should be based on an expansion of the commercial agricultural sector, emphasizing export production. It was commonly thought that investments in forest industries, and the expansion of forestry as a commercial activity, would lead to an increase in the export of raw timber or finished wood products. According to these theories, investments and commercial expansion of the wood sector would benefit broad sectors of society (Wiersum, 1999; Arnold, 1991, 2001), including the rural poor. The strengthening of the agricultural and forestry sectors implied that post-colonial governments should maintain control over a nation's forest resource.

Increasing awareness that focusing solely on economic growth does not automatically lead to improvements for the rural poor resulted in a shift toward development strategies aimed at improving the welfare of national economies, while pursuing strategies based in development cooperation. The new approach introduced integrated development aimed at addressing the basic needs of marginalized groups without considering the wider economy of the entire country. This change in international development thinking explains the projects and programs geared towards CFM that became central components of donor programs, beginning in the 1970s (Arnold, 1991). The primary objective of these projects and programs was to address the basic needs of the rural poor. These projects and programs reflected, at least partly, new ideas about the most appropriate strategies for the development of low GDP countries. The development assistance provided to CFM focused on reforestation of degraded forestlands to reduce the negative effects of forest clearing and the resulting timber and firewood shortage. The programs of that era focused on ensuring a supply of forest products for household consumption and providing alternative options to existing local agricultural practices that were

focused on market production to generate income (Arnold, 1991, 2001).

In reality, the governments of countries like South Korea, Nepal, India, Tanzania (Arnold, 2001), China (Chockalingam *et al.*, 2006a), the Philippines (Chokkalingam *et al.*, 2006b), and Vietnam (de Jong *et al.*, 2006) had programs in place since the 1950s and 1960s to address deforestation and declining forest product supply. These countries initiated wide-scale reforestation programs that involved popular participation, but were not concerned with the needs of rural populations.

Arnold (2001) observes that CFM support efforts during the 1970s had little success. The firewood crisis - one of the main motivations to provide development support to CFM - was not caused by a shortage of wood, rather high production costs and limited availability of manual labor. High costs and labor shortages also help explain why these CFM programs were not successful.

4. Development Models and Community Forestry

The previous section pointed out links between international development theories of the 1950s and 1960s and CFM-focused development cooperation. International development theories have continued to evolve since the 1960s. It is, therefore, relevant to evaluate the link between more recent dominant development models and CFM, once again considering actual CFM practices and development cooperation that addresses CFM.

Adams (2001) and Neumann (2006) observe that a significant change occurred during the 1970s when the sustainable development model replaced modernism, the previous dominant development model (described in the previous section). In the 1960s, development and natural resource experts began to contemplate the possible impact of universal economic growth on the world's natural resources and environment. The Conference on the Human Environment of 1972, organized by the United Nations, was proof of this concern. A new concept that Neumann (2006, p.85) identifies as development populism began to emerge during this period. *Development populism* maintains that rural development in low per capita GDP tropical countries must be based on local knowledge and limited in scope. Renewed

interest in placing the management of natural resources, including forests, in the hands of local communities seen in the 1970s and 1980s (Balee, 1984; Bergman, 1974; Casanova, 1975; Denevan *et al.*, 1984; Padoch *et al.*, 1985, Parker *et al.*, 1983) directly relates to development populism. Nevertheless, CFM continued to be promoted through the types of projects and programs described in the previous section. Agroforestry was also increasingly supported by newly established agencies like ICRAF and agricultural universities around the world during this period of time. Development populism has been an important factor in shaping the evolution of CFM.

On the other side, CFM as a development cooperation strategy did not expand much during the height of the development populism years. This is, at least partly, a result of the resistance of forestry agencies in many countries that continued to support corporate forestry. Another important reason is that the neoliberal model replaced the development populism model from the 1980s onward. Neoliberalism became the central doctrine in economic policy of most countries with emerging economies and dominated international development cooperation (Neumann, 2006). *Neoliberalism* called for an end to state control and the rise of market forces as the driving force of international development. Although this model promoted corporate commercial forestry above all, it had the side effect of placing development cooperation that focused on rural communities in the hands of NGOs (Neumann, 2006), thereby reducing the state's responsibility for rural development.

The neoliberal model has had other positive impacts for CFM because it largely supports yielding state property rights to private property holders. Additionally, the neoliberalism of the 1980s, and its continuation to the present, has contributed to a process of decentralization that has become a worldwide trend, even in countries with tropical forests. The effect of decentralization on the forest sector has been complex, but in several cases it has had positive effects on CFM (Larson *et al.*, 2006). In some instances (see Ruiz, 2004, 2005 for an example from Bolivia), governments promoted new legislation to offset the negative effects of neoliberal economic policies, even among populations living in forested regions. As Bernstein

(2005) explains, neoliberalism preached the abandonment of many state responsibilities, but created a new responsibility to promote “good governance” in both the political and private sectors, including the forest sector. Multinational agencies and donor countries, through their agencies of development cooperation, have emphasized good governance since the 1990s. Hence, while the state withdrew from many sectors that private actors could handle equally well or better, the neoliberal model created new policing tasks for national governments. These unexpected outcomes of the worldwide shift to neoliberalism have influenced processes of decentralization and democratization, even in the peripheral regions of countries with tropical forests (Larson *et al.*, 2006).

The shift towards the neoliberal development model, and subsequent withdrawal of state support for CFM, contributed to a wave of organizations and projects that support CFM because of its perceived contribution to the conservation of tropical forests and their biodiversity. One important strategy to achieve both rural development and forest conservation was through the commercialization of non-timber forest products (NTFP) and the so-called integrated conservation and development projects (ICDPs, see below). The popularity of neoliberalism coincided with growing international concern about the conversion of tropical forests in the second half of the 1980s. Much advertisement and popular support fed this concern, including support from artists and musicians who associated with tribal people from tropical forest regions to battle for a common cause, to save tropical forests for the sake of their inhabitants and for the good of the world community. The concern for tropical forests was shared by international development cooperation agencies that enthusiastically financed projects that had both development and conservation goals. Although the resulting projects that attempted to support forest conservation through commercialization of NTFP and ICDPs were generally unsuccessful, projects of such nature continued into the 1990s. Critics have repeatedly questioned the sincerity of forest conservationists in their efforts to support rural development objectives (e.g., Dove, 1994; Browder, 1992).

In the mid-1990s, the dominant development model changed toward poverty alleviation, which has subsequently become the central goal of the international development cooperation sector. Neoliberal economic policy and poverty alleviation share common objectives. The neoliberal model assumes growth of the national economy through a free market approach will improve conditions for the poor via a trickle-down effect. In the mid-1990s, international development cooperation shifted its focus to poverty alleviation because the trickle-down effect failed to materialize. The UN's Millennium Development Goals¹ provide the most explicit evidence of this trend. As a result, poverty reduction strategies that regulate lending and grants by international donors replaced the structural adjustment programs that were imposed by international lending institutions under the neoliberal doctrine of the 1980s and 1990s (Ngomba, 2003). Poverty reduction strategies charge the state with the responsibility to initiate and complete a survey of all pertinent social sectors and define a national strategy of poverty reduction, with the state serving in a central coordinating role. As international development cooperation has focused on poverty alleviation, the understanding of what poverty actually means has changed during the 1990s. Poverty is now widely viewed as an absence of various fundamental human needs, such as food, shelter, and access to healthcare and education, along with a political voice, security, and social equality. Therefore, poverty, or its opposite, wellbeing (CIFOR, 2007), must be measured using indicators that go beyond income, consumption, and access to vital services.

Ever since poverty alleviation became the dominant model of international development cooperation, there have been extensive discussions about the link between forest resources and poverty (CIFOR, 2007), and about the role forests should therefore play in poverty reduction strategies (CIFOR, 2007; Sunderlin *et al.*, 2006; Angelsen and Wunder, 2003). In summary, forest resources play an important role in the daily lives of many rural settlers. This suggests opportunities to improve the well being of those forest-dependent rural dwellers and to address economic or

¹ See www.un.org/millenniumgoals; accessed 2007-8-1.

environmental crises. Hence, forests play an important role in reducing people's vulnerability to political and economic instability, which may cause them to fall, for shorter or longer periods of time, into conditions of poverty. On the flipside, it is also generally recognized that forest dependency can increase vulnerability when it becomes a "poverty trap." This occurs when forest dependency limits an individual's options to improve personal or family conditions because such dependency may lead to overexploitation or declining market demand and prices of forest resources, compared to other sectors such as agriculture and fishing (CIFOR, 2007).

The forest sector does not yet play prominently in poverty reduction strategies (Oksanen *et al.*, 2003). CFM experts believe many within the forest sector fail to recognize the sector's potential to support poverty reduction strategies, especially through CFM (*Ibid.*). On the other hand, it can be argued that the emergent understanding of poverty as a multi-dimensional condition has, until recently, been insufficiently considered in the objectives of many CFM assistance efforts.

The strongest criticism of international development cooperation comes from a number of authors who discuss the sector within a critique of the politics that drive international development. In our view, development cooperation is never free of influence from (and it may sometimes be dominated by) economic and political ideologies and values. Development cooperation, as a result, represents interests, be they direct economic interests or more subtle political and ideological interests, of those who provide development assistance or the means for development assistance. This also includes development agencies within assistance-receiving countries and intermediate agencies, like NGOs, that carry out development cooperation with external funding. On the extreme, critics often suggest that international development cooperation attempts to consolidate control over countries that receive technical assistance to ensure a supply of raw materials or inexpensive products (see Neumann, 2006 for a discussion on this theme).

This debate has direct implications for the CFM-focused development cooperation discussed in this paper. It raises questions such as, who defines agendas

for CFM programs and to what extent do these agendas represent the true interests of the rural dwellers who practice CFM? In cases where there are common, but not entirely overlapping objectives in promoting CFM, how much power do outside agencies have to influence the choice, direction, and outcomes of CFM programs? How much does this jeopardize the true interests of CFM participants? More specifically, how much do CFM assistance programs help local elite, or more influential groups, maintain control over others within their own political sphere? These questions are difficult to answer and it may not be sufficient to rely on answers given by CFM communities. According to Tsing (1999), CFM communities frequently support and adopt the ideology of supporting agencies. The methods used by representatives of the development cooperation establishment - for example, to define the needs and aspirations of CFM communities - are often only partially helpful, or even misleading, because they seldom recognize local cultures' capacity for rational decision making. Thus, they lack vital input from the communities they intend to serve (Gasché *et al.*, 2006).

The underlying assumption of most criticism directed at CFM is that CFM participants have ulterior motives that involve economic gain. These ulterior motives must, in one way or another, be positioned both socially and politically within the dominant society's culture. Specialists who are professionally aware of and interested in CFM share these assumptions, allowing for the development of common agendas, even though economic gain may not be an overtly intentional objective. There are, of course, groups with different objectives that do not include economic gain or adapting their cultural and social structures to interface with the outside world. Members of these groups also have necessities related to forest resources, but little detailed analysis has been completed to determine what CFM would mean for such groups, whether there is an opportunity to provide such assistance, or what form such assistance would take.

5. Trends in Communal Forest Management Assistance

There are a number of clear trends in debates surrounding CFM and related development assistance. This section summarizes six major trends observed from the 1980s until the present. Three of these trends emphasize actual forest management and related increases in economic income, of which two include a changing focus to primary forest management and the marketing of NTFP. These two trends are very much a product of the global concern for tropical forest conversion and reflect efforts to address tropical deforestation. The third and more recent trend focuses on communal forest companies that support organization at the community level. Such organization is thought to more effectively carry out CFM and engage with regional, national, and international markets (Stoian and Donovan, 2007). Three other trends relate specifically to political aspects of CFM and include changing forest property rights (often towards regimes of common property), the decentralization of forest governance, and collaborative forest management. In this section, we comment on some of these trends.

As previously discussed, before the 1980s international development cooperation agencies that addressed CFM focused mainly on reforestation of deforested areas and tree production in agricultural lands. In the 1980s, these agencies refocused their attention toward communities and primary forests. The rehabilitation of degraded forestlands, the production of trees on agricultural lands, and fast growing tree plantations, were no longer considered to be within the realm of CFM. They became a new specialization identified as forest rehabilitation, agroforestry, and more recently plantation forestry outgrower schemes, or community-company forest plantation partnerships (Calderon and Nawir, 2006; Nawir and Santoso, 2005). The shift toward focusing on primary forests in CFM research and development cooperation coincided with worldwide concern for tropical deforestation in the 1990s and awareness that rural settlers occupied significant portions of tropical forests, and refused to abandon those forests to commercial interests. The latter also triggered intensified academic interest in primary forest-based CFM, beginning in the early 1980s.

The concept of NTFP emerged in the late 1980s, focusing on opportunities provided by a broad array of forest products that could theoretically generate local income while simultaneously achieving forest conservation objectives. Production of NTFP would help stop forest conversion because the economic benefits from NTFP surpass the benefits derived from other alternative uses, such as timber extraction or conversion for cattle and crops. This trend also built on the fact that NTFP play an important role in the economic strategies of forest settlers. Interest in NTFP itself, however, was not new. Non-timber products were among the first from tropical forests to be traded on the international market. Colonial forestry experts have had an interest in what were previously called “minor or secondary forest products” since the 19th Century (Belcher, 2003). Even though this suggests non-timber products played a minor role, tropical timber extraction for international markets did not begin until the 1950s in countries like the Philippines. Colonial tropical forest experts have produced a sizeable body of literature on the subject (e.g., Burkill, 1955; Kirtikar and Basu, 1935; Watt, 1889).

Renewed interest in NTFP since the late 1980s has much to do with CFM research and development assistance changing focus toward primary forests. Since the perception arose that NTFP could contribute to the conservation of tropical forests, much attention, mainly driven by conservation interests, has been given to NTFP. Important sectors of international development cooperation adopted the same environmental conservation agenda, pursuing a sustainable development agenda that attempted to reconcile the objectives of socioeconomic development with those of environmental conservation. Homma (1992), one of the leading scholars studying this trend, called it “neo-extractivism.” The NTFP boom continued through numerous donor-sponsored initiatives to promote the extraction and commercialization of NTFP, frequently identified as integrated conservation and development projects. These projects increased substantially in tropical forest regions, but they encountered difficulties in reaching their objectives (Wells *et al.*, 1992; Wolmer, 2004). Although the enthusiasm among international conservation NGOs for NTFP and their potential to pursue development and conservation

objectives simultaneously has declined substantially since the mid 1990s, an important number of initiatives to promote NTFP commercialization continue. Most projects today are managed by specialized national NGOs, with direct or indirect support of certain donors.²

In similar fashion, a trend started during the 1980s to return ownership of forestlands to the original forest inhabitants still living in or near the forest. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, social movements emerged in Latin America and Asia to fight against colonial and entrepreneurial invasion into indigenous people's lands. Since the end of the 1980s, a number of publications have appeared (e.g., Poffenberger, 1990; Peluso, 1992) that argue the original inhabitants of tropical forests have a hereditary claim to own forests and forestlands. In addition, these publications suggest local groups would take better care of tropical forests and subject them to more benign and sustainable resource use. In summary, the discussion of returning forestland ownership to the original inhabitants has two key arguments: (1) a moral argument, that contends property rights taken away from the original settlers must be returned; and (2) a utilitarian argument, that contends forests in the hands of local people are better cared for and thus protected for the good of locals and non-locals.

Initiatives to give back forest property rights have had tremendous impact on important international decrees, like Convention 169 (1989) adopted by the International Labor Organization³. Convention 169 instructs participating governments to return land that was occupied by indigenous populations before the government declared these lands to be state property. Many tropical forest countries signed Convention 169 and promulgated legislation to facilitate its implementation. As a result, at the beginning of the 21st Century at least 22% of all tropical forestlands were legally in the possession of indigenous groups (White and Martin, 2002). Efforts to devolve ownership of forestlands and the promotion of NTFP commercialization sometimes coincided, as in the case of Brazilian extractive rubber

² See <http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/publications/ntfbsite/index.htm>; accessed 2007-8-1.

³ See <http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/cgi-lex/convde.pl?C169>; accessed 2007-8-1.

reserves. Extractive reserves have a legal status that allows only local inhabitants to continue their traditional practice of rubber extraction and modest forms of agriculture, as a measure to protect those forests from invasion by cattle ranchers.

Property rights reform first took hold in the 1980s and 1990s. The trend continues today in almost all tropical forest countries, as reflected in their national legislation. For example, Bolivia created Original Communal Territories (TCO) in 1996 and Peru began with the titling of extensive forest territories held by native communities shortly thereafter. The same happened in Asian countries like Vietnam and the Philippines (Chokkalingam *et al.*, 2006b). Nevertheless, some critics (e.g., Edmunds and Wollenberg, 2003) observed that much of the forestland handed over to communities contained forests of low productivity or of no significant commercial value.

Property rights reform had two important consequences for CFM. During the 1990s, significant resources were dedicated to demarcating and titling indigenous lands. Significant investments were also made to promote common property management regimes for tropical forests (Arnold, 2001). Toward the end of the 1990s, common property forest management had the image of a universal solution to the problems of poverty and related resource degradation. Critics, however, questioned the faith put in common property tropical forest management (Campbell *et al.*, 2001). Arguments in favor include: (1) simpler administrative procedures for putting forestland into shared ownership, as compared to individual ownership, (2) a perceived equitable sharing of forest benefits, and (3) abstaining from resource degrading exploitation according to the “tragedy of the commons” syndrome. More recent assessments (e.g., Campbell *et al.*, 2001) suggest that common property regimes do not necessarily contribute to sustainable use, largely because the relative value of the forest does not justify the necessary investment in communal regulating mechanisms and related monitoring. Even though enthusiasm for common property has diminished since its peak in the 1990s, it continues to be of interest to development cooperation experts.

As forestland property rights have changed in the 1990s, a new initiative identified as collaborative forest management, or adaptive collaborative forest management (e.g., Fisher, 1995; Buck *et al.*, 2001; Ruitenbeek and Cartier, 2001; Colfer, 2005), has emerged. *Collaborative forest management*, in its basic form, implies close coordination and collaboration between local users of tropical forests (i.e., communities practicing CFM) and agencies that have technical and administrative responsibilities to manage forests for the public good. In most cases these are state agencies, often in collaboration with environmental NGOs, charged with the task of representing the common interests of society as a whole, while sharing forest management responsibilities with forest communities. *Adaptive collaborative management* extends the concept of collaborative management to include a social learning component that characterizes the evolving trend of collaborative management (e.g., Wollenberg *et al.*, 2007).

Most collaborative forest management systems include regulations and rules that define the conditions under which communities can use and benefit from forests. Communities participating in CFM and professionals from regulating agencies seek joint implementation of management objectives that ensure the interests of all those who consume goods and services from forests are equally represented. These interests may include harvested forest products, ecosystem services, the conservation of biodiversity, or scenic and spiritual values. Collaborative forest management is not a simple matter, much more difficult in practice than in theory. The interactions between regulating and administrative agencies, communities, and private interests, as in the case of property rights, are often characterized by conflict and friction (e.g., Ruiz, 2005).

In summary, the trends described here reflect differing approaches to development cooperation in support of CFM. Generally speaking, these approaches can be grouped into income-generating, property rights, and forest management strategies. The identification of NTFP as a potential market trend, along with the shift toward communal timber harvesting seen since 2000, are strategies to generate income for communities practicing CFM. Efforts to give communities formal

property rights over forestlands guaranteed the basic conditions needed to allow the continued success of CFM practices. The trend toward adaptive collaborative forest management suggests a more comprehensive network of support for the implementation of CFM. In addition to addressing the regulatory and technical aspects of forest management, adaptive collaborative forest management also provides legal security and product development and marketing for CFM projects, while considering social learning among diverse stakeholders.

Trends such as promoting the production and trade of NTFP, changes in property rights, common property regimes, and collaborative forest management show that the development assistance provided to CFM has split into separate and specialized themes that address different aspects of CFM.

6. Conclusion

Our paper has yet to explain why there is increased interest in CFM among forestry and rural development experts, as well as others. CFM has always been subject to waxing and waning interest from the development cooperation sector. Thus, one may wonder if the latest boost in interest comes from new insights into the potential of CFM, or that new development cooperation priorities make CFM a more appropriate focus. Perhaps other circumstances explain the recent trend as well.

To some extent, the observed trend is a product of changes that have taken place over the last decade, especially concerning forestland property rights. As a result, CFM, and the nature of assistance to communities practicing CFM, has changed. Nowadays, the commodities that in many cases are the focus of CFM development assistance have shifted from innocuous NTFP (for which markets and marketable products had to be established) to high value timber (where it still is available), Brazil nuts, eagle wood, rattan, or sandalwood. Thus, CFM assistance focuses on preparing forest management plans for timber production and establishing communal enterprises to market forest products.

As we have demonstrated, CFM has evolved through a non-linear series of events to reach its current state of development. Future trends inside and outside the forest sector will likely continue to shape its development in the years to come. Contemporary CFM is very much rooted in the activities of local people, as well as outside assistance and changes brought about by external economic, political, and social forces. Although our analysis may not provide any direct practical contribution for CFM development practitioners, we hope it gives some insight into the trajectory of CFM development assistance and the fragile bond that holds the two together. As the trajectory of CFM development assistance changes, so too will the on-the-ground reality for CFM practitioners. One can only hope that by the time outside agencies shift their focus to other areas, many communities practicing CFM worldwide will have gained sufficient experience and advanced their skills far enough to carry on with limited support, likely from regional advisors.

References

- Adams, W. (2001) *Green development: Environment and sustainability in the third world*, Routledge, London, 257p.
- Angelsen, A. and Wunder, S. (2003) *Exploring the forest – poverty link: Key concepts, issues and research implications*, Occasional Paper No. 40, Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia, 58p.
- Arnold J.E.M. (2001) *Forest and people: 25 years of community forestry*, Food and Agricultural Organization, Rome, 85p.
- Arnold J.E.M. (1991) *Communal forestry: 10 years in review*, Food and Agricultural Organization, Rome, 39p.
- Balée, W.L. (1984) *The persistence of Ka'apor culture*, Dissertation Columbia University, New York, University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, 290p.
- Belcher, B. (2003) What isn't an NTFP? *Int. For. Rev.* **5**: 161-168.
- Bergman, R.W. (1974) *Shipibo subsistence in the upper Amazon rainforest*, Dissertation Dep. Geography, University of Wisconsin, University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, 340p.

- Bernstein, H. (2005) Development studies and the Marxists, In A radical history of development studies: Individuals, institutions and ideologies (Kothari, U. ed.), pp.111-137, Zedbooks, London.
- Bradley, P.N. (2006) Migration and forests: An overview from Africa. In The Social Ecology of Tropical Forests: Migration, Population and Frontiers (de Jong, W., Lye, T.P. and Abe, K. eds.), pp.87-123, Kyoto University Press and Trans Pacific Press, Kyoto and Melbourne.
- Browder, J. (1992) The Limits of extractivism: Tropical forest strategies beyond extractive reserves, *Bioscience* **42(3)**: 174-182.
- Buck, L., Geisler, C.C., Schelhas, J. and E.Wollenberg (eds.) (2001) Biological diversity balancing interests through adaptive collaborative management, CRC Press, Boca Raton, London, New York, Washington D.C., 465p.
- Burkill, I.H. (1955) A dictionary of the economic products of Malay peninsula, I. The Crown Agent for the Colonies, London, 1481p.
- Calderon, M.M. and Nawir, A.A. (2006) An evaluation of the feasibility and benefits of forest partnerships to develop tree plantations: Case studies in the Philippines, CIFOR Working Paper 27, Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia, 72p.
- Campbell, B., Mandondo, A., Nemarundwe, N., Sithole, B., de Jong, W. Luckert, M. and Matose, F. (2001) Challenges to proponents of common property resource systems – Despairing voices from the social forests of Zimbabwe, *World Develop.* **29(4)**: 589-600.
- Casanova, J. (1975) El sistema de cultivo secoya, Special Issue, Bulletin de la Société Suisse d'Ethnologie, pp.129-143.
- Chibnik, M. (1991) Quasi-ethnic groups in Amazonia, *Ethnology* **30(2)**: 167-182.
- Chokklingam, U., Zhou Zaizhi, Wang Chufeng and Toma, T. (2006a) Learning lessons from China's forest rehabilitation efforts, Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia, 159p.

- Chokkalingam, U., Carandang, A.P., Pulhin, J.M., Lasco, R.D., Peras, R.J. and Toma, T. (2006b) One Century of Forest Rehabilitation in the Philippines, Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia, 132p.
- CIFOR (2007) Towards wellbeing in forest communities: A source book for local government, Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia, 90p.
- Colfer, C.J.P. (2005) The complex forest: communities, uncertainty, and adaptive collaborative management, Resources for the Future and Center for International Forestry Research, Washington, D.C., 370p.
- Colfer C.J.P. and Capistrano, D. (2005) The politics of decentralization: Forests, people and power, Earthscan Publications, London, 322p.
- de Jong, W., Do Dinh Sam, Trieu Van Hung (2006) Forest rehabilitation in Vietnam: Histories, realities and future, Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia, 75p.
- Denevan, W.M., Treacy, J.M., Alcorn, J.B., Padoch, C., Denslow, J. and Flores-Paitan, S. (1984) Indigenous agroforestry in the Peruvian Amazon: Bora Indian management of swidden fields, *Interciencia* **9(6)**: 346-357.
- Dove, M. R. (1994) Marketing the rainforest: Green panacea or red herring? Asia Pacific Issues, 13, East-West Center, Honolulu, 8p.
- Edmunds, D. and Wollenberg, E. (2003) Local forest management: The impacts of devolution policies, Earthscan, London, 208p.
- Fisher, R.J. (1995) Collaborative management of forests for conservation and development, IUCN, WWF, Gland, 65p.
- Gasché, J., Vela Mendoza, N., Vela Mendoza, J.C. and Babilonia Cácerelibertad, E. (2006) Dependencia y constreñimiento en las sociedades bosquesinas amazónicas, Instituto de Investigaciones de la Amazonia Peruana, Iquitos, Peru, 138p.
- Homma, A.K.O. (1992) The dynamics of extraction in Amazonia: A historical perspective, In Non-Timber Products from Tropical Forests: Evaluation of a Conservation and Development (Nepstad, D.C. and Schwartzman, S. eds.), pp.23-31, New York Botanical Garden, New York.

- Kirtikar, K.R. and Basu, B.D. (1935) Indian Medicinal Plants. Vols. I, II, III & IV. Bishan Singh Mahendra Pal Singh, Dehradun, India.
- Larson, A., Pacheco, P., Toni, F. and Vallejo, M. (2006) Exclusión e Inclusión en la Forestería Latinoamericana: Hacia Donde va la Descentralización. Center for Internacional Forestry Research, La Paz, Bolivia, 93p.
- Mayer, J. (1996) Trees vs trees: Institutional dynamics of indigenous agroforestry and industrial timber in West Kalimantan, Indonesia, PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 292p.
- Nawir, A.A. and Santoso, L. (2005) Mutually beneficial company-community partnerships in plantation development: Emerging lessons from Indonesia, *Int. Forestry Rev.* **7(3)**: 177-192.
- Neumann, R.P. (2006) Making political ecology, Oxford University Press Inc., New York, 213p.
- Ngomba, C. (2003) Poverty reduction strategy papers: A new approach to poverty reduction. In Forests in Poverty Reduction Strategies: Capturing the Potentials (Oksanen, T., Pajari, B. and Tuomassjuka, T. eds.), pp.101-108. European Forestry Institute, Proc. No 47, Helsinki.
- Oksanen, T., Pajari, B. and Tuomassjuka, T. (eds.) (2003) Forests in poverty reduction strategies: Capturing the potentials, European Forestry Institute, Proc. No 47, Helsinki, 206p.
- Padoch, C., Chota Inuma, J., de Jong, W. and Unruh, J. (1985) Amazonian agroforestry: A market-oriented system in Peru, *Agrofor. Systems* **3**: 47-58
- Parker, E.P., Posey, D., Frechione, J. and F. da Silva L. (1983) Resource exploitation in Amazonia: Ethno-ecological examples from four populations, *Ann. Carnegie Mus.* **52**: 163-203.
- Peluso, N.L., Turner, M. and Fortmann, L. (1994) Introducing community forestry: Annotated listings of topics and readings, Forestry Note 12, Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome, 146p.
- Poffenberger M. ed. (1990) Keepers of the forest: Land management alternatives in Southeast Asia, W. Kumarian Press, Hartford, Connecticut, 303p.

- Potter, L. (2004) Forests versus agriculture: Colonial forest services, environmental ideas and the regulation of land-use change in Southeast Asia, In *The political ecology of forests in Southeast Asia* (Leye, T.-P., de Jong, W. and Abe, K. eds.), pp.29-72. Kyoto Univ. Press and Trans Pacific Press, Kyoto and Melbourne.
- Ruitenbeek, J. and Cartier, C. (2001) *The invisible wand: Adaptive co-management as an emergent strategy in complex bio-economic systems*. Occasional Paper 34, Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia, 47p.
- Ruiz, S.A. (2004) Redistribución de los recursos forestales en el norte amazónico boliviano, In *Retos y Perspectivas del Nuevo Régimen Forestal en el Norte Amazónico Boliviano* (de Jong, W. ed.), pp.25-46, Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia.
- Ruiz, S.A. (2005) Institutional change and social conflicts over forest use in the northern Bolivian Amazon, *Freiburger Schriften zur Forst- und Umweltpolitik Band 10*, Verlag Dr. Kessel, Remagen-Oberwinter, Germany, 245p.
- Stoian, D. and Donovan, J. (2007) Capacidades empresariales para el desarrollo de empresas forestales comunitarias, Draft manuscript, 48p.
- Sunderlin, W.D., Angelsen, A., Belcher, B., Burgers, P, Nasi, R., Santoso, L. and Wunder, S. (2005) Livelihoods, forests and conservation in developing countries: An overview, *World Develop.* **33(9)**: 1383-1402.
- Tran Van Con (2006) Migration and tropical forests in the Central Highlands of Vietnam, In *The Social Ecology of Tropical Forests: Migration, Population and Frontiers* (de Jong, W. Lye, T.P. and Abe, K. eds.), pp.214-227. Kyoto Univ. Press and Trans Pacific Press, Kyoto and Melbourne.
- Tsing, A. (1999) Becoming a tribal elder and other green development fantasies. In *Transforming the Indonesian uplands* (Li, T. ed.), pp.159-202, Harwood, London.
- Watt, G. (1889) *A Dictionary of the economic products of India*, I. Cosmo Publications, Delhi, 520p.

- Wells, M., Brandon, K. and Hannah, L. (1992) People and parks: Linking protected areas and communities, World Bank, World Wildlife Fund and US Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., 99p.
- White A. and Martin, A. (2002) Who owns the world's forests? Forest Trends, Washington D.C., 30p.
- Wiersum, F. (1999) Social forestry: Changing perspectives in forestry science or practice, Dissertation, Agricultural Univ., Wageningen, Netherlands, 211p.
- Wollenberg, E., Iwan, R., Limberg, G., Moeliono, M., Rhee, S. and Sudana, M. (2007) Facilitating cooperation during times of chaos: Spontaneous orders and muddling through in Malinau district, Indonesia, In Sustainable Collaborative Forest Management: Meeting The Challenges of Decentralization in the Bulungan Model Forest (Gunarso, P., Setyawati, T. Sunderland, T. and Shackleton, C. eds.), pp.57-68. Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia
- Wolmer W. (2004) Biodiversity conservation and the eradication of poverty, *Science* **306**: 1146-1148

コミュニティー・フォレストリーと開発

ビル・デ・ジョング

要約：森林と林業は1970年代に開発を達成する道程として認識され、国際開発協力の中心的なものとしてコミュニティー・フォレストリーの認識へと繋がっていった。厳格な協力の機会、そしてそれらを如何に認識するかは国際的な開発が考えられ始めるにつれ、変化してきた。ここ数十年の間、非木質生産物、森林利権、分権化、そして共同管理などを含み、森林と地域の住民というポイントに焦点が当てられながら、コミュニティー・フォレストリーと開発実施に関する伝統的な分析が行われてきた。開発協力において、要求されている援助のタイプだけでなく、コミュニティー・フォレストリーで共有認識されるルールは国際開発の草案、優先順位そして、その目的の変化に伴い、進化し続けている。

キーワード：コミュニティー・フォレストリー、開発協力、貧困緩和、森林統治