

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <http://www.researchgate.net/publication/266382715>

Can Community Forestry contribute to livelihood improvement and biodiversity? Steps on how to improve community forestry programmes, lessons from work in 11 countries and communiti...

TECHNICAL REPORT · MAY 2010

DOWNLOADS

14

VIEWS

17

4 AUTHORS, INCLUDING:



[Carina Van der Laan](#)

Utrecht University

7 PUBLICATIONS 5 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



WWF

REPORT

MAY

2010

Can Community Forestry contribute to livelihood improvement and biodiversity?

Steps on how to improve community forestry programmes, lessons from work in 11 countries and communities



Hans J.J. Beukeboom (WWF Netherlands)
Carina van der Laan (WWF Netherlands)
Arnold van Kreveld (Ulucus Consultancy)
George Akwah (Consultant)

WWF Netherlands

Table of Contents

Summary	3
Checklist for enabling conditions for community forestry projects	5
1. Introduction	8
2. Community forestry and WWF	9
Community forestry	9
WWF's mission and policy statement on poverty	12
3. Approach and methodology	13
4. Results and Interpretation	16
Country studies	16
Case studies	23
Comparing country studies and case studies	27
5. Conclusions	31
6. References	33
Annex	36

Photocredits

Cover	Brent Stirton / Getty Images	Page 18	Hans Beukeboom / WWF-NL
Page 6	Simon de Trey-White / WWF-UK	Page 21	Edward Parker / WWF-Canon
Page 8	Simon de Trey-White / WWF-UK	Page 24	Michel Gunther / WWF-Canon
Page 10	Hans Beukeboom / WWF-NL	Page 27	Yoshi Shimizu / WWF-Canon
Page 13	N.C. Turner / WWF-Canon	Page 30	Brent Stirton / Getty Images

Summary

A significant area of the world's forests is owned and/or managed by communities and this area is growing rapidly. WWF is interested in the effects of community forestry on livelihoods and biodiversity conservation and wants to know what the main factors/issues are that should be considered when initiating a community forestry project or programme.

This report is based on a questionnaire that was sent out to experts in 11 countries: Albania, Bhutan, Brazil, Cameroon, Indonesia, Kenya, Mozambique, Nepal, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Peru and the Republic of Kosovo. For four of these countries (Cameroon, Indonesia, Mozambique and Nepal) a total of 10 case studies from the field was collected. Additional information was obtained from literature.

The great majority of the case studies, the country studies and literature report improved livelihoods as a consequence of community forestry. For some communities better access to resources such as firewood, water, medicinal plants, etc. for local use is the main benefit. Others succeed in generating income locally, in the region and even through sales internationally.

Positive ecological impact is also reported in some studies: mostly described as an increase in forest cover. Furthermore this includes reduced illegal logging, collecting and poaching and fewer fires. In a few instances a decrease in forest cover has been reported, but this may not be related to the community forestry management but to population pressure. This makes community forest a suitable approach in the landscape approach with national parks, bufferzones and sustainable managed areas.

The studies indicate that community forestry faces many challenges and progress is often slow. Challenges come from within such as the lack of technical, financial and marketing skills; but certainly also from outside, e.g. high population pressure, illegal logging and poaching, and the unrealistic expectation of donors and governments. It is important to realize that these challenges are in no way unique to community forestry and are in fact widespread, especially in developing countries.

Unfortunately good data are scarce. The positive impacts on livelihoods and forest are encouraging (possibly sometimes more perceived than real impacts), but results must be better quantified before stronger conclusions can be drawn.

The studies and literature make abundantly clear that a successful project has to deal with a large number of issues. The authors prepared a checklist (presented hereafter) for enabling conditions for community forestry, such as an enabling environment (e.g. proper legislation and stable government), social considerations (e.g. local involvement, balanced representation and organisational capacity), economic considerations (e.g. a good inventory and market information) and environmental considerations (e.g. appropriate scale).

When assessing the potential for a community forestry project, going through the checklist can help to ensure that only viable projects are started and that new projects incorporate all relevant issues. Some of the key issues are an enabling environment, clear ownership and land use rights, government attitudes, as well as an area's potential, financial skills, organisation and leadership.

Checklist for enabling conditions for community forestry projects

In literature several factors and interventions are given as preconditions or as supportive of community-based forest management (or sometimes of any other community-based conservation-development project). Based on these and the country and case studies, the following list of enabling conditions is suggested. This will help to pre-assess the likelihood that a project becomes successful, to identify where the main challenges lie and to ensure that a project focuses on all significant relevant issues.

Using the checklist will help to ensure:

1. no issues are forgotten and only potentially viable projects are started
2. that a project incorporates all necessary activities at all levels
3. thought is given to upscaling

1. Check for an enabling environment

- a. a supportive political environment (Brown and Wyckoff-Baird, 1992): good forest protection and management legislation, and supportive, capable and stable government at all levels
- b. governments are willing to reform tenure completely, including handing over control of high value forests and decision-making (Hobley, 2007)
- c. governments and communities have overlapping (or certainly not contradicting) objectives
- d. clear and secure property and/or land use rights (Apel, 2000)
- e. clear and secure access rights, accepted by the relevant authorities
- f. the state of natural resources and the benefits for the community are supportive of community forest management
- g. community plans are/can be integrated into the regional context
- h. local partners are willing and able (i.e. having the capacity) to take over a project from a national or an international initiative

2. Social considerations

- a. models respect local cultural, spiritual factors and local customs and make use of existing groups/organisations
- b. the community or group is clearly defined and recognized by the community and appropriate representation is ensured
- c. the community is involved from the start in project design and implementation and lead by committed and skilled group leadership (FAO, 1991)
- d. the community decides, with a high degree of consensus regarding management objectives, and agrees upon regulations and behavioral standards and monitors accordingly
- e. interventions have the goal of improving the livelihood of all local inhabitants, including the poorest, putting people (gender balanced), not conservation as the starting point
- f. the community is able to defend its rights (against outsiders and the state) and to deal with risks (e.g. fire and to an certain extend pests)

- g. (training to strengthen) the organisational capability of local government and village-based institutions (including ways of electing the representations) is critical in decentralized planning and implementation (Man Dongol et al, 2002)



3. Economic considerations

- a. a good inventory of important products within the community forest exists
- b. interventions aim to generate long-term and short-term economic benefits for the people (Sikor and Apel, 1998)
- c. a market for forest products is available and accessible (Woods and Petherham, 2001)
- d. developing markets - especially non-local - is not easy and includes the ability to source and produce regularized supply (quality, quantity and timely) and market what customers want (and thus there is the need to know what customers want) (Hewitt and Castro Delgadillo, 2009)
- e. the net revenue derived from conservation-dependent enterprises must meet or exceed the income generated from existing destructive practices
- f. outside investments require an increased local commitment to forestry activities
- g. (training to strengthen) financial skills as well as skills to acquire materials and funds is critical in decentralized planning and implementation (Aus der Beek and Ondoua, 2009)

4. Environmental/ecological considerations

- a. a reasonable scale and for WWF appropriate geographic location and landscapes; as an element in the landscape approach
- b. (training to strengthen) low impact harvesting techniques
- c. frequent monitoring of ecological impacts, e.g. through engagement of communities in conservation science and research partners (Zich and Compton, 2001)
- d. documented impacts as data are scarce but useful for funding, marketing, etc.
- e. continuous improvement of management plans based on proper data

When assessing the potential for a community forestry project this checklist can help to identify priorities. Activities for a successful project may – and in practice often will – be necessary at different levels. For example, locally financial skills may need to be built up whereas at the same time at the regional level a community forestry project may need to be incorporated in regional plans.

Projects that have activities only at the community level, thus neglecting the regional scale, may well prevent a project from ever becoming self-sustaining (even at a local scale). Furthermore work at different levels will also be necessary if the aim of the project is to scale up results and affect policies and institutions. Tax mechanisms may impede the formation of community forestry enterprises (Molnar et al, 2007) or the prevailing system of administration of forest resources by centralised state organisations using command and control may be inappropriate for community forestry (Pokorny and Jonhson, 2008).

1. Introduction

There is a general assumption that community forestry can contribute to biodiversity conservation and livelihood improvement. However evidence of successful community forestry implementation that has effectively and efficiently contributed to improved nature conservation (biodiversity) and enhanced livelihoods is scarce. However, community forestry is becoming increasingly a more important aspect of landscape and ecological networks and WWF is interested to know if indeed community forestry contributes to the biodiversity while also contributing to livelihood improvement.

WWF is interested in the effects of community forestry on livelihoods and biodiversity conservation in WWF's priority landscapes as part of ecological networks (national parks, buffer zones and sustainable managed areas) and wants to know what factors/issues are important to consider when initiating a community forestry project. Furthermore, WWF wants to consolidate lessons from current experiences in community forestry and draw up a list of enabling conditions to build on when planning, implementing and assessing community forestry projects.

This report is based on interviews, authors' experiences and literature. For this study 11 countries in 4 continents were selected which are important to WWF and for which information was available or could be obtained. These countries for which *country studies* were prepared are Albania, Bhutan, Brazil, Cameroon, Indonesia, Kenya, Mozambique, Nepal, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Peru and the Republic of Kosovo. For four of these countries (Cameroon, Indonesia, Mozambique and Nepal) a total of 10 *case studies* from the field was collected.

Chapter 2 provides background information on community forestry and WWF's role. In Chapter 3 the methodology is described. Chapter 4 presents the results and chapter 5 lists the main conclusions. Chapter 6 provides a checklist for Enabling Conditions, which can be used when assessing the potential for community forestry and when formulating a project.



2. Community forestry and WWF

In the global efforts to link natural resources management and poverty alleviation, community forestry has been identified and valued by development and Natural Resources Management policies across the world as a sector of investment capable of offering important economic opportunities for rural people: but how relevant is community forestry globally, and how effective locally?

Community forestry

The FAO (1978) defines 'forestry for community development' as forestry for the people and involving the people. The importance of the forest and its goods and services to rural people is threefold:

1. Forest trees provide fuel and other goods that are essential to meeting basic needs at the rural household and community level.
2. Forests and forest lands provide food and the environmental stability necessary for continued food production.
3. Forests and forest products can generate income and employment in the rural community.

FAO (1978) lists the following outputs of forestry to rural communities: fuel, building materials, food, fodder, grazing, saleable products and raw materials. A number of non-material potential outputs are very important as well, including local democracy and governance.

More than a decade later FAO (1991) states:

"Our present understanding leaves us with less clear-cut prescriptions for action than was the case when the problem appeared to be heavily concentrated on fuel wood shortages, deforestation and the consequent need to plant more trees. Clearly "community forestry" is most accurately and usefully understood as an umbrella term denoting a wide range of activities which link rural people with forests and trees, and the products and benefits to be derived from them. If there is one dimension to be stressed above others it is the range and diversity of these linkages, and the span of different disciplines which are engaged in aspects of community forestry. Community forestry is therefore not a separate discipline, or even programme, but one dimension of forestry, agriculture, rural energy and other components of rural development."

When implemented appropriately, forest tenure reform can benefit millions of rural people, help redress past injustices, and encourage better forest management (Sunderlin et al, 2008). Sunderlin et al found that there are at least 350 million hectares of forest land worldwide owned by communities and indigenous groups. An additional 77 million hectares of public forest land are designated for use by communities and indigenous peoples. In the developing countries studied in White and Martin (2002), 22% of the forest lands were owned by or designated for communities and indigenous peoples. Six years later in 2008, 27% of the forests in the same countries were owned by or designated for communities and indigenous peoples. This clearly illustrates the increased importance of communities in forest ownership



and management. Numerous projects - including WWF projects - implement community forestry with limited (pre-) assessment of their potential to improve livelihoods and conserve biodiversity. This results in projects in which the contribution of community forestry towards these goals is not clear or not clearly documented.

In practice, many problems are encountered. Examples are delays in implementation, continued illegal logging due to an influx of migrants, no repayment on investments, conflicts over resources, etc. Sunderlin et al (2008) summarize the challenges to clarifying and improving forest tenure rights as follows:

“Horizontal conflict among forest peoples and communities also poses a monumental problem. Governments are an important dimension of the challenge because they are susceptible to being swayed by the rich and powerful, because some aspects of forest decentralization and devolution have not ended up favoring the interests of forest peoples, and because the administrative capabilities of government may be limited. There is a fundamental problem that perpetuates this state of affairs. Forest peoples tend to lack the political power necessary to counteract the forcible appropriation of their lands and resources and to promote policies that would protect and enhance their rights. As various observers have rightly pointed out, rights lack meaning and utility unless they are accompanied by the power to enforce them.”

It is no surprise therefore that the international research project ForLive found that no spontaneous adoption of community forestry has taken place (Bokorny and Johnson, 2008). In an analysis of experiences in Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador and Brazil it was found that

considerable external resources were needed to overcome the technical, legal and financial barriers inherent in the current community forestry framework.

While this picture is gloomy, it is important to realize that forests under other types of management also face many threats. FAO (2010) reports that deforestation was at an alarmingly high rate in the last decade, with an annual loss of 13 million hectares. 1% of all forests are significantly affected by forest fires every year. Forests in protected areas are not safe either. Nelleman et al (2007) reported that 37 out of 41 national parks in Indonesia are affected by illegal logging and encroachment.

Sunderlin et al (2008) are hopeful about community forestry:

“There are four areas in which we see signs of progress: (1) recent policy changes in various countries that signal at least an intention to join the worldwide trend toward strengthening local forest tenure; (2) research findings suggesting that strengthened forest tenure can under some circumstances improve wellbeing, provide the means to exclude outside claimants, and improve forest management and conservation; (3) possible leverage that forest peoples might gain as a result of global responses to climate change; and (4) the emergence of grassroots mobilization for forest tenure reform.”

Some key examples, considered more or less successful socially and/or ecologically, include Vietnam’s upland (Tran Duc Vien, 2010), the Turf and Chipko systems in India, Umunnu in Nigeria, the Eastern Arc Mountains in Tanzania (Vyamana, 2009) and Sagia in Sudan which are acknowledged as ‘working’ community-based forest management systems. In Latin America, the examples of the Regional Corporation of Urabá in Colombia and the Municipal government of Concepción in Bolivia are cases in point (Johnson, 2009). Positive examples are also available in Bhutan where community forestry contributes to biodiversity and livelihood improvement (see A series of Case Studies on Community-Based Forest and Natural Resource Management in Bhutan (2006-2008).

On the other hand in the Terai Arc Landscape, Nepal, conflict over forest resources between the local communities who are managing the forest’s resources and immigrants, puts livelihood and conservation goals at stake. Furthermore, highly differentiated and unequal structures exist within rural communities (Hobley, 2007). Simply being pro-local, pro-community, pro-indigenous, pro-customary does not necessarily equate to being pro-poor. Policy and practice has largely ignored the rapidly increasing levels of inequality now being documented across the world. Community-based forest management may locally even be increasing the gap between rich and poor (Moss et al, 2005; Vyamana, 2009; Mahanty et al, 2009).

Johnson (2009) sums up lessons from community forestry in 5 Latin American countries:

“For the approach to expand in a spontaneous way it is necessary to create an enabling environment with appropriate incentive structures and systems of technical assistance and credit or other financial incentives to enable

communities to adopt forest management. The system of command and control has severe limitations especially in consideration of the limited capacity of the state and excessively centralised way in which it is implemented. Future work should then concentrate on dialogue with decision makers to design and implement such an environment.”

WWF's mission and policy statement on poverty

WWF's mission is to stop the degradation of the planet's natural environment and to build a future in which humans live in harmony with nature. Firstly, by conserving the world's biological diversity by protecting and where possible rehabilitating key priority areas, with specific attention to tropical and non-tropical forests, wetlands, seas and oceans. Secondly, WWF focuses on ensuring that the use of renewable natural resources is sustainable in order to reduce the pressure on WWF's key priority areas (in a landscape approach), by amongst others minimizing deforestation, desiccation, overharvesting of fish, climate change and illegal trade in flora and fauna.

Most of WWF's work takes place in high biodiversity areas where an estimated 70% of the poor live. WWF strongly believes that in order to achieve sustainable conservation results, poor rural people must be involved as equal partners and activities should be carried out in a just and equitable way. Sustainability is often more successful when initiatives come from within (Wilson et al, 2009). The dynamics between biodiversity and poverty are complex. A WWF policy statement on Poverty and Conservation has been formally adopted by the WWF network (2009). It gives guidance to the WWF Network on how to engage in nature – poverty issues. WWF Netherlands office has earmarked funds for the establishment of a learning network on poverty in Africa.

WWF Position Paper on Poverty and Conservation

WWF cannot celebrate the richness of the natural world while ignoring the poverty that exists in many places of high biodiversity. There is both an ethical and a practical imperative for WWF to address poverty issues. WWF recognizes that conserving and managing natural resources is essential in the fight against poverty and that conservation will only be successful in the long term if it addresses the development needs and aspirations of local communities.

The basis of WWF's stance on poverty is a commitment to strive to find equitable solutions for people and the environment and to enable poor communities to achieve tangible benefits from the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. In many instances, particularly where poverty levels are high and people are heavily dependent on natural resources for their wellbeing, WWF will take a pro-active position, embracing a pro-poor approach to conservation, and making special efforts to enable local people to play a key part in crafting solutions for sustainable development.

In addition WWF recognizes the important poverty-related aspects of our work to influence global policies and processes, as a means of helping to ensure that conservation and development strategies and agreements take account of poverty concerns. Our work to redress unsustainable consumption patterns and our concerted efforts in the fight against climate change also offer new opportunities for tackling poverty.

WWF stands ready to take up the poverty challenge, drawing on our long-standing experience at the field level and developing a strategic approach that integrates our poverty-related work from the local to the global level.

(The full policy is available on www.panda.org)

3. Approach and methodology

This report is based on 11 *country studies* (Annex A) and 10 *case studies* (Annex B). The respondents were either experts in community forestry (CF) or closely involved in or responsible for the implementation and/or support of community forestry projects.

From August 2009 till January 2010, a questionnaire was sent out to 11 countries (9 WWF offices and 2 SNV offices) involved in community forestry. The 11 countries involved are Albania, Bhutan, Brazil, Cameroon, Indonesia, Kenya, Mozambique, Nepal, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Peru and the Republic of Kosovo. Each respondent received the questionnaire consisting of 16 questions (see table 1) formulated by Hans J.J. Beukeboom, George Akwah and Carina van der Laan.



Table 1. Country study questionnaire

Topic (and description)	
1	<p>Government/Governance <i>Description of the general government structure and governance type especially related to forestry in general, forest management and CF (e.g. Ministry of Forestry/Development Cooperation/etc.), and to what extent is the government (de)centralized? What is the level of devolution of powers/decision-making/budget to regional/local and non-state entities?</i></p>
2	<p>Policies, laws/acts, rules and regulations and others relating to 1. Sustainable development, 2. Livelihoods development/poverty reduction; 3. General forest management; 4. Community-Based Natural Resource Management; 5.CF <i>Identification and brief description of existing policies, laws and regulations pertinent to sustainable development, poverty reduction, and forest management in general and CF more specifically</i></p>
3	<p>Name land use categories and where CF is possible <i>Brief description of the types and functions of land/forest use categories, their management and property regimes and management objectives (e.g. production), HCVF (e.g. conservation), National Park (e.g. protected), Agriculture (e.g. agricultural activities, no forest crops). Brief description of property regimes (e.g. ignorance or acknowledgement of customary land rights) and management objectives</i></p>
4	<p>CF motivations and objectives <i>Brief description of the reasons the national (or district/local) government embarked on the CF process (e.g. due to international pressure or adaptation to decentralized frameworks, biodiversity or socioeconomic motives, etc.)</i></p>
5	<p>CF and NRM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Types • The government's implementation strategy/approach • Steps of CF acquisition process <p><i>Description of the type / all types of NRM and CF in the country (e.g. in wetlands and forests, inside or outside national parks or possibility to sell logs/NTFPs), the government's implementation strategy/approach, and step-by-step described acquisition process for applicants</i></p>
6	<p>Organisations involved in CF, e.g. NGOs, private sector organisations, and the institutional/organisational structures at the administrative level of the government <i>Identification and description of non-governmental, private, as well as governmental organisations involved in/supporting the implementation of CF in this country and short description of their roles</i></p>
7	<p>Extension materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manuals • Training modules • Templates (management plans, activity planning, inventories...) <p><i>Identification and description of training, technical, and extension support materials set in place to support the implementation of CF by communities and organisations involved</i></p>
8	<p>Duration of management agreement with the government and the frequency of revision/updating of CF management plan <i>Description of the types of management agreements between the government and community forestry user group and Identification of how often CF management plans need to be revised/updated by the community forestry user groups</i></p>

Topic (and description)	
9	Law enforcement in Community Forestry Areas <i>Description of the level of law enforcement regarding CF;</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What is the role of governmental law enforcement of the management plan (during development and during execution of management plan)?</i> • <i>How does the community itself ensure proper implementation of the management plan (e.g. concerning illegal logging, overharvesting, fair sharing of benefits, etc.)?</i>
10	Do laws/regulations/rules say anything about business opportunities in CF? <i>Description of whether it is allowed to sell (excess) of CF products or to set off small and medium-sized enterprises.</i>
11	Minimum and maximum size of CF <i>Assessment of the minimum and maximum number of hectares allowed for CF</i>
12	Current progress of CF implemented (number of ha, households, % of natural products...) <i>Description of the current performance and achievements of CF with regards to (named and not named) livelihood and sustainable forest management objectives/expectations (e.g. number of jobs created, increase in income, and number of ha, number of households involved, % of natural products)</i>
13	Past/current role of WWF in CF <i>Description of the past and current role of WWF in CF</i>
14	Opportunities for involvement of WWF in CF <i>Description of which way WWF should (or should not) be engaged in CF (e.g. as problem identifier, facilitator of CF-implementation process, or CF implementer, etc.?). Besides, description of whether/why/why not WWF has the capacity to deal with CF projects or whether it is better for other organisations to deal with CF; whether enough other organisations are already dealing with CF or whether the communities trust/put sufficient faith in WWF?</i>
15	Elements of CF necessary for it to contribute to poverty reduction <i>Description, based on experiences of the respondent, about whether and how CF can contribute to poverty reduction</i>
16	Elements of CF necessary for it to contribute to biodiversity conservation <i>Description, based on experiences of the respondent, about whether and how CF can contribute to biodiversity conservation</i>

The responses of the 11 countries (Annex A) were analyzed and where possible common conclusions were drawn (see chapter 4). The common similarities (trends) were translated into a draft checklist for enabling conditions.

To get a better insight into experiences in the field, 10 community forestry case studies were collected; 7 through face-to-face interviews and 3 in writing (Annex B). The case studies are from Indonesia, Nepal, Mozambique and Cameroon. These four countries are all included in the 11 country studies. The main topics dealt with are the objectives of the communities to be involved in community forestry, the organisations that provide(d) support, resource management arrangements in the community, market organisation, livelihood impacts, biodiversity impacts, and the major difficulties the communities face(d).

4. Results and Interpretation

Firstly, the results and discussion (i.e. interpretations) of the 11 country studies are presented. Followed by the results of the 10 case studies. This chapter ends with a short comparison of the results of the country studies with the case studies.

Country studies

Question 1 Government/Governance

Question 2 Policies, laws/acts, rules and regulations related to sustainable development, livelihoods development/poverty reduction, general forest management, Community-Based Forest Management, community forestry

Question 3 Name land use categories and where community forestry is possible

Forest management issues are normally included under forest-related legal frameworks, while issues related to business and governance are often regulated under other legal frameworks (E.g. Home Affairs and Industries). As a result a great number of Ministries and Departments are involved at different stages in community forestry. Countries have different land use and forest categories making it difficult to compare where and when community forestry is allowed, and under which conditions. Overall it can be concluded that most countries do allow, with or without restrictions, community forestry in most land-use categories. Decision-making in most countries is rather centralized, but a slow trend is visible towards decentralization to more local authorities. This trend often goes hand in hand with decentralization policies and small scale business support to communities.

Interpretation

At a national level a detailed study of community forestry's legal framework is needed before taking the decision to establish or support a community forestry programme. Such an analysis will show where the opportunities are and where intervention will be crucial. It will clarify who the main governmental partners are, and at which level. As such it is instrumental for the formulation of an effective community forestry project.

Question 4 Community forestry motivations and objectives of the government

National governments in general are very ambitious when establishing community forestry and see this as a way to solve the problems of forest degradation and deforestation. Furthermore, community forestry is seen as a way to help and implement decentralization, reduce poverty, improve livelihoods and provide jobs.

Slowly it is generally being recognized that community forestry is not the answer to the above issues (as the communities are often not the cause of the problems!) but that community forestry can contribute to the solution. Community forestry is often initiated due to donor pressure. This could explain the ambitious objectives and the slow progress, as the donor's objective is not always (fully) supported by the receiving country/community.

Interpretation

Community forestry can contribute to bigger objectives like poverty reduction, deforestation and decentralization. However, to avoid disappointment in partners and donors it is crucial that any establishment of, and involvement in, community forestry programmes is based on realistic objectives (a slow trend towards more realistic results is currently visible).

Question 5 **Community forestry and NRM types, the government's implementation strategy/approach, and steps of community forestry acquisition process**

Question 6 **Organisations involved in community forestry, e.g. NGOs, private sector organisations, and the institutional/organisational structures at the administrative level of the government**

Community forestry, in the majority of the 11 studied countries, deals with management rights and not with land ownership (this remains with the state). In some countries community forestry is fully embedded in the decentralization process (and the communities are in the lead). In others it is a top-down process. Forest authorities at different levels are involved and this makes community forestry (unnecessarily) complicated and bureaucratic, with many paper checks and balances and (unnecessary) rules and requirements. The often centralized approval of community forestry shows some government distrust and reluctance to support community forestry. International NGOs are frequently involved in the establishment of community forestry programmes, but increasingly local NGOs are taking up this role.

Interpretation

Although legal frameworks are often very different, countries can learn from each other about what is really needed for the process of establishing and guiding the implementation of community forestry. Good examples exist of both decentralized and centralized community forestry programmes. It is important to clearly define the goals of community forestry and how to reach these. This could result in the simplification of government requirements. International NGOs can play an important role, but support from local NGOs and civil society is more important in the long run. Thus relevant local partners should be involved from the start.

Question 7 Extension materials, e.g. manuals, training modules, templates (management plans, activity planning, inventories...)

A wide range of materials is available varying from manuals to complete trainings. Many guidelines prepared by governments and/or NGOs, are referred to. In many cases companies also provide training material and capacity building. A great number of case studies has been produced describing the positive and negative aspects of community forestry. Most of the materials have been prepared with the involvement and support of international NGOs and Donors. Sometimes access to guidelines is seen as a problem. Technical assistance by NGOs is seen as useful for building local capacity.

Interpretation

Materials supported by the international community can and should be shared so that people can learn from each other. By using existing materials that have proved their worth in the field, a high quality can be guaranteed and duplication of work can be avoided. Adaptation to local circumstances will probably be necessary though.



Question 8 Duration of management agreement with the government and the frequency of revision/updating of community forestry management plan

It shows that the duration of an agreement for community forestry is longer in Africa than in Asia. The Government is often much involved in what the management plan should look like and the many formulations of the management descriptions, but there is not much follow-up which makes it just a paper exercise.

Interpretation

The preparation of a management plan is costly (time and resources wise) and it should thus be valid for a relatively long period to make the resources spent worthwhile. There is no reason why this period should be shorter than that of other management regimes, nor why requirements should not be tougher. Only information central to the management of the forest should be in the plan. In many countries management plans for community forestry are required to go into too much detail without any clear benefit.

Question 9 Law enforcement in Community Forestry Area by the government and/or community

Most of the communities have some form of (self) regulation as the government is only involved in the preparation phase. This regulation is often implemented through community guards or a similar local group. Often, communities take law enforcement seriously as this will show their good will to the government and not provide the administration with any pretext for claiming back the community-managed area. Governments in many countries do not provide follow-up support although on paper they should.

Interpretation

As the government is often not involved in community forestry after approval it is important that by-laws are practical and enforced by the community. Making communities responsible for law enforcement can be seen as part of the decentralization that comes with community forestry. Communities directly benefit from law enforcement and are thus motivated to take this seriously. This has positive effects on the forest management as well as the group's functioning.

Question 10 Do laws/regulations/rules say anything about business opportunities in community forestry?

Most countries allow establishment of businesses for timber and other forest products. In general excess products can be sold with or without paying royalties. It is important that the running of an enterprise is properly discussed and regulated within the community to avoid that only a few benefit or cause problems within the community. Many governments require management plans and annual harvest plans thus keeping oversight and control over economic activities. Some communities organise themselves in business or create a community-controlled business to manage their acquired community area.

Interpretation

Businesses resulting from community forestry should be linked to the harvest plans to ensure that economic activities do not lead to unsustainable harvesting and degradation of the forest. A different set of skills is required to establish and run a business which is often not available at community level, but also not at the local forestry levels. This requires capacity building.

Question 11 Minimum and maximum allowed size of community forest

No general conclusions could be drawn about the size of a community forest area as it varies too much per country and continent. Sometimes there is a clear maximum (of a few thousand hectares or a number of hectares per family), but just as often there is no upper limit. In some instances reference is made to the claims the communities have. No link between size and the objectives of community forestry (such as avoidance of deforestation, forest restoration or poverty reduction) was found.

Interpretation

The objectives for the community forestry established (from both government and community perspective) and the number of people in the community should match with the size and condition of the forest managed by the community to be able to fulfill the objectives. Otherwise the result may be overharvesting (too many people compared to the size of the area) or too much land to enforce regulations on (not enough people compared to the size of the area).

Question 12 Current progress of community forestry implemented (number of hectares, households, % of natural products...)

In general the scope and size of community forestry programmes is limited. Plans are ambitious but implementation in general seems slow. As can be expected, countries with longer experience in community forestry have established more community forests.

Interpretation

To monitor progress, statistics should be maintained on key community forestry data (e.g. the number of hectares, employment effects, etc.). These data are needed in order to evaluate the effectiveness of community forestry and to be able to adapt policies, where and when necessary.

Question 13 Past/current role of WWF in community forestry

Question 14 Opportunities for involvement of WWF in community forestry

WWF is involved in certain areas and has many different roles, both at policy and field level. WWF has often been working in the field for a long time and has gained the trust of partners, both locally as well as in (national) government. The organisation's established credibility is extremely important when facilitating complex processes. According to the respondents,



WWF should be more process-oriented and facilitate and support other NGOs who help the communities to move forward. Specific opportunities mentioned include technical support, fundraising, lobbying, market linkage and facilitation, preferably in areas of high biodiversity.

Interpretation

WWF is not a global leader in community forestry, but it is nevertheless locally considered an important player. The fact that WWF has many different roles is not necessarily a problem. Local conditions and necessities vary widely and these must be taken into account. When WWF gets involved in community forestry work it should from the start cooperate with partners who can take over specific tasks from WWF. But even then WWF should be prepared to stay involved for a long period as it takes time to gain trust and achieve a real and lasting effect. A problem with WWF's involvement is the organisation's insecure (short duration) funding cycles and insufficient capacity for e.g. community group formation, generating good governance within the group, defining whether there is sufficient access to the market and generating access to markets which all requires a long term commitment. WWF should limit its work on community forestry to areas of high relevance to the organisation.

Question 15 Elements of community forestry necessary for contribution to poverty reduction

In most community forestry programmes the people earn money from sales and sharing of royalties. Some communities are also involved in (paid) forest restoration work. Most countries have case studies showing that communities benefit financially from community forestry. Also important for community forestry in order to contribute to poverty reduction are other aspects that come with community forestry programmes such as community organisation (governance) and increased development plans. Good governance, local capacity, control over forest resources and effective local institutions are some of the factors mentioned as needed in order for community forestry to be able to successfully contribute to livelihoods.

Interpretation

Although communities benefit from community forestry, impacts are often not properly documented and it is not always clear if these benefits significantly improve livelihoods, or even if they are perceived or real. Results should be quantified, captured in reports and shared. This is especially important when further funding is required.

Question 16 Elements of community forestry necessary for contribution to biodiversity conservation

In general it is assumed that community forestry helps to stop the trend of forest degradation and deforestation. In some cases it results in an increase of the forest area. There is limited knowledge on the impact on biodiversity, only one documented case from Bhutan did show biodiversity increases after 5 years of community forestry. Elements contributing to ecologically responsible management are clear harvesting prescriptions, proper inventories, institutional capacity, and a link between biodiversity and livelihoods.

Interpretation

It is seen as positive that there are community forestry management plans outlining how to manage forests sustainably for timber and other forest products. By-laws and self-regulation by the communities also contribute to more ecologically responsible forest management and the protection of biodiversity (especially by-laws on poaching). With respect to traditional logging not much information is available about the effects on biodiversity, so it is not fair to demand well-documented results from community forestry. In recent years more scientific studies on the impacts of different forms of logging are appearing though. Therefore it is important to conduct and analyse biodiversity inventories for community forestry as well. If positive impacts are shown, this will be seen by the international community (donors and NGOs) as an important impact of community forestry and may broaden financial support.

Case studies

1. The objectives of the community to be involved in community forestry

Primarily communities become involved in community forestry to have easier access to, and authority over, 'their' community forest resources. They want to preserve the natural resources (incl. forest, land, wildlife) and thereby improve their lives, thus explicitly linking ecological balance to livelihoods. Halting illegal logging is mentioned specifically by a number of communities as something the government has not been effective on. Several communities indicate that they find this important also for future generations.

Interpretation

The communities indicate a clear link between socio-economic and ecological values of the community forest.

2. External support to communities

External support is/was mainly provided by international NGOs with a local office and local/national organisations. Support was given on a wide range of issues e.g. reforestation, community group formation, development of community forestry management plans, lobbying, etc. Additionally, most communities also received support from the government, mainly the District Environment/Forest/ Wildlife Office/Service. Government mainly provided technical support and help with reforestation (e.g. provision of seeds).

Interpretation

The support provided is/was context specific and was given by a variety of organisations (local – national, governmental and nongovernmental). In all cases, NGOs were involved. The wide support can be seen as positive, but the fact that support is needed on so many issues also illustrates the complexity of community forestry.

3. Resource management arrangements in the community

Most of the management plans describe under which laws the community forest is managed by the community. The plan often includes a zoning of the area, an inventory of available resources and a description of the planned interventions. In most cases, the management plan must be approved by the Forest Office (on a local level, e.g. district or provincial) and has to be updated and approved on a regular basis, for example every 2 or 5 years. In Nepal, several community committees 'punish' illegal harvesters who do not respect the management plan.

Interpretation

The community forestry management plan is a useful tool that helps communities manage their community forest sustainably and according to their own selected laws and interventions. Nevertheless overharvesting in some cases still takes place. The quality of a management plan or its implementation is thus not in all cases a guarantee for responsible forest management. Additional inventories and support are sometimes necessary. Complicated inventories and management descriptions will have little benefit for communities as they might not understand them. The forest will likely be better managed by utilizing and integrating the communities' practices and knowledge.



4. Market organisation

A wide range of products and services is reported: timber, grasses, bamboo, charcoal, fuelwood, resin, fruit, fibre, medicinal plants, tourism, game, organic tea, mushroom, beekeeping, aquaculture and water. Most of the harvesting is done by the community, but there are other arrangements, such as a joint venture with a private timber company. Several communities or members of the communities do not get their benefits from income generation, but from having access to natural resources. Some products are made locally, such as furniture and sleeping mats. Some communities sell processed products e.g. wood-based products, paper and charcoal, to local buyers within the village, as well as to buyers from other villages (incl. middlemen) or in the capital. One community is a shareholder of the Lokta paper factory and sells high quality paper nationally and internationally (a percentage of the profit is invested in the community fund). Jobs are thus created, but it remains unclear in most instances if enough revenue is generated for the operation to be economically viable. Some of the products are successful, whereas others (sleeping mats) are not sold 'contrary to promises made'.

Interpretation

Market organisation is not necessary when communities only (wish to) benefit from improved access to fulfill local needs. Most communities that sell products do so within the village or at local markets, requiring little organisation. Therefore market organisation apparently was not seen as an important issue by the respondents. However in some

cases products have been produced for which there was no market. The majority of all products are sold within the village, possibly because quality, volume or predictability are low. Another explanation of why products are sold locally is because there was no market organization to support selling outside the community.

5. Results livelihoods (incl. socio-economic circumstances)

Impacts such as ‘an increased external income’, ‘no decrease in/improved livelihood conditions’, and ‘better access to community forest and water resources’ were indicated frequently by the communities. Communities are positive about having user rights and feel ownership of the community forest. They can set up a revolving fund for community loans and consequently have the possibility to invest in social projects (construction of hospitals, schools, and roads). Other benefits reported by communities are a feeling of being more involved in decision-making, better access to forest resources by the poor, an increased feeling of strength, more democratic processes, and being more effective in influencing policy. The Nepali case studies specifically mention the poor benefiting from community forestry.

Interpretation

It is not known in all case studies whether the increase of income has been real, significant and whether it is shared (fairly) by the entire community (including the poor). Nor whether the income was greater than investments, in other words if the operation is economically viable without outside support. Data on significant and quantitative outputs and impacts were not found. Nevertheless most communities indicate that community forestry benefits them in some way.

6. Results in biodiversity conservation

Several communities report an increase in forest cover of the community forest, a reduction in bush fires, and a reduction in poaching and illegal harvesting of natural resources within their community forest. It is unknown whether the problem of illegal harvesting shifted to other (neighboring) areas outside the community forest. One project (Krui, Indonesia) focused on the impact of community forestry on biodiversity, with significantly more bird and plant species in the community forest than in an adjacent rubber plantation.

Interpretation

There has been much focus on the impact of community forestry on forest cover and much less on biodiversity. The communities in the case studies indicate that additional measures are sometimes needed to create positive impacts on the community forest such as reforestation, patrolling (by the government) and raising awareness. In most instances there was no forest cover loss and even an increase reported, but data on the quality of the forest were lacking. More reliable data are important for possible future income opportunities. In principle an increase in forest cover usually benefits biodiversity, but for animals that are used as a source for food this happens only if hunting/poaching is well regulated.

7. Difficulties the communities faced

Several communities pointed out that there is a lot of pressure on the community forest due to high population pressure within the village and from outsiders, slow regeneration of trees, poor management of extraction, illegal extraction of resources and bush fires. A few communities indicated problems with landslides, external extraction of firewood (by people outside the community) and overlapping concessions.

Some communities reported a lack of (starting) capital for small and large scale investments, lack of proper training, interference by the government in management of revenues and a lack of capacity.

Interpretation

Although communities promote community forestry they also face serious challenges. To overcome these they need support, such as support in law enforcement, capacity building and financial support. This is understandable, as community forestry deals with many different aspects and many skills are required. The high pressure from outside may be especially difficult to deal with and this is likely to increase even further in the years to come.

Comparing country studies and case studies

Interesting similarities are found between the country studies and the case studies, but also some noteworthy differences. These are listed in this part of the study. Some observations from literature have been added.

There is overlap in the goals mentioned in the country studies and those listed in the case studies. According to the country studies, governments aim to achieve decentralization and case studies report that communities are motivated by being more involved in decision-making. Increased local involvement in decision-making and decentralization of course are different perceptions – by communities and governments respectively – of the same process. As such, community forestry is widely reported to be successful, although gender issues are generally neglected (Agarwal, 2001; Bradley, 2005; Buchy and Subba, 2003; Namgay and Sonam, 2006; Odebode, 2005).

The country studies conclude that government and donor ambitions are often too high. They are often much more ambitious than the more realistic objectives of the communities. This is not mentioned as a problem in the case studies however. Although many different situations exist, it is always important to combine realistic ambitions with proper funding and community involvement.

The country studies also state that implementation of management plans is typically slow. Again, case studies do not report this problem. A third problem mentioned in the country studies, but not in the case studies, is the duration of management plans being too short. Communities are generally positive about having management plans, although the country



studies state that the process of preparing and approving a management plan is too complex and governments are inclined to want to keep too much control. According to the country studies, governments provide little follow-up after having approved the management plan. Case studies are more positive, mentioning technical support and help with replanting (provision of seeds) as examples of government assistance after approval of the management plan.

Johnson (2009), in his report based on experiences with community forest management initiatives with indigenous communities in five Latin American countries, is specific on this point:

“There is no presence of the State in rural areas and although many of the countries have reorganised the political organisation of national territories to decentralise the provision of public services to local communities, this has tended to have been limited to investment in health, education and infrastructure. Local economic development and environmental management are not considered to be development priorities. Thus, no official system to provide technical assistance to indigenous people or rural communities exists in any of the five countries, for either the agricultural or forestry sectors and no official lines of credit to promote community forestry exist.”

Both the country studies and the case studies report improved livelihoods and both remark that data are often lacking. The country studies state that most communities earn money. The case studies however conclude that many communities benefit primarily from better access to water, firewood and medicinal plants. Molnar et al (2007) report that community enterprises can be very profitable, with returns from 10-50% on timber and non-timber forest products. Johnson (2009) reports high income generation in areas where the forest is relatively abundant in relation to the number of communities and lower in areas with less forest per capita or higher extraction costs. Butterfield et al (2009) studied 3 community forestry enterprises that are part of the Rainforest Alliance’s TREES Programme and finds improved competitiveness, higher revenues and employment and development of new products. An analysis by Hobley (2007) shows that there have been really significant changes in the ways in which forests are managed, and that opportunities have been created for benefits to remain at the local-level; with the major challenge now being how to shift the benefit systems to ensure that they really do become sustained in their outcomes and pro-poor in the sense of reaching the poorer members within the ‘local’, the ‘community’, the ‘customary’ and the ‘indigenous’ group.

CIFOR’s Forest Livelihood Briefs (number 10, 2008) summarizes what is needed in the long run, in order for a community forestry enterprise to contribute towards poverty alleviation: it needs to generate profit, ensure equity in the distribution of income and ensure that the resources are not depleted. On community-corporate relationships, Hewitt and Castro Delgadillo (2009) found that key factors affecting success were: 1) the level of business skills, financial management and human capacity of the communities; 2) the level of support for

this type of relationship provided by the prevailing business and political environment and 3) the level of trust established between the company and community.

Country and case studies both report (perceived) improved forest/tree cover in community forestry. Data on biodiversity impacts are very scarce however. Case studies do report a need for additional measures such as awareness raising and patrolling. Furthermore they report problems due to increasing population pressure. This leads to forest degradation (e.g. collection of firewood), also within the community forest.

The issue of biodiversity and community forestry is of great importance to WWF. It is therefore interesting to note that the limited existing literature is more positive about conservation impacts. Molnar et al (2007) conclude, based on 20 case studies, that community forestry enterprises are important conservation agents in areas with high biodiversity: *“environmental benefits include reduced clearing at the agricultural frontier and less deforestation, access to better water supplies, reduction of risk of damage from disasters, improved biodiversity and integrity of the forest resource, and, in Nepal at least, agricultural productivity increases as a result of improved natural pest balance where forests have regenerated”*. Sunderlin et al (2008) report *“that strengthening forest tenure security can result in improved management and conservation of forests, and conversely, that weak tenure can result in poor management and conservation outcomes”*. Gregersen and Contreras (2010) reach the same conclusion: *“The transfer of a degree of control and ownership of forestlands to communities, particularly those that have established traditional rights, which had not been previously recognized by the state ... has proven to be more effective than state regulation in securing enhanced forest management and conservation (Molnar, Scherr and Khare, 2004).”* Both reports however do not sufficiently substantiate this claim with thorough scientific studies. The study referred to (Molnar et al, 2004) in fact it states: *“Important conservation benefits accrue from community conservation systems ... [but] Community ownership is not a guarantee of conservation behaviour.”* Johnson (2009) reports that in all five countries included in his study independent FSC-certification reports mention reduced illegal logging, which in general is good for biodiversity.



5. Conclusions

Communities are significant and of increasing importance to forest management

A minimum of 350 million hectares of forest land is owned by communities and indigenous groups. An additional 77 million hectares of public forest land are designated for use by communities and indigenous peoples. This share is growing: for 18 of the top developing forest countries it increased from 22% in 2002 to 27% in 2008. This makes community forestry not only relevant but also important for WWF.

Positive impacts on livelihoods are reported from community forestry

This report's country studies and case studies all report improved livelihoods. Precise data in most cases is lacking, but the fact that so many experts and beneficiaries broadly perceive positive impacts on livelihoods is a good indication. The country studies and relevant literature state that most communities earn money. The case studies conclude that many communities benefit primarily from better access to water, firewood, medicinal plants, land and vital resource pools, and have a feeling of land security.

Positive ecological impacts are often reported

The ecological impact most frequently reported is an increase in forest cover, but a decrease was reported as well in a few cases. Other impacts reported include decreases in fires, poaching and illegal harvesting. In literature, positive effects on conservation and biodiversity are mentioned, but most were not convincingly substantiated. Some FSC audit reports provided information on reduced illegal logging. More data is required to be able to confirm a positive impact.

Community forestry projects face many challenges

In practice, in many community forestry projects there is slow progress and there are many constraints. Examples are delays in implementation, continued illegal logging due to an influx of migrants, no repayment to investments, conflicts over resources, etc. A number of studies report that benefits from community forestry often do not reach the poor, and community forestry sometimes even increases local inequality.

Forests under other types of management also face many challenges

Management problems are in no way unique to community forests. Forests, including protected areas, are cut down for other land-use, logged unsustainably, suffer from hunting, pests and wildfires and many become increasingly fragmented. The hope of governments that communities will be more effective in management (enforcement) is one of the main reasons for the significant growth of the area of forests under community forestry in the past decade.

Reliable data are generally lacking

Literature on community forestry and its impact exists, but is mainly general and lacking clear and well-substantiated facts and data. Much can be learned about problems with community forestry, but very little about impacts. Only a few reliable studies providing concrete social, economic and ecological impact data were found. These did show positive livelihood impacts (such as increased jobs and income).

Think first, before starting with community forestry work

There are many reasons for the generally slow progress in community forestry work. Some may be beyond control of a project. A good pre-assessment is therefore crucial. This should include information on regulations, ownership and land use rights, government attitudes and an area's potential; but also on community skills, organisation, leadership, etc. This will help to formulate a complete and inclusive community forestry programme that can reach the objectives.

Clarity on enabling conditions is useful

Considering the (growing) significance of communities in forest management, the field experience becoming available in literature and the consistency in many of the lessons learned, it is now possible to list enabling conditions for community forestry (see checklist for enabling conditions at the beginning of this study). These will help to pre-assess the likelihood of a project to become successful, identify where the main challenges lie and help ensure that projects focus on all relevant issues at all levels.

WWF plays an important role in community forestry

WWF's role is appreciated in the country and case studies: certainly in projects in which WWF has been involved for a longer period. Many different roles are mentioned, both at the field level as well as in helping to create an enabling environment regionally and nationally. Although the benefits for biodiversity are not proven yet, community forestry will contribute to a wider landscape (national parks, buffer zones, and sustainable managed areas) which is needed to conserve biodiversity. Without community forestry these areas might become degraded.

WWF should focus its work on community forestry

WWF should focus CF work on areas/landscape that are important to the organisation (e.g. with high biodiversity, or vital landscapes that may need reforestation through community forestry). WWF should do a proper pre-assessment of needs, challenges and opportunities for improved livelihoods and conservation, before getting involved, fully involve communities (also in decision making), publicly choose a clear role and from the start have an exit strategy (e.g. by building local/regional capacity). Community forestry can so contribute to a wider landscape approach to ensure conservation of the biodiversity and livelihood improvement.

6. References

- Agarwal, Bina (2001). Participatory exclusions, Community Forestry, and Gender: an Analysis for South Asia and a Conceptual Framework. *World Development* 29 (10).
- Apel, Ulrich (2000). Forest protection regulations as a precondition for natural regeneration in the Song Da watershed, Northwest Vietnam. EC workshop on sustainable rural development in the Southeast Asian mountainous region Hanoi, 28-30 November 2000.
- Aus der Beek, Robin & Ondoua, Barthelemy (September 2009). Strategy paper for community forestry business cases. Linking Future Programme (WWF/Kudu-Zombo).
- Bradley, Amanda (2005). Natural Resources Management Networking in Cambodia. Status, Lessons Learned, and Future Possibilities. Community Forestry International.
- Brown, Michael & Wyckoff-Baird, Barbara (November 1992). *Designing Integrated Conservation and Development Projects*, Revised Edition. World Wildlife Fund, The Nature Conservancy, and World Resources Institute.
- Buchy, Marlène & Subba, Suman (2003). Why is Community Forestry a Social- and Gender-blind Technology? The Case of Nepal. *Gender, Technology and Development*, Vol. 7 (3).
- Butterfield, Rebecca & Fortin, Rolando & Hernandez, Trinidad & Manzanero, Manuel (2009). Strengthening the value chain for indigenous and community forestry operations through increased investment and use of technical assistance. Rainforest Alliance.
- Center for International Forestry Research (August 2008). Forest Livelihoods Briefs number 10. Developing Community-Based Forest Enterprises in Nepal.
- Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (1978). Forestry Paper 7: Forestry for Local Community Development. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/T0692E/t0692e00.HTM>
- Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (1991). CF Note 7: Community Forestry: Ten Years in Review (Revised edition). www.fao.org/docrep/u5610e/u5610e00.htm#Contents
- Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (2010). Global forest resources assessment 2010 - Key findings.
- Gregersen, Hans & Contreras, Arnaldo (2010). Rethinking Forest Regulations - From simple rules to systems to promote best practices and compliance. Rights and Resources Initiative.

- Hewitt, Daphne & Castro Delgado, Monica (May 2009). Key factors for successful community-corporate partnerships. Results of a comparative analysis among Latin American cases. Rainforest Alliance.
- Hobley, Mary (2007). Where in the world is there pro-poor forest policy and tenure reform? The Rights and Resources Initiative.
- Johnson, James (September 2009). Lessons learned from the Responsible Forest Management and Trade Programme in Latin America. WWF.
- Mahanty, S. & Guernier, J. & Yasmi, Y (2009). A fair share: sharing the benefits and costs of collaborative forest management. *International Forestry Review* Vol 11(2).
- Man Dongol, Chandra & Hughey, Kenneth F. D. & Bigsby, Hugh R. (February 2002). Capital Formation and Sustainable Community Forestry in Nepal. *Mountain Research and Development*, Vol 22 No 1 Feb 2002: 70-77.
- Ministry of Agriculture of Royal Government of Bhutan (2006-2008). A series of Case Studies on Community-Based Forest and Natural Resource Management in Bhutan (Edited by Hans J.J. Beukeboom et al).
- Molnar, Augusta & Scherr, Sara J. & Khare, Arvind (2004). Who Conserves the World's Forests? A New Assessment of Conservation and Investment Trends. *Forest Trends*.
- Molnar, Augusta & Liddle, Megan & Bracer, Carina & Khare, Arvind & White, Andy & Bull, Justin (2007). Community-based forest enterprises in tropical forest countries: status and potential. ITTO, RRI and *Forest Trends*.
- Moss, Catherine & Schrekkenberg, Kate & Luttrell, Cecilia & Thassim, Liz (draft of 29 April 2005). Participatory Forest Management and Poverty Reduction: a review of the evidence. Overseas Development Institute.
- Namgay, Kinzang & Sonam, Thubten (2006). Gender and Equity. A challenge in community forestry. A Series of Case Studies on Community-Based Forest and Natural Resource Management in Bhutan. Ministry of Agriculture, Royal Government of Bhutan.
- Nelleman, C. & Miles, L. & Kaltenborn, B. P. & Virtue, M. & Ahlenius, H. (2007). The last stand of the orangutan – State of emergency: Illegal logging, fire and palm oil in Indonesia's national parks. United Nations Environment Programme.
- Odebode, Stella (2005). Gender issues in community forestry: lessons from Nigeria. *International Journal of Food, Agriculture and Environment*, vol 3 (2).

- Pokorny, Benno & Johnson, James (February 2008). Community forestry in the Amazon: The unsolved challenge of forests and the poor. *Natural Resource Perspectives* 112. Overseas Development Institute.
- Sikor, Thomas & Apel, Ulrich (1998). The possibilities for community forestry in Vietnam. Asia Forest Network. Working paper series, volume 1.
- Sunderlin, William D. & Hatcher, Jeffrey & Liddle, Megan (2008). From Exclusion to Ownership? Challenges and Opportunities in Advancing Forest Tenure Reform. Rights and Resources Initiative.
- Tran Duc Vien (2010). Community-based forest management in Vietnam's upland - A case study from Ca river basin. Ha Noi University of Agriculture.
- Vyamana, V.G. (2009). Participatory forest management in the Eastern Arc Mountains of Tanzania: who benefits? *International Forestry Review* Vol 11(2).
- White, Andy & Khare, Arvind & Molnar, Augusta. Who Owns, Who Conserves and Why It Matters. Article based on *Who Owns the World's Forests: Forest Tenure and Public Forests in Transition* by
- Andy White and Alejandra Martin and *Who Conserves the World's Forests? Community-Driven Strategies to Protect Forests and Respect Rights* by Augusta Molnar, Sara Scherr and Arvind Khare, published by *Forest Trends* in 2002 and 2004 respectively.
- White, Andy & Martin, Alejandra (2002). *Who Owns the World's Forests? Forest tenure and public forests in transition.* *Forest Trends*.
- Wilson, Emma & MacGregor, James & Macqueen, Duncan & Vermeulen, Sonja & Vorley, Bill & Zarsky, Lyuba (May 2009). *Business models for sustainable development: innovation for society and environment.* IIED Briefing Paper.
- Woods, Paul & Petheram, John (2001). Pre-conditions for Spontaneous Agroforestry in Hilly Regions of Vietnam: Implications for extension. Institute of Land and Food Resources, the University of Melbourne.
- Zich, Frank & Compton, James (2001). The final frontier towards sustainable management of Papua New Guinea's agarwood resource. A TRAFFIC Oceania report in conjunction with WWF South Pacific Programme.

Annex

Annex A

- Country analyses Continent: Africa (20100217) 37
- Country analyses Asia (20100217) 46
- Country Table Eastern Europe and Latin America (2010310) 58

Annex B

- Community Forestry case study analysis Nepal, Mozambique, Indonesia and Cameroon 66

Topic (and description)	Mozambique	Cameroon	Kenya
<p>1</p> <p>Government/Governance</p> <p><i>Description of the general government structure and governance type especially related to forestry in general, forest management and CF (e.g. Ministry of Forestry/Development Cooperation/etc. and to what extent is the government (de)centralized? What is the level of devolution of powers/decision-making/budget to regional/local and non-state entities?</i></p>	<p>Mozambique is now in process of decentralized governance in which district and province governments have high levels of decision making authority (also on NRM – however, decision making and law enforcement are still under control of the state through its central and extension services). Still, the (local) government heavily influences the way communities organize and are governed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environmental Law of 1997; • The Land (Use) Law of 1997; governing CBNRM, protecting local communities' rights to land and access to NR (perceived as contradicting to Forestry and Wildlife Law which does not recognize ownership rights • The Land use Law Regulation of 1998; • The Technical Land use Law Annex of 1999; • The sector wide support program for agriculture and rural development (PROAGR) in place since 1999; • Decreed 15/2000, Local State Organs Law (Local Authority) of 2000; • Decreased about the traditional Authority of 2000; • Forest and Fauna Regulation 2002 • Poverty Reduction Strategy and Plan adopted in 2002; • The Ministerial decree 93/2005 about de channeling of the 20% NR exploitation taxes to the communities. <p>- New constitution adopted in 1990 (revised in 2004): 1) Guarantees people's rights access to and benefits from NR and NRM; 2) lays down foundation for decentralization and provides framework for shift from 1970s centrally-planned economy that focused on supporting large corporate farmers, to more people-centered and pro-poor policies that builds on NRM that no longer look at rural poor merely as "subsistence producers" but as "smallholder producers"; 3) obliges the state, for general national interest, to determine the condition under which citizens and other users should access and use NR</p>	<p>- The New Constitution of 1996 introducing decentralization (partially implemented);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Centralized governance in process of implementing decentralization; - sector implementation of decentralization in the forest sector <p>- The new constitution establishes a decentralized governance system, but this is partially implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there is a sector implementation of decentralized governance only in the forestry sector - Approval of Simple Management Plans for the formation of CF groups still centralized. 	<p>Kenya is now in the process of implementing decentralized governance in NRM following recently enacted environment related laws and policies that provides the opportunity for community participation. Although there is a shift towards involving communities and other stakeholders in NRM, there has been a slow pace in implementing the reforms. The country has developed criteria and indicators for Sustainable Forest Management with the support of FAO (May 2002) Forest and CF Related policy framework in place include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Kenya Forestry Master Plan (1994)- provided a 25 year blue print for forest management in Kenya - Forests Acts adopted in 2005 and draft Forest Policy of 2005 - Government Lands Act, cap 280 (revised 1984) - Wildlife Conservation and Management Act, Cap 376 - Grass fires Act, Cap 327 - Timber Act Cap 386 of 1972 - Environmental Management and Coordination Act No.8 of 1999 - Trust Lands Act, Cap 288 of 1962 (revised 1970) -New National Land Policy 2009 -Water Act, 2002 <p>- The new Forests Act 2005 provides the appropriate legal and institutional framework for sustainable forest management in Kenya.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Both the Forest Policy and the Forest Act have been revised to allow community participation in forest management and ensure more availability of forests for direct and indirect benefits - The new Forests Act 2005 recognizes the role of communities in the management of the country's forest resources and encourages their involvement as either co-managers or contract managers of the forests - The Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) recognizes the cultural and subsistence resources provided by forests to the Kenyan people - Forest Act 2005 provides for a Forest Management and Conservation Fund. The fund is still currently being established, but once its setup, the fund can be accessed at all levels <p>-Currently there is a budgetary allocation to KFS for establishment and capacity building of CFAs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Country Vision 2030 and strategic plan endorses community participation in NR management
<p>2</p> <p>Policies, laws/acts, rules and regulations and others relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustainable development - Livelihoods development/poverty reduction - General forest management - Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) - Community Forestry <p><i>Identification and brief description of existing policies, laws and regulations pertinent to sustainable development, poverty reduction, and forest management in general and CF more specifically</i></p>	<p>- Law No. 94/01 Of 20 January 1994 laying down forestry, wildlife and fisheries regulations; Revision of the Forest Law in progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the implementation decree of the 1994 forest law (N° 95/531/PM of 23 August 1995); - The right of pre-emption Order No. 518/MINEF/CAB of 13 December 2001 that gives priority to local communities claims of a forest space for CF against other uses that in the process of being exercised on it - Revised Community Forestry Manual (2009) <p>- Poverty Reduction Strategy and Plan adopted in 2002 and Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty (PARPA): Establishes a connection between development and NRM, with emphasis on the central role of NR for rural poor;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a Forestry and Wildlife Policy and Strategy was adopted by the Council of Ministers in 1997: ownership of all natural resources (soil, subsoil, interior and territorial waters, continental shelf.... is vested in the 	<p>Forest Act, 2005 and subsidiary legislation: - The Forest Act, 2005 requires that all forests be managed through approved management plans and participation of stakeholders. It also provides for benefit sharing through contractual agreements with KFS for sustainable use and management of forest resources. Draft forest rules covers areas on plantation establishment, Charcoal, tree harvesting and community participation</p> <p>Wildlife Act Cap 376- Provides for the protection, management and conservation of wildlife as a vital national and global heritage, which makes great contribution to sustainable development. It also provides for support to community initiatives to get optimum returns from wildlife through non-consumptive uses.</p> <p>The Environmental Management and Coordination Act (EMCA) No. 8 of 1999-Embraces all environmental management issues in the country gives due regard to ensuring that people live in a healthy and clean environment.</p>	

Topic (and description)	Mozambique	Cameroon	Kenya
<p>state</p> <p>- Forestry and Wildlife Law of 1999 (10/99) and Law Regulations of 2002 (12/02): Defines the rights and benefits of the forest and NR dependent communities: subsistence level use of the resources; participation in co-management with state and private sector; community consultation and approval prior to allocation of exploitation rights to third parties; communities can utilize any forest in the country for non-commercial purposes; development benefits derived from (timber) exploitation under a concession regime; return of earmarked 20% of forestry tax revenue to the communities; and 50% of the value of fines for the individual contributing to law enforcement</p>	<p>- Forests of the Permanent Domain; - Forests of the Non-Permanent Domain</p> <p>Forests of the Permanent Domain constitute the private estate of the State and are destined to be permanently covered by forest. Human activities within it are highly restricted and must be submitted to a clearly established and approved management plan. The Permanent Domain hosts the following types of forest: forest concessions for recreation forests, council forests, protected areas, timber exploitation, protected forests, research and parks; - Forests of the Non-Permanent Domain is destined to multiple uses. That's where most of human</p>	<p>It also emphasizes maximum participation by stakeholders in the development and implementation of policies, plans and processes for the management of the environment. EMCA provides for protection and conservation of the environment including forests, hilly & mountainous areas, planting of trees and conservation of biological diversity.</p> <p>Water Act 2002- Water Act lays out a mechanism for development of a national water resources management strategy, for the protection, management, use, development, conservation and control of water resources. It also provided for community participation in the management of water resources through Water Resources Users Associations</p> <p>Agriculture Act – Cap 318- provides for the preservation of the soil and its fertility and to promote and maintain the development of agricultural land in accordance with rules of good husbandry. The Ministry of Agriculture has also developed farm forestry guidelines</p> <p>Energy Act 2006- Provides the framework on energy in Kenya with the objective of ensuring adequate, quality, cost effective and affordable supply of energy to meet the demands while protecting and conserving the environment</p> <p>National Land Policy-This seeks to ensure that the management and utilization of land-based natural resources by public entities takes into account the need to share benefits with contiguous communities and that such communities are fully involved in the management and development of the resources including forests. More specifically, it advocates for forest conservation in order to protect water catchments areas from further degradation</p> <p>Vision 2030-This is the countries development blue print covering the period 2008-2030. It aims at making Kenya a newly industrializing middle income country providing high quality life for all its citizens by the year 2030. The vision is based on three "pillars" namely; the Economic pillar, the Social pillar and the Political pillar. The economic pillar aims at providing prosperity of all Kenyans through an economic development programme aimed at achieving an average Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth rate of 10 % per annum for the next 25 years.The social pillar seeks to build "a just and cohesive society with social equity in a clean and secure environment". The political pillar aims at realising a democratic political system founded on issue-based politics that respects the rule of law, and protects the rights and freedoms of every individual in the Kenyan society</p> <p>Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (ERS) 2003-2007- It was the government blue print to economic growth and poverty reduction recognized the importance of forests in national growth and its support to productive sectors especially agriculture</p> <p>Generally, the Forest Act, 2005 requires that all forests should be managed in accordance with a management plan and provides for joint management of forests. The Forest Act 2005 categorizes Kenya's forests into 3 categories based on ownership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State forest • Local Authority Forest • Private forest and farm forestry <p>The Forest Policy recognizes the following types of forests: Indigenous forests- The Act provides that all indigenous forests and woodlands shall be managed on a sustainable basis for purposes of - (a) conservation of water, soil and biodiversity; (b) riverine and shoreline protection; (c) cultural use and heritage; (d) recreation and tourism; (e) sustainable production of wood and non-wood products; (f) carbon sequestration and other environmental services; (g) education and research</p>	<p>state</p> <p>- Forestry and Wildlife Law of 1999 (10/99) and Law Regulations of 2002 (12/02): Defines the rights and benefits of the forest and NR dependent communities: subsistence level use of the resources; participation in co-management with state and private sector; community consultation and approval prior to allocation of exploitation rights to third parties; communities can utilize any forest in the country for non-commercial purposes; development benefits derived from (timber) exploitation under a concession regime; return of earmarked 20% of forestry tax revenue to the communities; and 50% of the value of fines for the individual contributing to law enforcement</p>
<p>3</p> <p>Name land use categories and where CF is possible <i>Brief description of the types and functions of land/forest use categories, their management and property regimes, and management objectives (e.g. production), HCVF (e.g. conservation), National Park (e.g. protected), Agriculture (e.g. agricultural activities, no forest crops). Brief description of property regimes (e.g. ignorance or acknowledgement of customary land rights) and management objectives</i></p>	<p>Exclusive ownership of NR vested in the state – communities have access rights. - A CBNRM Area generally covers the entire village territory of one or multiple communities' territory(ies) that members agree to place under an organized management process for the benefit of all community stakeholders - Two models of community managed areas: CBNRM Area and Community Forest Concession</p> <p>Land use categories: - Protected Areas (Áreas protegidas): Community involvement: Area of historical and cultural value. Government: management of National parks and reserves; Private sector: -</p>	<p>Exclusively owned by the state – communities have access rights. - A CBNRM Area generally covers the entire village territory of one or multiple communities' territory(ies) that members agree to place under an organized management process for the benefit of all community stakeholders - Two models of community managed areas: CBNRM Area and Community Forest Concession</p> <p>Land use categories: - Protected Areas (Áreas protegidas): Community involvement: Area of historical and cultural value. Government: management of National parks and reserves; Private sector: -</p>	<p>It also emphasizes maximum participation by stakeholders in the development and implementation of policies, plans and processes for the management of the environment. EMCA provides for protection and conservation of the environment including forests, hilly & mountainous areas, planting of trees and conservation of biological diversity.</p> <p>Water Act 2002- Water Act lays out a mechanism for development of a national water resources management strategy, for the protection, management, use, development, conservation and control of water resources. It also provided for community participation in the management of water resources through Water Resources Users Associations</p> <p>Agriculture Act – Cap 318- provides for the preservation of the soil and its fertility and to promote and maintain the development of agricultural land in accordance with rules of good husbandry. The Ministry of Agriculture has also developed farm forestry guidelines</p> <p>Energy Act 2006- Provides the framework on energy in Kenya with the objective of ensuring adequate, quality, cost effective and affordable supply of energy to meet the demands while protecting and conserving the environment</p> <p>National Land Policy-This seeks to ensure that the management and utilization of land-based natural resources by public entities takes into account the need to share benefits with contiguous communities and that such communities are fully involved in the management and development of the resources including forests. More specifically, it advocates for forest conservation in order to protect water catchments areas from further degradation</p> <p>Vision 2030-This is the countries development blue print covering the period 2008-2030. It aims at making Kenya a newly industrializing middle income country providing high quality life for all its citizens by the year 2030. The vision is based on three "pillars" namely; the Economic pillar, the Social pillar and the Political pillar. The economic pillar aims at providing prosperity of all Kenyans through an economic development programme aimed at achieving an average Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth rate of 10 % per annum for the next 25 years.The social pillar seeks to build "a just and cohesive society with social equity in a clean and secure environment". The political pillar aims at realising a democratic political system founded on issue-based politics that respects the rule of law, and protects the rights and freedoms of every individual in the Kenyan society</p> <p>Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (ERS) 2003-2007- It was the government blue print to economic growth and poverty reduction recognized the importance of forests in national growth and its support to productive sectors especially agriculture</p> <p>Generally, the Forest Act, 2005 requires that all forests should be managed in accordance with a management plan and provides for joint management of forests. The Forest Act 2005 categorizes Kenya's forests into 3 categories based on ownership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State forest • Local Authority Forest • Private forest and farm forestry <p>The Forest Policy recognizes the following types of forests: Indigenous forests- The Act provides that all indigenous forests and woodlands shall be managed on a sustainable basis for purposes of - (a) conservation of water, soil and biodiversity; (b) riverine and shoreline protection; (c) cultural use and heritage; (d) recreation and tourism; (e) sustainable production of wood and non-wood products; (f) carbon sequestration and other environmental services; (g) education and research</p>

Topic (and description)	Mozambique	Cameroon	Kenya
	<p>- Multiple use Zones (areas de uso múltiplo): Community involvement: establishment of Community multiple use zone or CBNRM under the Community Rights and Benefits Certificate (DUAT) (non-commercial purposes); Government: - ; Private sector: - - Concessions (Concessões): Community involvement: Community Forest Concession (commercial management); Government: - ; Private sector: Private forest concessions (for logging) - Wildlife/Game Farm (Fazendas do bravo): Community involvement: the Community Game Farm/Wildlife concession; Government: - ; Private sector: Private wildlife concession - Hunting Concession (coutadas): Community involvement: the Community Hunting Area, managed generally as a safari hunting area. A private operator can be subcontracted to manage and pay royalties to community; Government: Official hunting zone; Private sector: - - Plantations (Plantações): Community involvement: the Community Forest Plantation and agro forest systems; Government: Public forest plantation; Private sector: Private forest plantation</p>	<p>economic activities are allowed to take place. Most individual and collective user rights are exercised in this domain. That's also where CF are located.</p>	<p>purposes; (h) habitat for wildlife in terrestrial forests and fisheries in mangrove forests</p> <p>Plantations forests: The Forest Act, 2005 provides that all plantation forests owned by the state shall be managed by KFS on a sustainable basis with the primary objective being the production of wood and other forest products and services for commercial purposes. The Act also provides for management of plantations through a license, concession, contract and joint management.</p> <p>Farm forestry: Forest Policy, 2005 states that Forests and trees on private lands are established and managed using sound business principles and according to landowners' priorities. It provides for landowners to be supported through appropriate incentives including partnerships to have sufficient land under tree cover. The Landowners are encouraged and supported to sustainably manage natural and riverine forests in the farmlands, particularly for water and soil conservation.</p> <p>Dryland forests: - The policy provides for Forests and other types of woody vegetation in the drylands to be sustainably managed and conserved for the production of wood and non-wood forest products. It also provides for support to CFAs to establish micro-enterprises, rehabilitate degraded areas, promote tree planting, develop management plan and sustainable commercial production of charcoal.</p> <p>At the local level, the Participatory Forest Management Plans developed for Geta and North Kinangop Forests in Naivasha Basin with the support of WWF categorizes the forest into the following zones:</p> <p>(a) Protection zone- Comprises of natural forest & bamboo, water catchment and serves as wildlife habitat. The management objective is to conserve unaltered and undisturbed wildlife habitats of natural vegetation cover only allowing non consumptive utilization. The management option is conservation for ecosystem services, research and ecotourism with no extractive uses except for water.</p> <p>(b) Plantation zone- Comprises of areas suitable for development of plantations. The management objective is development of industrial plantations while the management option is establishment of both industrial and plantations through Plantation Establishment Livelihood Improvement Scheme (PELIS). Grazing under old plantations is also allowed</p> <p>(c) Rehabilitation zone- Comprises of all degraded sites in both the protected and plantation zones. The management objective is rehabilitation of either plantation forest or natural forest and wrongly sited plantations to revert to in indigenous forests. The management option is rehabilitation which will involve salvaging of low density plantations.</p> <p>(d) Community Interface Zone or forest buffer zone-Comprises of all the farm lands adjacent to the forest reserve. The management objective is to promote Income Generating Activities (IGAs) to alleviate poverty targeting community dependent on government forests. The management option is support nature based micro enterprises at community level.</p> <p>(e) Livestock grazing zone- Comprise of natural glades and areas under old plantations. The management objective is controlled grazing and dispersal area for wildlife while the management option is Livestock and wildlife grazing</p>
4	CF motivations and objectives	A community forest is "a forest forming part of the	The new Forests Act, 2005 that recognizes the role of communities in the

	Topic (and description)	Mozambique	Cameroon	Kenya
5	<p>Brief description of the reasons the national (or district/local) government embarked on the CF process (e.g. due to international pressure or adaptation to decentralized frameworks, biodiversity or socioeconomic motives, etc.)</p> <p>CF and NRM types</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the government's implementation strategy/approach - Steps of CF acquisition process <p>Description of the type / all types of NRM and CF in the country (e.g. in wetlands and forests, inside or outside national parks or possibility to sell logs/NTFPs), the government's implementation strategy/approach, and step-by-step described acquisition process for applicants</p>	<p>- Sustainable forest management: to reduce forest degradation by enhancing community control;</p> <p>- Livelihood objective: to alleviate poverty by enhancing access to NR and promotion of NR based incomes</p> <p>CF is embedded in broad concept of CBNRM in which government policy ensures community participation in and benefit from NRM.</p> <p>At the village level, CFs are managed through a government approved 'co-management council' that represents the village: COGEP – Comité de Gestão, or CGC – Comité de Gestão Comunitária. Government delegates management responsibilities to these entities. COGEP and CGC can apply for a Forest Concession or a Simple License</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - devolution of management powers to local communities; - co-management between state and communities - NR ownership invested in the states - granting of private concessions - local communities are granted use or management rights by the state - CF is managed by a community group that expected to be representative of entire social components of the community; - the Law fixes mechanisms for representation of community interests in respect to land use rights <p>CBNRM Area: Most commonly known form. A CBNRM Area is</p>	<p>non-permanent forest estate, which is covered by a management agreement between a village community and the Forestry Administration. Management of such forest – which should not exceed 5,000 ha – is the responsibility of the village community concerned, with the help or technical assistance of the Forestry Administration.”</p> <p>Source: Article 3(11) of Decree 95/531/PM of 23 August 1995.</p> <p>“The objectives of community forestry are to: (i) create jobs and generate income in rural areas; (ii) improve the living conditions of the people; and (iii) ensure the sustainable management of the environment while meeting the basic needs of rural communities. The stated aim is to address the basic constraints of: (i) rural communities' limited access to forest resources; (ii) inadequate handling by communities of their own development; and (iii) almost non-existent incomes at the local level. The analysis of community forest exploitation illustrates that achievements have been made by both the communities that organized and increased their capacities, and the other stakeholders who worked in partnership during the community forestry development (State, private companies, and civil society).” cited from: Pascal Cuny et al. in Local and Decentralized Forest Management in Cameroon: The Case of the Kongo Community Forest</p> <p>International pressures, community participation and contribution of forest management to community development</p> <p>The forestry sector is a very dynamic sector in Cameroon, particularly concerning its legal framework.</p> <p>Worthwhile to mention are the Forest Law of 1994 and its Décret d'application N° 95/531/PM of 1995 concerning forests, fauna and fishery: what is innovative about this Law is the recognition of the role of the local population in the management of natural resources (CBNRM) through Community Forestry..</p> <p>In order to implement such provision in 1998 the Government of Cameroon, in collaboration with bilateral and multi-lateral partners, already developed required guidelines “Manuel de procédures d'attribution et de gestion des Forêts Communautaires” . A revised version of the guidelines has been adopted in February 2009.</p> <p>The management of forests handed of to specific communities is based on prescriptions defined in the approved Simple Management Plan « Plan Simple de Gestion ».</p> <p>According to the revised Community Forestry Guidelines, the formation of a CF group covers two</p>	<p>management of the country's forest resources and encourages their involvement as either co-managers or contract managers of the forests</p> <p>- Participatory Forest Management (PFM) was introduced to Kenya mainly as a result of pressure from local forest-adjacent communities and civil society organizations led by research scientists who had been working on alternative approaches to reduce forest destruction. This was due mainly to the benefits accruing from the management approach that had been employed in Nepal and India. Other motivations for CF include: PFM instills a sense of ownership for communities adjacent to forest areas; demand for benefit sharing from forest resources and international pressure from forest products export markets for forest products to meet certain standards of production/certification</p> <p>- The policy proposes a number of actions aimed at enhancing sustainable management of indigenous forests. Among the proposed actions include to: (a) ensure that all existing indigenous forest reserves on public lands remain reserved;</p> <p>(b) determine the status of indigenous forests and take appropriate restoration measures where necessary;</p> <p>(c) promote participatory forest management approaches to ensure the participation of communities and other stakeholders in the management of indigenous forests;</p> <p>(d) ensure through “user pays principle” that users of benefits derived from indigenous forests contribute to their conservation and management; and</p> <p>(e) promote insect farming and other sustainable uses of biodiversity found in the indigenous forests.</p> <p>Kenya has embraced Participatory Forest Management (PFM) as an approach towards achieving sustainable forest management. In this approach, local communities and other stakeholders participate in management of forest resources as provided for by the Forest Act 2005. The Act provides for the establishment of Community Forest Associations (CFAs) through which local communities are conferred user rights in respect to access and control of forest resources in Kenya.</p> <p>Acquisition:</p> <p>(a) Members of a forest community organize and register themselves as a society under the Societies Act.</p> <p>(b) A registered society applies to the government through the Director KFS for permission to participate in conservation and management of a state forest as a CFA</p> <p>(c) The application contains among others the CFA's: list of members, address; constitution; financial regulations; and a management plan (or a draft where there is none)</p> <p>(d) The mechanism for enabling community and stakeholder participation in conservation and management of a forest is through a Forest Management Agreement.</p> <p>(e) The community through the CFA negotiates with the government through the Director KFS and signs a FMA.</p> <p>(f) The FMA confers user rights to the CFA</p> <p>KFS has developed detailed guidelines on how to operationalise PFM in Kenya. The key steps presented in the guidelines include:</p>

Topic (and description)	Mozambique	Cameroon	Kenya
<p>operated under government's Certificate of Land Use Rights and Benefits policy that guarantees local communities' access to and benefits from natural resources. Purpose of CBNRM is non commercial; license should be acquired from government for any commercial extraction within area. Approach gives much autonomy in decision making and control of resources.</p> <p>Acquisition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) community identifies the area; 2) community undertakes preliminary assessment of potential of area; 3) community writes letter to district officer to express its interest; 4) district officer forwards letter with his/her comments to provincial service; 5) provincial service approves/rejects; 6) community forms committee to act in its name during process (can take place at beginning of process or later after identification of the community area); 7) micro zoning (management plan) of the committee area; Optional: community acquires licenses from government for commercial exploitation of resources within area; timber exploitation is subcontracted to private operator who purchases exploitation rights from community; interest groups within community also purchase exploitation rights for various types of resources: charcoal burning, beekeeping, bamboo harvesting, mushrooms harvesting, etc. <p>Community Forest Concession:</p> <p>Commercial concession with primary focus on wood extraction. Communities are entitled to apply and acquire logging concession under the same conditions as private operators. Communities can also apply for game and hunting concessions, or plant and own a community forest concession.</p> <p>Acquisition: 1) draft map of the requested area; 2) community consultation; 3) description of physical, social, and cultural features of area; 4) preliminary inventory; inventory after preliminary approval; 5) description of management interventions; 6) description of business/venture model; 7) publication of claim with indication of coordinates for information of general public of intention of community to create a concession; 8) forward of demand to the governor office for approval after 30 days if there is no opposition or counter claims over the area</p>	<p>main stages ::</p> <p>Stage 1: Administrative issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness raising; - Selection and legalization of the legal entity; - Consultation meeting; - Elaboration and submission of the application file; <p>Stage 2 : Technical aspects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elaboration and submission of the Simple Management Plan and the Final Convention (Convention définitive de Gestion) ; - Approval; - Implementation 	<p>operated under government's Certificate of Land Use Rights and Benefits policy that guarantees local communities' access to and benefits from natural resources. Purpose of CBNRM is non commercial; license should be acquired from government for any commercial extraction within area. Approach gives much autonomy in decision making and control of resources.</p> <p>Acquisition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) community identifies the area; 2) community undertakes preliminary assessment of potential of area; 3) community writes letter to district officer to express its interest; 4) district officer forwards letter with his/her comments to provincial service; 5) provincial service approves/rejects; 6) community forms committee to act in its name during process (can take place at beginning of process or later after identification of the community area); 7) micro zoning (management plan) of the committee area; Optional: community acquires licenses from government for commercial exploitation of resources within area; timber exploitation is subcontracted to private operator who purchases exploitation rights from community; interest groups within community also purchase exploitation rights for various types of resources: charcoal burning, beekeeping, bamboo harvesting, mushrooms harvesting, etc. <p>Community Forest Concession:</p> <p>Commercial concession with primary focus on wood extraction. Communities are entitled to apply and acquire logging concession under the same conditions as private operators. Communities can also apply for game and hunting concessions, or plant and own a community forest concession.</p> <p>Acquisition: 1) draft map of the requested area; 2) community consultation; 3) description of physical, social, and cultural features of area; 4) preliminary inventory; inventory after preliminary approval; 5) description of management interventions; 6) description of business/venture model; 7) publication of claim with indication of coordinates for information of general public of intention of community to create a concession; 8) forward of demand to the governor office for approval after 30 days if there is no opposition or counter claims over the area</p>	<p>Identifying the community and verifying resources</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Assessing forest area and the community b) Preparing draft forest management plan c) Facilitating the formation of a forest association d) Negotiating, drafting and signing a forest management agreement and to declare the area a PFM area e) Implementing the plan f) Reviewing and revising the plan on the basis of the experiences g) Monitoring and evaluation on the process.
<p>Organizations involved in CF, e.g. NGOs, private sector organizations, and the institutional/organizational structures at the administrative level of the government</p> <p><i>Identification and description of non-governmental, private, as well as governmental organizations involved in/supporting the implementation of CF in this country and short description of their roles</i></p>	<p>- Interested communities submit request for CF following procedures contained in the Manual of Procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF concession to communities; - Management convention signed between managing community and government <p>The main stakeholders are:</p> <p>⇒ Ministry of Forest and Wildlife (MINFOF) in charge of the policy and legal framework, approval of CF applications, technical assistance to the communities, Law enforcement at</p>	<p>Government Administrative levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife has the mandate of conserving and managing forest resources in Kenya. • This is enforced through the KFS a semi-autonomous institution established by the Act and headed by a Director. • A KFS Board comprising of lead institutions and other non public servants with interest in forest matters is responsible for the management of KFS • The Act also establishes a Forest Management and Conservation Fund for funding the activities of the Service and other objects of the Act • Administratively, the country is divided into forest conservancy areas, forest divisions (zones) and forest stations for proper and efficient management of forests • A Forest Conservancy is headed by Head of Conservancy (HOC) and has a 	<p>6</p>

	Topic (and description)	Mozambique	Cameroon	Kenya
7	<p>Extension materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manuals - Training modules - Templates (management plans, activity planning, inventories...) <p><i>Identification and description of training, technical, and extension support materials set in place to support the implementation of CF by communities and organizations involved</i></p>	<p>- Provincial Services for Forests and Wildlife (SPFFB): the mandate of provincial services for forests and wildlife is to enforce law, allocate small concessions and simple licenses</p> <p>- District Services for Economic Activities (SDAE): the mandate of District Services for Economic Activities (SDAE) is to grant transport permits, grant licenses for charcoal, NTFPs and fuelwood, and to enforce law</p> <p>Local Community represented by CGC or COGEP</p> <p>NGOs: FAO, GTZ, ORAM (national NGO advocating for and supporting local communities in securing their land and NR rights through facilitation of acquisition legal titles) etc.</p> <p>WWF and other officials complained that there are not sufficient NGOs and CSOs, and those that exist are weak.</p>	<p>following levels :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Central : Forest Directorate and sub-directorate for Community Forestry in charge of mainstreaming community forestry, analyze the application files, incl. The annual workplans of each CF group and follow up of CF activities in the field.. - Regional: Forest Delegation to ensure the implementation of the Forest Law and technical assistance to the communities. - Department : Forest Delegation to ensure the implementation of the Forest Law and technical assistance to the communities. - Local: Range Post, for the application of regulations and technical assistance. <p>⇒ International Organizations providing technical assistance and financial support for the CF group formation.</p> <p>Contributions for the improvement of policy and legal framework, based on approaches, lessons learned and recommendations from the field.</p> <p>⇒ Local NGOs, providing support to the communities during the implementation of activities leading to the acquisition of CF approval. Contribution to the revision of legal framework and procedures.</p> <p>The administration responsible for the forest sector has well qualified staff (Forest Engineers and Technicians) with all required expertise to analyze CF related fields and are increasingly concerned about issues affecting the communities.</p> <p>International NGOs also provide required expertise.</p> <p>National and local NGOs are improving their</p>	<p>Forest Conservation Committee (FCC) at this level. Communities through CFA have representatives at FCC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Forest division (zone) is headed by a Zonal Manager and has forest stations under it • A Forest Station headed by a Forester and has a CFA at this level <p>There are many organizations in Kenya involved in CF at all levels.</p> <p>Organizations Supporting implementation of CF-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF): is an International Conservation Organization whose mission is "To stop the degradation of the planet's natural environment and to build a future in which humans live in harmony with nature, by: (i) Conserving the world's biological diversity (ii) Ensuring that the use of renewable natural resources is sustainable (iii) Promoting the reduction of pollution and wasteful consumption. • WWF through its projects in Kenya has facilitated CF process • The international Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)-is an international organization dedicated to natural resource conservation. It has supported implementation of projects supporting CF in Kenya • The Green Belt Movement (GBM): is an indigenous grassroots non-governmental organization based that takes a holistic approach to development by focusing on environmental conservation, community development and capacity building. It was founded by 2004 Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Prof. Wangari Maathai. GBM has been active in advocacy, lobbying, policy influencing and implementation of CF in the country • United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) UNEP is the designated authority of the United Nations system in environmental issues at the global and regional level. Situated in Kenya, UNEP has played a key role in policy influencing on environmental issues including conservation of forests <p>Organizations vocal in CF advocacy and lobbying</p> <p>The following are some of the NGOs who have been very vocal in advocacy and Lobbying for CF at national level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest Action Network (FAN)- is a networking NGO working with local communities, policy makers and researchers to develop a niche in advocating for an improved policy and legislative climate to support the sustainable management of natural resources • Kenya Forest Working Group (KFWG)- is a forum of individuals, organizations and institutions (government and non government, local and international) and grass root community organizations concerned with forests, working together to promote sound forest management and conservation practices in Kenya <p>Local level (CFAs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Alliance of Community Forest Associations (NACOFA)- is a community alliance acting as a focal point for all CFA in Kenya to advocate for and support the rights of communities to actively participate in Natural Resource Management and equitable sharing of accruing benefits. <p>Participatory Forest Management (PFM) guidelines: -KFS in partnership with KFWG have developed PFM guidelines. The guidelines provide a set of guiding principles to assist all the stakeholders to manage and conserve our forests in a sustainable manner and can also be used to develop enforceable rules and regulations for each forest</p> <p>Plantation Establishment for Livelihood Improvement Scheme (PELUS) Manual: How to involve communities in plantation establishment</p> <p>Forest Management Plans- Provide guidelines on management of forest</p>

	Topic (and description)	Mozambique	Cameroon	Kenya
8	<p>Duration of management agreement with the government and the frequency of revision/ updating of CF management plan</p> <p><i>Description of the types of management agreements between the government and community forestry user group and identification of how often CF management plans need to be revised/updated by the community forestry user groups</i></p>	<p>Up to 50 years or more</p> <p>CBNRM: Normally, no limit of the duration of the agreement for CBNRM, as this concerns permanent management of the community territory. CBNRM Area is not a concession, but mechanism to transfer management responsibilities to communities for sustainable management of resources in their community area.</p> <p>Community Concession: the 50 years duration fits best with the commercial concession.</p> <p>Frequency of updating: Every 25 years as required by the law</p>	<p>capacity with support from international organizations..</p> <p>All CF related processes and procedures are well described in the CF Guidelines, applied all over the country.</p> <p>- The duration of Management Convention between the Government and the communities is 25 years.</p> <p>This convention relies on the approved « Simple Management Plan » which clearly states the activities to be carried out etc.. This plan has to be revised every 5 years.</p>	<p>resources and detail programmes to be implemented</p> <p>Tree Nursery Manual – Manual for establishment and maintenance of tree nurseries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest Management Agreements are dependent on the forest management plan proposed for managing a particular forest. For example at the local level, Participatory Forest Management Plans have duration of 5 years while Ecosystem Management Plans at zonal level have a period of 40 years. However, its important to note that there is a provision in the management plans for review and revision based on experiences gained after implementation • Short term licences- (below 1 year) Annual licences for short term uses e.g. firewood • Concessions-longer term (25years) e.g. ecotourism • Special use licence long term (above 25years) - e.g. industrial plantation
9	<p>Law enforcement in Community Forestry Areas</p> <p><i>Description of the level of law enforcement regarding CF;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>What is the role of governmental law enforcement of the management plan (during development and during execution of management plan)?</i> - <i>How does the community itself ensure proper implementation of the management plan (e.g. concerning illegal logging, overharvesting, fair sharing of benefits, etc.)?</i> 	<p>Surveillance of the CBNRM is responsibility of managing community. Most communities resort to community guards that are trained in scouting and monitoring of area. In some communities, guards are equipped with bicycles to move around. Check points are also set at various entry and exit points of the community area. The community-trained guards become the invigilators of the CBNRM area and work in close collaboration with the provincial or district forest and wildlife services.</p>	<p>Manual of the Procedures for Attribution and Norms for the Management of Community Forests has been by the government (a revised version adopted in December 2008);</p> <p>“This manual clarifies the different procedures required to obtain and manage a community forest. It describes the standards and procedures concerning the presentation and the processing of applications for community forests, and also defines the minimum consultation procedures required for the legal allocation of a community forest”</p> <p>Control mechanisms and monitoring tools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Forest Administration is responsible for the supervision of the implementation of the Conventions and related Management Plans; • The local administration prepares half-yearly progress reports, summarizing progress achieved and challenges encountered by the communities; • The chairman of the CF group has to submit an Annual Plan of Operation and respective Annual Report to be approved by the Forest Department. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall responsibility of enforcing the Forest Act and other regulations such as the forest rules is the responsibility of KFS. The KFS has a disciplined force (Forest Rangers) for enforcement and protection of forests at all levels • One of the conditions for application for CF by the community is a CFA constitution and a management plan. The constitution has bylaws for self regulation by the CFA while the management plan has programmes for implementing the plan • The management plan has provision for community scouts/guards to undertake protection and enforcement in partnership with KFS
10	<p>Do laws/regulations/rules say anything about business opportunities in CF?</p> <p><i>Description of whether it is allowed to sell (excess) of CF products or to set off Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs).</i></p>	<p>-</p>	<p>All products of any kind obtained from the management of CF, entirely belong to the concerned community group. These rights don't apply for the products that are legally banned (endangered and protected species</p> <p>However, each year the community has to submit the harvesting plan which has to be approved by the Ministry</p> <p>The harvesting plan has to be based on a detailed inventory of the allocated forest area.</p> <p>This annual harvesting certificate is a document</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft forest rules provide for KFS to enter into contract with any qualified person or group (CFAs can qualify) to undertake specified activities within the forest on its behalf. Some of the specified activities provide business opportunities for CF e.g. Raising of seedlings, tree planting, silviculture, logging and non-resident cultivation • The Participatory Forest Management Plans prepared by CFAs describe the type of business opportunities they are going to undertake and any regulations required for successful implementation.

	Topic (and description)	Mozambique	Cameroon	Kenya
11	Minimum and maximum size of CF <i>Assessment of the minimum and maximum number of hectares allowed for CF</i>	From 10,000 ha upward (check!); no limitation. All depend on size of claimed and available community area.	that clearly specifies the products and volumes to be harvested. Management of such forest – which should not exceed 5,000 ha	• No limitation. Depends on the size of a forest station (area) identified in a management plan and for which a CFA applies to jointly manage with KFS
12	Current progress of CF implemented (number of ha, households, % of natural products...) <i>Description of the current performance and achievements of CF with regards to (named and not named) livelihood and sustainable forest management objectives/expectations (e.g. number of jobs created, increase in income, and number of ha, number of households involved, % of natural products)</i>	68 CBNRM initiatives ongoing in the country (no additional information available)	A total of 164 CF convention have been signed in Cameroon so far. In the buffer zone of the Campo-Ma'an national park already 8 conventions are signed for the benefit of a population of about 3500 people. Seven Simple Management Plans are awaiting the final approval In addition, 10 provisional Conventions are getting approved..	• The CF process is ongoing all over the country • Every conservancy now has an Forest Conservation Committee For Lake Naivasha landscape- • The PFM process, a mechanism for CF has been initiated and on course to achievement • 2 CFAs in place • 2 PFMPs completed • PELIS already being implemented in some areas (200ha) benefiting 1,000 households each cultivating 2 ^{1/2} acres of land • Access to some forest resources e.g. firewood and grazing on going though informally • CFAs engaged to undertake activities in the forest e.g. pruning, road clearing, seedlings raising (Geta CFA contracted to raise 100,000 seedlings) and tree planting
13	Past/current role of WWF in CF <i>Description of the past and current role of WWF in CF</i>	- facilitation of activities of the National Forum on CBNRM –a platform for exchanging information among stakeholders; - development and design of a national strategy for CBNRM for Mozambique, as the strategy is not yet clear in the country; - support for organization of national conferences to discuss major issues; - support to some field projects - advocacy for and support of the certification process in the country	WWF is supporting Community Forestry in Cameroon since 2003, both at field and policy level. The support provided is perfectly in line with the expectations of the Ministry (MINFOF, MINEP), other national and international organization, NGOs and all major stakeholders at community level. The focus is mainly on the buffer zone of protected areas and/or forest concessions. The WWF/CCPO programs currently engaged with CF are : - Kudu-Zombo (Campo Ma'an) ; - Jengi (South-East of Cameroon) ; - Sawa (South-West of Cameroon) ; - Dacefi (North-East of Cameroon). Campo-Ma'an : The WWF program is working in the landscape since 2003. The main result results are: - Study on Community Forestry progress in the landscape and joint planning of interventions. - Support the formation and implementation of three pilot groups. Achievements obtained through the LFP program since 2007: -Approval of 4 management Conventions -Elaboration of 5 Simple Management Plans -Approval of 9 Preliminary Conventions. - Technical and institutional capacity building of CF groups and local NGOs Provision of grants (equipment) for specific harvesting operations	• Facilitated the PFM process in partnership with KFS and other stakeholders in projects in the country –Mau, Coast, Bogoria, Naivasha • Capacity building of CFAs and other stakeholders in the forestry sector • Promoted nature based enterprises for livelihood improvement among CFAs- e.g. Apiculture, energy saving techniques and aquaculture • Policy influencing and support lobbying and advocacy for policy change • Implementation of the new forest Act • Promoting sustainable forest management
14	Opportunities for involvement of WWF in CF <i>Description of which way WWF should (or should not) be engaged in CF (e.g. as problem identifier, facilitator of CF-implementation process, or CF implementer,</i>	WWF stands a better position in leading the process of improving the Mozambican CBNRM process. Meeting with National Directorate for Land and Forests (DNTF) shows that the government counts on technical	- Financial support to local NGOs for the facilitation of the group formation process. - Market link - Integration of lessons learned into revised legal	• Considering the slow pace of implementing CF reforms in Kenya, WWF should be engaged in facilitation and provision of a shared vision through which CF can be achieved. • One of the lessons learnt from L.N landscape is that success in policy shift

	Topic (and description)	Mozambique	Cameroon	Kenya
	<p>etc.?). <i>Besides, description of whether/why/why not WWF has the capacity to deal with CF projects or whether it is better for other organizations to deal with CF; whether enough other organisations are already dealing with CF or whether the communities trust/put sufficient faith in WWF?</i></p>	<p>facilitation of WWF; as process leader. More in-depth discussion with WWF Mozambique needed to assess what, based on their experience, could be the best role in improving CBNRM process in the country.</p>	<p>framework and procedures (simplified guidelines)</p>	<p>from exclusion to joint management with communities and other stakeholders in forestry management require engagement of a third party to harmonize the various interests and provide facilitation for the process to be successful. WWF is therefore better placed to play that role</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WWF has already gained trust from KFS; community and other stakeholders in implementing CF process in L.N. landscape • WWF has wide experience in CF for learning and sharing • WWF has the capacity to mobilize resources for CF
15	<p>Elements of CF necessary for it to contribute to poverty reduction <i>Description, based on experiences of the respondent, about whether and how CF can contribute to poverty reduction</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Communities have access to 100% revenue through acquisition and management of a CBNRM or a community-managed commercial logging concession; - Communities get 20% share of forest royalties from the government; - Households may have direct access to NR within the community area for controlled commercial exploitation - Communities reinvest NRM benefits in community development 	<p>Market link for the commercialization of timber. Good Governance within the CF groups.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities are viewed as co-managers by the government rather than providing cheap labour • Communities and government have formal and negotiated agreements on user rights, access and control of forest resources • Communities have the necessary capacity to participate and enforce CF • Communities are given the first priority to opportunities arising from forest resources • Good governance • Promotion of IGAs that require relatively low investment at the initial stages
16	<p>Elements of CF necessary for it to contribute to biodiversity conservation <i>Description, based on experiences of the respondent, about whether and how CF can contribute to biodiversity conservation</i></p>	<p>-</p>	<p>Sustainable Forest management based on detailed inventory of the forest. Clear harvesting prescriptions for NTFPs. Protection of endangered species (anti-poaching). Regular Monitoring and Evaluation (Annual reports and inventories). Supervision for the enforcement of management prescriptions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional capacity to enforce rules & regulations and implement programmes contributing to biodiversity conservation • Strong link between livelihood improvement and biodiversity conservation • Communities benefit from of non-consumptive uses of forest resources e.g. ecotourism • Alternative livelihood sources are adopted by communities depending on unsustainable use of forest resources

Topic (and description)	Papua New Guinea (Zola)	Indonesia (Literature, Cristina and Pipit)	Bhutan (HB)	Nepal – literature, interviews with DG of the Community Forestry Division of Nepalese government, WWF (Trara and Santoshi) and NSCFP (Usha)
<p>1 Government/Governance</p> <p><i>Description of the general government structure and governance type especially related to forestry in general, forest management and CF (e.g. Ministry of Forestry/Development Cooperation/etc. and to what extent is the government decentralized? What is the level of devolution of powers/decision-making/budget to regional/local and non state-entities?</i></p>	<p>PNG has adopted the Westminster system of government but there is no house of lords. There are District, Provincial and Local Level governments however, they have very little or no power as to the decision making and law enforcement of Natural Resources as this is controlled by the National Government. The National Government decides and provides the policy framework and laws/regulations. Whilst the Provincial and Local Level Governments have the power to do planning and implement activities. The decentralization process is supposed to be facilitated through the Organic Law on Provincial and Local Level Government however, this hasn't been happening partly due to capacity issues. The Fourth Goal of The Constitution however states 'for Papua New Guinea's natural resources and environment to be conserved and used for the collective benefit of us all, and to be replenished for the benefit of future generations'</p> <p>-97% of land is also customary owned by the people therefore; any type of development including natural resource development must be developed with consent and in consultation with the resource owners. Ownership of rights is vested in clan groups where customary resource tenure is recognized by the National Constitution. However, anything that is hydrocarbons (Oils & Gas) and minerals belong to the State (Oil and Gas Act 1998, Mining Act 1992</p> <p>-Royalties are paid to Resources Owners by the State for the acquisition and extraction of any natural resource</p> <p>-Funds to Provincial Governments from the National Government is usually 2 Million PGK</p> <p>-Forest Management in the country is governed by the National Forest Policy 1991 which is administered by the PNG Forest Authority.</p> <p>Other main laws that deal with natural resources in Papua New Guinea are;</p> <p>- Environment Act 2000,</p> <p>- Forestry Act 1991</p> <p>- Crocodile Trade (Protection) Act Chapter 213</p> <p>-National Seas Act 1977</p> <p>- Fisheries Management Act 1998</p> <p>- Whaling Act Chapter 225</p> <p>- Fisheries (Torres Strait Protection) Act</p> <p>The main laws that provide for conservation are:</p> <p>-Conservation Areas Act Chapter 326</p> <p>-Fauna (Protection & Control) Act Chapter 154</p> <p>-National Parks Act Chapter 157</p>	<p>Barr et al., 2006:</p> <p>- Ministry of Forestry (MoF), Ministry of Forestry and Estate Crops (MoFEC)</p> <p>- Reformation process 1998/1999: Civil society groups and elements within government redirect/dismantle policies (=advocate reform??), practices and institutions, incl. a call for more equitable distribution of forest benefits, incl. giving rural communities greater access to forest resources and placing limits on logging (=control of illegal logging??).</p> <p>Decentralization: Law 22/1999 on Regional Governance, Law 25/1999 on Fiscal Balancing between Central Government and Regional Governments. Government Regulation 34/2002.</p> <p>Law 41/1999 and Regulation 34/2002</p> <p>- Community forestry in production forests is usually the responsibility of the GFTN (however it is a minimal portion of the portfolio at the moment) (pers. comm. Christina Eghtenter).</p> <p>Legally speaking, CF was conceived and regulated under the Ministry of Forestry. In this regard the authority to regulate on CF is the Minister/Ministry of Forestry, Head of the District (Bupati) and Governor (Province), and the Forestry Dept at regional level (Dinas)</p>	<p>Royal Decree in 1979 stating that "peoples' participation is key to conservation and utilization of forest resources"</p> <p>Constitution</p> <p>Every Bhutanese is a trustee of the Kingdom's natural resources and environment".</p> <p>Role of The Royal Government: conserve and improve the environment and safeguard the country's biodiversity. It is further developed to secure sustainable economic and social development.</p> <p>The Constitution further charges the Government to ensure that a minimum of 60 percent of Bhutan's total land area is maintained under forest cover for all time.</p> <p>Policies</p> <p>Document "Bhutan 2020" reaffirms the notion of Gross National Happiness (GNH) as the central development concept for the country.</p> <p>Two objectives relevant for CF: environmentally sustainable and rich biodiversity, and one related to governance.</p> <p>The current, 10th Five Year Plan (2008-2013) has poverty reduction as its primary goal.</p> <p>The ultimate power is with the Forest Department under the Ministry of Agriculture. The Gross National Happiness Commission sets the broad outlines. Since 2008 Bhutan is a constitutional monarchy and now the policies are made in parliament. The forest policy will be one of the first going through this process. The Department of Forests is present at field level through the territorial forest services (under control of the department) and the District Forest Service (under control of the Districts). This division of power and responsibilities is under</p>	<p>Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation (Amatya; FECOFUN)</p> <p>Government is decentralized: legal authority is given to communities (independent) – controlled by laws, rules and regulations (e.g. change of land use not allowed)</p> <p>District and local government have coordination role (do not get benefits from activities)</p> <p>There are not direct benefits in cash and kind but local government e.g. Village Development Committee-VDC, District Development Committee-DDC and Municipality are the major. All these are bound with Local self Government Act 1999 (LSG) where very obviously mentioned that each local government body could use, mobilize and generate resources from forest and other natural resource (National and other type of forest) This is how often contradict with Community forestry regulations that conflict of revenue sharing specially from community forest which generated from local efforts and labour. Though Local government body also received indirectly from government that Community forestry used to give 15% of revenue to national government as income from their CF. Besides, local government body also take revenue from forest resource based enterprises to DDC. There are different six sector committee in DDC of which environment and natural resource committee take care all forestry related activities through District Forest Office. The DF officer is member secretary of this environment and NR committee to DDC. That's why how often there is conflict of interest between local government body and CF on this.</p> <p>Generally local government body take benefit from national and other natural resources including forest. CF retains 85% of revenue and only 15% give to the Government.</p> <p>However, Nepal is going to restructure its state possibly in forms of Federalism; so what the status of local government is not predictable yet. Since There is disputes in parliament on ownership on NR and Access to Benefits on NR by indigenous and local community. That's why where the CF revenue would deposit/consume is becoming the question in future. The new constitutions supposed to be declared by the end of May 2010 which obviously outline the status of CF and its revenue again</p>

Topic (and description)	Papua New Guinea (Zola)	Indonesia (Literature, Cristina and Pipit)	Bhutan (HB)	Nepal – literature, interviews with DG of the Community Forestry Division of Nepalese government, WWF (Tara and Santosh) and NSCFP (Usha)
<p>2 Policies, laws/acts, rules and regulations and others relating to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Sustainable development 2) Livelihoods development/poverty reduction 3) General forest management 4) Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) 5) Community Forestry <i>Identification and brief description of existing policies, laws and regulations pertinent to poverty reduction, and forest management in general and CF more specifically</i> 	<p>Hierarchy of Laws; These laws came into force on or after independence (16th Sept 1975)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The Constitution -Organic Law on Provincial and Local Level Governments -Acts of Parliament -By laws -Customary Law <p>National Forest Policy 1991, The National Forest Policy was developed after the Barnett Inquiry in 1989 where findings of unsustainable logging and corruption within the Government and Forest Ministry were uncovered. This included transfer pricing, devaluing of premium species, non-compliance of regulations and extensive violations of landholder's rights as well as extreme environmental destruction. The Policy has six parts relating to forest management, industry, research, training and education, organization and administration and instruments for implementation. All these address issues such as resource ownership, forest classification, sustained yield management, reforestation, the environment and resource acquisition.</p> <p>There are also other sub-policies linked to the National Forest Policy;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Eco-Forest Policy 2004 (yet to be endorsed) -Forestry Act 1993 (amended), 2005 <p>(Amendments in 2005 are still being challenged in court and awaiting court decision)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Reforestation Policy 2003 -Downstream Processing Policy 2003 <p>CF is given minimal consideration in the National Forest Policy. It also makes mention of Small Scale Forest Based Industries as in promoting these industries with regards to portable sawmilling and NTFPs.</p> <p>Visit the Papua New Guinea Forest Authority website www.forestry.gov.pg</p> <p>The context and definition of CF in PNG is quite different in that CF is practised not only for economic/monetary benefit but also for cultural, poverty alleviation and for environmental purposes. It can also be seen as a participatory approach that strengthens the community's capacity to build their own local economy while at the same time protecting and enhancing their own forest. Therefore, CF facilitates sustainable forest management where the vision is to contribute to social and economic upliftment of peoples by promoting responsible and sustainable utilization of natural resources as well as encouraging tree centred development in the country. CF based approaches give communities both the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forestry Act 41/1999 (Barr et al., 2006) , - Government Regulation 6/2007, Ministerial Regulation 37/2007 <p>(two most important and key regulations in Indonesia for Community/Social Forestry) on Community Forestry provide Regulatory Framework for CF in Indonesia through 2 schemes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hutani Kemasyarakatan (Community Forestry) - Hutani Desa (Village Forest) <p>- Kemitraan (Part of logging concession can be managed in partnership with local community)</p> <p>By both regulations (6/2007, 37/2007), CF regulated as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establishment of the CF area by the Minister of Forestry upon recommendation of the Bupati/Governor. 2. Management license issued by the Governor/Bupati for Community Forestry and by the Governor for village forest. <p>The following Ministerial Decrees (no 433/2007, no 434/2007, no 435/2007, no 436/2007, no 437/2007, no 438/2007) represent the follow-up from the Ministerial regulations no 37/2007 to establish CF areas in 3 provinces (Lampung, Yogyakarta, and Nusa Tenggara Barat) for a total of 8,216 ha.</p> <p>The Ministerial decree (Permenhut no 49/2008) on village forest regulates the establishment of the concession, permits, the management plan, authority, development (Pembinaan—more like corporate social responsibility) and control.</p>	<p>discussion. For CF the district forest service is the most important (although the territorial service has to agree). Approval of CF is at Department level. The Department of Forest has Social Forest Division.</p> <p>Forest Policy it's National Forest Policy Goal: "Bhutan's forest resources and biodiversity are managed sustainably and equitably to produce a wide range of social, economic and environmental goods and services for the benefit of all citizens and natural environment while still maintaining a minimum of 60% of the land under forest cover thereby contributing to Gross National Happiness".</p> <p>The policy objective for CF is: "Empower rural communities to manage forests sustainably for socio-economic benefits, poverty reduction and to contribute to overall sustainable forest management at the national level."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At present, a new Forest Policy is under elaboration • Forest and Nature Conservation Rules 2006 are again under revision: • participatory forestry contribute to poverty reduction and socioeconomic development. • rules are recommended to be liberalised and simplified so that the CF programme can benefit even more local communities. - nationalisation of forests in 1969 - Social Forestry started in 1979 with a Royal Degree - CF/SF reflected in the FNC Act 1995 - CF program since 2000 in the Forest and Nature Conservation Rules (last revision in September 2006) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1976 National Forestry Plan (Karky and Banskota 2007) - 1978 community Forestry policy (Article: Y.B. Mallia, 2000) - Forest Act 2049/93 (to legitimize CF) (FAO) - Forest Regulations of 1995 (FAO) – legalisation of participatory CF! - Environmental legislations (FAO) - CF Directives 1994 (MFSC) <p>Bajracharya and Amatya (1993) concluded that the different policy guidelines provided by the major plans at the national level were adequate and correct. However, these national-level policies were not translated adequately into regional and program strategies (Amatya)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forestry Act 1994 - Forest by-laws 1995 - Buffer zone CF regulation 1996 <p>The Master Plan for the Forestry Sector (MPFS 1989) (Amatya):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to meet the people's basic needs for forest products on a sustained basis; - to conserve ecosystems and genetic resources; - to protect land against degradation and other effects of ecological imbalance; and - to contribute to local and national economic growth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Periodic Plan 5 yrs - Terai Landscape Strategy 2006 - National Biodiversity Strategy 2003 <p>(Database is currently being developed and will be accessible for everyone: text is available in English)</p> <p>In the hilly/mountainous areas, laws, regulations and policies are very supportive of community forestry. Especially, because the national government is not able to manage/maintain/ increase forest cover in these (very) remote areas.</p> <p>Could you please delete laws/policies/regulations that have been annulled and replaced by other laws? Of the laws/policies/regulations that are still valid, could you indicate per law what it means for Community Forestry?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Forestry Development programme guidelines 2008 • Forestry sector gender and social inclusion strategy 2008 • The Master Plan for the forestry sector 1989- outdated but still not out the new one • Three years interim plan-2007

Topic (and description)	Papua New Guinea (Zola)	Indonesia (Literature, Cristina and Pipit)	Bhutan (HB)	Nepal – literature, interviews with DG of the Community Forestry Division of Nepalese government, WWF (Tara and Santosh) and NSCFP (Usha)
<p>3 Name land use categories and where CF is possible <i>Brief description of the types and functions of land/forest use categories, their management and property regimes, and management objectives (e.g. production), HCVF (e.g. conservation), National Park (e.g. protected), Agriculture (e.g. agricultural activities, no forest crops), Brief description of property regimes (e.g. ignorance or acknowledgement of customary land rights) and management objectives</i></p>	<p>opportunity and the responsibility to manage their resources effectively and also to enjoy the benefits of that responsibility.</p> <p>Land is 100% customary owned and consent has to be given by the resource owners in consultation with the developers and the State. Land Use categories: -Protected Areas -Government: Manages National/Provincial Parks, Wildlife Sanctuaries, Reserves -Environment Act 2000 -Fauna and Flora Protection Act 1978 Wildlife Management Areas; Gazetted by the Government (Department of Environment and Conservation) but set up, established and managed by the resource owners facilitated by mostly NGOs Conservation Management Areas; A longer process involved for the establishment of this type of protected area Forest Concessions; -Forest Management Areas; Large Areas 80 000ha or more acquired by the State through consultation with the Resource Owners and advertised through tender. Developers register their interest by tender. The State then processes and approves the applications. -Timber Authorities (TA); There are four different types of TAs i) Road line TA ii) Agriculture iii) TA for Timber Harvest (not exceeding 5000m³) iv) TA for Harvesting of Plantations. -Timber Rights Purchase (TRP); Some areas are still under this concession (TRP) under the old</p>	<p>Basic Forestry Law 5/1967 delineated four functional categories (This law has been annulled by the law No 41/1999): 1) Permanent Forest Estate 2) Production Forest (forested areas used to produce forest products to meet society's needs in general and especially needs of development, industry and export – Barber and Churchill, 1987) 3) Protection Forest 4) Nature Conservation Forest, Recreation Forest (Barr et al., 2006) CF working areas can be provided in production and protection forests free from license or concession holders (Hindra, 2006?) This division of forest land based on status (right) and function does not cause conflict of interest as a CF concession can be issued on protected, production, and conservation forest (in the wilderness and use zones). Environmental Law 5/1990: 1. Nature sanctuary/reserve (Nature and Wildlife Sanctuary, Nature Reserve) 2. Conservation Forest (National Park, Tourism Park, Taman Hutun Raya National Forest, Recreation Forest???) 3. Hunting reserve 4. Protected Forest 5. Production Forest (Limited production; production; conversion to industrial/agro business estate)</p>	<p>- All rural house holds have access to (subsidized) timber for house construction, maintenance and fuel wood (rural timber supply) Community Forestry - Recent Trends • Forest areas around villages can be allotted as Community Forestry • Capacity of the forestry staff to implement CF programmes is partly strengthened • The NWFP development in community forests increased • Documentation of Community Forests development activities – increased awareness • Increased attention/support for the economic aspects of CF • Bhutan has about 72% forest cover • Almost 50% is national park and corridors • 14% under Forest Management Units • Remaining under Government Reserved Forest • 60% of the country has to remain under forest! • Currently less than 1% under Community Forest management Community forest in principle possible in all land categories (but in parks only for NWFP and not for commercial timber harvesting). The 1% is thus in all categories. If a CF is in a Forest Management Unit, this area will be excluded from the harvesting by the company and left for the community.</p>	<p>Panchayat Forest (PF): Establishment of new plantations on Government wastelands which were established and protected by communities. Panchayat Protected Forest (PPF): Rehabilitated and protected forests on existing forest land by communities (Gilmour, 2003; FAO) Land is owned by government, so land use change not allowed! Forest resources are owned by communities. CF possible on following land use categories: Production Forest, Protection Forest (e.g. in Terai), Wetland, Grassland, Conservation area No CF allowed on: National Park, Buffer zone Recently there are following type of forest • Government managed Forest • Community forests • Leasehold forest • Religious forest • Protected forest • Private Forest Can you indicate what land use categories exist and on what categories CF is possible? Forest area which is access to villagers and also has been using traditionally can be handed over as community forests where ever possible particularly government forest (except protected forests)</p>

Topic (and description)	Papua New Guinea (Zola)	Indonesia (Literature, Cristina and Pipit)	Bhutan (HB)	Nepal – literature, interviews with DG of the Community Forestry Division of Nepalese government, WWF (Tara and Santosh) and NSCFP (Usha)
<p>4</p> <p>CF motivations and objectives <i>Brief description of the reasons the national (or district/local) government embarked on the CF process (e.g. due to international pressure or decentralized frameworks, biodiversity or socioeconomic motives, etc.)</i></p>	<p>regulations before the National Forest Policy came into place</p> <p>No national model for CF however, CF is mainly supported by NGOs through FSC. The government acknowledges FSC as a voluntary scheme.</p> <p>Government's objectives are largely driven by economic return/revenue but also recognizing Sustainable Forest Management,</p> <p>Main Objectives;</p> <p>i) The Management and Protection of the nation's forest resources as a renewable natural asset</p> <p>ii) Utilization of the Country's forest resources to achieve economic growth, creation of employment, greater participation by Papua New Guineans in the industry and increased onshore processing</p> <p>Supportive Objectives include;</p> <p>-Forest Research</p> <p>-Forestry Training and Education</p> <p>CF is seen as benefiting only the resource owners of a particular area and not the Government/State and the country as a whole. Therefore, CF is not a priority for the government. However, where the State has established plantations in this case most are Pines (Araucaria hunstenii and Araucaria cunninghamii) and Pinus plantations, social forestry is part of the extension services of the government through the Forest Authority where mostly technical advice, guidance and support is provided to resource owners. In the Pine plantations the Taungya system has been adopted.</p> <p>Through this extension services, tree centred development is encouraged where areas especially in the Highlands of PNG where extensive subsistent agriculture and increase in population has also contributed to the degradation of forests and grasslands. Woodlots are established because of the need for fuel wood, other forest products (e.g. building materials, traditional paints/medicines) and the realization of the importance of protecting water catchments to prevent contamination and provide clean drinking water for the communities.</p>	<p>Colchester, 2002: Government's CF programme (early 1990s) has established co-management approach allowing communities (as coop's) to gain 25 yr leaseholds on State Forests lands. Programme mainly applied in degraded forest areas and among migrant farmer communities. - In 1980s MoF introduced social forestry program in Java (Taungya system).</p> <p>- Community Development Program: objectives socio-economic development of communities surrounding concessions (Hindra, 2006?)</p> <p>-Social Forestry Program 2003: empowerment of people living within/surrounding forest: increase local welfare, preserve forest (Hindra, 2006?)</p> <p>Social Forestry in Indonesia is aimed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - alleviate poverty around forest village at estimated ~40 million people all over Indonesia - support and accelerate process of reforestation in national scale <p>Officially, everybody in the Ministry is concerned with sustainable forest management and economic well-being of the communities. There is enough attention to community benefits (tools are not always appropriate or the implementation or the process are not always fully consulted and participated, my interpretation), but administrative procedures sometimes make it cumbersome for communities to apply for licenses and permits. The issue of illegal logging, international and civil society pressure, and the commitment of the current Minister of Forestry are all factors in the recent efforts to support sustainable management of the forest and sectoral reform. The issue of benefit-sharing is larger than just the issue of CF.</p> <p>Of course you will find differences in perspectives and expectations between central and district governments, and communities and government. The other big issue is "power" related to the richness of natural resources in this country and the role of the Ministry of Forestry having been very powerful so far (not the case in European States, n'est pas?), so you can expect some degree of internal, bureaucratic resistance to radical reform (again, my thought).</p>	<p>The policy objective for CF is: "Empower rural communities to manage forests sustainably for socio-economic benefits, poverty reduction and to contribute to overall sustainable forest management at the national level."</p> <p>"Community Forest" is, according to the Forest and Nature Conservation Act of Bhutan, 1995, means any area of Government Reserved Forest designated for management by local community in accordance with rules issued under this act.</p> <p>Benefits of Community Forest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social benefits: create ownership, own governance through by-laws and groups process, equity • Environmental benefits: increased plantations, improved quality of forests, maintain ecological functions • Economic benefits: income through sale of timber and NWFP, saving funds, sustainable supply of products <p>In the beginning, CF was primarily promoted to ensure forest protection and reforestation, it is now increasingly viewed as a means to improve rural livelihoods and contribute to poverty reduction.</p> <p>Future of criteria for CF proposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • removing the cap on the area of CF per household for CF allocation (maybe make a minimum area), • allowing also smaller communities than 10 households to found a CFMG, and • using, where ever possible, traditional and natural boundaries for the CF. • determining the CF areas by a set of criteria including customary rights and practices, availability and productivity of 	<p>To make Community Forestry a legitimate form of forestry intervention, forest plantation and protection; tackle deforestation and deterioration forests (Gilmour, 2003; Amaty; Karky and Banskota 2007)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF Programme (MFSC) objectives: To achieve sustainable management of forest resources by converting accessible national forests into Community Forests on a phase wise manner. - To halt the problem of deforestation in lowland (Terai Arc Landscape) and hilly/mountainous areas based on 1975 report of World Bank with prognosis that Nepal's forests would be gone by 2000 - Government was not successful in sustainable forest management and to reduce the Government's costs of management and forest protection <p>The thrust behind the CF is engage community to protect their forest through increasing ownership, access to revenue from forest, sustainable availability of forest product for domestic and enterprise, environmental balance and ensure livelihoods of local people who are entirely dependent on forest resources</p>

Topic (and description)	Papua New Guinea (Zola)	Indonesia (Literature, Cristina and Pipit)	Bhutan (HB)	Nepal – literature, interviews with DG of the Community Forestry Division of Nepalese government, WWF (Tara and Santosh) and NSCFP (Usha)
<p>5</p> <p>CF and NRM types</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the government's implementation strategy/approach - Steps of CF acquisition process <p><i>Description of the type / all types of NRM and CF in the country (e.g. in wetlands and forests, inside or outside national parks or possibility to sell logs/NTFPs), the government's implementation strategy/approach, and step-by-step described acquisition process for applicants</i></p>	<p>No national model for CF however, CF is mainly supported by NGOs such as The Forest Management & Product Certification Service (FORCERT) and The Foundation for the People's Community Development (FPCD) through FSC. The government acknowledges it as a voluntary scheme. CF is practised on a very small scale at the community/village level. FORCERT and FPCD are local NGOs.</p> <p>Step-wise-Approach by FORCERT through FSC forest certification</p> <p>Eleven steps developed by the Islands Region Environment Community Development Programme in 1997 which was funded by the European Commission. The overview was developed and written by Nick Salafsky of the Biodiversity Conservation Network (BCN) in Washington DC, USA.</p> <p>FORCERT approach includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Awareness of FSC development of land use 2. Socio-economic and environmental survey, forest management planning, business management planning, forest inventories, Chain of Custody Training, Training on effective timber production, timber enterprise planning and management, 3. A Forest Industry Participant Certificate from the PNG Forest Authority must be acquired for the CF participants. 4. CF is managed by the community/clan group. <p>Land Use Planning includes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Demarcating land boundaries -Other land use activities e.g. cash cropping, subsistent agriculture -HCVFs, conservation areas, sacred sites -Incorporation of Land Groups (Incorporation of Land Groups Act 1974) -Forest Management Area; Production Forest Areas identified through inventories <p>These CFs are quite small areas ranging from 400-5000ha</p> <p>PNG Forest Authority (Government)</p> <p>Extension services in the highlands include afforestation of extensive grasslands which have not been forested for quite some time.</p>		<p>forests (size based on timber requirement and possible income (depends on different forest type)),</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • and the willingness and ability of the CFMG to manage its forests. <p>Community forestry can be for NWFP, timber harvesting or just claiming the management of the area.</p> <p>The ownership remains with the Government. Management plans are approved for 10 years, with the possibility for extension.</p> <p>A management plan describes the management of the resources and ensures sustainability of the resources and services. The plan also includes the by-laws of how the Community Forest Management Groups (CFMG) functions.</p> <p>The CF manuals describe all the steps that need to be taken.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Initiation of the CF process (awareness) 2. Application from Community to District Head 3. Review of application (key role by the territorial Forest services) 4. Approval of the application 5. CF management preparation 6. submission of the plan and the by-laws 7. Approval 8. Implementation of the plan 9. Monitoring (and evaluation) 	<p>- CF Programme (MFSC) strategy: Handing over of accessible forest areas as CFs to the FUGs for management and utilization of forest resources.</p> <p>Swiss were investing in development very early (integrated development concept) and planted pine trees (some domestic, some exotic)</p> <p>In 1978 the government started CF – FAO (UN) provided support (UNDP was not yet established)</p> <p>CF focused on: timber, firewood, generating income, environmental services (e.g. conservation of water), capacity development, center of awareness creation</p> <p>Two types of CFUGs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CFUGs - CFUGs in conservation area/buffer zone (under conservation perspective everything allowed (???) <p>Different constructions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UG water shed areas - collaborative forest management users are sharing benefits with government: 15 % tax of commercial trade to national (treasury) of government - awareness creation/program <p>Acquisition process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) group forming and registration at District Forest Office 2) Forest resource assessment/inventory 3) writing constitution/operational/management plan by CGUGs 4) approval plan by District Forest Office 5) hand over CF to CFUG and implementation of plan 6) Evaluation activities by CFUG and District Forest Office 7) revision of constitution/operational/ management plan every 5 years <p>When it concerns a project/program: project plan development with communities involved, mandatory local district meetings</p> <p>a. Nepal UK Community Forestry Program-NUKCFP was also one of the pioneer program that made changes in Forest management model initially in Four district later expanded to seven district; now with new Name Livelihoods and Forestry Program (LFP) from DFID funded its coverage is 15 district including three major Tarai District. There was Department of Forest Survey and research supported by DFID. This second model of community forest through LFP clearly linked with people livelihoods with forest with capitalizing benefit and ensure access to forest resource for their livelihoods</p> <p>b. Nepal Australia Community Forestry Program is also another pioneer community forestry program which later converted as Nepal Australia Community Resource Management and Livelihoods Project (NACLMP) with little bit large coverage district. AusAID supported this project had included Livelihoods component in their second phase which focused people centred forest management approach but now it is completely phased out</p>

Topic (and description)	Papua New Guinea (Zola)	Indonesia (Literature, Cristina and Pipit)	Bhutan (HB)	Nepal – literature, interviews with DG of the Community Forestry Division of Nepalese government, WWF (Tara and Santosh) and NSCFP (Usha)
<p>This involves the process of establishing central forest nurseries.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Foresters go out and conduct awareness in the villages on the benefits and uses of the different types of tree species for various applications in their everyday life. 2) This visit is normally followed by the distribution of seedlings to the local people/communities who are interested. If the area is more than a hectare then the Extension Officer helps with marking, surveying and mapping of the area. Tree planting is also a prerequisite to agro-forestry activities such as inter-cropping of other cash crops such as coffee and cardamom. 3) The area is then registered with details of the owner/s, species planted, location etc....and kept on file for follow up visits in the future. <p>The PNGFA has now changed its approach in that now a Participatory Rural Appraisal has to be carried out, land use planning before any planting takes place.</p>	<p>FORCERT and FPCCD with funding support from EU, WWF and ICCO and various other donors.</p> <p>The National Forest Policy in relation to CF calls for the National Forest Services which are offices in each province of the country to establish a forestry extension capacity to coordinate as well as provide guidance and support to community forestry/social forestry and should work closely together with the agriculture extension staff which mostly deals with social/community forestry (woodlots, plantations etc...). However, currently there is no capacity in the PNG Forest Authority to deal with and monitor CFs especially through the use of portable sawmills.</p> <p>NGOs through the PNG Eco-Forestry Forum www.ecoforestry.org.pg and NGOs such as FORCERT www.forcert.org.pg and FPCCD www.fpccd.org.pg support community forestry in primary forests. Both FORCERT and FPCCD have forest extension officers who facilitate the establishment of CFs through FSC forest certification and promoting the use of portable sawmills to sustainably manage their natural forest resources</p> <p>PNG Forest Certification Inc pngfscni@datec.net.pg is the national representation of FSC in PNG.</p>	<p>Colchester, 2002: MoF established a Directorate of CF.</p> <p>Promoting CF in Indonesia: Ford Foundation, ICRAF, GTZ, USAID, DfID (recently), national NGOs, and local and (inter)national CF networks (Colchester, 2002)</p> <p>Social movement of indigenous peoples and community mapping are useful in supporting CF (Barr et al., 2006)</p> <p>FKKM http://www.fkkm.org</p> <p>- Indonesian Forest Service (founded in 1945) (Barr et al., 2006)</p> <p>- District administrators and regents (Colchester, 2002)</p> <p>Dinas kehutanan (tingkat kabupaten/ provinsi) dan Badan Planologi serta Rehabiliasi Lahan dan perhutanan social Departemen kehutanan</p> <p>The local forestry bureau/dept (district and provincial), the planning, land restoration, and social forestry directorates of the Ministry of Forestry</p>	<p>The district forest services are the key to implement the CF program.</p> <p>The Government has an awareness campaign through radio, brochures and district parliament debates. Also if the Minister goes to the field they promote CF!</p> <p>In-service trainings for extension staff and for CFMG leaders.</p> <p>Exchange visits by CFMGs to further promote CF. Learning for other areas and identifying common problems so the Government can think of a solution.</p> <p>The College of Natural Resources trains the extension agents.</p> <p>The Rural Development training centre trains the lead farmers</p>	<p>Major donors: DFID, AusAID, USAID, GTZ (MFSC)</p> <p>- Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), SNV, WWF, IUCN, FECOFUN (1995 established - Nepali), RECOFTC, UNDP, Forest Action (Nepali), OEF (HR/CF), and many others</p> <p>FECOFUN (CSO) local level (technically and legally supported by NSCFP):</p> <p>Helps preserve rights and duties of CFUGs; supports better management of community forest and CFUGs (lifestyle, institutional support, activities according to needs and wants of CFUGs – e.g. trainings and meetings); mediator between CFUGs and district officer and CFUGs and NSCFP; helps improving policies on CF in order to increase no. of CFUGs, CFs and driving force for NSCFP and government</p> <p>FECOFUN national level: policy advocacy; capacity building; protecting rights communities; sharing lessons/experience/knowledge; expanding CF in Nepal</p> <p>- Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation (Amatya); FECOFUN, WRM</p> <p>- CF division under Forestry Department, Regional Forestry Directorate, District and Local Forest Offices are responsible for CF</p> <p>Community Forestry and Afforestation Division (CFAD) of Department of Forests – responsible for implementation of Nepal's new forest policy and its rules and regulations. Consists of technical specialists in forestry to support its field programme. CFAD's CF Unit does silvicultural and ecological work and gives technical support to field activities. The 4 other units collect and distribute tree seeds, supervise training and extension activities, design and test more efficient wood-stoves, monitor project progress, evaluate project impact and assess major socioeconomic factors in CF (FAO). CF field activities are carried out by CF Assistants who do not have territorial duties or power of arrest (FAO). Divisional Forest Officer is responsible for CF and territorial activities.</p> <p>- Department of Forests is legally obliged to supply seedlings (free) to village panchayats and to pay for planting.</p> <p>NFUG – Nepal Forestry User Group, as CSO, it is also working CFUGs capacity</p>

Topic (and description)	Papua New Guinea (Zola)	Indonesia (Literature, Cristina and Pipit)	Bhutan (HB)	Nepal – literature, interviews with DG of the Community Forestry Division of Nepalese government, WWF (Tara and Santosh) and NSCP (Usha)
<p>7</p> <p>Extension materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manuals - Training modules - Templates <p>(management plans, activity planning, inventories...)</p> <p><i>Identification and description of training, technical, and extension support materials set in place to support the implementation of CF by communities and organizations involved</i></p>	<p>The second edition to the Small Scale Operations Guide and the Small-Scale Sawmilling Information Pack were revised in 2007 by a consortium of NGOs and funded by the Interchurch Organization for Development Corporation (ICCO). The first edition published in 2001 was funded by the PNG Community Development Scheme and The John D. and Catherine T. McArthur Foundation.</p> <p>Eleven Steps by the Islands Region Environmental Community Development Programme published in 1997</p> <p>Communities involved in CF through NGOs have developed their own Management Plans and Business Plans through different training conducted by the NGOs and their partners. These plans are kept by the community/clan group. The Small Business Development Corporation (SBDC) facilitates training in the FORCERT system in Start Your Timber Business (SYTB) which is the development of Business Plans for communities who are involved in CF. SBDC is a statutory body under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry.</p>	<p>Training Opportunities (http://www.dephut.go.id/files/ASFN_2nd_08_Indonesia_Report_Pre4.pdf):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exchange of Farmer Groups on Best Practices and Lessons Learned in Social Forestry - Training Facilities established under the Cooperation in Social Forestry between Ministry of Forestry of Indonesia (MoF) and Partner Organisations (Ford Foundation, RECOFTC, etc) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-service training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o CF management planning o Conflict Management and Facilitation o Silviculture o GPS-GIS • Enterprise development CF manuals (4 parts) • Silviculture manual and posters • Four draft guidelines for NWFP management (and more in pipeline) • CF brochure and posters to create awareness (all available through web sites of soft copies) <p>Most management plans are available in soft copies</p>	<p>enhancement, coordination, advocacy and technical capacity, governance activities and scientific management of protected area and buffer zone forest since a long.</p> <p>NTNC- National trust for national conservation, working since a long basically research, and scientific management of protected area and buffer zone forest since a long.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF guideline to guide the process (1991 English, now also in Nepali - all districts) - CF inventory guideline (e.g. resource availability –all districts) - Other guidelines dependent on project (e.g. SNV project or WWF project in Terai) <p>FECOFUN: development guidelines and manuals for on demand trainings on e.g. record keeping, etc.</p> <p>Forms/docs available at MFSC: CFUG Registration, CF Handover, Contents of CF Constitution and Contents of CF Operation Plan (Nepalese)</p> <p>Training/ extension materials: nursery and plantation flip-chart and booklet, guide for Foremen and Watchers, calendar for seed collection and sowing , radio programme, etc. (FAO).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Government: CF guideline, posters and pamphlets (awareness), training materials (capacity). Difficult to implement according to DG. Materials only in Nepali and not available through internet. <p>Can you indicate specifically what extension materials WWF Nepal has made available for CFUGs?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Micro finance operation guideline (Revolving fund operation to CFUG member to increase their access to low-interest rate loan and could install bio-gas plant with investment options to diversify livelihoods activities that create pressure to forest/habitat (in TAL) 2. Community Based Anti-Poaching Operation Guideline : to mobilize youths and active users for stewardship of forest and habitat resources (all WWF site) 3. Livelihoods Mainstreaming Strategy Manual: this document is developed not for only CFUG but all user committee, council and project staff to enhance the livelihoods with appropriate selection of intervention that reduce one hand pressure on natural resource and improve and diversified livelihoods pressure, on the other (for SHL/TAL) 4. Livelihood Improvement Plan for Buffer zone Community Forest User Group-BZCFUG (SHL) : with support from SAGUN-CARE, the principle of governance and right to access mainstreamed in community and buffer-zone forestry management. The Objective behind LIP is to increase marginalized and asset deprived forest users groups to CFUG/BZUG and reflects their voice to committee. The tool Well being ranking find out the assetless people among the users and this LIP is developed to address specially to these groups 4. Livelihoods Mainstreaming Training Manual for Community Forestry Coordination Committee-CFCC : This is targeted for CFCC including Buffer-zone Management Committee-BZMC and Conservation Area Management Committee-CAMC in SHL 5. Livelihoods Change Monitoring Manual for CFUG/CFCC (the manual is recently completed, this is based on Gov of Nepal CFUG guideline) 6. Population Health and Environment Operation Manual (Site specific) the document basically focuses on enhancing CFUG/CFCC capacity to integrate population and health agenda in to Community forestry planning. This is supported from USAID and Johnson and Johnson US. The project is limited within three critical corridor and bottleneck site of TAL where population pressure is rapidly increasing due to of conflict; internal migration and livelihoods security (Internally displaced people)

Topic (and description)	Papua New Guinea (Zola)	Indonesia (Literature, Cristina and Pipit)	Bhutan (HB)	Nepal – literature, interviews with DG of the Community Forestry Division of Nepalese government, WWF (Tara and Santosh) and NSCFP (Usha)
<p>8</p> <p>Duration of management agreement with the government and the frequency of revision/ updating of CF management plan</p> <p><i>Description of the types of management agreements between the government and community forestry user group and identification of how often CF management plans need to be revised/ updated by the community forestry user groups</i></p>	<p>Government participation is lacking and there is a general lack of policy support and other community based forest management (CBM) by the State to encourage genuine local participation in community based forest management in natural forest and supporting NTFPs.</p>	<p>The management plan is for 10 years and renewable. The plan needs an evaluation before it can be extended/ revised/ updated. An inventory of the resources is needed before an extension can be granted. So far only a few management plans went through this process as the first management plan was approved in 1997, but through the few examples the trend is being established for the rest.</p>	<p>Can you indicate what extension materials exactly NSCFP and the local government has made available for CFUGs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audio cassettes for advocating regarding on CF through songs (NSCFP) • CF guidelines, Gender and social inclusion strategy (NSCFP) • Pamphlets mentioning the promotion of CF programme (NSCFP) <p>- Every 5 years update is necessary</p> <p>Takes much time because of much work load for District Forest Office</p> <p>Each CFUG which is registered in DFO (District Forest Office) should have Forest Operation Plan (FOP). The FOP should also ratify by CFUG general assembly, should be audited and should be comprise of a clear annual plan and target. Recently, GoN of Nepal has developed a new CFUG Guideline (2007/8) that obviously, indicated that FOP should integrate social inclusion and governance principle to improve those people who are asset less but dependent on nearby forest and other natural resources. That mean the FOP is one of the strategy to improve people (deprived and marginalized) livelihoods through ensuring the proper address in FOP. CFUG also have to develop annual plan based on FOP and submit to DFO for funding and other support.</p> <p>In WWF Nepal working site, Each CFUG usually submit their annual plan to DFO and simultaneously to CFCC (community forestry coordination committee) which collect and coordinate to WWF TAL program for funding and technical support. At the same time they also submit DFO as apex wing of district to inform to get technical support and resource. There are buffer-zone based community forest which also submit their annual and periodic plan to BZ management council (BZMC)</p> <p>CFUGs write own constitution/operational/ management plan which needs to be approved by District Forestry Office.</p> <p>Village Panchayats need to sowing seeds, planting seedlings and protecting forests from theft and fire (FAO).</p> <p>CFUG and District Forest Office organise evaluation activities</p> <p>Each CFUG should have Forest Operation Plan that ensure all aspect of forest management, plantation, weeding, thrashing, logging, selling distribution which is performed with technical support from DFO/Range office. The FOP also mentioned targets of collection, rule for using, user fee, fuel wood, grass collection, grazing and land use for economic activities, land demarcation, inventory preparation etc</p> <p>There are well established customary practices for the operation and management of community forests in Nepal</p> <p>Is this information correct? Yes but if some CF is not much productive can make operational plan for 10 years.</p>	<p>7. Community based anti-poaching operation unit operation manual : This is focused under the CFCC and support from CFUG to engage youths against the illegal activities that might happen in and around the community and buffer zone forest</p> <p>Besides these: Some Information Communication and Education Material are also developed as extension material</p> <p>Biodiversity specific, Non formal Education material for CFUG users, Anti-poaching materials, Eco-club materials, Good governance Principle poster, Green Enterprise related Poster, Mega and flagship species, space specific species, Wetlands and other related for distribution. Beside these there is regular Radio Education Program (FM) which update mountain and TAL about the program and issues, interview, success story for CF management and the like</p>
<p>9</p> <p>Law enforcement in Community Forestry Areas</p> <p><i>Description of the level of law enforcement regarding CF;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the role of governmental law enforcement of the management plan (during development and during execution of management plan)? - How does the community itself ensure proper implementation of the management plan (e.g. concerning illegal logging, overharvesting, fair 	<p>There is no monitoring by the government. CF is practised by communities/clans in this case through FSC guidelines and criteria are followed. This is with the FORCERT example where monitoring is done by extension foresters and Corrective Action Requests are issued if there is non-compliance.</p> <p>Audit is carried out by Woodmark.</p> <p>The PNG Logging Code of Practice has 24 Key Standards that offer practical guidance to reduce the adverse effect of logging on the forest and the communities living in them. It also allows for the protection of the environment and maintenance of forest productivity through economically viable operations within acceptable safety standards.</p> <p>The Logging Code of Practice is mostly used for large scale commercial logging and requires</p>	<p>Bothe the Territorial and District Forest Service monitor the CF performance and action is undertaken to make adjustments if not properly implemented. So far no licence has been revoked. The CFMG has the option to revise the plan whenever needed (with the assistance of the District Forest Service).</p>	<p>Bothe the Territorial and District Forest Service monitor the CF performance and action is undertaken to make adjustments if not properly implemented. So far no licence has been revoked. The CFMG has the option to revise the plan whenever needed (with the assistance of the District Forest Service).</p>	<p>CFUGs write own constitution/operational/ management plan which needs to be approved by District Forestry Office.</p> <p>Village Panchayats need to sowing seeds, planting seedlings and protecting forests from theft and fire (FAO).</p> <p>CFUG and District Forest Office organise evaluation activities</p> <p>Each CFUG should have Forest Operation Plan that ensure all aspect of forest management, plantation, weeding, thrashing, logging, selling distribution which is performed with technical support from DFO/Range office. The FOP also mentioned targets of collection, rule for using, user fee, fuel wood, grass collection, grazing and land use for economic activities, land demarcation, inventory preparation etc</p> <p>There are well established customary practices for the operation and management of community forests in Nepal</p> <p>Is this information correct? Yes but if some CF is not much productive can make operational plan for 10 years.</p>

Topic (and description) <i>sharing of benefits, etc.?</i>	Papua New Guinea (Zola)	Indonesia (Literature, Cristina and Pipit)	Bhutan (HB)	Nepal – literature, interviews with DG of the Community Forestry Division of Nepalese government, WWF (Tara and Santosh) and NSCFP (Usha)
	<p>that the PNG Forest Authority fully comply with these in its planning, monitoring and control procedures for Natural Forest Logging Operations.</p> <p>The logging code of practice is also used to some degree in CFs of Natural Forest especially when doing the set-up plans through the Forest Management Planning Process.</p> <p>The extension foresters of the Forest Service provide technical assistance and advice to communities who manage woodlots. The communities have in place committees who draw up the laws and penalties and do their own monitoring with the assistance of the extension officer.</p>	<p>It is allowed to extract and sell timber and NTFP from community and village forests in production forest. While in protected forest, only the extraction and commerce of NTFP is allowed.</p> <p>It is allowed to apply eco-tourism in protected and production, conservation (Regulation 18/1994) forests.</p>	<p>The forest act allows the establishment of enterprises. The other acts and rules also allow and the regional trade and industries offices actually stimulate this actively!</p> <p>The community has to fulfil their own needs first and if the management plans has the option for sale excess they are encouraged to sell!</p>	<p>- No business model! All under discussion. Also no pilots among CFUGs – not on national level</p> <p>- there are no rules on the use of finance/funds by the CFUGs, but: 25% needs to be used for management of forest (reforestation) and 35% for poorer HH (according to FECOFUN)</p> <p>CFUG can allocate the land for economic activity without creating pressure on conserved community and closed national forest. But they have to invest their revenue to forest management at least. But they should take permission from DFO prior to bid out the amount of sale that should be in FOP</p> <p>Can you answer the question in second column about law enforcement in CF area? FUG writes its own constitution and District Forest Office enforce the according to forest act and regulations</p>
<p>1 Do laws/regulations/rules say anything about business opportunities in CF? <i>Description of whether it is allowed to sell (excess) of CF products or to set off Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs).</i></p>	<p>Extracted timber or sawn timber and NTFPs can be sold. Eco-tourism is also allowed depending on what infrastructure is available. CFs must be registered as business entities with the Investment Promotion Authority by law. They must also be registered with the PNG Forest Authority as a Forest Industry Participant to have the appropriate tree felling licence.</p>	<p>There is no limitation, depends on the conditions of the area at the time of establishment by the Minister, and process of verification by the local and provincial Forestry Bureau</p>	<p>Max 2.5 ha per household for timber management. For NWFP no limit. The current trend is to be flexible with the upper limit to allow communities to sell excess timber and make some income. The preference is to follow natural boundaries (as long as no conflict with neighbouring communities.)</p>	<p>Each Panchayat is eligible to receive 125ha for creation of Panchayat forest and responsible for planting and protection of all trees. In return, it obtains all rights to forest products (FAO). Each Panchayat village is entitled to 500ha of forest land for creation of Panchayat protected forest. In return, it can collect fuel wood, fodder and minor forest products for local use and receives 75% of revenues from timber (FAO).</p> <p>- No fixed size of forest or group! This can cause problems: sometimes groups are too large (overharvesting, conflicts within the group, etc.) or there is too much land to manage (illegal harvesting external from group, etc.);</p> <p>Which information is correct? Is there a minimum and maximum size or not? No fixed size of forest and group</p>
<p>1 Minimum and maximum size of CF <i>Assessment of the minimum and maximum number of hectares allowed for CF</i></p>	<p>Size of CF area allowed must be below 20 000ha and not exceeding a harvest volume of 500m³. Usually at the community level the area is very small and harvest volumes are even smaller. Most areas are between 400-5000ha.</p>	<p>1999: forest management leases to communities of 92,000 ha for rehabilitation of degraded dry forests (Colchester, 2002)</p> <p>- Social Forestry Permits released for 3 Provinces in Indonesia (http://www.dephut.go.id/files/ASFN_2nd_08_Indonesia_Report_Pre4.pdf);</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 173 CFs established • involving approx. 8,650 rural households and • Covering approx. 21,000 ha, i.e. 0.9% of the total forested area • It is projected that by mid 	<p>1997 - CF covered 362,552 ha (Joshi, 1997); 2003 - CF covered 850,000 ha, ~12,000 FUGs registered (Gilmour, 2003); 2007 - 1.4 million households and 13,000 FUGs (Karky and Banskota 2007) Projects: SAGUN Program, Jana Awaaj Project, NTFP-FC Program, WPCFCA project - 2008 – 1.45 mill HH involved in CF (35% population), 14,337 CFUGs have been formed (of which 778 women-only committees), 1,219,272 ha National Forest. 1,647,717 HH benefited (MIFSC)</p>
<p>1 Current progress of CF implemented (number of ha, households, % of natural products...) <i>Description of the current performance and achievements of CF with regards to (named and not</i></p>	<p>Currently 35 communities in 8 Provinces with 62 406ha of total forest area under land use Number of clans involved is 172. Number of workers 286 Total forest production forest area of all communities involved is 28 203 ha With the Extension services of the Forest</p>			

Topic (and description)	Papua New Guinea (Zola)	Indonesia (Literature, Cristina and Pipit)	Bhutan (HB)	Nepal – literature, interviews with DG of the Community Forestry Division of Nepalese government, WWF (Tara and Santosh) and NSCFP (Usha)
<p>named) livelihood and sustainable forest management objectives/expectations created, increase in income, and number of ha, number of households involved, % of natural products)</p>	<p>service, the areas are even smaller ranging from 1ha to 5ha mostly of woodlots and agro-forestry activities.</p>	<p>- Target of 400,000 ha social forestry area set for implm. until 2009 (http://www.dephut.go.id/files/ASFN_2nd_08_Indonesia_Report_Pre4.pdf)</p> <p>At the launching of the Community Forestry program by the Vice President in Yogyakarta, 15 August 2007, a decree was issued stating a total community forestry area of 8,216 ha and the “use” licenses given by Head of the Districts tp 54 farmers groups from 3 provinces (Yogyakarta, Lampung, and NTB). Especially in the case of NTB, the community forest area is in the village of Batukilang, District of Central Lombok, managed by “ponpes Darusadiqin”, reaching in size 1,809.5 ha.</p> <p>The aim is to have 400,000ha under community forestry by 2009, and 2.1million ha by 2015.</p> <p>The plan is pushed through a process of verification and evaluation conducted in various areas to make sure that the overall target is attainable. So far, community forestry activities have been implemented in 17 provinces and 42 districts in Indonesia for a total area of 203, 573.18ha that have already been evaluated, while verification has been completed in 2 districts in 1 province for a total area of 16,294.9 ha. Re the permit to establish of CF has been granted to 7 provinces (Yogyakarta, NTB, NTT, Lampung, central Sulawesi, Bali, Bengkulu) in 11 districts for a total area of 11,990.6. Other CF areas waiting for establishment (by the Minister of Forestry) are in 12 provinces and 26 districts for a total area of 175,556ha.</p> <p>As a follow up step from the establishment, 55 concession/use licenses have been granted by heads of the districts in 3 provinces (Lampung Yogyakarta, NTB) and 6 districts (one of which is the location in Central Lombok).</p> <p>In the same way as for CF, the program for village forest is also being pushed by the government to secure optimal results. The process of verification based on recommendation by the Head of the District has been conducted in 3 provinces (Jambi, Bali, Lampung) and 4 districts for a total area of 3,226ha. One of these areas has been established in conjunction with the launching of the Village Forest program (Bungo District in Jambi as the first Village Forest) by the Minister of Forestry on 30 March 2009.</p> <p>http://www.antarane.ws.com/berita/1249378200/menhut-serahkan-sk-areal-kerja-hutan-kemasyarakatan-di-ntb</p>	<p>2013 about 3 to 4% of the forest area of Bhutan will be designated as CFs involving at least 400 CFMGs</p>	<p>Currently: number of CFUGs: 14,439 (+~6,000 groups NPs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Average size of CF: 86 ha - Average size of CFUG: 113 HH <p>Progress 2009 (government's figures):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1,659,775 Households involved - 1,229,669 ha handed over - 33% of the total population involved in CF - 21.5% of the total forest area handed over as CF <p>In Terai Arc landscape: government very resistant (according to FECOFUN), hidden agenda local/district government/managers. Much corruption and illegal timber extraction. Since Oct 2008 progress in handing over CF to CFUGs.</p> <p>No comment: the available data is quite well.</p> <p>WWF is working almost 350 CFUG and 15 their Coordination Committee in TAL outside Protected and Buffer-zone area.</p> <p>In mountain WWF is working for 200 BZCFUGs and 300 BZCFUGs in TAL</p> <p>In Total WWF is working 34 district with more than 150 thousands direct CF or BZCF users through mobilization of 1500 different level Civil society and community based organization (CSO/CBOs) and 850 CFUGs, BZCFUG across the project areas within 34 district.</p>
1 3	<p>Past/current role of WWF in CF</p>	<p>WWF currently manages funding support to FORCERT and FPDC for implementation of CFs.</p>	<p>As far as I know very limited</p>	<p>WWF Nepal: - capacity building, education and awareness (among communities)</p>

Topic (and description)	Papua New Guinea (Zola)	Indonesia (Literature, Cristina and Pipit)	Bhutan (HB)	Nepal – literature, interviews with DG of the Community Forestry Division of Nepalese government, WWF (Tara and Santosh) and NSCP (Usha)
<p>1 4</p> <p><i>Description of the past and current role of WWF in CF</i></p>	<p>WWF also provides technical support, advisory and advocates for policy changes in support of CFs. The organization has been involved from the beginning with other NGOs (international/local), government, civil society, forest industries and local communities to support CF activities. The Kikori Integrated Conservation Development Programme was a programme under WWF South Pacific which supported small-scale sawmilling in the Kikori area where some lessons have been learnt on working with communities.</p> <p>WWF is also involved in developing the National Forest Management Standards for PNG through the PNG FSC National Working Group which was endorsed by the International FSC body early last year.</p>	<p>areas, rights of communities and IPs, shared benefits, community mapping, etc are usually the domain of the Community Empowerment Unit and Working Group coordinated by Christina Eghenter (pers. comm. Christina Eghenter)</p> <p>- Papua Region program is the only program where there are current efforts to support community forestry in production forest in the context of REDD scheme development (pers. comm. Christina Eghenter). And NTB (see above)</p> <p>In connection with the development of REDD schemes, the Papua team is reconsidering working with community forestry concession in Jayapura District (the experience of Kopermas) –licenses, strengthening community management etc. The experience in NTB (Lombok, Sumbawa) is also relevant. WWF is not directly leading the efforts but is part of a coalition/partnerships with other institutions, including CIFOR .</p>	<p>They could promote CF in parks and corridors as they work with communities.</p> <p>If resources available they could also initiate CF in important areas</p>	<p>- linking drivers (climate change, encroachment, etc.), monitoring of change of people's lives based on people's own perception/experience (not only progress) and reporting to government</p> <p>- coordination between CFUGs and government (all levels)</p> <p>- support to communities by means of: diversification livelihood strategies, income generating activities, microfinance, alternative energy sources, institutional governance, community services</p> <p>- health improvement activities in priority areas</p> <p>Specific support WWF:</p> <p>- Mountains: livestock insurance scheme (e.g. yak kills by snow leopard), revolving funds,</p> <p>- Hills: provision of seed capital to diversify activities)</p> <p>- Terai: compensation human-wildlife conflicts, livestock incentives (income generating activities)</p> <p>Can you check whether this information is correct and add information where necessary?</p> <p>Yes, all are correct and obvious. WWF using CFUG as strategy to conserve and protect forest, habitat bottleneck and biological corridor on hand and capitalize the forest resource to improve people livelihoods who are dependent on forest and living in and around the forest simultaneously. To manage in scientific and best way WWF Nepal also contribute technical support to coordinate through CFCC (a community based Community Forest Coordination Committee) who coordinate CFUGs and linking and bridging with donors, FECOFUN and district office including TAL/WWF</p>
<p>1 4</p> <p><i>Opportunities for involvement of WWF in CF Description of which way WWF should (or should not) be engaged in CF (e.g. as problem identifier, facilitator of CF-implementation process, or CF implementer, etc.?). Besides, description of whether/why/why not WWF has the capacity to deal with CF projects or whether it is better for other organizations to deal with CF; whether enough other organisations are already dealing with CF or whether the communities trust/put sufficient faith in WWF?</i></p>	<p>WWF should support NGOs such as FORCERT who have already been working with the communities and already have a strong link with the communities they work with. WWF doesn't have the capacity to implement CFs but can work with other NGOs such as FORCERT and FPDC who can implement CFs. WWF can engage in identifying problems and advocate/lobby for policy support for CFs and forest certification.</p> <p>-There have also been a lot of lessons learnt in establishing and managing CFs.</p>	<p>I think that functions, roles and conditions of engagement would need to vary depending on social, economic and environmental context/regions/landscapes. In many ways, WWF-Indonesia is already engaged in CF but with different headings according to priority issues and areas of work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rights of IPs and local communities in conservation areas • Work on CCAs and CF in production forest under REDD schemes development • Application of HCVF principles for oil certification • Work in production forest (GFTN) • CF in NTB (plantation, restoration) • "New Trees" program <p>Development of fair benefit-sharing schemes (PES, Ecotourism, etc) for communities and IPs.</p>	<p>CF is contributing to poverty reduction. Several case studies have been published proving that it works. These also show that assistance is needed by extension or other services. E.g development of Business Plan (modules now exist in Bhutan) Rules should allow sale of products (both Timber and</p>	<p>- Can you indicate what you see as WWF Nepal's opportunities to be involved in CF?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Opportunity for people who are entirely dependent on forest and living in and around the forest but not have substantial asset for subsistence 2 Opportunity to reduce pressure on National and corridor forest that connected with Protected area and Buffer zone area including Churia forest through with their collective and scientific management efforts 3 Connectivity and maintaining functional biological corridor in critical and buffer zone area that link its with national forest, protected area forest, buffer-zone forest and Trans-boarder biological corridor to India Nepal in Tarai and Nepal China and India to Mountain where key and endangered, flagship species and their prey species move and live around 4 Opportunity to engage local people, providing leadership and domestic role change, local stewardship and keeping engage to biodiversity and environmental services to their live. 5 Future opportunity for local and national revenue generating for community to maximize benefit through REDD, Forest carbon and other large NTFP and raw material production, <p>Other spill over impact from CFUG : users have opportunity for Bio-gas finance, monitoring and leadership, saving and credit, local entrepreneurship, income generating opportunity from CFUG reserved fund with minimum rate of interest to its member</p> <p>FECOFUN: at least 40% involvement of women in CFUGs</p> <p>In the hilly/mountainous areas, CF is contributing to basic needs, e.g. housing (timber), supply of fruit, seeds and traditional medicine for the poor. Besides, all members of CFUGs in the hilly/mountainous areas contribute a share of their benefits from the forests (either non-economic, e.g. timber, or economic, e.g. sale of timber) to the fund. This fund is used for social projects, e.g. construction/repairation of roads, school or hospitals. Additionally, poor people get 30% of this fund for housing, sanitary, etc.</p> <p>In order to get sufficient financial gains for CFUGs, FECOFUN is focusing on carbon</p>
<p>1 5</p> <p><i>Elements of CF necessary for it to contribute to poverty reduction Description, based on experiences of the respondent, about whether and how CF can contribute to poverty reduction</i></p>	<p>CF can contribute to improved housing for communities, access to medicines for improved health, school fees for children's education. Communities benefit in community development/investment plans that also make up the business plans.</p>	<p>Some case studies across the world (for Indonesia in NTB, Lombok) produced by MPO-ECPE program), show positive linkages between CF and empowerment and improvement of economic well-being.–also check the important work conducted by Resource & Rights initiative, CIFOR etc on CF contribution to poverty alleviation and sustainable management of forest resources. Most importantly, WWF Indonesia shares a common perception that</p>	<p>CF is contributing to poverty reduction. Several case studies have been published proving that it works. These also show that assistance is needed by extension or other services. E.g development of Business Plan (modules now exist in Bhutan) Rules should allow sale of products (both Timber and</p>	<p>CF is contributing to poverty reduction. Several case studies have been published proving that it works. These also show that assistance is needed by extension or other services. E.g development of Business Plan (modules now exist in Bhutan) Rules should allow sale of products (both Timber and</p>

Topic (and description)	Papua New Guinea (Zola)	Indonesia (Literature, Cristina and Pipit)	Bhutan (HB)	Nepal – literature, interviews with DG of the Community Forestry Division of Nepalese government, WWF (Tara and Santosh) and NSCFP (Usha)
		empowered communities (rights and tenure security) in the management of forest land and resources (production and conservation) and fair benefit-sharing will be positive for sustainability and people's well-being. The "measurement" of the positive correlation however is still relatively unsystematic. Monitoring is not always conducted and good criteria & indicators do not always exist. A good exception to this might be Guatemala and Mexico, still leading programs when it comes to CF in production forests.	NWFP), procedures need to be adjusted as they were written for big businesses. By-laws are needed to ensure equity and equality in the CFMG	According to DG CF dep. results so far: - For livelihoods: CF has great potential and there are examples of success. But, need to speed up quantitatively (number of CFUGs and CFs) and qualitatively (more benefits for poor people, more income necessary, and more mobilization and investments of income generated from CF activities in order to 'grow' and to become more economically active) Population pressure should not be too high (e.g. Terai Arc Landscape = high, compared to hilly/mountainous areas = low), communities should be homogenous (low conflict possibility) FECONFUN national level: rights community should be recognized; national/international support needed; focus should be on CFUGs institutional arrangements and management Do you have comments or any information to add? In addition to this, CF has provided community to be organized themselves and that is to opportunity to integrate other non forest but livelihoods issues e.g. Population health and environment issues has been integrated in three major site of TAL with USAID support. Similarly, Livestock Insurance Scheme, NTFP farming, large scale non palatable crop framings, integration of health and sanitation, climate change issues, poaching and trade issues, green enterprises, good governance and social inclusion principle are integrated within CFUG plan and process. Since most of the CFUG members are representing in other role like in health committee, agriculture, water user committee, education committee so the integrated development and livelihoods issues are also address through CFUG. Unlikely, social and religious services like infrastructure improvement, temple, monastery, holy places,, road graveling, trail and shelter house maintenance, water source and catchments , small and micro irrigation canal maintenance are some key example that CFUG generated revenue invested and supported to address CF users other development issues together with conserving forest
1 6 Elements of CF necessary for it to contribute to biodiversity conservation <i>Description, based on experiences of the respondent, about whether and how CF can contribute to biodiversity conservation</i>	CF can contribute to biodiversity conservation through FSC forest certification where HCVFs are recognised and monitoring is carried out. Whereas in large scale commercial logging monitoring and compliance is lacking due to resources and capacity issues within the PNG Forest Authority. Therefore, biodiversity conservation is not practiced or monitored.			Before the start of CF projects in the hilly/mountainous areas, SDC and the national government started a large scale reforestation program. In these areas, CF has contributed significantly to a maintenance and increase of forest cover. Focus of research has not been on biodiversity conservation, maintenance or increase – in other words, no biodiversity has been recorded prior to the reforestation or after (according to LFP-DFID) Do you have comments or any information to add? From the biodiversity benefit, WWF Nepal take CF is an crucial and critically important Strategy to : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobilize and engage community who are asset less, deprived and dependent on forest for their livelihoods • Maintain biodiversity connectivity, species, flora and fauna, reduce pressure on core protected area, buffer-zone area and critical corridor even beyond boarders • Contribute to environmental flows by maintaining forest connectivity, watershed area and catchments • Conservation of endemic plants and species • Greening environment that response to global warming in long term • An opportunity to revenue generation to forest coverage expansion A strategy to reduce pressure on national and protected forest

Country Table Eastern Europe and Latin America (2010310)

Topic (and description)	Albania (SNV – Janaq Male)	Republic of Kosovo (SNV - Haki Kola)	Brasil (WWF Brazil - Alberto Tavares)	Peru (WWF Peru - Alfredo Rodriguez and Carlos Cubas)
<p>1 Government/Governance</p> <p><i>Description of the general government structure and governance type especially related to forestry in general, forest management and CF (e.g. Ministry of Forestry/Development Cooperation/etc. and to what extent is the government (de)centralized? What is the level of devolution of powers/decision-making/budget to regional/local and non-state entities?</i></p>	<p>MEFWA is the central institution responsible by law that follows up and is responsible for the protection, social, ecotourism and economic activities carried out in the national forest fund and other forestry and non forestry resources, based on the principle of sustainable and multifunctional management, presented in the strategy and development policies of the forest and pasture sector, as well as the organizational and functional scheme of the administration of Albanian Forestry Service, judicial relations, its responsibilities and tasks, for the creation of a sustainable and sustainable forestry service. (this function is realized by means of three main directorates: DFPP; DFCP; DNPP)</p> <p>It prepares and submits in the government, bills and draft decisions for all the activities for a sustainable development of forest and pasture fund, fauna and medical plants.</p> <p>It organizes the technical governing of forest and pasture sector according to forest and pasture management. "The way of drafting of management plans of forests and pastures which is enforced by all the forms of forest ownership, is defined by the resolution of the minister. The management plan of state forests is analyzed by the technical commission at the Forest Policy Directorate, established by the order of the minister. The plans are approved by the minister."</p> <p>It organizes the forestry service in accordance with principles of professionalism, independence, transparency, services towards the public, responsibility and accuracy in enforcing the legislation in power by establishing two main structures: a- managing; b- controlling. Where: the management is function of DPPK and DPMN and control of DKPP.</p> <p>Detailed regulations for the establishment and management of National Cadastre of Forestry Fond, for the registration, update and changes in it are approved by the Minister.</p>	<p>The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Development (MAFRD) is the highest authority in charge of forestry. At central level it has two main forestry branches – the Kosovo Forest Agency (KFA) and the Department of Forestry (DOF).</p> <p>KFA has four central directorates , six coordinating directorates which are forest activities through 25 municipal units, where one the main task is to cooperate with local governments (municipalities)</p> <p>DOF has the role of developing the policy and regulatory framework as well as controlling/inspecting forest operations leading to the enforcement of the law. DOF's inspectors are ultimately responsible for controlling the forest sector – the public as well as the private parts</p> <p>Decentralisation is a major aspect to be addressed and this has also its effect in forestry. Decentralised forestry is aimed at involving local government. Currently the Law on Local Self-Government delegate to the local government the competence for forest protection and harvesting through: " forestry protection on the municipal territory within the authority delegated by the central authority, including the granting of licenses for the felling of trees on the basis of rules adopted by the Government"¹</p> <p>One pilot project in three communes is in the first steps of implementation? SNV is cooperating with MAFRD to agreed on criteria and select the communes. The aim of the project is to pilot the CF in Kosovo, in the frame of actual legal frame</p>	<p>There are 3 levels of government in Brazil: national (federal), regional (state) and local (municipal):</p> <p>a) Federal-responsibility to formulate public policies; the ministry of environment and ministry of agricultural development are responsible for drafting the national policy to support forest communities.</p> <p>There is the Institute of Biodiversity Chico Mendes-ICMbio which is responsible for the management of extractive reserves and the Brazilian Forest Service responsible for the management of public forests.</p> <p>b) Regional- responsibility to formulate public and implementation of public policies: the government of Acre to 10 years developed policies aimed at strengthening the forest economy on a sustainable basis through various government agencies.</p> <p>c) Local: the municipal governments in general do not have financial resources to support community forestry activities, but are important for logistical support. site Public policies are decentralized but there are different levels of responsibility and decision-making levels vary, but generally extractive reserves have centralized management and ICMBio the forest, crossing of the Management of protect area.</p>	<p>Peruvian Forest Direction DGGFS (Dirección General Forestal y de Fauna Silvestre), which depends on the Ministry of Agriculture, is the institution in charge of the administration of the natural resources and therefore has the responsibility of regulating, controlling and prosecuting the forest operations in the country. The institution in charge of the forest sector before de DGGFS, was called INRENA and was dissolved at the beginning 2009; The transference of duties to the regional governments but the process was supposed to be completed by now but it is still in progress and it is happening very slowly.</p> <p>The Ministry of Production is responsible for the primary and secondary timber transformation industries. Nonetheless, this entity does not rule, control or prosecute the industry, leaving the sector isolated and without any institutional support; in consequence there is no national objective defined where to direct the industry. This allows other sectors to intervene in its administration, bringing with them different criteria and priorities from those which are really needed in the forest sector.</p> <p>Mincetur and Promperu are working in a more organized fashion, in two fields: the improvement of the export offer qualified products and the development of external markets. However, the productive sector expected a bit more from Promperu in relation to market research, commercial intelligence, business missions and promotion material but unfortunately it appears to be that Promperu responds to big and known companies interests before the hole export business sector.</p> <p>There are considerable efforts to reinforce the institutionalism. Produce, DGGFS, Mincetur, universities and business associations are strongly working on finding common points about technical, administrative and political aspects. The results obtained in these intentions turn out to be mere recommendations to the government since they do not have the power to regulate.</p>

¹ Law Nr. 03/L-040 ON LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENT 20 February 2008, Article 18.1 f Delegated Competencies

Topic (and description)	Albania (SNV – Janaq Male)	Republic of Kosovo (SNV - Haki Kolia)	Brasil (WWF Brazil - Alberto Tavares)	Peru (WWF Peru - Alfredo Rodriguez and Carlos Cubas)
<p>2 Policies, laws/acts, rules and regulations and others relating to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Sustainable development 2) Livelihoods development/poverty reduction 3) General forest management 4) Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) 5) Community Forestry <p><i>Identification and brief description of existing policies, laws and regulations pertinent to sustainable development, poverty reduction, and forest management in general and CF more specifically</i></p>	<p>Forestry Law, may 2005 The strategy for development of forest and pastures sector</p> <p>Ministry of Environment, Forests and Water Administration (MEFWA) Directorate of Forest and Pasture Policies (DFPP)</p> <p>One of the main objectives of the forestry policy in Albania is to increase decentralization and sustainable governance of forests and pastures by transferring the ownership to communes . On July 30th 2008, transfer procedures were carried out for 326 Local Government Units by a decision of the Council of Ministers (CM) where 790 thousand ha of forests and pastures were transferred in use and ownership. The Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Water Administration (MEFWA) has undergone restructuring, creating Directorates for specific policies. This new structure has increased its responsibilities and has focused it on efforts to strengthen law enforcement and sustainable management of natural resources, environmental integration and approximation of the environmental legal framework with EU standards. The main goals remain strengthening environmental and sectoral policy-making, as well as enforcement of the governmental control policies in areas under MEFWA responsibility, as this will help Albania to fulfil SAA requirements. The National Environmental Plan for Approximation of the Legislation has been adopted and will be incorporated into the new National Strategy for Environment approved during 2006. This new arrangement defined in the Council of Ministers Decision no.22 dated 09 January 2008, provides management authority and responsibilities to the Local Government Units, bringing these forests and pastures into the management and accountability structures of local government units (communes).</p>	<p>New policy strategy paper for forestry was approved by MAFRD (October 2009). It is in approval procedures in Kosovo Parliament. This important document calls better cooperation between central and local government "the roles and responsibilities of central and local governments must be communicated and fully agreed upon". Of particular importance is to reach a common understanding for the potential benefits of introducing decentralized systems for forest management, considering also the needs for coordinated investment activities and forest protection. It calls also for support to the introduction of joint forest management systems in low forest and where the overwhelming part is firewood</p> <p>Of particular importance in this respect are the Agriculture and Rural Development Plan (ARDP) for Kosovo 2007 – 2013 and EU strategies and action plans for forest sector development. The ARDP includes sections that provide a frame for forestry development up to 2013</p> <p>The main Law in forestry is Law no3/2003 "on Kosovo forest"</p> <p>Strategy on forestry engage the Government to strive toward optimizing the social benefits from forest operations in both short- and long-term perspectives. Intensified management of young forests will provide immediate benefits in form of employment opportunities and increased access to wood. In a longer-term perspective the creation of new forests through plantation programs will allow for not only increased operations of the sector, but will also have positive effects on the environment</p>	<p>There are different public policies at different levels, but Brazil still needs to advance in the legal frameworks for forest management as much timber as non-timber. Some examples:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National security policy of purchase and payment of minimum price for some extractive products - in development; 2. Presidential Decree of the National Policy on community forest management - still depending on some adjustments and implementation; 3. Since 1999 the state of Acre law created the Chico Mendes payment of subsidies on the price of rubber native; 4. In the state of Acre are several policies to support timber management community with finance, technical assistance, logistics and marketing; 5. The state of Acre is developing with support from WWF-Brazil, the state plan of payment for environmental services related to carbon, which intends to include forestry production chains as beneficiaries of that policy. 	<p>The institution in charge of CF matters in the DGFFS and the INDEPA (Instituto Nacional de desarrollo de los pueblos andinos, amazonicos y afro-peruanos)</p> <p>The new Forest and Fauna Law (DL 1090) has been recently derogated by the constitution commission of the Peruvian congress. The reasons given for its nullity responds to the privatization impulse and the forest market through the promotion of the transference of the logging rights, even when the rights are being questioned for administrative processes, as well as the prohibition of some practices of the indigenous communities over the forests. This derogated law also includes the payment for environmental services linked to water usage, forest services and was prepare to adapt regulations for FTA's.</p>
<p>3 Name land use categories and where CF is possible <i>Brief description of the types and functions of</i></p>	<p>Albania is considered a country of abundant forests and pastures resources. More than half of the country's surface is classified as forests</p>	<p>Communal Forestry The strategy and policy paper: The Government shall introduce joint management systems in</p>	<p>In Brazil there are several categories of protect areas. In Acre the WWF-Brazil has been working in the area that allow the</p>	<p>Categories: Forest Land Protected areas</p>

Topic (and description)	Albania (SNV – Janaq Male)	Republic of Kosovo (SNV – Haki Kolia)	Brasil (WWF Brazil - Alberto Tavares)	Peru (WWF Peru - Alfredo Rodriguez and Carlos Cubas)
<p>land/forest use categories, their management and property regimes, and management objectives (e.g. production), HCVF (e.g. conservation), National Park (e.g. protected), Agriculture (e.g. agricultural activities, no forest crops), Brief description of property regimes (e.g. ignorance or acknowledgement of customary land rights) and management objectives</p>	<p>(1026.000 ha) and pastures (446.000 ha). About 47% of the forests are classified as high forests with beech, black pine and oak predominating. The remaining forests consist of coppice forests (29%) composed of oak, beech and broadleaved species, and shrub forests (25%). All forests (public and private), the so-called Forest Fund of Albania, are grouped in 36 administrative units (or districts). CF areas is composed mainly (about 50%) by oak copes for forest, scrubs 40% and about 10% high forest. A common feature of CF is the degradation due to over harvesting and overgrazing during communist time and transition period. Just last 10 years as a results of decentralization process, donors funding and increased interest of local communities most of CF are rehabilitated or under rehabilitation</p>	<p>which local communities, Forest Owners Associations and entrepreneurs with proven skills and capacities are given greater responsibilities for forest management within certain delineated areas. Priority will be given to areas of low forest where the overwhelming part is firewood, and where new forest management plans exists</p>	<p>sustainable use of natural resources: extractive reserves, public forests for production and agro-extractive settlement projects;</p>	<p>Agricultural Lands Grazing land Permanent cropping fields All of them except for protected areas can represent some sort of conflict at one point</p>
<p>4 CF motivations and objectives Brief description of the reasons the national (or district/local) government embarked on the CF process (e.g. due to international pressure or adaptation to decentralized frameworks, biodiversity or socioeconomic motives, etc.)</p>	<p>All the process developed so far was mainly supported by different projects and programmes funded by World Bank, USAID, SNV, SIDA, WFP etc. The World Bank started to support CFM through the Albanian forestry project (1996-2004) and Natural resources development project (2006-2010). A crucial concept in CF is to work through FPUAs. It provides the social context to involve all local forest users in an effort to improve awareness on the one hand and on the other hand to provide an instrument for local empowerment to have an influence on use of natural resources for their social and economic livelihood.</p>	<p>The Republic of Kosovo is having the implementation of the so called Arhasaari agreement as one of its main goals. Decentralisation is a major aspect to be addressed and this has also its effect in forestry. Decentralised forestry is aimed at involving local government and financed by Sida will test the reasons and objectives as well as the models of CF One detailed action plan is prepared and is under presentation phase to all stakeholders</p>	<p>The main reasons are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to protect forest of deforestation and reduce carbon emissions to protect land against degradation and other effects of ecological imbalance to conserve ecosystems and genetic resources; to contribute with social inclusion; to contribute to local and national economic growth </p>	<p>As mentioned before a new law is being developed. This new law involves several articles about CF. There is not a clear effort from the Central Government regarding CF.</p>
<p>5 CF and NRM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> types the government's implementation strategy/approach Steps of CF acquisition process <p>Description of the type / all types of NRM and CF in the country (e.g. in wetlands and forests, sell logs/NTFPs), the government's implementation strategy/approach, and step-by-step described acquisition process for applicants</p> </p>	<p>The process has a good political support since in the National Development Strategy, the Environmental Protection Strategy, the Green Strategy and the Forestry Sector Development Strategy; the transfer of communal forests and pastures with full rights for usage or ownership to the local government units and communities are clearly stated as primary objectives in the decentralization of the government and management of Albanian natural resources. Despite these positive developments, the transfer process and the management of communal forests with full rights of usage or property by the local community still have many deficiencies and shortcomings especially in dividing responsibilities and competences as well as sharing profits and investments in the communal forests.</p>	<p>Law Nr. 03/L-040 ON LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENT 20 February 2008, Article 18.1 f Delegated Competencies Currently the Law on Local Self-Government delegate to the local government the competence for forest protection and harvesting through: "forestry protection on the municipal territory within the authority delegated by the central authority, including the granting of licenses for the felling of trees on the basis of rules adopted by the Government. The regulation will be prepared by three working group's in three communes with the participation of the communities and will submitted to the government</p>	<p>The policies and strategies in Acre is oriented in empowering communities to manage forests, both in production and marketing. However, some partnership arrangements governmental, non-governmental organizations and the private sector are needed to enable the production and marketing. In general, the regional government provides technical assistance, logistics and in some cases the infrastructure for industrial processing of products. Other partners supporting the strengthening of cooperative associations of producers beyond the market. Currently in Ontario is developing a policy for payment for environmental services in line with the REDD mechanism, associated to the productive chains of forest products, s</p>	<p>There is not a strategy for models of CF. There are only general laws to regulate the operations.</p>

Topic (and description)	Albania (SNV – Janaq Male)	Republic of Kosovo (SNV - Haki Kola)	Brasil (WWF Brazil - Alberto Tavares)	Peru (WWF Peru - Alfredo Rodriguez and Carlos Cubas)
<p>6 Organizations involved in CF, e.g. NGOs, private sector organizations, and the institutional/organizational structures at the administrative level of the government</p> <p><i>Identification and description of non-governmental, private, as well as governmental organizations involved in/supporting the implementation of CF in this country and short description of their roles</i></p>	<p>Communal forests have distinctive features in their management. This type of management consists of many actors with specific responsibilities and obligations. In Albania, the main role is played by the Forests and Pastures Users' Associations (FPUAs), their structures at regional level (Federations) and national level (national association). Other main actors are the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Water Administration (MEFWA), the Directorate Forestry and Pasture Policy (DFPP) with its local structure District Forest Service (DFS), local government units (Communes and Qarks) and other local structures (village commissions, etc.). The institutional reform process should address the following functions of the Forestry Service as outlined and elaborated under agreements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest and pasture extension functions • Inspection and control functions • State forest management functions • Policy functions <p>The transfer of 60% of forest areas to the communes made it paramount that commune management and the local population be assisted by extension services</p> <p>-MEFWA,DFPP – Directorate of Forest and Pasture Policies, is the department within the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Water Administration that is responsible for the preparation and implementation of national policies on forest and pasture area management and protection,</p> <p>- NFA -National Forest Association, is a third level NGO that represents 10 Regional Federations and through them 230 Communal Forest and Pasture Users Associations (FPUAs) covering almost all regions of Albania. The NFA concentrates on representation of all communal forest and pasture users in Albania at national and international level, advocacy and lobbying work, and service delivery and capacity building towards regional federations and FPUAs, in order to have a more effective and just implementation of communal forestry practices in the country.</p>	<p>There is a very low level of involvement of local actors, such as municipalities and communities in forestry resulting in limited adjustment of forest management regarding the needs of these local actors and giving limitations to opportunities for economic development. As such only private and state forest management exist in Kosovo. Municipal or communal forests do not exist, however in the reform process an ongoing trend of decentralisation is occurring</p> <p>The objective of pilot project is to test in participatory way the CF Institutions, Planning process, as well as participation of forest users and other stakeholders</p> <p>Main partner NGO-s during implementation of pilot project on forest management decentralization will be NAPFO, national and communal, as well as the Local action groups of each included commune established in the frame of preparation strategies on local development. This organizations would be called to be the main partner of the work group in commune and national scale</p>	<p>it is believed that can extend the median income of forest and balance the opportunity cost of production chains with predation as the case of livestock farming.</p> <p>In addition to the governments there is a lot of NGO's and national and international cooperation agencies working to ensure the sustainability of forest communities, CF: GTZ, IUCN, WWF, CTA, PESACRE, FSC, etc..</p> <p>In recent years the policies and strategies to support forest communities has been developed by government institutions and NGOs, however, has not been sufficient to ensure an economic relationship and financial balance between forestry and agribusiness, especially because the forest products have low market competition, the high production cost and low added value. In general, the Amazon has been an exporter of basic raw materials, is critical when deploying industries into manufacturing in the region. Therefore organizations in support of CF should guide their actions to these challenges with a strategic vision of forestry modern and competitive.</p>	<p>Indigenous federations, IBIS, WWF, CESVI, SNV, DED, USAID, KfW, TRAFFIC, AIDER, FONDEBOSQUE</p>

Topic (and description)	Albania (SNV – Janaq Male)	Republic of Kosovo (SNV - Haki Kolia)	Brasil (WWF Brazil - Alberto Tavares)	Peru (WWF Peru - Alfredo Rodriguez and Carlos Cubas)
<p>7</p> <p>Extension materials: - Manuals - Training modules - Templates (management plans, activity planning, inventories...) <i>Identification and description of training, technical, and extension support materials set in place to support the implementation of CF by communities and organizations involved</i></p>	<p>-LGUs-Local Government Units are the new owners of CF that have to take administrative and managerial responsibilities -Private sector is involved mainly in preparation of MP</p> <p>DFPP has prepared some regulations on transfer and administration of CF as well as guidelines for preparation and implementation of MP. SNV in frame work of NRDP and other projects prepared a set of modules and training materials on OS/ID and technical issues on CFM of FPUAs and other stakeholders involved.</p>	<p>There are some modules prepared by SNV Albania, SNV Macedonia as well as SNV Kosovo on different interventions on the frame of preparation and implementation of Management Plans mainly in thinning, using different tools as GIS GPS etc on mapping of family forest and identification of contested ownership as well as guidelines on participatory preparation of MP hired from World Bank-SNV-Albania Identification and description of training, technical, and extension support materials set in place to support the implementation of CF by communities and organizations involved</p>	<p>Os materiais de extensão podem variar de cartilhas, a cartazes que são utilizados em processos de capacitação práticos, ou seja, training on job ou visitas técnicas de profissionais do governo estadual ou municipal. Vale ressaltar que em geral a extensão e assistência técnica são uma grande dificuldade nas cadeias produtivas. No estado do Acre recentemente essa atividade foi descentralizada e atualmente pode ser desenvolvida por organizações NGO e empresas. The materials can vary in books, the posters that are used in more practical training, or on job training or technical visits of professionals from the state government or municipal level. Note that in general the extent and technical assistance is a great difficulty in supply chains. In the state of Acre recently this activity has been decentralized and can now be developed by NGO organizations and businesses.</p>	<p>§ Community diagnosis § Native life plans § Stepwise approach system § Business plans</p>
<p>8</p> <p>Duration of management agreement with the government and the frequency of revision/updating of CF management plan <i>Description of the types of management agreements between the government and community forestry user group and Identification of how often CF management plans need to be revised/updated by the community forestry user groups</i></p>				<p>Communities have to prepare and present to the DGFFS (National Forest Authority) an annual operative plan (AOP). These plans could be presented at three different levels. Main characteristics as follows: § Level 1: No more than 650 m³. Logging has to be managed directly by the native communities. Species as Cedro (Cederela odorata) and Caoba (Swietenia macrophylla) are not allowed to be harvested. Forest machinery is not allowed (skidders, tractors, caterpillars, trucks). § Level 2: No more than 2500 m³. Machinery and third parts manage the harvesting is allowed. Production forest area has to be no more than 5 000 ha. § Level 3: Production forest area could be more than 5 000 ha. Levels 2 and 3 require a forest management general plan (GPFM). (RJ 232-2006 DGFFS)</p>

Topic (and description)	Albania (SNV – Janaq Male)	Republic of Kosovo (SNV - Haki Kola)	Brasil (WWF Brazil - Alberto Tavares)	Peru (WWF Peru - Alfredo Rodriguez and Carlos Cubas)
<p>9 Law enforcement in Community Forestry Areas</p> <p><i>Description of the level of law enforcement regarding CF:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>What is the role of governmental law enforcement of the management plan (during development and during execution of management plan)?</i> - <i>How does the community itself ensure proper implementation of the management plan (e.g. concerning illegal logging, overharvesting, fair sharing of benefits, etc.)?</i> 				<p>These plans have to be known by the communities. For the complex of the document it has to be prepared and sign by a Forest Engineer. A technical staff of the DGFFS has to do a visual inspection in the forest.</p> <p>Natives are usually in charge of monitoring the land tenure covering the borders. Some of them are being trained in fauna and land tenure monitoring.</p> <p>On the other hand, DGFFS Staff has to check, at the beginning of the process, the forest area. Along the main rivers DGFFS has some control huts where legal documents (permissions) and timber have to be inspected.</p>
<p>1 Do laws/regulations/rules say anything about business opportunities in CF?</p> <p>0 <i>Description of whether it is allowed to sell (excess) of CF products or to set off Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs).</i></p>				<p>Old laws/regulations/rules do not say anything about business opportunities. Nevertheless, we have rules to promote non timber forest products, but they do not talk nothing specific about business, just forest operations.</p> <p>It was explained above.</p>
<p>1 Minimum and maximum size of CF</p> <p>1 <i>Assessment of the minimum and maximum number of hectares allowed for CF</i></p> <p>1 Current progress of CF implemented (number of ha, households, % of natural products...)</p> <p>2 <i>Description of the current performance and achievements of CF with regards to (named and not named) livelihood and sustainable forest management objectives/expectations (e.g. number of jobs created, increase in income, and number of ha, number of households involved, % of natural products)</i></p>	<p>-Communities organized in 230 FPUAs, 10 RF, 1NFA, about 100,000 householders involved, 20,000 created (temporary), increase incomes mainly as a results of increased production from 1m3/ha to 4m3/ha.</p> <p>sustainable forest management objectives/expectations: -rehabilitation of about 250.000ha degraded forest, multi-species forests, fauna rehabilitation, erosion control</p>	<p>Describe the results of current/past performance and achievements of CF projects - especially of the projects funded by WWF NL - with regards to: - livelihood development (e.g. number of households involved, number of jobs created; increase of income) and; - sustainable forest management objectives/expectations (incl. number of ha, % of natural products produced/extracted, ecological conservation, and assessment of whether objectives are reached, etc.)</p> <p>No activities in Kosovo</p>	<p>The main results achieved in the production chains that WWF-Brazil and other partners have supported are: Rubber native-FDL (2008-2009): Production 12,000 kilograms per 30 families Copaiba oil (2008-2009): production of 2,000 kg of oil per ~ 60 families Brazil nuts: 12.000 ton in 2007 and 38.000 ton in 2009 involving 1.700 families Community timber (2009): 10.000 m³ of certificated FSC timber per 4 communities.</p>	<p>More than USD 300,000 in sold timber</p> <p>Almost 1000 households involved</p> <p>More than 350 jobs created</p> <p>200% on income increase</p> <p>400,000 ha of natives communities forest evolved</p>
<p>1 Past/current role of WWF in CF</p> <p>3 <i>Description of the past and current role of WWF in CF</i></p>			<p>The community forestry production chains are made by production, forest management, quality control and marketing. The development of productive chains of forest wood, brown, Copaiba, rubber because they are important role in the monetary economy and livelihood of traditional. WWF-Brazil has supported</p>	<p>Strategic supervisor, technical advisor, trainer and generator of commercial links between IC's and private companies</p>

Topic (and description)	Albania (SNV – Janaq Male)	Republic of Kosovo (SNV - Haki Kola)	Brasil (WWF Brazil - Alberto Tavares)	Peru (WWF Peru - Alfredo Rodriguez and Carlos Cubas)
<p>1 Opportunities for involvement of WWF in CF 4 Description of which way WWF should (or should not) be engaged in CF (e.g. as problem identifier, facilitator of CF-implementation process, or CF implementer, etc.?). Besides, description of whether/why/why not</p>	<p>-multi functions and ecology of CF -nature conservation and integrated natural resources management -environmental services of CF</p>	<p>Process of establishment of the multi stakeholder forest management in Kosovo is in the first steps. It is foreseen to have the pilot communes selected in the end of January 2010 and the first results will be produced in the end of</p>	<p>catalyst processes of community forestry production chains, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance arrangements multi-institutional productive; • Best practice in management, which involves the control and registration of producers, the geo-referenced mapping of trees and preparation of forest management plan. Quality control is the drafting of reports for quality control of the oil and compendium, which enables the achievement of standards for different types of Copaliba oil. • The marketing involves search, market research and product marketing. • Training is needed in all parts of the chain with the objective of improving the technical efficiency and organization of social stakeholders involved. • research and technology must address specific problems, for example, finding quality standards in the existing forest products, and ensure the high quality level and regularity of production and thereby ensure that the price differential, enabling family and community forms of social organization for production <p>Public policies, research and technology, communication. The public policies should be developed with a view to (i) tariff reduction of productive chains community forestry by fiscal and tax, (ii) possible forms of payment for environmental services provided by the reduction of deforestation in productive forest areas preserved, (iii) enable lines of credit and capital available for financing and purchase of the production.</p>	<p>§ The execution of the planned activities in the community have allowed the knowledge of the communal production cycle for the different activities, thus managing to optimize participation from settlers in the forest activities without neglecting their other daily</p>

Topic (and description)	Albania (SNV – Janaaq Male)	Republic of Kosovo (SNV - Haki Kola)	Brasil (WWF Brazil - Alberto Tavares)	Peru (WWF Peru - Alfredo Rodriguez and Carlos Cubas)
<p>WWF has the capacity to deal with CF projects or whether it is better for other organizations to deal with CF; whether enough other organisations are already dealing with CF or whether the communities trust/put sufficient faith in WWF?</p>		<p>2010. There is enough room for WWF in Kosovo, especially in participatory planning and</p>	<p>development projects in different biomes. WWF-Brazil else works through local partnerships with community organizations, government sector and non-government and the private sector. A major challenge is to harmonize the time (usually slow) the formulation and implementation of public policies with the cycle time of projects of a NGO such as WWF.</p>	<p>activities such as agriculture, fishing, family time and others; this has allowed for a harmonious participation. § The diversity of forest species found in the Amazon forests compared to the few species in the market have called for an exploitation plan according to each product demanded by the market in order to commercialize each product and generate income. § A multidisciplinary team is required. An oral-based culture prevails among the indigenous populations, causing verbal agreements to be taken as commitments, this knowledge has allowed for an improvement in the communication with the communities and now only attainable actions may be communicated during the assemblies; otherwise the technical team and the project both lose credibility.</p>
<p>1 Elements of CF necessary for it to contribute to poverty reduction 5 Description, based on experiences of the respondent, about whether and how CF can contribute to poverty reduction</p>	<p>-increased number of people working in CF -Increased wood and non wood productions of forest</p>	<p>There is a real opportunity to involve local population in young forest thinning operations as well as in agroforestry and forest farms, it can result in better employments and in supplying rural families with heating material with a very good positive impact in the annual revenues for households</p>	<p>The forestry production chains enable the strengthening of communities' traditional relationship with the forest, and historic role in the conservation of these forests. Forest management also contributes to the conservation of forests generates income for the community and being supported with public and private (market) can be a great asset in reducing deforestation (and carbon emissions) and improved quality of life of these populations by increasing their income and strengthening the traditional way of life if we combine fair price to pay for environmental services (PSE).</p>	<p>By stressing the link between poverty and natural resource degradation, one often tends to overlook the fact, that poor people do not degrade natural resources 'per se'. In many cases they manage and conserve their natural and productive resources with great care and in a proper way. So instead of putting the emphasis on bad conservation practice by the poor, we first should study traditional, good environmental practice by families and communities in order to help strengthen that capacity (by participatory investigation and well directed technical assistance) as well as to learn from it, to orient the work with less conservation minded communities. Families and communities use to take good care of natural resources when these resources are of vital interest for their economy and subsistence, and their management is a key part of their cultural heritage and identity. This usually expresses itself in the preservation of indigenous knowledge with regard to those resources, and in the effective functioning of social institutions which aim at regulating their use in order to maintain their stock. These institutions may be very old, but maintain their vitality, precisely because of their aim and proven function to conserve resources, considered to be of vital importance by the community (Prins, 2000).</p>
<p>1 Elements of CF necessary for it to contribute to biodiversity conservation 6 Description, based on experiences of the respondent, about whether and how CF can contribute to biodiversity conservation</p>				

Community Forestry case study analysis Nepal, Mozambique, Indonesia, and Cameroon

Details CF projects	Name project: NSCFP NEPAL Community: Khorthali (Charikot town) Managing body/enterprise: Khorthali CFUG Committee				
07-10-2009	Key information		Remarks		
District/Province	Dolakha – Bhimeswor municipality				
Population	No. of people: No. of households: 560 HH (earlier 533 HH)		Has increased because of migration For its governance, the CFUG is subdivided in 3 groups with each 25 representatives – each group owns ‘extraction’ areal and goes to forest every other day		
Project period	Handed over in 1995				
CF or CBNRM Size/zoning (in activities)	184 ha				
CBNRM regime (user rights/ownership?)	Land owned by government All forest resources owned by all users of CFUG				
Management status	Community based				
Objective of community	To have easier access to forest resources. In past, always permission of District Forest Office (DFO) necessary. Now, much easier: only permission necessary from CFUG committee		CFUG needs to preserve forest, otherwise DFO will break agreement (take away user rights)		
Support by...	No support from government; support by NSCFP/SDC				
CBNRM acquisition steps/process	Through government, very easy! 1) form group 2) write constitution/operational plan 3) apply to DFO, approval of plan by DFO				
Operates under a management plan (Y/N)	Y. CFUG writes operational plan/constitution itself with laws on a) what to extract, b) how much, c) how often, etc.		Large CF, many HH. For its management, every month each of 3 groups has meeting; results are taken to committee of CFUG; Committee/technical team gives authority for resource extraction (e.g. they mark trees for cutting and 2-3 times/year harvest of trees is possible)		
Frequency of revision of Management plan	In past every 5 years; now every 10 years (unless necessary earlier)		Every year the CFUG representatives have meetings on whether plan needs to be revised. Rules can be revised after meeting; then ask approval to DFO		
Resources management arrangements in the community	Activity	Used for HH need	Sold to	Jobs created	Remarks
	Timber/wood (m/w, 3 groups with each 25 people)	X (m/w)	Excess to local market or Kathmandu	Few	a) mark trees (CFUG and techn. team); b) cut trees; c) define amount for sale (only excess); d) go to factory and take care of getting good price; e) income goes to fund
	Firewood	X (m/w)		-	
	Many herbs available, but no extraction/use!			-	
Note	Men and women have equal rights to use forest! (more women involved in extraction)				
Market organization					
Results livelihoods (Community perceived)	Compared to past, lifestyle has changed positively! Life is good, improved, especially now that they have own user rights and ownership of forest. In past long walking distances (days) to forest resources; long process to get approval for extraction; now democratic process, own forest, making own decisions, poor have access to forest resources,				
Results ecological sustainability (Community perceived)	Before CF much illegal logging by villagers, forest was empty (grazing land)! Swiss agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and DFO started planting trees. Now much forest cover				
Difficulties	Small area CF, many HH, so much pressure on forest! Besides, pressure from outside: a) migration from villages to municipality (all new HH can/need to be included in CFUGs; in order to prevent illegal extraction); b) many hotels and small holders so illegal extraction for firewood. If illegal extraction: 3 subgroups identify (illegal) person, present to committee, and punish (if laws in constitution/operational plan are broken)				

Details CF projects		Name project: NSCFP NEPAL Community: Dhande Singhadevi Managing body/enterprise: Dhande Singhadevi CFUG (Boanch Village Development Committee)			
07-10-2009	Key information	Remarks			
District/Province	Dolakha				
Population	No. of people: No. of households: 311 HH (earlier: 256)	Other data from community: earlier 272, now 340			
Project period	Handed over in 1997				
CF or CBNRM Size/zoning (in activities)	135.4 ha				
CBNRM regime (user rights/ownership)	Land owned by government All forest resources owned by all users of CFUG				
Management status	Community based				
Objective of community	- preserve forest because government not able to - CFUG plant, use and protect forest resources				
Support by...	- for replanting, technical support and agriculture: District Forest Office, FECOFUN, NSCFP - for CF: NSCFP				
CBNRM acquisition steps/process	Easy process! re-plantation fruit and natural trees by SDC together with District Forest Office 1) Community formed group/CFUG, 2) Community wrote constitution/operational plan, 3) Received permission from district forest office, 4) Forest handed over to comm.				
Operates under a management plan (Y/N)	Yes				
Frequency of revision of Management plan	Every 10 years				
Resources management arrangements in the community	Activity	Used for HH need	Sold to	Jobs created	Remarks
	Timber	X	local/Kathmandu market	-	
	Firewood	X		-	
	Grasses			-	
	Medicinal herbs (machhino for pain relief)	X	Internal market	-	1) application from international buyer; 2) comm. together agrees on price; 3) application to District For. Gov; 4) gov gives permission
	Nepali paper (outer shell trees)		Local industries	-	
Note					
Market organization	Products directly sold to buyers (no local middlemen)				
Results livelihoods (Community perceived)	Lives have improved: now easier for community to use forest resources. In past always permission from District Forest Office necessary. Also poor people now have access to resources (in past not) More benefits from selling products: 25% profit, very good! Rest goes to industries.				
Results ecological sustainability (Community perceived)	Good care of forest				
Difficulties	Before no good representative/leader. Now good representative present! Leader/representative is responsible for fund, makes plans and new programs No significant problems: only afraid that government will take forest back				

Details CF projects		Name project: NSCFP NEPAL Community: Kalobhir CFUG Managing body/enterprise: Jiri Village Development Committee			
08-10-2009	Key information	Remarks			
District/Province	Dolakha, Jiri village				
Population	No. of people: No. of households: 251 HH (earlier 214 HH)	Ethnic groups: especially Jiril 13 poor members – 5 women, 8 men Many CFs in area			
Project period	Handed over in 1998	Established after 6 years			
CF or CBNRM Size/zoning (in activities)	145.25 ha				
CBNRM regime (user rights/ownership?)	Land owned by government All forest resources owned by all users of CFUG				
Management status	Community based				
Objective of community	When government was responsible for forest management there was much illegal logging and harvesting. So to control activities, the community grouped and started CFUG in order to preserve and protect the forest				
Support by...	SDC, ECARDS DFO				
CBNRM acquisition steps/process	Difficult process a) discussions among community members; b) group formation; c) creating constitution/operational plan; d) application to DFO with support from SDC; e) established after 2-3 years	Difficult process, because was 2 nd CF in Nepal and 1 st in Dokhara in that time 1 st CF with FSC certification in Nepal			
Operates under a management plan (Y/N)	Y (looks professional; but in Nepali, so cannot read!)	Forest divided in 2: 1) protected area (no use) 2) only dry wood and herbs can be collected			
Frequency of revision of Management plan	First every 5 years; now every 10 years	Committee (elected by members) is allowed to revise laws and articles, then signed by DFO			
Resources management arrangements in the community	Activity	Used for HH need	Sold to	Jobs created	Remarks
	NTPF – Lokta (paper factory in village: 7 CFUGs involved of 4 villages) Shareholding: 25% identified poor; 28.24% FUGs; Private 11.41%; Local 16.57%: rest???		Kathmandu/intern ational	350-400 HH indirect; 5 IDP (3 seasonal) and 41 others (27 seasonal) direct employed	FSC certified; 'good price', 'satisfactory': Direct employ: 31,500-54,000 Rs/yr Indirect empl: 1,000-5,000 Rs/yr/HH
	Timber	HH	Local	Many	
	Firewood	HH	-	-	
	Medicinal herbs (Chiraito)	HH	Local/Kathmandu/ India/China/Tibet		FSC certified
Note	If member wants to build house: for fixed Rs, member can have logs (paid to fund) If member wants herbs/lokta: HH pays 5 Rs (fixed) for fund Rent grazing land to outsider (= 50 Rs/yr), to HH member (25 Rs/yr)				
Market organization	CFUG is shareholder of paper factory. A % of profit and payment of Lokta is invested in fund				
Results livelihoods (Community perceived)	CF focuses on poorest members of community, lifestyles have better level, especially because of fund which is used for poorest members e.g. as loan for potato farming (no interest), for sanitary (25 % is support)				
Results ecological sustainability (Community perceived)	Forest cover decreasing because of timber extraction; not enough funds for replanting. For Lokta-trees: no need replanting necessary, because Lokta re-grows/young trees arise themselves				
Difficulties	Regeneration Lokta trees is too slow Timber over-extraction due to high pressure on forest because of increasing population pressure				

Details CF projects		Name project: NSCFP NEPAL Community: Simpani (= ' water resources') Managing body/enterprise: Simpani CFUG			
09-10-2009	Key information	Remarks			
District/Province	Dolakha – Bhimeswor municipality				
Population	No. of people: No. of households: 88 HH				
Project period	Handed over in 1994	Since 1975/1980 CF management by community started			
CF or CBNRM Size/zoning (in activities)	58.07 ha (is increasing: land earlier used illegally is now added to CF)				
CBNRM regime (user rights/ownership?)	Land owned by government All forest resources owned by all users of CFUG				
Management status	Community based				
Objective of community	Ecological balance: preserve forest to increase life standard; to preserve land and wildlife; conservation of forest for next generations; having access to forest resources and feeling of 'our forest'				
Support by...	By government and NGOs: DFO, NSCFP (financial), FECOFUN (organizational and development support), SDC,				
CBNRM acquisition steps/process	Very difficult! - Preservation committee existed first Steps: group, survey + data (no. of HH), marked area, made laws, DFO,	A that time very difficult to transform from PA to CF (took 19 yrs) because: - concept of CF did not yet exist in Nepal. When concept became clear it went fast for other CFs as well - it was only possible to had over land to government (were also individuals). This slowed process. Community fought to get community rights.			
Operates under a management plan (Y/N)	Y				
Frequency of revision of Management plan	In past: 5 years, now 10 years				
Resources management arrangements in the community	<i>Activity</i>	Used for HH need	Sold to	Jobs created	Remarks
	Water resources	X			
	Timber	X	Local industry (raw material) and export (processed timber)		Only excess is sold to outside community
	Firewood	X			
	Grasses	X			
	Herbs	X			
	Organic tea (naturally available in forest)	X			
Note					
Market organization					
Results livelihoods (Community perceived)	<p>- Before, lives of community not so good. Now, access to firewood and herbs, community feels stronger and have feeling of 'our forest'.</p> <p>- CF Simpani seen as model of CF in district: well management and preservation, financially strong, provide water to other communities.</p> <p>- CF quite satisfactory, now at optimal level: loans given to poor members (without interest) which are paid back when they get benefits, income for fund generated from harvesting resources and selling timber, fund used for construction of roads, taps.</p> <p>- Till now no taxes to government; Laws are now being written on PAN number which is necessary in order to pay taxes. (see further below)</p>				
Results ecological sustainability (Community perceived)	Number of trees and forest increased, young trees regeneration (naturally), water quality good (for drinking: measured by Nepalese government drinking water supply department)				
Difficulties	<p>- CF good for land preservation, but still land slides because land is very weak</p> <p>- Because of timber PAN number: to renew PAN no. every year a fixed amount has to be paid to government even though timber is not exported in that year. If they export: costs can be overcome. If they don't export: problem!</p>				

Community Forestry case study analysis Mozambique

Details CF projects	The Pindanyanga community based natural resource management initiative Community: Pindanyanga Community-Based Natural Resources Management Committee MOZAMBIQUE				Remarks
31-07-2009	Key information				
District/Province	GONDOLA/Manica				
Population	16600 persons, 3418 households; Predominant social groups: Matewe, Sena				
Project period	Since 2001				
CF or CBNRM	31300 ha				
Size/zoning	Zoning: a) residential area; b) forest area; c) wildlife area; and d) charcoal burning area				
CBNRM regime	User rights (DUAT)				
Management status	Community management with transfer of management rights without ownership				
Objective	<p>Governor of the Manica province visited the area and discovered its potential in NR. He encouraged the community to embark into a sustainable community-based management of the village natural resources. To learn communities about CBNRM, the governor took some community members to visit the Tchuma Tchato CBNRM experience. Communities then enthusiastically informed the entire village</p> <p>Objective community (probably inspired by supportive NGOs): - To guarantee the sustainable use of the NR for today and future generations</p> <p>When talking with community members, it appeared that they would like to secure access to and authority over their resources. There's general feeling, not always expressed, that if they don't do something to control their resources, outsiders, with help of the government, may hijack them.</p>				
Support by..	At the beginning: GTZ (community organizational assistance); FAO (initiator project); government (technical assistance); ORAM (Rural Association for Mutual Assistance –assistance communities in land tenure and community development issues); 2 private partners (exploit timber under signed agreement with community)				
CBNRM acquisition steps/process	<p>1) Submission of a letter of interest to the district officer; 2) inventory of resources in the community area (by sub-contracted external expert); 3) organization of community meetings to make management decisions; 4) zoning of the area</p> <p>In general, an assigned technical person from the provincial or district forest and wildlife services to a community provides technical assistance to communities.</p>				
Name of managing body/enterprise					
Operates under a management plan (Y/N)	<p>Yes: the zoning of the area comprises: a) a residential area; b) a forest area; c) a wildlife area; and d) a charcoal burning area.</p> <p>Management plan describes: kind of management operations (wood extraction, charcoal burning, NTFPs extraction, wildlife management, ecotourism, residential area, agriculture area, etc.) This description should be supported by a zoning and microzoning plan that indicates where each activity will take place within the CBNRM area.</p>				
Frequency of revision of Management plan	<p>After every 2 years. But no revision has been done so far by the community the adoption of ongoing management plan, due to complain by community that they don't have the resources.</p> <p>The community explained they do not have money, as they still do not benefit from the assistance of FAO. It appears that communities still need much coaching to understand the usefulness of updating their management plan, and reinvesting part of their CBNRM' gained resources.</p> <p>Updating of management plans should be one criteria of government's commitment to sustainability</p>				
Resources management arrangements in the community	<p>: granting of Community Rights and Benefits Certificate by the government; Joint-venture between the community and private operators for timber exploitation.</p> <p>Not possible to determine whether resources generated are enough for re-investment in updating management plans. More obvious is that arrangements within the community secure access to resources by community members for non commercial and commercial exploitation. Community members who undertake commercial use pay some fees to the group for re-investment in collective projects. It is not clear whether the price paid to communities by companies per m³ is fair. Much assessment is needed to understand what the companies gain by the timber sales.</p>				
	Activity	Quantity available/S	Used for HH need	Jobs created	Remarks

Details CF projects	The Pindanyanga community based natural resource management initiative Community: Pindanyanga Community-Based Natural Resources Management Committee MOZAMBIQUE					Remarks
31-07-2009	Key information					
		<i>old</i>				
	Timber exploitation (industrial roundwood): Community does not extract or sell (commercial) timber itself/directly, but has signed two agreements with 2 private companies that have exploitation rights, that extract and sell wood, and pay a fee of 170 MT/c (about US\$6 to communities as per agreement. Besides, companies pay taxes to the government and 20% of these taxes are returned to the community;	High (6000M ³)/High	Limited	64	Note: For logging, community leases to a private company with whom a one-year renewable contract is signed, and a plot assigned for the period of the lease.	
	NTFPs: community members are allowed to collect NTFPs freely; (medicinal plants, fuel wood (- household use)	Med. Plants: High/Medium	High			
	Pasture management					
	Wood manufacturing					
	Sustainable NR management					
	Wildlife: there are no community specific wildlife management plan/rules , as it is the case for other resources. This is the cause of weak control and leads to poaching.				Wildlife management in the country is regulated by the following law/policy frameworks: - Forestry and Wildlife Law of 1999 (10/99) - Law Regulations of 2002 (12/02)	
	Ecotourism	N/A				
	Charcoal burning: the community has 4 groups of community-based charcoal burners; a charcoal burning license is granted to each group; the group burns the charcoal for the benefits of its members, and pays 2 MT per back of charcoal to the community;	High/High	Medium			
	Bamboo exploitation: the community has 3 groups of community-based bamboo exploiters. A bamboo extraction license is granted to each group; the group exploits the bamboo for the benefit of its members, and pays 5 MT per stere of bamboo to the community	Hig/High	High		The CBNRM experience initiative is still quite recent to be able to assess the impact of community resource access and exploitation arrangements to ecological sustainability.	
Note	Charcoal and bamboo: some community exploiters can take the product to neighboring markets. But it is more advantageous if a truck comes to in the village. The community grants the buying truck with a transport license to certify that it comes from an official community managed area. In general, buyers come to purchase on the spot in the community.					
Market organization						
Results livelihoods	1) Change in living standards of the community (charcoal burners now build more decent					

Details CF projects	The Pindanyanga community based natural resource management initiative Community: Pindanyanga Community-Based Natural Resources Management Committee MOZAMBIQUE	Remarks
31-07-2009	Key information	
(Community perceived)	houses; investments have been undertaken to rehabilitate the village school, which standard has been upgraded by the government as the consequence of this improvement); 2) security of community resources; 3) secured access to resources by entire community; 4) government upgraded the village school to a higher standard as result of better organization and investment of the community into the school; 5) charcoal burning group members are building better houses; 6) with the 20% taxes from the government and US\$6/m ³ paid by the private companies to the communities, the village has been able to rehabilitate classrooms, the village health center, and establish a revolving fund to support projects of the village members; 7) community has more authority over decision making concerning use of resources and management of the community; 8) community has more capacity to influence the government.	
Results ecological. Sustainability (Community perceived)	1) Maintenance of the good status of the forest area; 2) better community control of use of the forest; training of community scouts for patrolling of the forests; 3) better cooperation with the district and provincial forest and wildlife services in the management of the community area	
Difficulties	The following difficulties were expressed by the committee members: 1) The committee still faces difficulties in controlling bush fires; 2) there's still a lack of community awareness on the need of reforestation; 3) there still lack proper mechanism for managing wildlife as it is the case for other resources, this resulting in weak control by the community which gives room to open access to and poaching of wildlife by intruders from neighboring communities and cities; 4) lack of a community-based transformation unit like sawmill; 5) interference of local authorities in the management of money generated by the CBNRM and 20% tax share from the government.	

Project historical background

Before, a lot of outsiders were cutting and taking logs away, without communities having any neither benefit nor capacity to prevent this illegal harvesting. Only the chiefs could benefit as the illegal exploiters would give them bicycles or flatter them with sweet words and false promises. They used to cut without any regards to our cemeteries and in sacred groves. They were also cutting trees of vital importance to communities such as those used for charcoal burning. Poaching was widespread, and fishing was done in the river using toxic chemicals that poisoned water and caused a lot of diseases within the communities.

An NGO, ORAM (a Mozambican NGO that advocates for local land and natural resources rights) started creating awareness on the sustainable use of resources, on land and natural resources laws and property rights, etc. Communities started organizing to better manage their resources.

- In June 2007, the 5 communities met to form their natural resources management committee, and elected 30 members for the committee;
- in October 2007, the committee was trained in financial management, community enterprise planning, forestry, mapping/zoning, and HIV;
- from 28 November to 1st December 2007, forest inventories were completed for the entire area, as well as the delimitation of the all five community areas concerned;
- 14 December 2007, a community consultation took place within the 5 communities, in the presence of the two districts governors, officers of the two districts forests and wildlife services, village chiefs and other influential people of each of the 5 communities;
- in August 2008, we the communities started building our processing camp;
- in November 2008, we finished building the camp, and assembled our US\$50 000 sawmill sponsored by donors (OXFARM, EU, Christian Aid).
- In December 2008, we created our community based forest enterprise called "MAHIKU KHALIKANA" (meaning "Days are not Equal") to run the community concession.

All 5 communities are shareholders in this enterprise. 13 elected people represent the communities in this enterprise. These 13 are part of the management committee, and include 4 board members. Every community provides 2 workers that rotate to other two of their community after achieving their working volume. Communities gain based on the volume of resources the owned within entire volume extracted. We need a kick up capital, as the donors provided the equipment without a startup capital. We are a little slowed down by the fact that we don't have money for fuel needed to operate. ORAM is assisting us prepare a business plan to submit to the District Services for a 500 000 MT support in framework of the 7 000 000 MT decentralization support fund provided by the government to local services. The District office has expressed the wish to support the community concession, based on the business plan that will be received.

Details CF projects	Nipiodi Community Forest Concession MOZAMBIQUE Community: Mwakiwa-Patela, Maria, Namakitavelho, Nigulavelho, Mersa	Remarks
06/08/09	Key information	
District/Province	MOCUBA & ILE/Zambezia	
Population	12,000 people, 2500 households Predominant social groups: Matewe, Sena	
Project period	Since 2006	
CF or CBNRM Size/zoning	20000 ha	
CBNRM regime		
Management status	Community-based commercial management	
Objective	(Community:) Establish sustainable use mechanism; promote reforestation; reduce illegal logging; generate benefits for the five communities involved.	
Support by..	ORAM, Forests and Wildlife Services of the districts of Mocuba and Ile	
CBNRM acquisition steps/process	1) production of draft map of the area of interest; 2) description of the physical, socioeconomic and cultural features of the area; 3) community consultation; 4) preliminary inventory; 5) inventory; 6) description of the planned management interventions; 7) description of the management model (exploited by the community itself, or through a signed agreement with a private operator; 8) publication of a public claim of the area with indication of the coordinates; 9) if there's no opposition 30 days after publication of the public claim, the demand is taken to the governor for partial approval; 10) after partial approval by the governor, the file is sent to Ministry of Agriculture and Forests for final approval by the National Director of Agriculture and Forests; 11) the concessionaire (be it community or private) is given 6 months to produce the management plan In this case, communities also subcontract external experts to undertake inventories. In general, provincial or district forest and wildlife services provide technical assistance to communities. In general, a technical person from the district or provincial service is assigned to a community or number of communities to help them move forward with the CBNRM agenda. However, this rapid assessment of CF in Mozambique did not give time to assess the quality of government technical assistance to communities.	
Name of managing body/enterprise	COGERFN-Comité de Gestão dos Recursos Florestais e Faunísticos do Nipiodi	

Details CF projects	Nipiodi Community Forest Concession MOZAMBIQUE Community: Mwakiwa-Patela, Maria, Namakitavelho, Nigulavelho, Mersa				Remarks
06/08/09	Key information				
Operates under a management plan (Y/N)	Yes: as required by regulations governing commercial logging concessions				
Frequency of revision of Management plan	5 years, as required by the law.				
Resources management arrangements in the community	<p>Community access and use arrangements: <i>5 interest groups within the communities involved:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charcoal burning group Aquaculture group; Beekeeping group; Carpentry group; Mushroom group <p>The Management Committee is still reflecting on the mechanism for taxation of resource harvesting by community members, as well as the amount of fees to be paid.</p> <p>Benefits Sharing Arrangements: Households only have access to credits/loans, social services and collective infrastructure provided from the CBNRM initiative</p> <p>Community-based Forest Enterprise: the community created and registered a company to run the concession.</p> <p>Bush fire Management: the community also focuses on campaigning against and raising awareness on the negative impacts of bushfires.</p> <p>The Nipiodi Community Forest Concession initiative is still very recent, but appears to interesting in terms of management arrangements at the level of the community.</p>				
	<i>Activity</i>	<i>Quantity available/S old</i>	<i>Used for HH need</i>	<i>Jobs created</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
	NTFPs: community members interested in harvesting NTFPs join one of the interest groups and operates within that framework.	High	Medium	N/A	Most NTFPs management is focused on harvesting. It is not yet clear if the community plans to undertake planting of the harvested resources.
	Timber exploitation (industrial roundwood): forest is exploited by the communities through a CBNRM arrangement. The communities involved have created their own Community Forest Enterprise, registered at the district financial department with a tax payer number. This enterprise will operate the logging business, instead of leasing the community concession to a private logging company.	High (640m3 timber; 400m3-1500Mt/m3 sawn wood)	Limited	14	
	Carpentry (manufactured products): A group of carpentry made of 9 community carpenters that manufacture and	Limited	Limited	9	

Details CF projects	Nipiodi Community Forest Concession MOZAMBIQUE Community: Mwakiwa-Patela, Maria, Namakitavelho, Nigulavelho, Mersa				Remarks
06/08/09	Key information				
	sell furniture to the community.				
	Mushroom: a group of mushroom harvesters exist, but not yet fully operational			N/A	
	Ecotourism: the community is planning to build some ecotourism camps in the forest as well as arrange for some nature trails;	N/A		N/A	
	Charcoal burning: a group of charcoal burners exists in which interested resource users of each of the 5 communities involved are found.	High (6000 bags-40Mt/bag)/ High	Medium	N/A	
	Aquaculture: A group of aquaculture has been formed to promote aquaculture in member communities	High/High	High	N/A	
	Beekeeping: A beekeeping group exists, composed of beekeepers of each of the 5 member communities	Limited	Limited	N/A	
Note					
Market organization	All products are sold in the village. Buyers come and purchase on the spot. The community also supplies specific commands, and arrangements are made depending on the client.				
Results livelihoods (Community perceived)	Community perceived: After one year of operation: 1) members of the mushroom group and charcoal burning group are having substantial incomes from their activities; 2) better and clear water for the 5 communities as there's no more fishing with poisonous chemicals in the river; 3) the Community Based-Forest Enterprise (CBFE) created is registered at the finance department with a tax payer number; 4) availability of wood for carpentry and community furniture; 5) wide community interest in aquaculture.				
Results ecological. Sustainability (Community perceived)	1) production and distribution of 4000 local species seed to all communities involved for reforestation; 2) expansion of fish ponds in the five communities; 3) introduction of leguminous plants in degraded lands to restore fertility; 4) the rate of bushfires has significantly reduced as communities are more and more aware of its negative effects.				
Difficulties	The community has been facing some investment difficulty. They claim to be in need of a kick up capital, as the donors provided the equipment without a startup capital. They say that they are little slowed down by the fact that they don't have money for fuel needed to operate. ORAM is assisting them prepare a business plan to submit to the District Services for a 500 000 MT support in the framework of the 7 000 000 MT decentralization support fund provided by the government to local services. The District office has expressed the wish to support the community concession, based on the business plan that will be received.				

Details CF projects	Name of project: The Mahel Community-based Natural Resources Management Initiative					Remarks
	Community name: Mahel MOZAMBIQUE					
07-08-09	<i>Key information</i>					
District/Province	MAGUDE /MAPUTO					
Population	229 people; 540 households Predominant social groups: Shangane					
Project period	Since 1998					
CF or CBNRM Size/zoning	33000 ha					
CBNRM regime						
Management status						
Objective	Community: To sustainably manage community natural resources and generate income to invest in community development					
Support by.. Support by..	Provincial and district government, IUCN					
CBNRM acquisition steps/process	1) Meetings with the provincial and district governors; 2) Creation of the Community NRM Committee and election of 3 leaders: President, Secretary and Treasurer; 3) participatory mapping of the community area; 4) training and strengthening of the Committee; 5) delimitation of the community area in presence of neighboring communities to make sure limits are not contested after; 6) certification of the area involving lawyers paid by the community in order to strengthen and confirm the legitimacy of the Mahel community rights over the area; 7) zoning of the area, assigning 14000 ha as game farm, and other areas assigned as grazing lands, agriculture, etc.					
Name of managing body/enterprise	The Mahel Community Association					
Operates under a management plan (Y/N)	Yes: Zoning plan is as follows: 1) Game farm; 2) Grazing land; 3) Agriculture lands					
Frequency of revision of Management plan	5 years, as required by the law.					
Resources management arrangements in the community	Type of management agreements:					
	<i>Activity</i>	<i>Quantity available/Sold</i>	<i>Used for HH need</i>	<i>Jobs created</i>	<i>Remarks</i>	
	Chacoal burning group: undertakes charcoal burning for the interest of their members, and pays 3Mt/bag of charcoal to the community;	High (11000 bags-170Mt/bag)	Medium	N/A		
	Weavers group: exploit NTFPs, undertaking mats weaving and sells the product for the interest of their members. Reflection is ongoing on the amount of fee they should pay to the community	Limited	Limited			
	Beekeeping group: Undertakes beekeeping and sails honey for the benefit of their members. Reflection is ongoing on the amount fees they should pay to the community;	Limited	Limited			

Details CF projects	Name of project: The Mahel Community-based Natural Resources Management Initiative Community name: Mahel MOZAMBIQUE					Remarks
07-08-09	<i>Key information</i>					
	Game Farm management: this will be operated in contract with a private operator that will share benefit with the community. In order to add value, the community, with support of partners, is undertaking some investments in game farm such as fencing, establishment of water points for drinking spots, etc. these investment would increase the bargaining capacity of the community when entering into a deal with an operator.	N/A				
	Access to resources by community members: all community members have access to vital resources, provided they respect the rules set by the management association;	N/A				
	Patrolling of the area: the community has a pool of trained scouts equipped with bikes that patrol the resource regularly. There are community checkpoints at different entries of the community area where the community scouts verify the content of all outgoing vehicles.	N/A				
Market organization	All products are sold in the village. Buyers come and purchase on the spot, and are delivered a transport permit by the community to prove origin					
Results livelihoods (Community perceived)	Community perceived: 1) the community receives 20% of forest exploitation taxes from the government; 2) with the CBNRM initiative, the community is able to raise income and invest in social infrastructure and services: rehabilitation of classrooms; 3) the CBNRM initiative is a great incentive for community organization; 4) illegal and uncontrolled harvesting has reduced, giving opportunity to the community to have more access and available resources.					
Results ecological. Sustainability (Community perceived)	1) poaching and illegal harvesting of resources has significantly reduced; 2) better controlled/patrolling of the area by the community scouts; 3) community awareness of the negative effects of bushfires; 4) destruction/confiscation of snares and guns used by poachers.					
Difficulties	Community: Lack of proper training for beekeeping groups, causing improper handling of beehives which are being destroyed by termites and insects; the sleeping mats produced by the community are not finding market, contrary to promises that were made; the tailoring group closed off because they couldn't pay back the loan given to them by the community.					

Details CF projects	Name project: <u>Damar Forest Gardens</u> , Krui District INDONESIA Community: - Managing body/enterprise: -				
07-10-2009	Key information		Remarks		
District/Province	Krui district area				
Population	?		10-20 traders/village		
Project period					
CF or CBNRM Size/zoning (in activities)	54,000 ha of mature damar agroforest (based on satellite images)				
CBNRM regime (user rights/ownership?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ownership of <i>damar</i> forest gardens (hereditary rights) – no full property rights over land - and HH are subject to community (<i>marga</i>) restrictions (such as : approval to transfer or cutting of trees of larger extended family is necessary. - Policies to devolve communities’ access to state forests have yet to be implemented (Gunarso et al., 2007). Most villages in Indonesia’s outer islands remain without formal rights to State forest land - Legislation KdTI gives Krui rights to both timber and non-timber forest products - Scientific research and institutional coalitions have both played important role in gaining greater tenure security for Krui communities over their <i>damar</i> forests 				
Management status	<i>Adat</i> (customary) laws and institutions of Krui area people (forest land is jointly held by the hereditary lineage groups (<i>marga</i>))				
Objective of community	Traditional system that is existent for several centuries... no named objectives				
Support by...	<i>Tim Krui</i> and The Communication Forum for Community Forestry (FKKM = coalition of NGOs and academics) and other coalitions support local communities by policy influencing and				
CBNRM acquisition steps/process	-				
Operates under a management plan (Y/N)	? Not sure				
Frequency of revision of Management plan	Not sure...				
Resources management arrangements in the community	Activity	Used for HH need	Sold to	Jobs created	Remarks
	Resin from damar trees (largest family of commercial timber trees in Southeast Asia)	Low quality	Middlemen and finally to Europe and US (high quality) - domestic paint/batik factories (low quality)		- Farmer (300 kg/ha/month) can receive for high quality <i>damar</i> \$180/harvest.
	Fruit (durian)/coffee/spices	X	X		
	Wood/timber	X	X		
	Fiber	X	X		
	Medicinal materials	X	X		
	Fuelwood	X			
Note	Many wild as well as planted resources, e.g. fruit, sap from palms, bamboo, thatching leaves etc. within forest gardens continue to be held as community property				
Market organization					
Results livelihoods (Community perceived)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Household income enhanced greatly in e.g. Pahlunguan village also from sales of fruits (\$1200-1800/year (127 person days) from agroforest) - Social and ecological studies over past 20 yrs have confirmed high levels of productivity and long-term sustainability of mixed agroforests of the Southern Sumatra coast (incl Krui) and value as habitat for biodiversity - Expected income farmers (1996) from good harvest (300 kg/ha/month) of high quality <i>damar</i> could be : \$180/harvest. 				

Details CF projects	Name project: Damar Forest Gardens , Krui District INDONESIA Community: - Managing body/enterprise: -	
07-10-2009	Key information	Remarks
Results ecological sustainability (Community perceived)	Results general study: Damar forests have much higher biodiversity than rubber estates because of intercropping (but more than half of plants of neighbouring rainforests) and have become important habitat for endangered mammals (Sumatran rhinoceros, tiger, tapir, etc.). - Comparative study of sample plots indicate : 230 species in rainforests – 120 in damar forests (10 in rubber estates!) - 130 birds in rainforests, 70 birds in damar forests, 5 in rubber estates)	
Difficulties	In 1990s 29,000 ha of local Krui farmers (formally located in State Forestry Zone) were leased to timber concession! Besides, oil palm companies started encroaching Krui's agroforests! Work group/coalition of researchers (called Tim Krui coalition) was formed to help local communities to protect their forest gardens	

Details CF projects		Name project: A Teak Wood Plantation in Konawe Selatan District (Hindra, 2006) INDONESIA			
		Community: -			
		Managing body/enterprise: -			
07-10-2009	Key information	Remarks			
District/Province	Konawe Selatan district (South East Sulawesi Province)				
Population	1,360 HH (2 sub-districts, 46 families)				
Project period					
CF or CBNRM Size/zoning (in activities)	38,000 ha (15,112 ha teak plantation)				
CBNRM regime (user rights/ownership?)	- Only production and protection forest that is free from license and concession holders				
Management status					
Objective of community	Initially forest rehabilitation, but community participation not encouraged (except to serve as paid labor). Later on part teak plantation (15,112 ha) assigned to be managed by community (1,360 families, located in two sub-districts, 46 villages)				
Support by...	?				
CBNRM acquisition steps/process	Under MoF Regulation 1/Menhut-II/2004 the area covered by teak plantation was assigned to be managed by community				
Operates under a management plan (Y/N)	Yes - All stakeholders, incl community leader, is involved in defining forest management plan				
Frequency of revision of Management plan					
Resources management arrangements in the community	Activity	Used for HH need	Sold to	Jobs created	Remarks
Note					
Market organization					
Results livelihoods (Community perceived)	- Tentative benefit sharing scheme between community and government at ratio 70:30 - establishment of 46 productivity groups - establishment of 46 productivity groups				
Results ecological sustainability (Community perceived)	- Forest rehabilitation of 2,400 ha				
Difficulties					

Details CF projects		Name project: Kilum Ijim Forest Project (KIFP) and Bamenda Highlands Forest Project CAMEROON Community: - Managing body/enterprise: -			
07-10-2009	Key information	Remarks			
District/Province	Bamenda Highlands region (Cameroon); Kilum-Ijim Forest				
Population	40 communities				
Project period	Project founded in 1987, since 1995 start of network of legally attributed community forests covering entire forest 2000				
CF or CBNRM Size/zoning (in activities)					
CBNRM regime (user rights/ownership?)					
Management status	Partnership between conservation community, Ministry of Environment and Forestry and local population				
Objective of community	Maintenance of forest! Communities: Conserving and managing forest to have access to various benefits of forest, essential and useful services Conservation org's: conservation biodiversity				
Support by...	Birdlife International in collaboration with Ministry of the Environment and Forestry Support mostly by technical advice (so no other incentives)				
CBNRM acquisition steps/process	?				
Operates under a management plan (Y/N)	Yes: Forest Management Plans				
Frequency of revision of Management plan	?				
Resources management arrangements in the community	Activity	Used for HH need	Sold to	Jobs created	Remarks
	Fuelwood				
	Medicines				
	Honey				
Note	Most trees are too small and inaccessible to be of interest to commercial loggers and thus there is little potential for timber exploitation				
Market organization					
Results livelihoods (Community perceived)	Very community driven: communities have own way of working According to evaluator community forestry has prevented major deterioration of livelihoods (that would have occurred when the loss of environmental services from the forest would have been lost)				
Results ecological sustainability (Community perceived)	Halt of destruction of Kilum-Ijim Forest				
Difficulties					