



Part 2

CONTEMPORARY FORMS OF COMMUNITY FORESTRY

PART 2 DEALS WITH community forestry systems that result, at least in part, from interventions by governments, donors and civil society organizations to stimulate and support local management of forest and tree resources. These interventions encompass a wide variety of approaches, from minimal adjustments designed to improve the enabling environment of existing systems and practices, to initiatives to bring about fundamental changes in favour of increased local ownership or rights.

The assessment in Part 2 focuses on longer-running programmes that have acquired enough of a track record, and a sufficiently documented assessment of their record, to allow them to be described and evaluated with some confidence. Therefore, it should not be assumed that these case studies necessarily reflect the present state of community forestry as a whole. In some countries and regions, community forestry is at an earlier and more fluid stage. While it is likely that some of these newer programmes will develop along lines similar to the earlier, more established experiences discussed here, some involve innovative approaches that could result in community forestry that follows other development paths.

It is evident that community forestry can take many different forms, involving different combinations of users, resources and institutional arrangements, which can be organized, for purposes of presentation and analysis, in a number of different ways (Wiersum, 1999; Byron and Arnold, 1999; Wollenberg, 1998). In the present publication we use a classification that distinguishes four broad categories of user/resource relationship.

- Forests are managed by users as common property, through collective management and control.
- There are several categories of users and stakeholders with different interests in the resource requiring joint management and control.
- Users obtain their forest product supplies largely from agroforestry sources, managed as part of farm rather than forest resources.
- Involvement is through processing and trade of forest products, rather than through management and use of the primary resource.

Box 7 contains a summary of the main characteristics of these categories.

Key characteristics of the main categories of community forestry system

BOX 7

FORESTS ARE MANAGED BY USERS AS COMMON PROPERTY		
<p>Stakeholder groups</p> <p>There are homogeneous user communities, with shared attitudes to resource use.</p>	<p>Livelihood connections</p> <p>Forests are central to the livelihood system, which has often been historically stable but difficult to sustain in the face of current market and other pressures.</p>	<p>Community forestry features</p> <p>There is collective management and control, if assured of real empowerment and effective government support (e.g. against forest industry, encroachment, and countervailing sector policies such as settlement).</p>
FORESTS ARE USED BY MULTIPLE STAKEHOLDERS WITH DIFFERENT INTERESTS		
<p>Stakeholder groups</p> <p>Multiple user groups have overlapping/competing claims on the forests. This is the case both among local and other users and among different categories of local user; consequently there is a lack of shared attitudes towards resource use, and a potential for conflict.</p>	<p>Livelihood connections</p> <p>Forests are of continuing importance in coping strategies of the very poor. With growth, the poor risk losing access to the resource because it passes into the control of wealthier or more powerful elements who are better able to exploit market opportunities, or to privatize forest land and put it to non-forest uses.</p>	<p>Community forestry features</p> <p>Fragmented, internally differentiated user groups are likely to lack capacity to manage competing users unaided. Further work is needed to develop and support appropriate management approaches. Incentives to local participation need to be matched to the changing role of forest products. Policy-based impediments may include tenurial change that threatens existing rights, and restrictions on smallholder harvesting and trading of forest products.</p>
FOREST PRODUCTS ARE SUPPLIED LARGELY FROM AGROFORESTRY SOURCES		
<p>Stakeholder groups</p> <p>Tree growing is only available to those with access to land that they can farm. It may also not be possible for sharecroppers and other farmers with tenurial constraints.</p>	<p>Livelihood connections</p> <p>Farm trees can provide poor farmers with a low-cost means of enhancing site productivity, of diversifying to reduce exposure to risk, and of meeting household needs with lower labour inputs. Commercial production of tree crops is more likely to be suited to farmers who do not rely on the land for food, and/or farmers who have other sources of income.</p>	<p>Community forestry features</p> <p>Tenurial conditions that constrain (or appear to constrain) tree growing may need to be clarified or modified. Policy needs to focus more on matching supply with demand. Impediments that restrict farmer access to markets (and that depress prices for their forest/tree products) need attention (these include poorly functioning trading systems and competition from subsidized supplies from State forests).</p>
PROCESSING AND TRADE ARE IMPORTANT SOURCES OF EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME		
<p>Stakeholder groups</p> <p>Small-scale forest products manufacturing and trade can be available to the landless as well as to those with access to the land, to women as well as to men, and to some of the urban poor.</p>	<p>Livelihood connections</p> <p>These activities can be important components of coping strategies of the very poor, but they often generate low returns and poor growth prospects. More profitable activities often require skills and inputs not available to the poorest. Wage employment in forest industry can help the poor move away from stagnant activities, if only temporarily.</p>	<p>Community forestry features</p> <p>There may be a need to remove biases in favour of competing industrial and State producers. Different potential target groups have different support needs in order to progress (credit, training, etc.). It may be better to help people faced with declining prospects in their current activity to move into more rewarding options (e.g. employment in logging may not prove sustainable).</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Source: Developed from Byron and Arnold, 1999</i></p>



Selling palm fruits in Senegal. Tree and forest products often play an important role in local livelihood systems.

The literature on community forestry tends to focus primarily on experiences that involve some form of collective management of a forest resource by the local population. However, as is evident in the categories of user/resource relationship described above, and the discussion in Chapter 2, community forestry can equally involve activities on an individual, or on an individual household basis, such as tree growing on farms or small-scale processing and trading of forest and tree products. Moreover, there are no clear-cut boundaries between the different forms that community forestry takes. Many people who draw upon collectively used forest resources for some of their needs also create or maintain tree resources on their farms. Individual producers may also come together in collective groupings, such as cooperatives.

In practice, the various forms of community forestry coexist and are often linked, and many community forestry support programmes contain several different

components in response to such patterns. This reflects the fact that collective or individual forms of organization of community forestry, and the management of forest or farm tree resources, introduce a number of very different issues that need to be addressed separately. Therefore, Chapter 3 first examines collective forms of community forestry, which encompass both management of the resource as common property by a group of users, and joint management by multiple stakeholders. Chapter 4 then examines systems involving management at an individual or household level, such as trees in forest areas adjoining farmland, trees managed as part of farm resources, and trees for small-scale processing and trade. For each, the circumstances under which they have proved to be appropriate, and the strengths and weaknesses of present and past support policies and practices, are assessed. Issues that affect community forestry as a whole, and that straddle both collective and individual forms, are discussed in the final part of the publication.