

Community based Forest Management in Northern Mindanao, Philippines

GENERAL INFORMATION	
<i>Sources of information about the practice</i>	Reported in "A case documentation of the SARD Initiative implemented by ANGOC," available online at: SARD Initiative ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/009/ag256e/ag256e00.pdf
<i>Relevant contacts</i>	ANGOC (Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development), 6-A Malumanay Street, UP Village, Diliman Quezon City 1103, Philippines Email: angoc@angoc.ngo.ph
<i>Useful links</i>	ANGOC www.angoc.ngo.ph
INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROGRAMME OR PROJECT PROMOTING THE PRACTICE (IF APPLICABLE)	
<i>Programme or project</i>	Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development (SARD) in the Uplands – Community Based Forest Management Programme (CBFMP)
<i>Time frame</i>	1996-1999
<i>Donor</i>	<u>IGOs</u> : IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development), <u>Canadian NGOs</u> : Partners in Rural Development <u>Government Institutions</u> : Japanese Embassy
<i>Implementer of the programme or project</i>	<u>Local NGO</u> : ANGOC <u>Government Institution</u> : Department of Environment and Natural Resources, DENR
LOCATION OF THE PRACTICE	
<i>Region</i>	Asia
<i>Country</i>	Philippines
<i>Province, Districts, Villages</i>	Northern Mindanao
<i>Climatic zone</i>	Perhumid
<i>Other descriptive information</i>	-
INFORMATION ABOUT THE PRACTICE	
<i>Practice category</i>	Access to natural resources Managing natural resources sustainably
<i>Practice type</i>	Institutional practice for accessing resources Institutional practice for natural resource management
<i>Sector</i>	Forest management and conservation
<i>Institutions fostering the practice</i>	<u>Local NGOs</u> : ANGOC, Centre for Alternative Rural Technology <u>Government Institution</u> : Department of Environment and Natural Resources, DENR
<i>Beneficiaries of the practice</i>	Indigenous forest-dwelling families and communities
<i>Users of the practice</i>	Indigenous farmer groups
<i>Natural resource used or accessed (if applicable)</i>	Forested land
BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PRACTICE	
<i>Background/problem statement</i>	The uplands and other ecologically fragile areas in Asia are home to some 40% of the rural poor. They are rainfed farmers, forest dwellers, highlanders and indigenous peoples. Some 20 million Filipinos (26% of the national

	<p>population) live in the uplands (2000). More than 8 million hectares of the 11.9 million hectares classified as uplands in the country “were under some kind of cultivation” in 1998. This is disquieting as the denuded uplands are extremely fragile and highly susceptible to erosion. With the forest gone, the denuded areas can easily become acidic, infertile grasslands susceptible to fire. In the Northern Mindanao Province, swidden (or shifting) agriculture is the main form of cultivation. The upland farmers are barely able to survive. They do not have access to land, and continue to strip the forest cover in a desperate bid for survival. If the uplands were properly managed, however, they could be a major source of water, power and biological diversity and produce high-value products such as organic foods and fine wool (IFAD, 2001).</p> <p>The Community Based Forest Management Programme (CBFMP) was initiated to address the problems of access to land, encroachment of illegal loggers and deforestation.</p>
<i>Approach followed</i>	<p>Under the co-management agreement with the Philippine Government, forest occupants were given secure land tenure rights and other incentives in exchange for developing and managing specific portions of forest land.</p> <p>An important support activity in the land transfer process was the organization and official registration of strong and viable indigenous community groups, as the government deals only with organized groups. Other components included the issuance of the Certificates of Stewardship Contract (CSC), a tenurial instrument that allowed the indigenous communities to manage the forestlands for 25 years; support to the domain management plans; a land survey to delineate boundaries and legal assistance and facilitation of granting CSCs. 1,650 hectares were distributed to the farmers over a period of two years.</p> <p>The land was delineated according to lands for cultivation and those for reforestation. Fairly denuded and very steep areas were planted with different varieties of hardwood and fruit trees such as acacia mangium, g-melina, narra, cashew, mango, jackfruit and santol. Both the DENR and the communities provided seedlings for planting. A survival of 60% was recorded and the forest has been partially recovered.</p>
<i>Innovative elements</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The programme provided opportunities for indigenous communities, farmers and other sectors to dialogue with government agencies at the local, provincial and national levels. • Co-management agreements between Government and indigenous forest-dwelling communities.
<i>Impacts on natural resource base</i>	<p><u>Expected:</u> Protection of the remaining forest. Restoration and stabilization of soil.</p> <p><u>Actual:</u> More than 80,000 trees are now growing in severely deforested areas</p>
<i>Impacts on livelihood of the practice users</i>	<p><u>Actual:</u> 1,650 hectares were distributed to the farmers over a period of 2 years. The communities became active in protecting the remaining forest while satisfying their food and basic needs.</p> <p><u>Expected:</u> Forest dwellers are given an opportunity to develop markets for new forest products (tree fruits).</p>
<i>Other impacts</i>	<p><u>Actual:</u> Translation of field experiences into concrete policy options to influence government policies to protect the forest. Increased local communities' environmental awareness.</p>
<i>General success factors</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The programme was supported by a strong mass-based environmental movement. NGOs and people organizations actively engaged in organized non-violent street actions, court cases, anti-logging checkpoints, negotiations for agrarian rights and stewardships contracts and other direct actions. This environmental movement was subsequently supported by the middle class (university, media and professionals). • Registration of indigenous community groups was a necessary requirement in order to enter into co-management agreements between the Government and individual families using and managing the national

	<p>forest lands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of support services for obtaining assured access to land was important to enhance the capacities of the farmers. • The improvement of the tenurial arrangements led to the adoption of more sustainable farming practices. • The stewardship arrangement is consistent with the local indigenous communities cultural practices as it is akin to their concept of land use and ownership: dominions over a territory give them the right to usufruct but not absolute ownership of the property. • Establishment of a multi-sectoral group chaired by the nearest city mayor and composed of government agencies, NGOs, media, police and the military, church and other civil society organizations. This group was mandated to monitor the enforcement of forest laws, investigate illegal removal, cutting and/or transporting of trees and other forest products in violation of forestry laws in all the remaining forests in the area.
<i>Technology success factors</i>	-
<i>Institutional success factors</i>	<p>Access to inputs and resources Institutional support and outreach Ownership by end users Policy environment</p>
<i>Problems remaining to be resolved</i>	<p>The programme attempted to link the farmers to the market when they were producing surpluses; however a number of problems were encountered when trying to implementing this component.</p>
<i>Keywords</i>	<p>Agroforestry, Access to resources, Agrarian reform, Agricultural policies, Agroforestry, Biodiversity, Capacity building, Community development, Conservation, Empowerment, Environment, Environmental management, Environmental policies, Farmers associations, Forest conservation, Forest management, Forest resources, Forestry, Forestry development, Forestry policies, Forestry production, Forests, Land access, Land policies, Land reform, Land use, Natural resource conservation, Natural resource management, Nature conservation, Participatory approaches, Policy, Renewable resources, Resource conservation, Resource management, Silvicultural system, Silviculture</p>