

2 Methodology

Two complementary approaches comprise this review: regional assessments of MFM, and a global survey conducted using a Web-based survey technique. Both are described below.

REGIONAL ASSESSMENTS

Three regional assessments were carried out between 2009 and 2012 to identify and draw lessons from on-the-ground MFM initiatives in the Amazon Basin (Sabogal and Almeida, 2009), the Congo Basin (Essoungou and Lescuyer, 2010) and Southeast Asia (Broadhead, 2012).

Two key questions were addressed in the assessment:

- What MFM initiatives are currently in place?
- What are the main constraints and the ecological, social, institutional, economic and forest policy/regulation drivers for the implementation of functional MFM systems?

In the Amazon Basin, the assessment focused on three countries²: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil and Peru. In the Congo Basin, the assessment comprised Cameroon, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Gabon. In Southeast Asia, the assessment included relevant past and ongoing MFM initiatives in seven countries: Cambodia, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines and Viet Nam. In all three regions, information was collected using semi-structured interviews of country-based forestry experts, forest managers and technicians, including in national and international organizations. Information searches were conducted on the Web and in relevant printed publications. Information was collected on the size and location of MFM initiatives, the forest type and condition, forest tenure and responsibility for forest management, forest management details such as objectives and outputs, and constraints in establishing and maintaining MFM. Annex 1 shows the format of the information collected and the variables used in the assessments.

GLOBAL ELECTRONIC SURVEY

Although comprehensive, the three regional assessments had differences in scope and depth. For this reason, a complementary, Web-based questionnaire using the Survey Monkey tool³ was designed to look at the following variables in either ongoing or completed MFM initiatives at the country level: driving forces and enabling conditions; barriers and opportunities; and recommendations to promote

² Ecuador was originally considered as well but was omitted because interviews with national forestry experts and searches of the printed literature and the Web were unable to identify suitable MFM initiatives.

³ www.surveymonkey.com

MFM. The sampling universe considered the experiences, views and perceptions of a variety of managers and stakeholders (e.g. representatives of communities, researchers, non-governmental organizations – NGOs – and the private sector) directly or indirectly involved in MFM initiatives in the three regions. Respondents were identified using various forestry-related list servers and contacted by email. The survey was open for two months in the period March–May 2011.

The questionnaire used in the survey (Annex 2) had three sections: general information on the MFM initiative, such as information about land tenure and management; information on the barriers to MFM, and recommendations for increasing the success of MFM initiatives; and background information on the respondent. To examine the barriers hindering MFM, 22 economic, technical, sociocultural, institutional and policy-related variables were selected (Annex 3). Respondents were asked to rate the strength of each variable according to the following scale: strong barrier; moderate barrier; somewhat a barrier; and not a barrier. The options “don’t know” and “not relevant to my initiative” were also available for each question.