Levelling the Playing Field: Fair Partnership for Local Development to Improve the Forest Sustainability in Southeast Asia

The project is working in contexts where multi-stakeholders with different views and power act on forest management. The project aims to improve the forest management by facilitating stakeholders’ coordination and capacity building. It will develop approaches and tools for stakeholders to share views and create condition to manage the forest together.

Centre de coopération Internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement (CIRAD) and Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) are managing this project with three partners, universities well known for their involvement in forest management research, which are Gadjah Mada University (UGM), University of the Philippines Los Baños (UPLB) Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM). This first year (2004), after building a common methodological framework with the projects’ partners, the project started focusing on two of the three locations.

In Palawan (the Philippines) the project is working in the former CIFOR’s Adaptive Co-Management (ACM) project field site, where the government has devolved the rights and responsibilities to manage forests to the People’s Organisations through a Community Based Forest Management framework. In Java it will set up field work to help Perum Perhutani to put in force a similar program locally called PHBM, whose aim is to improve the forest management of their teak plantations by sharing both benefits and control with the villagers. The field work in Malaysia will start in the second year.

http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/lpf
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1.0 Welcome Remarks by the Chairman and Introduction of SC and Project Members

Prof. Dato Nik Muhamad Majid, the Steering Committee Co-Chairman, opened the meeting by welcoming the Steering Committee members and the LPF project team. On behalf of the SC and project members who joined the field trip to Palawan, he expressed his appreciation for a wonderful trip and the cultural presentation hosted by Mayor Hagedorn. After this note of appreciation, he introduced himself and afterwards requested everyone to briefly introduce himself/herself for the benefits of the SC members who attended the meeting for the first time.

Of the 12 SC members, six members were present, namely, Prof. Dato Nik Muhamad Majid, Bernard Mallet, Agus Sarsito, Doris Capistrano, Markku Kanninen, Sofyan Warsito. Ms. Remedios Evangelista, Mr. Mohd Yusoff Bin Baharom, and Mr. Wahyu Wardhana represented Mr. Romeo Acosta, Mr. Nazir Khan, and Dr. San Afri Awang, respectively. Dr. Jean-Guy Bertault, Thibaut Portevin, Chip Fay, and Jacques Weber were not able to participate in this meeting.

The others who were present were the LPF project team leader and project coordinators from the three countries. For the complete list of participants, please refer to Appendix 1.

Prof. Majid further expressed his appreciation, on behalf of the project, to Ms. Hartanto for her contribution to the LPF project. She will be leaving for Australia in the following week to pursue her Doctor of Philosophy degree.

2.0 Approval of the Minutes of the First SC meeting and Adoption of the Proposed Agenda

Prof. Majid drew the participants’ attention to the minutes of the first SC meeting. The participants went through the minutes of the first SC meeting page by page and confirmed that they did not have any further inputs. Hence, the minutes was approved and adopted. Mr. Guizol announced that the minutes of the previous SC meeting has been posted on the LPF web and the same will be done for the minutes of the second SC meeting. The agenda as contained in Appendix 2 were adopted by the SC members.
3.0 Presentation of LPF Approaches, Project Progress, and the Outputs of Coordination Meeting

Mr. Philippe Guizol presented three main things: the LPF approaches, general progress in the project sites, and the results of the coordination meeting which was held just before this SC meeting.

3.1 LPF Approaches

Mr. Philippe Guizol mentioned LPF’s three overall objectives, namely, promoting governance, local livelihood, and ecosystem sustainability. He presented the context by which the different cases are described and the common three stages applied in the six LPF project sites, i.e. baseline study, intervention, and monitoring and impact assessment. He emphasized the importance of facilitating the development of common objectives among the stakeholders and the need to address short-term as well as long-term issues concerning the stakeholders. Detailing the intervention stage further, Mr. Guizol then described five different steps that the project will use in facilitating or mediating stakeholders, and the outcomes of those steps. This includes 1) stakeholders’ mutual recognition, 2) shared long-term objectives, 3) definition of management scheme, and 4 - 5) design of management organization, implementation, and monitoring.

Since the LPF is very much concerned with forest sustainability, the speaker used forest management case to differentiate the LPF project approach from the classical forest management. In the classic forestry management, the project managers develop management objectives and management plans, in isolation from other stakeholders, based on their understanding of the wood resource and ecosystem dynamics. The assumption is that the managers have full control over the forests and the people. But in reality, forest management involves multi-stakeholders and therefore there is a need to come up with common long-term objectives among these stakeholders. In deciding and improving their management plan in the subsequent years, it is important not only to consider ecosystem dynamics and wood resource but also appropriation regime and authorities legitimacy. He emphasized that basically the same management holds true with other renewable resources. He then described how the three different project stages operate in that management cycle. The project will also use participatory modeling (CoMod) that follows similar approach and therefore is appropriate tool to be used in the project.

3.2 Progress in Sites

Project accomplishments at the regional level basically included training and coordination. Trainings on role playing game and workshop facilitation have been conducted, while training on modeling is on going. Coordination activities centered on
coordination within country team and across different country teams through regional coordination meetings, and development of website to improve communication and information exchange. Progresses in the different sites were also discussed briefly (See Appendix 3).

3.3 Coordination Meeting Results

The coordination meeting, attended by LPF researchers from the three countries, was held on May 8-10, 2005 at the Traders’ Hotel, Manila. Mr. Guizol reported that coordination meeting have been productively used for:

- Sharing of baseline study results in the three countries
- Discussion on the project approach on forest management
- Discussion on action research, learning theories, and their integration in the project
- Clarifications on the intervention stage
- Preparation of the logical framework per site
- Organizing information for LPF website improvement
- Organizing information for EC evaluation

Related to the last item, Mr. Guizol announced that the EC evaluation has been postponed to October, just in time for the preparation of the annual report in September. Closing Mr. Guizol’s presentation was a presentation of a film on the coordination meeting which was put together and edited by Mr. Yusoff, the Malaysian team member.

3.4 Discussion on the LPF Approaches

During the morning discussion, Dr. Mallet pointed out that in the report of the first steering committee meeting, there are several recommendations. The first one is related to site selection, the second one is on the methodological approach, and the third one is on the methodological framework for site selection. He congratulated the project for having implemented last year SC members’ recommendations.

Dr. Capistrano commented that the project is very interesting because it combined a number of relatively novel approaches that are not directly recognized in the research community. The process analysis that accompanies the generation of new information is always thought of with all sorts of uncertainty simply because the methodologies are still being worked out. In some of the disciplines, especially the social science discipline, the methodologies are fairly well established and understood. However, at the end of the day, the planners and the foresters, who need to take up the results of the research, will need to address the biophysical aspects. She advised that in projects like this, it is not only important to document the methods and the findings but also to be self-critical about the methodology and to improve the rigor with which the research has been adapted. She pointed out the need for peer review protocol for each stage. According to her, implicit in the stakeholder analysis and the discussion and the validation is the peer review process. Coming together to report on the findings and getting feedbacks from different stakeholders and circulating drafts are parts of validation protocols. She suggested that, as the reports are written up, there should be much more explicit attention to the stages of the methodology that match the more accepted conventional scientific approach. Alongside the technological development,
there should be a clear and rigorous explicit analysis of what the research has entailed and what it lacked based on the protocol standards.

With regard to long-term planning, Dr. Agus Sarsito suggested the project to look at the linkage between forestry planning and people’s livelihood at the community, district, and provincial levels. He said that although forests may be a central issue at the community and district levels, this may not be true at the national level. There should be interdependence in the planning at the different levels, and planning should consider population growth in the project sites. Any substantial increase in the population will put heavy pressure on the resources. With regard to people’s livelihood, it is best to consider the resource’s carrying capacity. What is the number of people that could be supported by the resource so that the people can get good income from the forests? According to Dr. Sarsito these things should be part of the macro planning. What does government need to provide to people as alternative income sources to decrease pressures on the forest?

Mr. Guizol and Prof. Majid agreed to the point raised by Dr. Sarsito that there should be an analysis of the biological dynamics in the project sites. Dr. Mallet added that sustainable production is important to be considered by the stakeholders in coming up with a common vision and long-term objectives. He emphasized that there should be harmony among the objectives at the different planning and decision-making levels. Since the conditions differ in the different sites, Mr. Guizol mentioned that stakeholders may work at different levels. In relation to this, Prof. Majid commended the Palawan case for their efforts in integrating the project concerns at the provincial level.

Dr. Villanueva expressed that sustainable production can be included in the LPF project since the latter is concerned with natural resources management. It is an important consideration and should be included in the modeling that the project researchers will develop. Dr. Capistrano added that carrying capacity is a very loaded concept that can be included at several levels and will be very useful in coming up with alternative scenarios and at explicit decision points.

From the discussions, Dr. Majid summarized two main suggestions, 1) the need for subjecting the research results to peer review, and 2) the need to consider the concept of carrying capacity or sustainable production of the ecosystems in the project sites as it relates to people’s livelihood and natural resources management.
4.0 Progress and Plan for 2005-2006

The LPF researchers presented the progress and plan for 2005 and 2006 on the six case study sites namely, Java, South Sumatra, and Jepara in Indonesia; Matang and Pahang in Malaysia; and Palawan in the Philippines.

Indonesia

Java Case
Presenter: Mr. Wahyu Wardhana

The case study in Java centers on the Collaborative Forest Management Model (Pengelolaan Hutan Bersama Masyarakat/PHBM) program which is implemented by Perum Perhutani. The project aims for: 1) better management of teak forests by multistakeholders, 2) enhanced community livelihood, and 3) institutionalization of the forest management partnership involving the stakeholders. The presentation included the accomplishments of the project during the first year of implementation, highlighting the methods, findings, lessons learned, and the assumptions and challenges in the baseline studies. Among the findings presented are the identified stakeholders, issues with regard to PHBM, forest management, forest security and Perum Perhutani management.

The second part of the paper discussed the intervention steps implemented in the second year following the intervention framework formulated by the LPF. The presentation highlighted the implementation progress in Gempol village in KPH Randublatung. Essentially, the intervention stage covered Steps 1 to 3 in the framework, i.e., development of common vision, identification and prioritization of local issues, and development of strategies to address the local issues. For more detailed information about the Java case, please refer to Appendix 5.

MHP Case
Presenter: Dr. Herry Purnomo

The case study involves a 296,400-ha Acacia mangium plantation of Musi Hutan Persada (MHP). MHP case highlights the involvement of not only huge amount of money but also diverse actors and problems. Two types of partnerships have been developed, MHBM at the concession land and MHR at people’s land. At the national level, MHP’s partnership can be considered as a model forest management system. In consonance with millennium development goals, MHP aims to eradicate poverty, ensure environmental sustainability, and develop global partnership. Its overall objectives are to contribute to the improved communities’ livelihood and sustainable forest plantation in South Sumatra.
Among the issues in the project site were benefit sharing, partnership schemes between the community and the company, and land security and ownership. Dr. Purnomo also discussed the key project activities undertaken and the methodologies used. For the project accomplishments, these include field visits and secondary data review, communicating and building trust with the stakeholders, and establishment of a multi-stakeholders forum. In the course of project implementation, a number of challenges categorized as short-, medium-, and long-term have been identified. Plan for 2005 includes formation of secretariat, visioning and scenario building, and facilitation. Some initial findings were also presented, details of which can be found in Appendix 6.

**Jepara Case**  
*Presenter: Mr. Philippe Guizol*

Mr. Guizol described Jepara as an industrial district with teak resources that provides wood materials for its furniture industry. However, a number of issues threaten the furniture industries. These include poor data on teak wood consumption, employment, and teak value chain; illegal logging; bad perception of smallholders’ wood quality; bad furniture reputation in the international market due to informal wood supply; teak supply shortage; and lack of fair trade.

The objectives of the Jepara project are to protect employment and improve the development of the furniture industries through sustainable use of teak resources, and to facilitate the use of teak wood from smallholders. There are several purposes of the project and they basically aimed at providing incentives for smallholder teak growers, supporting responsible teak business people, providing government with access to reliable data on furniture industries in Jepara, providing furniture industries with access to documented teak resources, helping furniture industries to develop technologies for smallholder teak, and collectively involving the stakeholders in improving teak supply in the district.

The project expects to achieve the following: 1) documentation of the current value chain from teak producers to end users, 2) understanding among teak smallholders of the industrial demand for teak, 3) awareness of forest resources by industries, 4) identification of the stakeholders’ perceptions about issues and demand, 5) identification of policies to mitigate smallholders’ constraints and promote responsible business, 6) identification of incentives for smallholder teak plantation development, and 7) emergence of common objectives from wood producers and buyers.

In the early part of 2005, some of the key project activities to be undertaken include survey of industrial district, value chain analysis, and increase stakeholders’ awareness. Plans for 2006 include analysis of teak smallholders’ perceptions and constraints, tracking system feasibility, conduct of intervention stage, and communication.

Some of the initial lessons pointed out that Jepara is an industrial district characterized by very small enterprises organized according to a hierarchical network, where
technical innovations emerge but collective investment is relatively weak. Another lesson learned is that teak from smallholders is of poor quality because it is not dry and the diameter is small. Although large diameter teak is preferred, there are several constraining factors faced by smallholders such as their need for immediate cash income and the informal state monopoly over large diameter teak logs has made it difficult for smallholders to sell large diameter teak. For details, please refer to Appendix 7.

**Malaysia**

*Presenter: Dr. Khamuruddin Mohd Noor*

**Matang Case**

The study site is a mangrove ecosystem where multi-stakeholders with different viewpoints and interests on the resource exist. The general concerns include the livelihood sustainability within the mangrove environment, and the benefit sharing both in terms of resources and market. Some of the specific issues are land use conflict among resource uses; number of cages, cockles rearing, farming and natural harvesting of cockles; navigation of waterways in the estuarine; deep sea versus coastal fishing; and forest quality and species survival in the Kuala Gula bird sanctuary.

The objectives of the project are to improve the local people’s livelihood and enhance forest and natural resources sustainability through good governance. Meanwhile, its purposes are to improve the linkages among the stakeholders, to create commitment to improve management of the Matang ecosystem, and introduce a new approach towards building a common vision among the stakeholders.

Under the baseline study, the key project activities undertaken include scoping process and visitation; stakeholder analysis through expert meeting and focus group meeting (FGM) with local stakeholders and authorities; and surveys on socio-economic and livelihood, resource and resource use, environment, and institutions. Preliminary findings showed that there is limited space for settlement for the local people; employee’s safety from pirates is a concern; difficulty in hiring local employees; presence of illegal logging activities; high fuel cost; and water pollution.

From the expert meeting, it was learned that a number of work have been conducted in the mangrove area, the experts are willing to share their experiences, and public awareness and conservation are of important concern to them. On the other hand, from the FGM with the local stakeholders, it was learned that the stakeholders are heterogeneous, there are influential individuals among the stakeholders, and stakeholders are willing to cooperate fully in the right environment. The challenges faced by the research team are to have all the stakeholders to agree on the project’s long-term goals; input into the project the scientists’ knowledge; to draw information from the other stakeholders, at the same time acknowledge the existence of influential
stakeholders; and to bring together relevant agencies into the ecosystem. A detailed presentation of the case is attached as Appendix 8.

**Pahang Case**

The case centers on the Orang Asli in Pekan, Pahang, Malaysia. The Orang Asli people in Pekan reside in 31 villages with a population of 10,960. About 55 percent of the population lives in deep rural areas and 60 percent depends on the forest for income and survival. Because of their low level of self-confidence, they have low interaction with other communities. Despite the efforts and money to improve the communities’ socioeconomic status and livelihood, development in the communities has been very slow over the years.

The case is confronted by two key issues. First is the need to create a space to involve the communities themselves in the negotiation and planning process of their livelihood, participation and empowerment in achieving a socially acceptable, economically viable, and sustainable development plan. Second is the need for more comprehensive social and economic baseline data. The project’s objective is the creation of space for the Orang Asli to participate in decision making process about forest management and their own social development. The project purposes are twofold, 1) a socially acceptable concept or guideline for local development in improving the communities’ livelihood; and 2) a sustainable natural resources management approach.

The key project activities undertaken were also discussed. These activities generated some preliminary findings such as the existence of relationship between the indigenous people and the forest for their livelihood, the need for a platform for the stakeholders to voice their opinion in the decision making process, and the need to create people-oriented tools and approaches in natural resources management. The challenge for the project is to facilitate the stakeholders to agree on common visions and long-term priorities. For the full presentation of the case, please refer to Appendix 9.

**Afternoon Session**

**Philippines**

*Presenter: Dr. Teodoro R. Villanueva*

In Puerto Princesa City, Palawan, new policies give rights to stakeholders to manage the forest and other natural resources. These stakeholders have different interests, goals, views on natural resources management (NRM) and also possess different levels of skills, knowledge and authorities.

The project site consists of about 5,000 hectares of Community-Based Forest Management (CBFM) area covering three barangays. Aside from the natural forests, other resources include lowland and coastal areas which have very low productivity. Various farmer and community organizations exist, but the San Rafael, Tanabag, and
Concepcion Multipurpose Cooperative, Inc. is the people’s organization managing the CBFM area.

The key issues that confront the project are conflicting policies which hinder proper renewable resource management; heavy emphasis towards conservation; conflicts arising from overlapping institutional mandates and functions; unclear communication, negotiation, agreements, and contracts between and among stakeholders; poor stakeholders’ participation in resource management; and inequitable access to natural resources. Hence, the project aims to: 1) identify and clarify relevant stakeholders’ roles and responsibilities, 2) address issues of renewable resource management, 3) facilitate negotiations and agreements among stakeholders; 4) improve stakeholders’ capabilities in managing their resource; and 5) improve supporting agencies’ delivery of services and assistance.

The project focused on the improvement of: local people’s livelihood, renewable resource management, community processes, and governance. Dr. Villanueva likewise presented the expected impacts, key project activities during the baseline studies, intervention, monitoring and evaluation stage, and several project results. The details of this presentation can be found in Appendix 10.

5.0 Steering Committee Members’ Discussion

5.1 Discussion on the Case Presentations

Focusing on the Java and MHP cases, Dr. Sarsito explained that the concept of partnerships means mutual benefits and respect among the partners. In the involvement of the community and the company, there is a need to find out the determinant elements for the partners to have a fair partnership. What does the community need to do to have a fair bargaining power? In the case of Jepara, Dr. Sarsito pointed out that the home industries have very low bargaining power as seen in the product flow. This forces the people to produce more to get sufficient returns for a living by getting more timber, thereby exerting more pressure on the forests. The concern therefore is how to increase the community’s bargaining power.

Mr. Guizol pointed out that MHP area is around 300,000 hectares. In their partnership scheme, the factory depends on the plantation. He believes that there is a better balance of power. In Jepara, the project attempts to increase the balance of power by including the buyers and increasing the availability of information to the stakeholders.

Dr. Mallet asked for clarification about MHBM and MHR schemes and asked how the people gain power to negotiate the price for their timber. Dr. Purnomo explained that the whole of MHP covers about 300,000 hectares, and two partnership schemes have been developed. One is the MHBM which is adopted in concession land covering about 80,000 hectares and the other is the MHR implemented in people’s land covering about 5,000 hectares. According to Dr. Purnomo, the people’s bargaining power is increased
by their looking for opportunities to process their products, rather than supplying them all to MHP. With regard to the problem of lack of capital, the people manage to get more contracts from MHP. In addition, micro-financing are available to the people.

Dr. Kanninen raised several questions on the presented cases. These were: 1) in the case of MHP, whether the farmers are paid production fee and if so how much, 2) why benefit sharing has come 20-30 years hence, 3) in Jepara, how does negotiation (buying and selling) take place, and 4) whether the furniture industry is the only teak wood buyer or there are other opportunities of selling teak wood.

Responding to the first question, Dr. Purnomo computed that for a village which manages 10,000 hectares for MHBM, it will get about 100 million rupiah/year, or approximately 10,000 US dollars/year. To the second point, Mr. Wardhana explained that for some teak planters, they may get benefits within 10 years but those who started the plantation from practically empty land, it may take 50 years before benefits can be realized. Dr. Kanninen disagreed and pointed out that one does not need to wait that long to get benefits because one can get profit from thinning in 10 years. The issue of whether the silvicultural management of the Perum Perhutani is correct or outdated has already been raised.

Responding to Dr. Mallet’s question on why the productive area is less than the unproductive area in the Java case, Mr. Wardhana explained that this is based on the Perum Perhutani’s perception only. According to Ms. Santoso, in Java there are 26 forest management districts and only six of the 26 districts have been declared by the Perum Perhutani as profitable. She also pointed out the possibility that Perhutani may not provide the correct figures with regards to the productivity of their plantations and their profits.

5.2 General Discussion

Dr. Mallet, the SC Chairman, facilitated the afternoon session. He raised several issues such as how to maintain the sustainability of the project at the project sites beyond the project’s lifetime, disseminate project results, and produce scientific publications. He also reminded the SC about two issues, i.e. peer evaluation and carrying capacity, which were discussed in the morning session.

Project Sustainability

Dr. Sarsito pointed out that it is necessary to transfer the concepts of capacity building and institutional building to the mayors and governors in the project sites. He advocated that these stakeholders should be involved in the beginning so that project outputs are understood and agreeable to them.

Ms. Hartanto pointed out that the project in Palawan has attempted to involve stakeholders in research activities and increase their capacities early on in the project. The project invited representatives from local government to attend the modeling training in Bangkok. She believes that when we talk of project sustainability, this means extending the project beyond its lifetime. It is important therefore to engage the government agencies and other local stakeholders so hopefully they can allocate funds and resourced to continue the project.
Mr. Wardhana supported the idea of linking up with the local government. He shared that the Gadjah Mada University (UGM) has good relationship with the local government and has encouraged the involvement of the local people and the local government in the project. He felt, however, at the earlier stage of negotiation it is not useful to involve people from the higher level and stressed the need for capability building among the local people.

Citing a successful ecotourism project in Sulawesi where everybody benefited, Dr. Sarsito stressed that it is important that the all stakeholders accept the project concept because people may have different interpretation, and therefore different acceptance. With regard to the observation that Perum Perhutani measures only profit, teak stakeholders should understand the social investment and accept it as a measure of social performance.

**Dissemination of Research Results**

Mr. Guizol explained that the project has not initiated this at the national level but he assured the group that the research teams will start developing the initiatives at the national level. At the district level, what is being done is to notify the district officers what the project is doing. Workshops inviting different stakeholders have been or will be done and the researchers ensure that the concerned agencies are involved right from the beginning. In this way, the issues faced by the agencies will be addressed and the project establishes links with concerned agencies.

Dr. Majid added that in order for the research results to be used, he suggested the research teams to organize a national workshop in each country and invite the government authorities so that they can pick up the research recommendations. The agencies can use their funds to attend the workshop. He added that in Malaysia, the government is very supportive of programs such as social forestry, biodiversity, and there has been a shift from traditional forestry to social/community forestry. Workshops along these lines have been organized.

Related to the above, Dr. Mallet agreed to the formal presentation of the research results and added that it is the responsibility of the people to integrate the findings into the country policies as what was done in Africa. In the case of CIFOR Adaptive Collaborative Management (ACM) project, Ms. Evangelista shared that the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (Philippines) is going to declare ACM approach as a national policy to be incorporated into the country’s Community Based Forest Management program. Hence, ACM will be institutionalized. In this connection, Mr. Wardhana said that a legal act coming from the national government needs a strong support from the provincial and local levels. The willingness of the local officials to support a legal act from the Perum Perhutani is important. He stressed that political support is a determinant of project sustainability. In relation to this, Ms. Santoso shared that the PHBM implementation is not very well accepted at the district level. She emphasized the need for institutionalization of the project within the stakeholders’ institutions so that the project will continue to be supported despite the changes in staff.

Ms. Hartanto agreed that a national workshop in each country, which would bring the agencies together, is an excellent idea. In the Philippines, however, where there is only
one project site, it will be a big challenge for the project to convince policy-makers that LPF approach works in different contexts. If a national workshop will be held in the Philippines, project representatives from Malaysia and Indonesia should present their findings as well.

Dr. Mallet added that it becomes very important for the project to determine the conditions under which LPF approach work or does not work in the different sites. Mr. Guizol agreed and stressed that comparison among the different sites is important. To do so, it will be necessary to re-visit the baseline data.

Going back to the concern on dissemination of research results, Dr. Mallet reiterated Dr. Capistrano’s suggestion to post the reports in the website. Mr. Guizol added that this is possible because the research teams have prepared the materials for the website. He encouraged everyone to visit the website to obtain different reports.

**Scientific Publication**

Regarding this concern, Dr. Purnomo suggested the researchers to submit papers to conferences like the International Conference on Common Property to be held in Bali, Indonesia, in June 2006. Mr. Guizol added that everyone should make use of the project site to post their research results.

**Capability Building**

Dr. Mallet raised another concern related to project sustainability, i.e. capability building. He mentioned specifically the training of the students which is an important part of the LPF project. He stressed that there is a need to organize such trainings. Mr. Guizol agreed and said that training for BS, MS and PhD students is actually one of the many trainings that can be done. He shared that in the Jepara case, they have involved several students in undertaking research activities.

Focusing on the community, Dr. Sarsito brought out the concern that community capability building should focus on what the community needs and what is important to them. He asked whether there is an economic assessment of ornamental plants which he observed in Palawan.

Agreeing on Dr. Sarsito’s comments on community capability building, Dr. Mallet cited the importance of coming up with community toolboxes from the different scientific findings. These will be indeed very useful to the communities. Responding to Dr. Sarsitos’ inquiry about economic analysis of ornamentals, Dr. Villanueva explained that there is none yet. He added that the growing of ornamental was proposed by the community and it is still at the experimental stage.

Related to community training, Dr. Purnomo mentioned that in the MHP case, they have trained the community on microfinance schemes. They have also discussed with MHP the possibility of conducting joint training activities on forestry, fishery, and livestock. They have also organized a forum where project participants discuss their problems and situations. In the Malaysian project sites, Dr. Khamuruddin mentioned that in connection with short term loans provided to the people, they have introduced financial and cash flow management system. In the Java case, Mr. Wardhana shared
that they have implemented training on forest landscape management so that the community plan can be integrated into the Perum Perhutani planning/management system.

With regard to micro-enterprise training, Ms. Hartanto mentioned that an NGO in Palawan can offer a complete enterprise training to prepare and train community groups to go into enterprising. The challenge is to build capacities, skills, and attitudes of the community for such initiative. It is possible to organize such a training but we should make a proper assessment on whether or not the communities are ready to do so. In the case of ornamental gardens in Palawan, she was not sure that the community members are ready to go into business at this stage. It may be better for the households to stay that way and gain profit for the households, rather than for the people’s organization. To this, Mr. Guizol added that through visioning, prioritization and learning processes, the communities hopefully will realize if they need such trainings.

Dr. Sarsito added that the communities do not need fancy trainings. What needs to be taught is for them to value themselves when they work. Simple book-keeping will be very helpful. Micro financing is a charity scheme and this may be difficult for the community. Mr. Guizol agreed that people need to realize that they need to pay themselves.

Agreeing with Dr. Sarsito’s comments, Ms. Hartanto emphasized the importance of proper training need assessment which will help determining what kind of training the community groups need, whether simple or complex trainings.

**Carrying Capacity**

Dr. Warsito expressed his apprehension on the application of the results of carrying capacity analysis to human. In Java, for instance, the project site is within the forest and the number of people is not decreasing. In this particular project area, Dr. Warsito does not see the use of the carrying capacity analysis. In connection with this, Mr. Guizol stressed the point that carrying capacity is not the right concept for human as in many case people are able to adapt to their environment; but the project is taking into account the biological dynamisms and their possible future impact on people livelihood.

**Logical Framework**

With regard to the logical framework which the teams prepared, Ms. Evangelista commented that the activities indicated in the framework should take into account the results of the baseline studies. The activities in the logframe should be consistent to know whether the teams are achieving the project objectives. In relation to the indicators, she added that there is a need to include quantifiable or measurable indicators. She suggested adding another column on “necessary inputs” before the column on “necessary assumptions”.

Mr. Guizol acknowledged the suggestions and explained that the teams did not have enough time to prepare the logframes properly. Meanwhile, Dr. Villanueva commented that since there will be more time to prepare the logical framework, it can be improved. But he suggested updating the framework since the researches have changed the focus from forestry alone to other ecosystems, such as the coastal and lowland ecosystems.
Mr. Guizol agreed with the suggestion since the old one is of global concern while what needed in the respective project site is a specific framework.

**Community Fund Generation**

Mr. Yussof’s concern was how the communities, particularly in Indonesia, can generate funds while waiting for the tree crops to be harvested. Dr. Purnomo and Mr. Wardhana explained that funds for the communities can come from the different schemes, e. g., MHR, from which the community can receive a 40% share. The people can also engage in agriculture, fishery, and livestock enterprises which can bring more business linkages and livelihood opportunities. Whenever possible, the people can also put up some savings. The concept of paying themselves for the productive goods and services they provide to any economic activity was also mentioned.

They also added that there is a need to discuss with the people the opportunities and possibilities to widen their economic options. The partnership between MHP and the local communities provide for economic incentives for activities such as weeding, slashing, etc. Dr. Warsito commented that the research team should assess the increase in people’s incomes as the result of the project.

A related issue which Dr. Purnomo brought to the attention of the Steering Committee was the conversion of national forests to oil palm plantations which can provide three times as much benefit. Dr. Mallet recommended to look at the national and local laws which specify what lands can be converted and what cannot be alienated. There is also a need to look whether it is worthwhile converting and what the possible impacts are. To this concern, Dr. Sarsito cited that there are cases where people still gain profit even if oil palm is not planted. Dr. Mallet also suggested the team to develop models for the different alternative crops. Mr. Guizol emphasized that the role of the research team is to facilitate, not to impose.

For state forest which has been claimed, Mr. Wardhana commented that the issue should be raised to the Ministry of Forestry. Ms. Santoso added that the role of the research is to bring the tenure issue to the provincial level.

**Next Steering Committee Meeting**

It is agreed that the next steering committee meeting will be held sometime in the week of 8-13 May 2005 in Malaysia. Similar activities will be undertaken, i. e., coordination meeting, field visit, followed by steering committee meeting.

**6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations**

On behalf of the Steering Committee members, Dr. Mallet expressed his impressions that the project has been progressing very well. However, he reiterated the need for the project to address the issues of project sustainability and to ensure the integration of the project results in the different plans of the various levels in each participating country. Another point emphasized was the necessity to come up with scientific publications as a means of transferring and disseminating the research results. On the part of the community, there is a need to conduct training for sustainability purposes. Dr. Mallet reminded everyone the need to produce the LPF annual report for the EU evaluation.
Lastly, he acknowledged Herlina, Vanny, and Jopay for their support and hard work to make this meeting a success.
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## Appendix 2. Steering Committee Meeting Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00-09.10</td>
<td>Welcome speech by the Chairman</td>
<td>Prof. Dato Nik Muhamad Majid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 09.10-09.30 | - Introduction of new SC Members  
- Minutes of 1st SC meeting  
- Propose and adoption of the agenda | Dr. Bernard Mallet                            |
| 09.30-10.10 | Presentation about:  
- the LPF approaches  
- progress in all sites in general  
- result of coordination meeting | Mr. Philippe Guizol                          |
| 10.10-10.30 | Questions and Discussion                                                    |                                               |
| 10.30-10.45 | Coffee break                                                               |                                               |
| 10.45-11.40 | Sites presentations on progress and plan for 2005-2006                      |                                               |
| 11.40-12.25 | Indonesian presentation  
- Java case (15 min)  
- MHP case (15 min)  
- Jepara case (5 min)  
Discussion (20 min) | Mr. Wahyu Wardhana  
Dr. Herry Purnomo  
Mr. Philippe Guizol |
| 12.25-13.30 | Lunch                                                                      |                                               |
| 13.30-13.50 | Philippine presentation  
- Palawan case (10 min)  
Discussion (10 min) | Dr. Teodoro Villanueva                       |
| 13.50-14.10 | Coffee break                                                               |                                               |
| 14.10-15.30 | Steering Committee Members’ Discussion                                    | Dr. Bernard Mallet                            |
| 15.30-16.00 | - Next steering committee meeting  
- Conclusions and Recommendations | Dr. Bernard Mallet                            |
Appendix 3. Philippe Guizol’s presentation on LPF Approaches, Site Progress and Coordination Meeting Results

**LPF: Levelling the playing field**

**Outline**

- The LPF approaches
- Progress in sites
- Result of Coordination meeting

**Project objectives**

Three overall objectives:

1. Promoting governance
2. Local people livelihood
3. Ecosystem sustainability

2 & 3 ➔ Integration social / biological sciences
1 ➔ same coordination process applied to the 6 sites
Scientific Scope

- Context
  - multi-stakeholders with different viewpoints and interests
  - long term issues: livelihood and sustainability
  - Benefit sharing issues (resource and market)
  - Multi-scales
  - Overlapping issues
- Approach: focus on processes
  - Action research / learning
  - Cross-level studies
  - Comparative approach: learn from the 6 sites

A common approach on 6 sites
Project Implementation Framework

Baseline study (biophysical and social surveys)

Intervention (initialization and additional studies requested by stakeholders)

Monitoring and impact assessment

Social process for sustainable forest management

- Initialization
- Building common views
- Co-designing management scheme (rules, plans, tools)
- Choosing management structure, roles
- Implementing (control, sanction, enforcement)

Assessment, renegotiation

A common approach on 6 sites

What the project does

What the stakeholders do

Market and Policies

Sharing view

Common long-term objectives

Co-design integrated management scheme

Choosing management organisation

Implementation & monitoring

Stages for long-term management of forest resources

INITIALISATION & BASELINE

LPF provide information on market, renewable resources and policies

DISTRICT LEVEL

VILLA GE LEVEL

MICRO PROJECT

communication

learning

Facilitate stakeholders and provide information as requested by stakeholders

INTERVENTION

MONITORING

LPF monitor progress and impacts

BASELINE

MONITORING

INITIALISATION & BASELINE
# Process of mediation / coordination

## Step 1
**Stakeholders mutual recognition**
- Facilitate stakeholders to agree on initial conditions (IC)
- Discuss trends and conflict origins
- Discussion on trends acceptability

## Step 2
**Shared long term objective LTO**
- Prospective discussion about very long term objectives (30 years)
- Define legitimize a process to define a common LTO
- Ritualize decision on LTO

## Step 3
**Define management scheme**
- How to reach the LTO from the Initial Conditions? - Test different scenarios

## Steps 4 and 5
**Design management organization, implementation and Monitoring**

## Expected outcome

### Step 1
**Stakeholders mutual recognition**
- Agree about disagreements; Don’t prove wrong or right any body
- Don’t discuss the conflicts but their perceptions from different actors
- Legitimize all perceptions; Mutual learning
- No research of solutions yet

### Step 2
**Shared long term objective LTO**
- Prospective projection of stakeholders in future
- Overcome short term conflicts or issues
- LTO emerges
- Stakeholders will refer to LTO not anymore to conflict

### Step 3
**Define management scheme**
- Reach compromises based on LTO
- Stakeholders refer now to LTO and not to current conflicts

---

**What is forest management?**
Classic forestry management

- Forest 'Etat' Year X
- Forest management plan design
  - Observed trends
  - Object of control
- Action plan
- Outcomes

Classic forestry management (2)

Assumption: Full control on forest (....and people)

Real life!

Multi-stakeholders’ forest management

- Situation year x Forest ‘Etat’
  - World outlook
  - Knowledge on dynamics
  - Appropriation regime
    - Use, access, representations, sharing, transfer
  - Institutions
    - Local to state
- Decision process
  - Observed trends
  - Negotiated Action plan
- Outcomes

Appropriation regime

Social Dynamics

Biological Dynamics

Appropriation regime / ownership


Multi-stakeholders’ renewable resource management – the same

Baseline

- Stakeholders
- Resource and resource use
- Institutions
- Analysis of formal and informal agreements
- Policy framework
  - ......

Situation year x Resources attributes

State of resources
Knowledge on Dynamics

Appropriation regime
Use, access, ownership, sharing, transfers

Institutions
From local to state

Stakeholders
Resource and resource use
Institutions
Analysis of formal and informal agreements
Policy framework

Policy framework

Baseline

Situation year x Resources attributes

State of resources
Knowledge on Dynamics

Appropriation regime
Use, access, ownership, sharing, transfers

Institutions
From local to state

Authorities legitimacy
Set of rules in use, Control and sanction systems

Negotiated action plan

Outcomes

Decision process

Observed trends
Objective (L.T)

Outcomes

Situation year x Resources attributes

State of resources
Knowledge on Dynamics

Appropriation regime
Use, access, ownership, sharing, transfers

Institutions
From local to state

Authorities legitimacy
Set of rules in use, Control and sanction systems

Negotiated action plan

Outcomes

Decision process

Observed trends
Objective (L.T)
Intervention / mediation

- Challenges
  - Wood, fishes = public good means difficult to exclude outsiders
  - Need cooperation for control
  - Costs now and return on long term
  - Issues of perceptions

Status of resources
Knowledge on Dynamics
Decision process
Objectives
Negotiated trends
(L,T)
Action plan
Outcomes

Institutions
Appropriation regime
Resources attributes
From local to state
Situation year x
x + n
Use, access, representations, sharing, transfer.

Authorities legitimacy
Control and sanction systems
Set of rules in use

"Participatory - modeling"
COMod

Literature
Actors
Field study
Lead to hypotheses
Simulations
Model
INTERVENTION

Draft vision statement
Community working groups
Steering Committee at provincial level

Identify alternative scenarios for renewable resource management and negotiation among stakeholders (e.g., MAS)
Discuss local issues at SC level
Revisit vision statement to agree on long-term objectives; ritualisation

Formulation of management plan for renewable resource management
Agreement on management structure, roles, responsibilities, and development of agreements/contracts, resource mobilisation

Implementation of management plan
Monitoring and evaluation
Continuous improvement of management plan

Mgt plan
Contracts

Agreed common vision & political commitment
Development of common vision (e.g., Future Scenario)
Identification & prioritisation of local issues
Development of strategies to address local issues
Identification & development of focus groups

Village level, community-led
Village & Higher levels in close interactions

Collective action to address local issues (micro-projects), using learning-based cycle

Progress at Regional Level

- Training
  - Role playing game
  - Modelling (ongoing)
  - Facilitation (3 training workshops)

- Coordination
  - Coordination meeting with each team
  - Regional coordination meetings (Puncak, Manila...)
  - Website

Field progress as in the proposal

Time frame: Year = From September to August

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palawan</td>
<td>MHP-Indo</td>
<td>Java - Teak</td>
<td>Teak_Jepara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Java teak = teak on State Forest
| MHP = partnership for pulpwood
| Teak_Jepara = smallholders teak plantation / furniture industries in Jepara

Field sites identification
Regional workshops
Regional training
Field work site 1
Field work site 2
Field work site 3
Field work site 4
Field work site 5
Field work site 6
Analysis and publications

Training: Role playing game, Modelling, Facilitation (3 training workshops)
Coordinational Activities: Coordination meeting, Regional coordination meetings
Website: Field progress as in the proposal include Palawan, MHP-Indo, Java - Teak, Teak_Jepara

Field work sites include Palawan, MHP-Indo, Java - Teak, Teak_Jepara, and others.
## Progress in the fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field sites identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work site 1</td>
<td>Palawan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work site 2</td>
<td>Java teak</td>
<td></td>
<td>MHP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work site 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work site 4</td>
<td>Matang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work site 5</td>
<td>Repara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work site 6</td>
<td>Jepara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Results from Coordination Meeting

- Share experience on baseline studies
- Discuss project approach about forest management
- Discuss action research and learning theories
- Clarify the different steps in intervention
- Precise logical frameworks for each site
- Prepare information for website improvement
- Inform team about EC evaluation

## Thank you
**Levelling the Playing Field:**
Fair partnership for local development to improve the forest sustainability in Southeast Asia

**Site Location and Issue**
Collaborative issue on Teak Forest Management (PHBM) (Pemalang and Blora)
1st year baseline study and 2nd year intervention steps

**Project goals**
- Teak Forest Plantation will be better managed by multi-stakeholder (Community, Perhutani, Local Government, Traders,....)
- To increase the forest community livelihood
- Institutionalize of the adaptation of the partnership (forest management) which involve the stakeholders
Project Purpose

- Emergence of a new forest management system, which involve multistakeholders

Baseline Study – 1st year

Assess demand from stakeholders and select sites

Conduct baseline studies

Key stakeholders:
- local community (forest user group)
- LMDH (community organisation)
- representative, Perhutani, local government

Sites: Randublatung and Pemalang

Information collected:
- Basic information (demography)
- Stakeholder analysis
- Resource and Resource use
- Livelihood
- Institution exist
- Formal/Informal agreement
- Framework in Government Policy

Methods

- Basic Information
  - Survey
  - Literature study
  - Secondary data
- Stakeholders Analysis
  - PACT
  - Key Informant (KI)*
- Resource and resource use
  - Focus Group Discussion (FGD)
  - Survey

- Livelihood
  - Survey
  - Key Informant
- Institution
  - FGD
  - Key Informant
- Formal / Informal Agreements
  - FGD
  - Key Informant
- Framework in Government policy
  - Key Informant
Baseline Results findings

(1) List of identified stakeholders (PACT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Wood Government</th>
<th>Perum Perhutani</th>
<th>Producer</th>
<th>Middleman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmer plant look in their own land</td>
<td>Head of village</td>
<td>Head of KPH</td>
<td>Wood Industry (big furniture maker)</td>
<td>Wood broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest farmer (Baronan)</td>
<td>Head of sub-district</td>
<td>Head of BKPH</td>
<td>Small workshop</td>
<td>Wood collector (Bakul kayu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMDH member</td>
<td>Head of district</td>
<td>Mayor or Mandor</td>
<td>Wood carpenter</td>
<td>Truck owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabod (in PP (Banjar harian))</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Polhut</td>
<td>PP staffs</td>
<td>Local NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td>Head of KPH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State court in district</td>
<td></td>
<td>Head of BKPH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Baseline Results

- PHBM issues:
  - Different understanding about PHBM inside PP (concept vs actual)
  - Lack of human resources to deal with PHBM initiative
  - Lack on awareness raising the program
  - Some villages reject PHBM initiative
  - Various implementation of PHBM
    - Pemalang → using collaborative compartments approach (400 – 1000 ha) → some KPH area will not be in PHBM scheme
    - Randublatung → using village administrative (claim) approach (1000 – 3000 ha) → all KPH will be divided based on village administrative boundaries
      - In KPH Randublatung it has been shared the benefit approx. Rp. 1,000,000,000.00 (report up to February 2005) and Pemalang approx Rp. 50,000,000.00 (for Surajaya village)
    - Community Institution (LMDH) problem

- Forest Management (FM) issues:
  - Unproductive area > productive area (one profitable KPH support 3 to 4 KPHs)
  - Land use management (tenure issue with other SHs)
  - Problem of selling and tracking systems
  - Lack of coordination and communication with other SHs on teak plantation FM
  - Less concern on environmental issue (profit oriented)
  - Regulation from MoF on Annual Allowable to Cut
  - High dependency of the community to the forest resources
(2) Baseline Results

- **Forest security (illegal logging)**
  - Lack of law enforcement (internal and external PP)
    - Lack of capacity to control the plantation
    - Lack of coordination with other SHs
- **Management issue of PP**
  - Autonomy at district level vs PP central-unit or district office (KPH)
  - Political influence related with decentralization era about PP status
  - Blamed for natural disaster, such as flooding

Lesson Learnt from Gempol – Tanggel Community: Allocation of shared benefit (Randublatung)

1. Board of LMDH: 12%
2. Perhutani team (success team): 5%
3. Village communication forum: 5%
4. Sub district communication forum: 3%
5. Operational of Organization (LMDH): 15%
6. Social: 20%
7. Productive activities: 40%

Assumptions & Challenges

- Perhutani has the authority to manage the state forest in Java however in the implementation it is recognized that its involved multistakeholders (community, local government, traders, industry, etc.)
- There is a lack of coordination and communication (information flows) among those stakeholders (at various level)
- Different understanding and expectation at various level among stakeholders about PHBM
- Most of the villages surrounding the teak forest plantation are dependant to forest resources (forest land)
- Benefit sharing is important issue for collaboration and how to allocate the shared benefit needs good coordination and communication (internal)
Intervention Steps 2nd Year

Intervention

1. Development of common vision (e.g. Future Scenario)
2. Identification & prioritization of local issues
3. Development of strategies to address local issues
4. Identification & development of focus groups
5. Discuss local issues at SC level
6. Collective action to address local issues (micro-projects), using learning-based cycle

CONTINUE...

Community Working Group
Steering Committee at higher level
Agreed common vision & political commitment

Progress of implementation

- Intervention at village level is implemented in 4 villages
- 2 villages in KPH Randublatung: Gempol and Tanggel
- 2 villages in KPH Pemalang: Surajaya and Glandang
- Progress in each villages: up to steps 3 with 2 outputs (common vision and community working group)
Case at Gempol village

(1) Development of common vision
Methods: Future Scenario, group discussion
Steps:
- Local stakeholders at village level are involved in the workshop. They are divided into several groups based on their occupation, such as: farmers, small entrepreneur, local government, Perhutani at village level, community leader, etc.
- Each group drawn their expectation and concern about the condition of the system (natural resources) in the next 15-20 years and compared and analysed the pictures and seeks common components, such as: economy, health, forestry, education, social and cultural, communication technology, infrastructure, agriculture, and husbandry, local industry, institutional, community relationship
- Formulated of common vision

Gempol case (Cont.)

Draft Common Vision of GEMPOL village:
"with sincerely of the collaboration spirit among stakeholders, the human and natural resources potential are well-managed to achieved the justice and prosperity of the Gempol community"

(2) Identification & prioritization of local issues
Methods/Tools: group discussion, brainstorming, meta-cards
Steps:
- Identified opportunities at local level
- Identified current issues
- Clustering process
- List of local issues and opportunities
- Define criteria of priority issues
- List of prioritized issues

(3) Development of strategies to address local issues
Methods/Tools: group discussion, brainstorming, meta-cards
Steps:
- Identified strategy and beneficiaries of each priority issues
- Identified potential coordination of each strategy
- Develop community working group
### Problem Priority and the strategy to achieve the common vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities problem</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Option for Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Local community</td>
<td>Short Term (ST)</td>
<td>(1) Develop and submit proposal to related agency (local government, Perhutani), or initiate planning and collaborative initiative with others stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Gov (LG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>LC, LG, Perhutani</td>
<td>Long Term (LT)</td>
<td>Training, extension, religion study, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local institutions</td>
<td>LC, LG, Perhutani</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Improve communication and coordination through regular meetings and social awareness programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest management</td>
<td>Perhutani, LC, LG, local entrepreneur</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Better coordination and cooperation, levelling the roles, improve forest security, better implementation of exist structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST/middle/LT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperate institution, develop small industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>LC, LG</td>
<td>ST/middle/LT</td>
<td>Seek opportunities for soft-loan though cooperative institution, develop new business, allocate benefit sharing on PHBM for profitable activities, develop and submit proposal to related offices (Perhutani, LG, state-owned company/BUMN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast</td>
<td>LC, local entrepreneur</td>
<td>ST/middle/LT</td>
<td>Promote local product to higher level, develop partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Problem Priority and the strategy to achieve the common vision (mandate of SH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority problem</th>
<th>Board or working group</th>
<th>Follow up Agenda</th>
<th>stratagy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road infrastructure</td>
<td>Perhutani, village rehabilitation (URB), village government, Perhutani LMDH, village government, village, local community</td>
<td>Head of village and head of LMDH</td>
<td>June 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child opportunity</td>
<td>School committee, religion elite, village government, village, local community, teacher</td>
<td>Head of village and teacher</td>
<td>May 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village institution</td>
<td>Perhutani, LMDH, village government, all village organization</td>
<td>Head of village organization</td>
<td>May 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of forest resources</td>
<td>LMDH, Perhutani, village institution, elite persons, local community</td>
<td>Head of UPR and Village government</td>
<td>May 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Village government, LMDH, Perhutani, local government</td>
<td>Head of the village and head of LMDH</td>
<td>June 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Entrepreneur, common people, kayu, other forest, Perhutani LMDH, village government, tax and application office (local)</td>
<td>Mr. Suwarto and LMDH</td>
<td>May 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Thank You**
Appendix 5. MHP by Herry Purnomo

Levelling the Playing Field:
Fair partnership for local development to improve
the forest plantation sustainability in South Sumatra

Context
- Acacia mangium commercial plantation (296
  400 Ha) of PT. Musi Hutan Persada (MHP)
- Involve huge amount of money
- Diversity of actors and problems
- Has been developing partnerships:
  - MHBM (at concession land)
  - MHR (at people land)
- Local devt. ‘Gerbang Serasan’

Context (cont.)
- Indonesia
  - Plantation is an Indonesia comparative advantage (AA summit analysis)
  - MHP’s partnership can be a model forest; how can communities benefit?
- Millennium Development Goals
  - Eradicate poverty
  - Ensure environmental sustainability
  - Develop global partnership for development

(Scherr et al. 2004)
(Scherr and Anuar n.d.)
Key Issues

- Benefit sharing among the community members
- Partnership schemes (MHBM and MHR) between the communities and the company
- Land security and ownership

Overall Objectives

- To contribute to improved livelihood of the communities
- To contribute to the sustainable forest plantation in South Sumatra

Purpose

Improved (fair) partnership between the company and the communities
Expected Results

- Improved capacities of stakeholders to (re)negotiate and come up with agreements.
- Effective forums for stakeholders to communicate and share views at village and district levels.
- Guidelines, tools and papers

Key Project Activities

- Review existing studies, field visits and consultations ✓
- Baseline survey
- Capacity building ✓
- Simulation and game development for envisioning the partnership
- Facilitate village members
- Facilitate multi-stakeholder forum at district level
- Monitoring the change

Methodologies

- Surveys and consultations
- Simulation and Game
- Participatory Action Research
Progress

- Achieved
  - Field visits and secondary data review
  - Communicating and building trust with the stakeholder
  - Establishment of a multi-stakeholder forum “SEBAHU SEJALAN”

- Plan for this year
  - Secretariat establishment
  - Visioning and scenario building
  - Facilitations

Issues revisited: challenges for the next two years

- Short term
  - Institutions for managing the production fee
  - Community access for the employment

- Medium term
  - Improvement of MHBM scheme for the next rotation
  - Extending the extent of MHR and its benefit
  - Improving market access for the community products

Challenges (cont.)

- Long term
  - Integration with the regional and local development policies
  - The resilience of the partnership
  - Sustainability of the plantation and its product
  - Land certainty
Temporary Findings

- The playing field is imbalance
- Money is the (most) important trigger for the emerging/reforming institutions
- Diversity of perceptions inside the company and communities regarding the partnerships
- There is changing of land ownership through time

Temporary Findings (cont.)

- The emerging new land lords from MHR scheme
- Barito Pacific will sell its share to Marubeni Corporation; it might trigger new situation
- Pressures (‘advocacies’, certification etc.) are conducive for the change
- Complexity vs. Simplicity

Conclusion

- MHP is a right LPF site, where
  - Different actors with different power level exist
  - High dependency: the pulp industry, plantation co., communities and government
- Partnership has been started; emerged from the reform era, and now is evolving
- There is a clear demand for the LPF research
- We have been starting the activities
Public awareness, advocacy and forest certification scheme maintain pressure to all stakeholders for the improvement of community livelihood.

Indonesian national policy is conducive for betterment of community livelihood.

Effective mechanisms exist for two-way communication related to forest management among stakeholders.

Level of conflict is acceptable to stakeholders.

Opportunities exist for local and forest-dependent people to receive employment and training from forest companies.

**Results:**

1. Improved capacities of stakeholders to (re)negotiate and come up with agreements.
2. Effective forums for stakeholders to communicate and share views at village and district levels.
3. Guidelines and tools to facilitate collective action for better partnership.

**Market for Acacia mangium based products is promising.**

Mechanisms for sharing benefits are seen as fair by the local communities and company.

Examples of better agreement exist.

**Purpose:**

Improved (fair) partnership between MHP and the communities.

**Overall objective:**

To contribute to improved livelihood of communities and sustainable forest plantation in South Sumatra.

**Assumptions:**

Sufficient supports from the company and local government.

**Activities:**

1. Collecting and analyzing secondary data (provide the state of the art).
2. Conduct baseline survey of forest resources, household and institution.
3. Capacity building.
4. Model and MHP development for envisioning the partnership.
5. Facilitate village member to have institutions to discuss and solve their problems.
6. Facilitate multi-stakeholder forum at district level for the improved partnership.
7. Participatory monitoring, project monitoring.

**Source of verification:**

Public awareness, advocacy and forest certification scheme maintain pressure to all stakeholders for the improvement of community livelihood.

Indonesian national policy is conducive for betterment of community livelihood.

**Indicators:**

1. Better livelihood opportunities and income for the communities.
2. All stakeholders feel secure about access to resources.
3. Examples of better agreements exist.

**Log Frame**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Source of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall objective:</td>
<td>1. Better livelihood opportunities and income for the communities 2. All stakeholders feel secure about access to resources</td>
<td>1. Comparison of the baseline study and the project monitoring in year 2 and 3, conducted by the LPF South Sumatra team. 2. Selective C&amp;I monitoring</td>
<td>1. Public awareness, advocacy and forest certification scheme maintain pressure to all stakeholders for the improvement of community livelihood. 2. Indonesian national policy is conducive for betterment of community livelihood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose: Improved (fair) partnership between MHP and the communities</td>
<td>1. Mechanisms for sharing benefits are seen as fair by the local communities and company. 2. Examples of better agreements exist</td>
<td>Selective C&amp;I monitoring</td>
<td>Market for Acacia mangium based products is promising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results: 1. Improved capacities of stakeholders to (re)negotiate and come up with agreements. 2. Effective mechanisms exist for two-way communication related to forest management among stakeholders. 3. Level of conflict is acceptable to stakeholders. 4. Opportunities exist for local and forest-dependent people to receive employment and training from forest companies</td>
<td>1. Effective mechanisms exist for two-way communication related to forest management among stakeholders. 2. Level of conflict is acceptable to stakeholders. 3. Opportunities exist for local and forest-dependent people to receive employment and training from forest companies</td>
<td>Selective C&amp;I monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market for Acacia mangium based products is promising.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>1. Collecting and analyzing secondary data (provide the state of the art). 2. Conduct baseline survey of forest resources, household and institution. 3. Capacity building. 4. Model and MHP development for envisioning the partnership. 5. Facilitate village member to have institutions to discuss and solve their problems. 6. Facilitate multi-stakeholder forum at district level for the improved partnership. 7. Participatory monitoring, project monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient supports from the company and local government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6. Jepara Case by Philippe Guizol

Private teak growers / Jepara

Sponsored by:

Conducted by:

Main partner:

Strategy: facilitate use of smallholders teak wood as an alternative wood resource
Jepara - Site description

Context:
- Jepara is an industrial district with three teak resources
- These furniture industries generate 00,000 jobs

Key issues:
- Poor data on teak wood consumption, employment, teak value chain,
- State forest sustainability threaten by illegal logging
- Bad perception of smallholders' wood quality by industries
- Bad furniture repute on international market due to "informal" wood supply
- Employments in industries threaten by short teak supply
- Fair trade

Jepara project

Objective:
- Protect employment and development of furniture industries in a context of sustainable use of teak resource
- Facilitate the use of teak wood from smallholders

Purpose
- Smallholders get more incentives to grow teak
- Responsible teak business people get supports
- Government have access to reliable data on furniture industries in Jepara
- Furniture industries have access to documented teak resources
- Furniture industries develop technologies to use teak from smallholders
- Stakeholders are involved in a collective action to improve Jepara teak quality

Expected Results

- Document current furniture value chain from teak producers to end users
- Industrial demand understood by teak smallholders
- Industries aware about teak forest resources
- Identification of the perceptions about issues and demand of the different stakeholders
- Policies to mitigate smallholders constraints and promote responsible business are identified
- Identification of incentives for development of smallholders teak plantation
- Emergence of a common objective from wood producers to wood buyers
Key project activities

- 2005: Survey of industrial district of Jepara, value chain analysis and Stakeholders awareness
- 2006: Teak smallholders’ perceptions and constrains, tracking system feasibility, intervention /communication

2005 activities

- Preparation method to analyze Jepara
- Step 1 - Typology and spatial distribution
- Step 2 - Qualitative and quantitative survey
- Step 3 - Investigation about the resources
- Workshop for stakeholders’ awareness

Expected result step 1:

Units
- Workshop
- Showroom
- sawmill
Origin of teak supply in Jepara

Structure of questionnaires
First lessons learnt

- Jepara is an industrial district:
  - Very small enterprises organized according to a hierarchical network
  - Collective efficiency
  - Technical innovations emerge
  - Collective investment (relatively weak)
  - Wages are high and increase
- Teak quality from smallholders is poor as it is not dry and diameter are small
- Assumption about de-incentives of smallholders to grow old teak trees
  - Smallholders need money fast as they are poor
  - Large diameter are not easy to sold due to an informal state monopoly over large diameter teak logs.

Thank you...
Appendix 7. Matang Case by Khamuruddin Mohd Noor

Levelling The Playing Field: Social Process For Sustainable Management of Mangrove Forest

Khamurudin – Site Leader
Syarifah Norazizan
Abd Aziz Abdullah
Mohd Kamil
Zin Jusoh
Nadwan

Outline

• Context
• Key Issues
• Objectives
• Purpose
• Key Project Activities
• Lesson Learnt
• Challenges

Project Context

• Multi-stakeholders with different viewpoints and interests of the Mangrove environment
• Sustainability of the livelihood within the mangrove ecosystem
• Issues of benefit sharing – both in terms of resource and market and market
Key Issues

- Land use conflict between fishing industry, timber producers, and fish aquaculture, environment.
- Number of cages, cockles rearing, farming and natural harvesting of cockles,
- Navigation of waterways in the estuarine,
- Deep sea vs coastal fishing, encroachment of deep sea fishermen, overlapping demand of resources,
- Quality of the forest and species survival (?) in the bird sanctuary (Kuala Gula)

Objectives

- To improve local people’s livelihood and enhance sustainability of forest and renewable resources through good governance.

Purpose

- Improve the linkage between different entities (stakeholders)
- Create commitment (collective learning?) to improve the management of the Matang system
- Introduce new approach towards building a common vision among the stakeholders
Key Project Activities

- **BASELINE STUDY**
  - Scoping Process and visitation
  - Stakeholders analysis
  - Expert meeting
  - FGM with local stakeholders
  - FGM with local authorities
  - Surveys on:
    - Socio-economic and Livelihood
    - Resource and resource use
    - Environment
    - Institutional

Scoping Process and Visitation

- Initial Site Visit
  - 10 – 11th August 2004
- Key informant
- 100 Years Mangrove Conference
  - 5 – 8 th October 2004

Stakeholders Analysis

- **Expert Meeting**
  - 14 April 2005, Kuala Lumpur
- **SWOT Analysis**
- Cause and Effect Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Participation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Harvest Level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of Current Policy or Regulation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost and Benefit</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholders Analysis

- FGM With Local Stakeholders
  - Perception Analysis
  - Identification of other SHs
  - SWOT analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Freq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of food supply</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish, prawn and cockle</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the mangrove forest</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife habitat</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic income</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil protection/prevent erosion</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Stakeholders

- Charcoal importer (Japanese & Koreans)
- Forest Department
- Tourists
- Students
- Department of Environment
- NGO’s
- Department of Fishery
Preliminary Findings in Among the Local SH’s

• Limited space for settlement
• Safeties of employee- pirate
• Hard to find or hire local employee
• Illegal logging activities
• High operation cost mainly due to diesel supplies
• Water pollution

Lessons Learnt

Expert Meeting
- There have been a lot of work conducted in the Mangrove
- The experts are willing to share their experiences
- Public awareness and conservation were among important issues to the experts

Local SH’s
- The SH’s are not homogenous
- The existence of influencing individuals among the SH’s
- SH’s are willing give full cooperation in the right environment

Challenges

• To have all the SH's agree on the LT goals of the site
• To capitalize the knowledge of available scientist into this project
• To be able to draw the information from other SH’s while at the same time acknowledge the existence of influencing SH
• To bring together various government agencies relevant to the ecosystem
Appendix 8. Pahang Case by Khamuruddin Mohd Noor

Levelling the Playing Field: Improving Livelihood of Orang Asli – Pekan, Pahang

Rosta Harun – Site Leader
Khamurudin
Syarifah Norazizan
Mohd Kamil
Abdullah
Hilmizi

Outline

• Context
• Key Issues
• Objectives
• Purpose
• Key Project Activities
• Lesson Learnt/Preliminary Findings
• Challenges

Project Context

• There are 31 Orang Asli villages with a population number of 10 960 peoples in Pekan.
• Their residential areas were not in the forest. However, majority of them still depends on forest for incomes and survival.
• Current socio-economic status:
  • 55 % of the population live in deep rural areas
  • 60 % of the population depends on forest for incomes and survival
  • Low level of self confidence-low social interaction with other community
• A lot of efforts and money were spent in order to improve the socio economic status and livelihood of this community. However, the success remains questionable due to a slow progress of development on this community over the years.
### Key Issues
- A need for space to involve the community itself in negotiation process for planning purposes in terms of their livelihood, participatory and empowerment in achieving a socially acceptable, economically viable and sustainable future development plan.
- A need for a more comprehensive baseline data which includes the community historical background, community-forest interaction and conflicts and detailed assessment on socio-economic aspect.

### Objectives
- Creation of space for the indigenous community (Orang Asli) to participate in decision making process about forest management and their own social development.

### Purpose
- A socially acceptable recommendations of concept or guide line for local development to improve the livelihood of the community
- Sustainable natural resources management approach for the site- improvement of coordination schemes

### Key Project Activities
- Consultation
- Site selection and visit
- Baseline study
- Pilot study
- Life history analysis
- PACT method
- Social-economics assessment
- Focus group meeting
Lesson Learnt/Preliminary Findings

• There is a relationship between the indigenous people and the forest in their livelihood. However the existing baseline data is not sufficient to properly describe the linkages and the interaction.
• A need for a platform for the stakeholders to voice their opinion in the decision making process.
• A need to create people oriented tools and approaches in natural resource management.

Challenges?

• All the SH’s agree on the common visions and the LT priorities
Appendix 9. Palawan Case by Teodoro Villanueva

Context

- New policies that give the rights to local stakeholders to manage parts of forests and other natural resources are emerging.
- Communities, farmers, fishermen, forest managers, non-government organizations, government agencies, and local government units have different roles to play.

- These stakeholders often have different interests, goals, and views on how natural resources should be managed.
- They also have different kinds and levels of skills, knowledge, and authorities that make management of natural resources complex.
Context

- The project site consists of three barangays in the city of Puerto Princesa, Province of Palawan.

- The landscape consists of a 5,006 hectare of a Community Based Forest Management (CBFM) area which is being managed by the People's Organisation of San Rafael, Tanabag, and Concepcion Multi-Purpose Cooperative Inc. (STCMPC).

- There are also vast lowland and coastal areas that have very low productivity.

- Various farmers and community organizations exist in the sites.

- The project builds on the previous CIFOR project on ACM (1999-2002).
Key Issues

- Conflicting policies that hinder the proper management of natural resources.
- Heavy orientation towards conservation.
- Conflicts result from overlap of mandates and functions of institutions.
- Confusing processes for communication, negotiation, agreements and contracts between and among stakeholders.
- Poor participation of stakeholders in the management of resources.
- Inequitable access of natural resources.

Purpose

- Improved livelihood for women and men in the project site.
- Improved management of natural resources (forest, lowland coastal areas).
- Improve processes for communication, negotiation, agreements, contracts, between and among different stakeholders.
- Good governance and conflict solving processes useful for stakeholders.
Purpose

- To identify and clarify roles and responsibilities of relevant stakeholders
- To address issues related to natural resource management
- To facilitate negotiations agreements among stakeholders on natural resources management
- To improve capability of stakeholders properly managed natural resources
- To improve delivery of services or assistance by supporting agencies

Expected impacts

The project will target key stakeholders (particularly the women, indigenous people, the poor and minority groups) in order to maximize impacts on local beneficiaries over time.

- Capacity built to source funds, to access services, to communicate and share information and to prepare local development plans
- New opportunities to improve the real prosperity of local households and communities, based on sustainable forest and natural resource management, will be explored.
- Improved capacities of local institutions, in forms of improved skills, knowledge, and awareness, to communicate, enforce rules and sanctions, monitor, and improve their management.
- Stakeholders will coordinate and collaborate better with each other due to improved understanding of their roles, responsibilities, and functions.
- Costs and benefits from the forests will be shared more fairly.
Project results

• Production of decision-making tools.
• Policy recommendations to policy-makers.
• The production of tools, processes, and guidelines for multi-stakeholder negotiation that can be used in other parts of the world.

Key Project Activities

• Baseline Studies
  – Stakeholder analysis
  – Institutional analysis
  – Socio-economic survey
  – Resource and resource use survey
  – Agreements and Contracts
  – Policy
• Interventions
  – Capability-building
  – Market Study
  – MLA
  – MAS Modeling to support efforts to find alternative management scenarios and stakeholder negotiation
  – Site level facilitation
  – Support to Community Development Activities
• Monitoring and Evaluation
  – Evaluation form
  – Activity tracking
Levelling the Playing Field: Fair Partnership for Local Development to Improve the Forest Sustainability in Southeast Asia

The project is working in contexts where multi-stakeholders with different views and power act on forest management. The project aims to improve the forest management by facilitating stakeholders’ coordination and capacity building. It will develop approaches and tools for stakeholders to share views and create condition to manage the forest together.

In Palawan (the Philippines) the project is working in the former CIFOR’s Adaptive Co-Management (ACM) project field site, where the government has devolved the rights and responsibilities to manage forests to the People’s Organisations through a Community Based Forest Management framework. In Java it will set up field work to help Perum Perhutani to put in force a similar program locally called PHBM, whose aim is to improve the forest management of their teak plantations by sharing both benefits and control with the villagers. The field work in Malaysia will start in the second year.

http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/lpf
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