

COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT OF FORESTS FOR CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

R. J. Fisher

IUCN-The World Conservation Union

World Wide Fund For Nature

September 1995

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction	5
Co-managing protected areas	10
Collaborative management	16
Collaborative management outside protected areas	26
Implementation: Issues	27
Implementation: Methodology	39
Conclusions	44
Appendix 1: Collaborative Forest Management	45
Appendix 2: People and protected areas	46
Bibliography	48

Collaborative management

Social Forestry, Community Forestry and Joint Forest Management

All forestry is social: it is about the use or management of forests to meet social goals. Many forestry practices have been distinctly antisocial from the point of view of tribal or rural people, however. Conventional forestry science was concerned with meeting demands "expressed through either economic or political power" (Leslie, 1987). Forestry frequently implemented policies that met the interests of the economically and politically powerful.

As Leslie points out: ". . . history is replete with examples of conventional forestry extinguishing whatever rights such people [those without effective political and economic power] might have had or subordinating them to the welfare of the forest" (Leslie, 1987),

A major theme of several papers in *Keepers of the Forest* (Poffenberger, 1990) is that the history of forestry in countries such as the Philippines, Indonesia and Thailand involves a shift from traditional (indigenous or local) tenure to state control. This shift has occurred in many countries and has often been abrupt. Current approaches to joint forest management and community forestry programmes might be seen as returning control to local communities.

Given local peoples' loss of control over forests, it is ironic that these same people are often blamed for deforestation. It is a fallacy that deforestation has largely been caused by the actions of local peoples, and a corollary fallacy that forest agencies are needed to save forests from the people. Historically, forest management by centralised agencies has usually involved changing forest use from relatively sustainable local use to intensive commercial operations. The concept that local management may have something to offer needs to be taken very seriously, conversely, claims that state forestry agencies have a unique capacity for conservation need to be treated with some skepticism.

In the 1970s attitudes began to shift toward forms of forestry that were more responsive to local needs. Part of the motivation for this was a recognition of the need to redress the inequitable results of much state forestry and of the pragmatic value of local involvement.

The approach was initially referred to as "social forestry". Social forestry programmes were funded by international agencies in a number of countries. Unfortunately, they often paid only superficial attention to the concerns of local people, whose participation was often limited to providing paid labour. Programmes frequently perpetuated the alienation of earlier forms of forestry, even while using the rhetoric of participation and peoples' interests. In some countries social forestry developed very unpleasant connotations; it is partly because of this that alternative integrated approaches to forestry development and conservation have emerged under new names like "community forestry" and "joint forest management".

The wide range of terminology has caused great confusion. Many different types of projects have been described as community forestry joint forest management has a similarly wide application. The Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) defined community forestry broadly, as "... Any situation which intimately involves local people in a forestry activity" (FAO, 1978). Gilmour and Fisher (1991) employ a more narrow definition: "...the control and management of forest resources by the rural people who use them especially for domestic purposes and as an integral part of their farming systems". This definition does not rule out sale to markets, nor does it imply full local control, but it does require some actual local control.

A. J Leslie (1987) Foreword to J. Westoby' "The Purpose of Forests Follies of Development"

...history is replete with examples of conventional forestry extinguishing what rights such people those without effective political a economic power might have

Of the two definitions the first is broad and descriptive; the second more particular. It would be useful to devise a notion of community forestry that distinguishes it from other models on the basis of some specific characteristics. Local control seems to be an important enough characteristic to delineate a specific approach. Unfortunately, people do use "community forestry" in many ways and there is little point in insisting on a narrow use. In this paper I will use the phrase when it is an official term used to define a particular policy, such as Nepal's Community Forestry Programme.

*had or subordinating them
the welfare of the forest.*

Joint forest management (JFM) is an approach to collaborative forestry that has been tried in several countries in Southeast Asia (see Poffenberger, 1990b) and in India. With support by governments and NGOs in these countries, and with strong support from the Ford Foundation, it has developed as a very credible model and has had some major successes.

In JFM the emphasis is on collaboration in management between the agencies with legal authority over state-owned forests and the people who live in and around these forests. Some authors talk about legitimizing local use (Campbell, 1992) and guaranteeing usufruct rights (Campbell et al., 1994). There is also an emphasis in many JFM programmes on agreements that specify rights of forest peoples to certain products. Nevertheless, the term JFM implies cooperation between local people and state authorities. In JFM literature there seems to be an assumption that programmes involve encouraging and legitimizing the participation of local people in forestry activities on land that remains essentially under state control.

It is tempting to differentiate between community forestry and JFM based on the degree of local control and collaboration. This is simplistic, however, as a discussion of participatory forestry in India and Nepal will show. I prefer to use the broader term collaborative forest management to encompass a variety of approaches and then to explore different programmes according to particular characteristics. While it might be possible to differentiate between community forestry and JFM on the basis of those characteristics which particular advocates think should differentiate them, in practice each term has been used to cover a wide range of projects and there is a great deal of overlap.

I will now turn to a discussion of what could loosely be called collaborative forest management projects in a number of countries. I will be placing particular emphasis on Nepal and India.

Nepal

Nepal's community forestry programme is well known and is widely held to be an excellent example of successful participatory forest management. The programme has been extensively documented (for an overview see Gilmour and Fisher, 1991).

The recent history of Nepal's forest policy begins in 1957, with the nationalization of forests. The intent of this initiative was to place forests under the control of the forest department. By the 1970s, however, it had become obvious that the department did not have the capacity to manage the forest effectively and that forest regulations made life very difficult for rural people. They continued to use forests — they had little choice — but most forest use was illegal. Even though the department had no effective control of forests, illegal use meant significant penalties for those people who were caught and created inconvenience for others. Control was inconsistent; to a large extent forests in the hills were ignored by the authorities, except for attempts to police forest use.

In the late 1970s innovative thinking by a number of Nepali foresters brought a new approach. This involved handing over forests to local panchayats (official politico-administrative units) that were willing to protect them. The legislation allowed for the use and harvesting of forest products by the people of the panchayat, subject to the forest department's approval of a management plan. In practice, however, very little forest was handed over prior to the late 1980s, and very little of that was governed by management plans that allowed any significant forest use (Fisher, 1990).

Plantation establishment and natural forest protection were successful in some areas, but, with few exceptions, people received limited benefits in terms of access to forest products. A series of institutional changes took place, including the completion of a national forestry master plan in 1988, the issue of operational guidelines to assist implementation of the master plan pending revised legislation and, ultimately, new forestry legislation (The Forestry Act, January 1993). These brought significant changes, which have led to easier implementation, greater incentives for people's participation and, consequently, a rapid expansion of the programme. Significant features of the programme as it now stands are:

- Forest management agreements (operational plans) are negotiated between the forest department and user groups (i.e. groups of people with a direct interest in use of a particular forest and claiming usufruct rights) rather than larger political or administrative units.
- Under the legislation and guidelines the user groups are extensively involved in the design of operational plans. There is the potential for considerable flexibility in management and for a high level of local control, subject to the ultimate authority of the District Forest Officer (DFO). Substantial forest use and harvesting are possible. In practice many plans are not as flexible as they could be, nor do they provide as many benefits, largely because foresters find it difficult to hand over control as much as they are permitted. Nevertheless the legislation provides for flexible management and substantial benefits and there are a significant number of cases where the agreements match this potential.
- There is no benefit-sharing by the forest department. At present communities are entitled to use all products raised through management and may use all income raised for development purposes. Whether this will be extended to allow for greater levels of income from more substantial commercial use of forest products has not yet been tested.
- Indigenous systems of forest management have been increasingly recognised in Nepal (Messerschmidt 1986a, 1987; Fisher 1989, 1991a, 1993; Tamang 1990). Many of these have developed in the near vacuum of forest management that existed after the nationalisation of forests in 1957. Community forestry guidelines provide for agreements to be made with existing user groups. This is a major shift away from the previous emphasis on official boundaries and highly formal and newly-established committees. The guidelines also permit existing groups to incorporate their management practices, where they are effective, into management plans.

In Nepal, community forestry originally concentrated rather heavily on involving local people in the management of new plantations on degraded land. The focus has now shifted substantially much greater emphasis is placed on the management of natural forests and shrublands. This has important implications in the conservation of biodiversity. Unlike plantations — which are usually limited to a single species — natural forests, even degraded ones, contain a great diversity of species. User groups deciding management priorities also tend to favour multiple uses, which also works in favour of biodiversity. Ingles (1994a) stresses the importance of community forestry to biodiversity conservation. He argues: "Nepal's National Conservation strategy could be improved by increasing its emphasis on community forestry and identifying activities . . . that will increase the potential for community forestry to contribute to the conservation of biodiversity". The key to the strategy suggested in Ingles is a "simple rapid method for monitoring forest condition and biodiversity".

The implications of community forestry for biodiversity in Nepal are considerable. In terms of biodiversity of plant species the implications are clear. There is also some potential for conservation of faunal biodiversity, although the benefits so far have been less obvious.

Community forestry, by protecting or re-establishing habitat, has helped birds and animals to survive. Interestingly, operational plans often include prohibitions against hunting, included at the request of local people.

India

In India, the dominant model of participatory forest management is JFM. With support from the Ford Foundation and, more recently, from a variety of international donors, it has been promoted by NGOs (including the Society for Promotion of Wastelands Development), the Tata Energy Research Institute in New Delhi and has been presented as a national programme by the Government of India. In August 1994, 15 states had orders regarding the operation of programmes inspired by JFM (J. Campbell, pers. comm.).

JFM in India is well documented (for general discussions see Poffenberger, 1990; Campbell, 1992 and Campbell et al., 1994). Several publications are devoted to JFM, including a newsletter (Wastelands News, published by the Society for the Promotion of Wastelands Development), a Joint Forest Management Series (published by the Haryana Forest Department and the Tata Energy Research Institute) and a series of Joint Forest Management Working Papers (published by the National Support Group for Joint Forest Management). The main characteristics of JFM in India are:

- It generally deals with agreements between forest departments and local people about forest protection. In return for protecting the forest, people receive access to a range of non-timber forest products, along with any resulting income. While actual arrangements vary from state to state, in most areas agreements include arrangements for sharing any benefits of future commercial harvests with the forest department. The size of the share varies but averages around 25 per cent (see Campbell, 1992, for a table of benefits in various states). In practice, relatively little in the way of benefits has yet emerged

from these commercial harvests, probably because few forests have matured fully. Nevertheless, there have been significant financial benefits and income generation has been widely encouraged. Recorded examples of income generation include: bamboo for basket-making (Varalakshmi 1992); bhabbar and other grasses (Arora et al. 1993); and Pisciculture (Vijh et al. 1993).

- A considerable degree of control remains with the forest departments: tenure remains unambiguously vested in them.
- Emphasis is very much on development of wastelands rather than on managing healthy or moderately healthy forests.

The Philippines

In the Philippines a number of different approaches have developed under the broad tide of social forestry. Approximately two-thirds of the country is public forest land (Gibbs et al., 1990) and the issue of forest use by local peoples has been important. In 1982 an Integrated Social Forestry Programme (ISFP) was established.

According to Gibbs et al. (1990): "The ISFP's achievements include the creation of new land-use options designed to increase the tenure security of forest occupants, expansion of public land areas eligible for settled occupancy, the development of 'bottom-up' approaches to agro-forestry farm planning, and the development of an active research and programme-support group".

One of the tenure options that Gibbs et al, regard as particularly exciting is Communal Forest Stewardship Agreements (CFSA). These are leases issued to communities, including indigenous communities and some Islamic and migrant settlements. The leases indicate the boundaries of the relevant area (generally between one and four thousand hectares in

size), but leave up to the community the further division of the land into plots (for more detailed discussion of CFSA's see Cornista and Escueta, 1990).

Gibbs et al, 1990. The Growth of the Philippine Social Forestry Programme

The ISFP's achievements include the creation of new land-use options designed to increase the tenure security of forest occupants, expansion of public land areas eligible for settled occupancy, the development of "bottom-up" approaches to agro-forestry farm planning, and the development of an active research and programme-support group.

Cameroon

Cameroon has recently passed new forestry legislation that provides for community forestry. However, Nurse et al. (1994) comment that the government does not yet know how to implement the new law. Nurse et al. describe a "promising test case" for community forestry in Cameroon: a model that combines development with protection of a bird conservation area. Although only in its early stages, the Cameroon experience is an interesting initiative, which potentially allows active use of forests for grazing along with collection of various forest products.

Nurse et al. make the point that local people already do manage forests under an indigenous management system. The paper is mainly concerned with the process of investigation and negotiation involved in handing over a large area of Montane forest under the new forestry legislation. An interesting feature of this model is the apparent willingness of the government and forest authorities to treat as fundamental the claims of existing forest users. There is a suggestion that these claims are regarded as legitimate rather than grudgingly conceded.

Another aspect of note is the existence of large household and essentially separate user groups. It remains to be seen how effectively these diverse local interests can be accommodated.

Other regions

I have focused on collaborative forest management in a few selected locations. Although there is not the space here to present a detailed overview, it is important to note that various approaches to collaborative forest management have been tried in other regions.

There is a considerable interest in community forestry in Latin America. (See Perl et al., 1991 and Cabarle, 1991 for broad overviews; see also Poole, 1989, for a discussion of issues involving environmental partnerships in Latin America.) Perl et al. (1991) report on a workshop in which representatives of 14 pilot projects from seven different countries in Latin America met to discuss their activities.

There are several striking accounts of struggles by coalitions of local people and NGOs. These groups, supported by some politicians, have attempted to gain control of forest resources that are being exploited by large commercial interests. Examples of such conflicts are the cases of the Sierra Juárez in Mexico (Bray, 1991) and the Chimalapas, also in Mexico (Anonymous, 1993).

Collaborative forest management is also being tried in a number of European countries, including Scotland (Dudley, 1994), Italy (Merlo, 1995) and Portugal (Brouwer, 1995). The potential of traditional common property regimes is an important theme in the latter two countries.

Similarities and differences

Several of the participatory approaches to forest management discussed earlier (notably Nepal, India and the Philippines) seem to take as a starting point the idea that the ultimate title to the land in question remains with the government. There are different ways of providing access to land, however. In Nepal, a large degree of control of the forests can — according to the law, if not always in practice — be delegated to local user groups. In India, the approach is more a case of forest departments rewarding users for assistance in forest management, on land that unquestionably remains the property of the state. Users receive benefits in the form of forest products and, potentially, cash income from harvesting. In the Philippines, land is leased to rural people and substantial support services are provided. In Cameroon, the government seems to be recognising traditional usufruct rights and handing over forests to be managed by traditional users, while at the same time negotiating rules to conserve wildlife.

Each of these approaches represents some differences in the attitude of governments about who should have ultimate control. I would suggest that the crucial differences in the approaches lie not in actual tenure, but in such matters as:

- relative access to benefits;
- the extent to which local practices and traditional rights are part of the process — programmes that are strictly standardized are less able to achieve flexible agreements that meet local needs; and
- the extent to which a genuine local role in decision-making is encouraged and honored.

Examining different programmes suggests that there is no simple relationship between the presence of these characteristics and terms such as "social forestry", "community forestry" and "joint forest management". The terms do not clearly represent the different approaches, making it impossible to construct a typology of approaches to participatory forest management on the basis of them.

Some recent papers (Campbell and Denholm, 1993; Holey et al., 1994) have pointed out that India's JFM programs and Nepal's community forestry programme have not made much use of each other's experiences. At this point it may be worthwhile to identify some differences between the programmes in India and Nepal:

- Holey et al. argue that Nepal could learn from India in terms of emphasis on income generation. There has certainly been much greater emphasis on income generation in India on the part of various agencies. Malla (1992) shows that there is a great deal of economic activity based on forest products in some districts of Nepal, but that it is largely unrecognised in forest policy. Malla argues that the community forestry programme must recognise this activity and treat it as an integral part of community forestry. Current efforts to establish sawmills for user groups in at least one district may indicate a shift in this direction. In fairness, however, the Nepal programme has in many cases provided significant benefits in terms of the increased legal supply of forest products (including fuelwood and timber). In addition, cash income from sale of forest products does go to the user group.
- Community forestry policy in Nepal has gone much farther than in India to recognize the legitimacy of existing user groups and practices, and guidelines require forest department staff to try to increase this. In contrast, JFM in India generally requires new structures (often based on local government

organisations) to be set up for the purposes of management agreements. Forest use seems to be more of a concession than a right.

- Hopley et al. feel that, in India, the JFM approach provides an incentive for foresters to remain involved in villages. This is because the forest departments continue to receive a share of revenue (from timber harvest, not from non-timber forest products). They suggest such incentives may be lacking in Nepal. This may not be such an important difference, on the other hand, since the departments, not the foresters, receive the share of revenue.

Conservation potential

Collaborative approaches to forest management have clear advantages in their potential to provide benefits to local people in exchange for the costs of conservation. They accomplish this by providing continued access to forest products, or through income generation, or both. At the same time, they have the potential to contribute to conservation. Unlike traditional industrial forestry, which tends to focus on extensive harvesting for industrial cellulose (such as chips and timber), JFM and community forestry have often focused on production of non-timber forest products (NTFP), or on the selective harvesting of trees. These activities can often be compatible with biodiversity conservation. Conservation is frequently a goal of collaborative forest management projects, although environmental concerns have often been phrased in terms of soil conservation priorities rather than biodiversity. An awareness of the economic value of NTFPs or of selective harvesting of mixed forests can allow collaborative forest management to become more explicitly focused on conservation values while still allowing some forest use.

Clay (1988, 1992) has shown how income from NTFPs from the Amazon rainforests can provide economic benefits without threatening biological or cultural diversity. The Cameroon case study mentioned earlier also suggests possibilities for combining conservation values with more deliberate economic strategies involving forest use. There is no obvious reason why these lessons could not sometimes be applied to protected area management as well as outside protected areas. In fact, Mitchell et al. (1990) describe a social forestry project in the Cyclops Mountain Conservation Area of Irian Jaya which explicitly links conservation and forest use.

Bibliography

Note: This bibliography contains a fairly complete list of references consulted for the review. Not all items listed are referred to in the paper itself. The uncited references are provided because they may be of value in subsequent research.

Anonymous, (1993). *La Lucha Por Chimalapas. 1987- 1992: Una experiencia de concertacion. (The Struggle for Chimalapas/ 1987-1992: An experience in concertacion)*. Oaxaca: Espacios culturale de Innovación Tecnológica, S. C.; Instituto de la Naturaleza y la Sociedad de Oaxaca S. C; Optión, S. C. -Proyecto Social de Comunicación. (Limited circulation).

Argyris, C., R. Putnam and D. McLain Smith. (1981). *Action Science: Concepts, Methods and Skills for Research and Intervention*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Arnold, J. E. M. and J. Gabriel Campbell. (1986). *Collective Management of Hill Forests in Nepal: The Community Forestry Development Project*. In: *Proceedings of the Conference on Common Property Resource Management, April 21-26, 1985*. Washington, D.C: National Academy Press.

Arnstein, Sherry R. (1969). *A Ladder of Citizen Participation*. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, Vol. 35: pp. 216-224. Arora, Sham Sunder, Rohini Vijh and V. Varalakshmi. (1993). *Yield of bhabbar and grasses from the areas managed by HRMS and Ballarpur Paper Mill: A Comparative Analysis*. Joint Forest Management Series, 5. New Delhi: Haryana Forest Department and Tata Energy Resource Institute.

- Bray, David Barton (1991). The Struggle for the Forest: Conservation and Development in the Sierra Juárez. *Grassroots Development* (Journal of the Inter-American Foundation), Vol. 15 (3): pp. 13-25.
- Brouwer, R. (1995). Baldios and Common Property Resource Management in Portugal. *Unasyuva No* 180 (Vol. 46): pp. 37-43.
- Brownrigg, Leslie A. (1985). Native Cultures and Protected Area: Management Options. In: Jeffrey A. McNeely and David Pitt (eds). *Culture and Conservation: The Human Dimension in Environmental Planning*, pp. 33-44. London and Dover, New Hampshire: Croom Helm.
- Budowski, Gerardo. (1994). Tropical Forest Conservation in Central America. Paper prepared for Biological Diversity Outside Protected Areas: Overview of Traditional Agroecosystems. Workshop held at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, April 1994. (Forest Conservation Programmes, IUCN, Gland Switzerland.)
- Bunting, Bruce W., Mingma Norbu Sherpa and Michael Wright. (1991). Annapurna Conservation Area: Nepal's New Approach to Protected Area Management. In: Patrick C.
- West and Steven R. Brechin (eds). *Resident Peoples and Protected Areas: Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation*, pp. 160-172. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Cabarle, Bruce J. (1991). Community Forestry and the Social Ecology of Development. *Grassroots Development* (Journal of the Inter-American Foundation), Vol. 15 (3): pp. 3-9.
- Calhoun, John B. (1991). Plight of the Ik. In: Patrick C. West and Steven R. Brechin (eds). *Resident Peoples and Protected Areas: Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation*, pp. 55-60. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Campbell, Andrew. (1994). Community First: Landcare in Australia. Gatekeeper Series No 42. London: International Institution for Environment and Development.
- Campbell, J. Gabriel and Jeannette Denholm. (1993). *Inspirations in Community Forestry: Report of the Seminar on Himachyan Community Forestry, Kathmandu, Nepal, June 1-4, 1992*. Kathmandu: ICIMOD.
- Campbell, Jeffrey Y. (1992). *Joint Forest Management in India*. *Social Change*, Vol. 22 (1): pp. 36-54.
- Campbell, Jeffrey Y., Subhabrata Palit and Shree Bhagwan Roy. (1994). Putting Research Partnerships to Work: The Joint Forest Management Research Network in India. Paper prepared for the Fifth International Symposium on Society and Resource Management, June 7-10, 1994, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Carew-Reid, Jeremy. (1990). Conservation and Protected Areas on South-Pacific Islands: The Importance of Tradition. *Environmental Conservation*, Vol. 17 (1): pp. 29-38.
- Carew-Reid, J., R. Prescott-Allen, S. Bass and D. B. Dalal-Clayton. (1994). *Strategies for National Sustainable Development: A Handbook for Their Planning and Implementation*. London and Gland, Switzerland: IIED and IUCN.
- Carruthers, I and R. Chambers. (1981). *Rapid Appraisal for Rural Development*. *Agricultural Administration*, Vol. 8: pp. 407-422.
- Caulfield, R. A. (1993). Greenlanders, Whales and Whaling: Conflict and Marginalisation in an Arctic Resource Regime. PhD Thesis, University of East Anglia.
- Cernea, M. (1988). Alternative Social Forestry Development Strategies. In: J. Ives and D. C. Pitt (eds). *Deforestation: Social Dynamics in Watersheds and Mountain Ecosystems*. London and New York: Routledge.
- CIIFAD. (1992). *Sustainable Development and Biodiversity: Conflicts and Complementarities. Proceedings from a Symposium at Cornell University Ithaca, NY September 19-22, 1991*. Cornell, Ithaca: CIIFAD.
- Clad, James C. (1985). Conservation and Indigenous Peoples: A Study of Convergent Interests. *Culture and Conservation: The Human Dimension in Environmental Planning*, pp. 45-62. London and Dover, New Hampshire: Croom Helm.

- Clay, Jason W. (1985). Parks and People. *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, 9: pp. 2-5. Clay, Jason W. (1988). *Indigenous Peoples and Tropical Forests: Models of Land Use and Management from Latin America*. Cultural Survival Report 27. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cultural Survival, Inc.
- Clay, Jason W. (1992). Report on Funding and Investment Opportunities for Income Generating Activities that Could Complement Strategies to Halt Environmental Degradation in the Greater Amazon Basin. Report prepared for The Biodiversity Support Programme, the World Wildlife Fund, the Nature Conservancy, WRI/Center for International Development and Environment. (18 February 1992.)
- Cornista, Luzviminda B. and Eva F. Escueta. (1990). Communal Forest Leases as a Tenurial Option in the Philippine Uplands. In: Mark Poffenberger (ed.). *Keepers of the Forest: Land Management Alternatives in Southeast Asia*, pp. 134-144.
- Dani, Anis A. (1988). Peripheral Societies in a Nation-State: A Comparative Analysis of Mediating Structures in Development Processes. Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania.
- Dani, Anis A. and J. Gabriel Campbell. (1986). *Sustaining Upland Resources: People's Participation in Upland Management*. ICIMOD Occasional Paper No 3. Kathmandu: International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development.
- Dasmann, Raymond F. (1984). The Relation-ship Between Protected Areas and Indigenous Peoples. In: Jeffrey A. McNeely and Kenton R. Miller (eds). *National Parks Conservation and Development: The Role of Protected Areas in Sustaining Society*, pp. 667-671. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institute Press.
- Dudley, Nigel. (1994). Putting People Back Into Forests. Report produced for the Forests and People in Rural Areas Initiative: Scotland. October 1994.
- East, Ken M. (1991). Joint Management of Canada's Northern National Parks. In: Patrick C. West and Steven R. Brechin (eds). *Resident Peoples and Protected Areas: Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation*, pp. 333-345. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Emadi, Mohammad H., R. J. Fisher and Robert Woog. (1992). Action Research as an Approach to research and Development Among Iranian Nomads. Paper prepared for International Conference Nomadism and Development: Survival Strategies and Development Policies, Share-Kord, Iran 1-6 September 1992.
- Erickson, David L. (1976). Public Involvement in Natural Resource Planning and Decision-Making: A Select Bibliography. Monticello, Ill.: Council of Planning Librarians.
- Ewel, Jack. (1992). Conservation and Agriculture: A Commentary. In: CIIFAD (ed.). *Sustainable Development and Biodiversity: Conflicts and Complementarities. Proceedings from a symposium at Cornell University, Ithaca, NY September 19-22, 1991*, p vii. Cornell, Ithaca: CIIFAD.
- Falanruw, Marjorie V. C. (1984). People Pressure and Management of Limited Re-sources on Yap. In: Jeffrey A. McNeely and Kenton R. Miller (eds). *National Parks Conservation and Development: The Role of protected Areas in Sustaining Society*, pp. 348-354. Washington D. C.: Smithsonian Institute Press.
- FAO. (1978). *Forestry for Local Community Development*. FAO Forestry Paper No. 7. Rome: Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations.
- Fearnside, Philip M. (1989). Extractive Reserves in Brazilian Amazonia. *Bioscience* Vol. 39 (6): pp. 387-393.
- Fisher, Larry, Vance Russell and Tahnee Robertson. (1994). Sustaining Conservation in Protected Areas: Strategies for Managing Conflict. Paper prepared for the Northern Arizona University 1994 Graduate Student Interdisciplinary Symposium Exploring the Challenges of Conflict: Issues and Alternatives in the 20th Century, Flagstaff, Arizona, 4-5 November 1994.
- Fisher, R. J. (1989). Indigenous Systems of Common Property Forest Management in Nepal. Honolulu: Environment and Policy Institute, East-West Center, Working Paper No. 18.
- Fisher, R. J. (1990). Institutional Incompatibility in Community Forestry: The Case of Nepal. In: Jefferson Fox and R. J. Fisher (eds). *Community Organizations and Government Bureaucracies in Social Forestry*. pp. 11-26. Honolulu: Environment and Policy Institute, East-West Center, Working Paper No. 22.

Fisher, R. J. (1991a). Studying Indigenous Forest Management Systems in Nepal: Toward a More Systematic Approach. Honolulu: Environment and Policy Institute, East-West

Center, Working Paper No. 30.

Fisher, R. J. (1991 b). Local Organizations in Community Forestry. In: Cor Veer and Jim Chamberlain (eds). *Local Organizations in Community Forestry Extension In Nepal*. Bangkok: Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations.

Fisher, R. J. (1993a). *An Annotated Bibliography on Common Property Forest Management, With Special Reference to Nepal*. IOF Project Discussion Paper DP93/1. Pokhara, Nepal: Institute of Forestry Project.

Fisher, R. J. (1993b). Creating Space: Development Agencies and Local Institutions in Natural resource Management. *Forests, Trees and People Newsletter, No 22*: pp. 4-11.

Fisher, R. J. (1994). Indigenous Forest Management in Nepal: Why Common Property is Not a Problem. In: Michael Allen (ed.). *Anthropology of Nepal: People, Problem and Processes*. Kathmandu: Mandala Book Point.

Fisher, R. J., Hukum Bahadur Singh, Deepak Raj Pandey and Helmut Lang. (1989). *The Management of Forest Resources in Rural Development: A Case Study of Sindhu Palchok and Kabhre Palanchok Districts of Nepal*. Discussion Paper No 1, Mountain Populations and Institutions. Kathmandu: ICIMOD

Fox, Jefferson. (1990). Diagnostic Tools for Social Forestry. In: Mark Poffenberger (ed.). *Keepers of the Forest: Land Management Alternatives in Southeast Asia*, pp. 119-133. Geisler, Charles C. (1993). Rethinking SIA: Why Ex Ante Research Isn't Enough. *Society and Natural Resources*, Vol. 6: pp. 327-338.

Geisler, Charles and Susan Kittel. (1994). Who Owns the Ecosystem? Property Dimensions of Ecosystem Management. Paper prepared for Institutional Problems Analysis Workshop, 20-22 October 1994, Skamania Lodge, Oregon. (Co-sponsored by the US Forest Service and the Consortium for Social Values of Natural Resources).

Gibbs, Christopher, Edwin Payuan and Romulo Castillo. (1990). The Growth of the Philippine Social Forestry Programme. In: Mark Poffenberger (ed.). *Keepers of the Forest: Land Management Alternatives in Southeast Asia*, pp. 253-265. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Gilmour, D. A. (1994). Conservation and Development: Seeking the Linkages. Paper Prepared for Community Development and Conservation of Forest Biodiversity through Community Forestry, Regional Community Forestry Training Center, Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand, October 26-28, 1994.

Gilmour, D. A. and R. J. Fisher. (1991). *Villagers, Forests and Foresters: The Philosophy, Process and Practice of Community Forestry in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Sahayogi Press.

Glick, Dennis and Jorge Orejuela. (1991). La Planada: Looking Beyond the Boundaries. In: Patrick C. West and Steven R. Brechin (eds). *Resident Peoples and Protected Areas: Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation*, pp. 150-159. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Goodland, Robert. (1985). Tribal Peoples and Economic Development: The Human Ecological Dimension. In: Jeffrey A. McNeely and David Pitt (eds). *Culture and Conservation: The Human Dimension in Environmental Planning*, pp. 13-31. London and Dover, New Hamp-shire: Croom Helm.

Gronow, Jane and Narayan Kaji Shrestha. (1990). From Policing to Participation: Reorientation of Forest Department Field Staff in Nepal. Policy Analysis in Agriculture and Related Resource Management, Research Report Series No. 11. Kathmandu: HMG Ministry of Agriculture/Winrock International.

Harmon, David. (1991). National Park Residency in Developed Countries: The Example of Great Britain. In: Patrick C. West and Steven R. Brechin (eds). *Resident Peoples and Protected Areas: Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation*, pp. 33-39. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Häusler, Sabine. (1993). Community Forestry: A Critical Assessment. The Case of Nepal. *The Ecologist*, Vol. 23 (3): 84-90.

Hill, M. A, and A. J. Press. (1994). Kakadu National Park: An Australian Experience in Co-management. In:

David Western and R. Michael Wright (eds). *Natural Connections: Perspectives in Community-based Conservation*, pp. 135-157. Washington, D.C., Covelo, CA: Island Press.

Hladik, C. M., A. Hladik, O. F. Linares, H. Pagezy, A. Semple and M. Hadley (eds). (1993). *Tropical Forests, People and Food: Bio-cultural Interactions and Applications to Development*, Man and Biosphere Series, Vol. 13. UNESCO, Paris and The Parthenon Publishing Company, Carnforth, Lancashire and Pearl River, N.Y.

Hobley, Mary. (1987). *Involving the Poor in Forest Management: Can it be Done? The Nepal-Australia Project Experience*. ODI Social Forestry Network Paper, No 5c.

Hobley, M., J. Y. Campbell and A. Bhatia. (1994). *Community Forestry in India and Nepal: Learning from Each Other*. In: D. N. Tewari (ed.). *Community Forestry in India and Nepal: Sharing Experiences in Himalayan Ecosystems*. Dehra Dun: Indian Book Distributors.

Hough, John. (1991). *Grand Canyon National Park and the Havasupai People: Cooperation and Conflict*. In: Patrick C. West and Steven R. Brechin (eds). *Resident Peoples and Protected Areas: Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation*, pp. 215-230. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Ingles, Andrew W. (1994a). *Conserving the Biological Diversity of Nepal's Forests: Some Opportunities Provided by Community Forestry*. Paper prepared for Biological Diversity Outside Protected Areas: Overview of Traditional Agroecosystems. Workshop held at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, April 1994. (Forest Conservation Programmes, IUCN, Gland Switzerland.)

Ingles, Andrew W. (1994b). *The Influence of Religious Beliefs and Rituals on Forest Conservation in Nepal*. Paper prepared for Biological Diversity Outside Protected Areas: Overview of Traditional Agroecosystems. Workshop held at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, April 1994. (Forest Conservation Programmes, IUCN, Gland Switzerland.)

IUCN (1986). *Managing Protected Areas in the Tropics*. Gland, Switzerland: International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.

IUCN/UNEP/WWF (1980). *World Conservation Strategy*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN, UNEP, WWF.

IUCN/UNEP/WWF (1991). *Caring for the Earth: A Strategy for Sustainable Living*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN, UNEP, WWF.

Jackson, Cecile. (1993). *Environmentalisms and Gender Interests in the Third World*. *Development and Change*, Vol. 24: pp. 649-677.

Jamieson, N. (ed.). (1991). *Wood Fuel Flows: Rapid Appraisal in Four Asian Countries*. Bangkok: FAO Forests, Trees and People Publications.

Jeffries, Bruce E. (1984). *The Sherpas of Sagarmatha: The Effects of a National Park on the Local People*. In: Jeffrey A. McNeely and Kenton R. Miller (eds). *National Parks Conservation and Development: The Role of Protected Areas in Sustaining Society*, pp. 473-478. Washington D. C.: Smithsonian Institute Press.

Jodha, N. S. (1990). *Rural Common Property Resources: Contributions and Crisis*. *Economic and Political Weekly*, June 30, 1990: A-65-78.

Johannes, R. E. (1984). *Traditional Conservation Methods and Protected Marine Areas in Oceania*. In: Jeffrey A. McNeely and Kenton R. Miller (eds). *National Parks Conservation and Development: The Role of Protected Areas in Sustaining Society*, pp. 344-347. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institute Press.

Kajembe, George C. (1994). *Indigenous Management Systems as a Basis for Community Forestry in Tanzania: A Case Study of Dodoma Urban and Lushoto Districts*. Wageningen: Wageningen Agricultural University, Tropical Resource Management Papers, No. 6.

Kaul, O.N. (ed.). (1993). *Joint Forest Management in Haryana: Workshop Series*. Joint Forest Management Series, 15. New Delhi: Haryana Forest Department and Tata Energy Research Institute.

Korten, David C. (1984). *Rural Development Programming: The Learning Process Approach*. In: David C. Korten and Rudi Klaus (eds). *People-Centred Development: Contributions Towards Theory and Planning*

Frameworks. West Hartford: Kumarian Press.

Kutay, Kurt. (1991). Cahuita National Park, Costa Rica: A Case Study in Living Cultures and National Park Management. In: Patrick C. West and Steven R. Brechin (eds). *Resident Peoples and Protected Areas: Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation*, pp. 114-129. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Lerner, Sally (ed.). (1993). *Environmental Stewardship: Studies in Active Earthkeeping*. Department of Geography Publication Series, 39. Waterloo, Ontario: Department of Geography, University of Waterloo.

Leslie, A. J. (1987). Foreword. In: J. Westoby *The Purpose of Forests - Follies of Development*. pp. vii-xiii. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Liliehalm, Robert J. and Jeff Romm. (1992). Pinelands National Reserve: An Intergovernmental Approach to Nature Conservation. *Environmental Management*, Vol. 16 (3): pp. 335-343.

Liroff, Richard. A. and G. Gordon Davis. (1981). *Protecting Open Space: Land Use Control in the Adirondack Park*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.

Little, Peter D. (1994). The Link Between Local Participation and Improved Conservation: A Review of Issues and Experiences. In: David Western and R. Michael Wright (eds). *Natural Connections: Perspectives in Community-based Conservation*, pp. 347-372. Washington D.C., Covelo, CA: Island Press.

McIvor, Chris. (1994). Management of Wildlife, Tourism and Local Communities in Zimbabwe. Discussion Paper No. 53. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD).

McNeely, Jeffrey A. (1988). *Economics and biological diversity: developing and using economic incentives to conserve biological resources*. Gland: IUCN.

McNeely, Jeffrey A. (1994a). Forestry in the 21st Century: Environmental Priorities for Sustainability. Paper presented to Symposium on Educating the 21st Century Forester, Association of University Forestry Schools of Canada, Quebec City, Canada, 11-12 May 1994.

McNeely, Jeffrey A. (1994b). Conserving Biodiversity Outside Protected Areas: How Traditional Agro-Ecosystems Can Contribute. Paper prepared for Biological Diversity Outside Protected Areas: Overview of Traditional Agro-ecosystems. Workshop held at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, April 1994. (Forest Conservation Programme, IUCN, Gland Switzerland.)

McNeely, Jeffrey A. and Kenton R. Miller (eds). (1984). *National Parks Conservation and Development: the role of protected areas in sustaining society*. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institute Press.

McNeely, Jeffrey A. and David Pitt (eds). (1985). *Culture and Conservation: The Human Dimension in Environmental Planning*. London and Dover N.H.: Croon Helm.

Malla, Y. B. (1992). The Changing Role of the Forest Resource in the Hills of Nepal. Ph.D. Thesis. Canberra: Australian National University.

Merlo, M. (1995). Common Property Forest Management in Northern Italy: A Historical and Socio-Economic Profile. *Unasylva* 180 (Vol. 46): pp. 58-63.

Messerschmidt, Donald A. (1986a). People and Resources in Nepal: Customary Resource Management Systems of the Upper Kali Gandaki. In: Panel on Common Property Resource Management (eds). *Common Property Resource Management*. Washington D.C: National Academy Press.

Messerschmidt, Donald A. (1986b). 'Go to the People': Local Planning for Natural resource Development in Nepal. *Practising Anthropology* vol. 7 (4): pp. 12-15.

Messerschmidt, Donald A. (1987). Conservation and Society in Nepal: Traditional Forest Management and Innovative Development. In: Peter D. Little and Michael M. Horowitz (eds). with A. Endre Nyerges. *Lands at Risk in the Third World: Local Level Perspectives*. pp. 373-397. Boulder, Colorado: Westview.

Messerschmidt, Donald A. (1991). *Rapid Appraisal for Community Forestry The RA Process and Rapid*

Diagnostic Tools. IOF Project Discussion Paper Series DP 91/2. Pokhara, Nepal: Institute of Forestry Project.

Metcalf, Simon. (1994). The Zimbabwe Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE). In: David Western and R. Michael Wright (eds). *Natural Connections: Perspectives in Community-based Conservation*, pp. 161-192. Washington, D.C., Covelo, CA: Island Press.

Michon, Genevieve and Hubert de Foresta. (1994). Forest Resource Management and Biodiversity Conservation: The Indonesian Agroforest Model. Paper prepared for Biological Diversity Outside Protected Areas: Over-view of Traditional Agroecosystems. Workshop held at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, April 1994. (Forest Conservation Programme, IUCN, Gland Switzerland.)

Mitchell, Arthur, Yance de Fretes and Mark Poffenberger. (1990). Community Mountain for Conservation Area Management in the Cyclops Mountains, Irian Jaya, Indonesia. In: Mark Poffenberger (ed.). *Keepers of the Forest: Land Management Alternatives in Southeast Asia*, pp. 237-252. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Mitchell, Joan. (1987). Planning at Canyon de Chelly National Monument. *Cultural and Resource Management Bulletin* (US National Park Service), February 1987.

Molnar, Augusta and Gotz Schreiber. (1989). Women and Forestry: Operational Issues. Policy, Planning, and Research Working Papers, Women in Development. Washington: Population and Human Resources Department, The World Bank.

Momberg, Frank, Dolvina Damus, Godwin Limberg and Samuel S. T. Padan. (1994). *Participatory Tools for Community-Forest Profiling and Zonation of Conservation Areas: Experiences from the Kayan Mentarang Nature Reserve, East Kalimantan, Indonesia*. WWF Indonesia Programme - Kayan Mentarang Project (PHPA-WWF-LIPI).

Morgan, Joseph R. (1986). Watersheds in Hawaii: An Historical Example of Integrated Management. In: K. William Easter, John A. Dixon and Maynard M. Hufschmidt (eds). *Watershed Resources Management: An Integrated Framework with Studies from Asia and the Pacific*. Studies in Water Policy and Management, No. 10. Boulder and London: Westview Press.

Murphree, Marshall W. (1993). Communities as Resource Management Institutions. Gatekeeper Series No 36. London: International Institute for Environment and Development.

Narain, Urvashi (1994). Women's Involvement in Joint Forest Management: Analysing the Issues. Paper prepared for the Ford Foundation Joint Forest Management Working Paper Series, May 6, 1994.

Newby, John E. and John F. Grettenberger. (1986). The Human Dimension in Natural Resource Conservation: A Sahelian Example from Niger. *Environmental Conservation*, Vol. 13 (3): pp. 249-256.

Nguyen Xuan Quat. (1994). Home-garden systems in Vietnam. Paper prepared for Biodiversity Outside Protected Areas: Overview of Traditional Agroecosystems. Workshop held at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, April 1994. (Forest Conservation Programme, IUCN, Gland Switzerland.)

Nowicki, P. (1985). Cultural Ecology and 'Management' of Natural resources or Knowing When Not to Meddle. *Culture and Conservation: The Human Dimension in Environmental Planning*, pp. 269-282. London and Dover, New Hampshire: Croom Helm.

Nurse, M. C., C. R. McKay, J. B. Young and C. A. Asanga. (1994). Biodiversity Conservation Through Community Forestry, in the Montane Forests of Cameroon. Paper presented at the Birdlife International XXI World Conference: Global Partnership for Bird Conservation. Rosenheim, Germany. 12-18 August 1994.

Palit, Subhabrata. (1993). The Future of Indian Forest Management: Into the Twenty-First Century. Joint Forest Management Working Paper No 15. New Delhi: National Support Group for Joint Forest Management, Society for Promotion of Wastelands Development and The Ford Foundation.

Panda, Abhash; Manoj Dabas, V. Varalakshmi; V. N. Shah and J. R. Gupta. (1992). Grass Yield Under Community Participation in Haryana Shivaliks. Joint Forest Management Series, 1. New Delhi: Haryana Forest Department and Tata Research Institute

Panda, Abhash, V. Varalakshmi, J. R. Gupta, Bakhshish Singh and Manoj Dabas. (1992). Impact of Participatory Forest Management on the Ecology of Shivalik Hills in Haryana State. Joint Forest Management Series, 2. New Delhi: Haryana Forest Department and Tata Energy Research Institute.

Pathan, R. S., N. J. Arul and M. Poffenberger. (n.d.) Forest Protection Committees in Gujarat: Joint Management Initiative. New Delhi: Ford Foundation. Sustainable Forest Management, Working Paper Series No 7.

Pearl, Mary C. (1994). Local initiatives and the rewards for biodiversity conservation: Crater Mountain Wildlife Management Area, Papua New Guinea. In: David Western and R. Michael Wright (eds). *Natural Connections: Perspectives in Community-based Conservation*: pp. 193-214. Washington, D.C., Covelo CA : Island Press.

Peluso, Nancy C. (1992). *Rich Forests, Poor People: Resource Control and Resistance in Java*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Peluso, Nancy Lee; Mark Poffenberger and Frances Seymour. (1990). Reorienting Forest Management on Java. In: Mark Poffenberger (ed.). *Keepers of the Forest: Land Management Alternatives in Southeast Asia*, pp. 220-236. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Perl, Matthew A.; Michael J. Kiernan; Dennis McCaffery; Robert J. Buschbacher and Garo J. Batmanian. (1991). Views from the Forest: Natural Forest Management Initiatives in Latin America. Report on a workshop held December 3-7, 1990. World Wildlife Fund.

Pimbert, Michel C. and Jules M. Pretty. (1994). Participation, People and the Management of National Parks and Protected Areas: Past Failures and Future Promise. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, International Institute for Environment and Development, World Wide Fund for Nature. Draft Discussion Paper (April 1994).

Pineda, Francisco D. and Javier Montalvo. (1994). Biological diversity in the traditional systems of land use: Dehesa systems in Western Mediterranean. Paper prepared for Biodiversity Outside Protected Areas: Overview of Traditional Agro-ecosystems. Workshop held at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, April 1994. (Forest Conservation Programme, IUCN, Gland Switzerland.)

Pinkerton, Evelyn. (1989). Cooperative Management of Local Fisheries: New Directions for Improved Management and Community Development. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Pleumarom, Anita (1994). The Political Economy of Tourism. *The Ecologist*, Vol. 24 (4): pp. 142-148.

Poffenberger, Mark (1990a). *Joint Management for Forest Lands: Experiences from South Asia*. A Ford Foundation Policy Statement. New Delhi.

Poffenberger, Mark (ed.). (1990b). *Keepers of the Forest: Land Management Alternatives in South-east Asia*. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Poffenberger, Mark, Betsy McGean, Arvind Khare and Jeff Campbell (eds). (1992). *Joint Forest Management Field Methods Manual* Vol. 2: Community Forest Economy and Use Patterns: Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) Methods in South Gujarat, India. New Delhi: Society for Promotion of Wasteland Development.

Poffenberger, Mark, Betsy McGean, N.H. Ravindranath and Madhav Gadgil (eds). (1992). *Joint Forest Management Field Methods Manual* Vol. 1: Diagnostic tools for Supporting Joint Forest Management. New Delhi: Society for Promotion of Wasteland Development.

Poole, Peter (1989). Developing a Partnership of Indigenous Peoples, Conservationists, and Land Use Planners in Latin America. Policy, Planning, and Research Papers Working Papers (Environment). Washington D.C: The World Bank.

Pragtong, Kamon and David E. Thomas (1990). Evolving Management Systems in Thailand. In: Mark Poffenberger (ed.). *Keepers of the Forest: Land Management Alternatives in Southeast Asia*, pp. 167-186. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Pye-Smith, Charlie and Grazia Borrini Feyerabend with Richard Sandbrook. (1994). *The Wealth of Communities: Stories of Success in Local Environmental Management*. West Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian

Press.

Raju, G. (1994). JFM Orders: A Critique from the Field. *Wasteland News*, Vol. 9 (2): pp. 65-68.

Rao, K. and C. Geisler. (1990). The Social Consequences of Protected Areas Development for Resident Populations. *Society and Natural Resources*, Vol. 3: pp. 19-32.

Raval, Shishir R. (1991). The Gir National Park and the Maldharis: Beyond 'Setting Aside'. In: Patrick C. West and Steven R. Brechin (eds). *Resident Peoples and Protected Areas: Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation*, pp. 68-86. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Redford, Kent H. and Allyn M. Stearman (1989). Local Peoples and the Beni Biosphere Reserve, Bolivia. *Vida Sylvestre Neotropical*, Vol. 2 (1): pp. 49-56.

Robinson, David W. (1994). Reappraising Adventure Tourism Impacts in Sagarmatha (Everest) National Park, Nepal: Lessons for Alternative Tourism. Paper prepared for The Fifth International Symposium on Society and Resource Management, Fort Collins, Colorado, June 7-10, 1994.

Ruddle, Kenneth and R. E. Johannes. (1983). The Traditional Knowledge and Management of Coastal Systems in Asia and the Pacific. Papers presented at a UNESCO-ROSTSEA regional seminar held at the UNESCO Regional Office for Science and Technology for Southeast Asia, 5-9 December, 1983. Jakarta: UNESCO.

Rural Advancement Foundation International. (1994). *Conserving Indigenous Knowledge: Integrating Two Systems of Innovation*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.

Sarin, Madhu. (1993). From Conflict to Collaboration: Local Institutions in Joint Forest Management. Joint Forest Management Working Paper No. 14. New Delhi: National Support Group for Joint Forest Management, Society for Promotion of Wastelands Development and the Ford Foundation.

Sarin, Madhu. (1994). Regenerating India's Forests: Reconciling Gender Equity with Joint Forest Management. Paper prepared for the International Workshop on India's Forest Management and Ecological Revival: New Delhi, 10-12 February 1994.

Savory, Allan C. (1988). *Holistic Resource Management*. Washington, D.C: Island Press.

Schelhas, John and Russell Greenberg (1993). *Forest Patches in the Tropical Landscape and the Conservation of Migratory Birds*. Washington D.C: Smithsonian Migratory Bird Center, National Zoological Park.

Scherl, Lea M., David S. Cassells and Donald A. Gilmour. (1994). Pluralistic Planning: Creating Room for Community Action in the Management of the Global Environment. Paper prepared for The Fifth International Symposium on Society and Resource Management, Fort Collins, Colorado, June 7-10, 1994.

Schoepf, B.G. (1983). Unintended Consequences and Structural Predictability: Man and Biosphere in Zaire's Lufira Valley. *Human Organization*, 42: pp. 361-67.

Seymour, Frances J. (1994). Are Successful Community Based Conservation Projects Designed or Discovered? In: David Western and R. Michael Wright (eds). *Natural Connections: Perspectives in Community-based Conservation*, pp. 472-496. Washington D.C., Covelo CA: Island Press.

Shimizu, T. (1994). Community Forestry in the Annapurna Conservation Area Project (ACAP), Nepal; Comparative Study of a Sponsored Forest Management System and an Indigenous Forest Management System. M.Sc. thesis, Department of Forestry, Wageningen Agricultural University, The Netherlands.

Singh, Bakhshish, Sham Sunder Arora and J. R. Gupta. (1993). Management of Bamboo Forest under Joint Participatory Forest Management in Haryana Shivaliks. Joint Forest Management Series, 6. New Delhi: Haryana Forest Department and Tata Energy Research Institute.

Society for Promotion of Wastelands Development (1992). *Joint Forest Management: Concept and Opportunities*. Proceedings of the National Workshop at Surajkund, August (1992). New Delhi: Society for Promotion of Wastelands Development.

- Society for Promotion of Wastelands Development. (1993). *Joint Forest Management Update 1993*. New Delhi: Society for Promotion of Wastelands Development.
- Stern, Melissa, John Schelhas, Walter Hartwig (1993). *Forest Remnants Project Directory*. Washington D.C: Smithsonian Migratory Bird Center, National Zoological Park. (Mimeo)
- Stevens, Stanley F. (1993). *Chiming the High Ground: Sherpas, Subsistence, and Environmental Change in the Highest Himalaya*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford: University of California Press.
- Tamang, Devika (1990). Indigenous Forest Management Systems in Nepal: A Review. Policy Analysis in Agriculture and Related Resource Management, Research Report Series No. 12. Kathmandu: HMG Ministry of Agriculture-Winrock International.
- Turnbull, Colin M. (1972). *The Mountain People*. New York: Simon and Schuster. Uphoff, Norman (1986). *Local Institutional Development: An Analytic Sourcebook With*
- Cases. West Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian Press.
- Uphoff, Norman (1992a). Local Institutions and Participation for Sustainable Development. Gatekeeper Series No 31. London: International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Uphoff, Norman (1992b). *Learning from Gal Oya: Possibilities for Participatory Development and Post-Newtonian Social Science*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Uphoff, Norman (1994). Report on Integrated Watershed Analysis and Management Work-shop, Dominican Republic Practicum, October 8-15, 1994. Unpublished Trip Report. Ithaca New York: Cornell University.
- Varalakshmi, V. (1992). Economics of Bam-boo Basket Making: A Case Study. Joint Forest Management Series, 3. New Delhi: Haryana Forest Department and Tata Energy Research Institute.
- Varalakshmi, V., Rohini Vijn and Sham Sunder Arora. (1993). Constraints in the Implementation of Joint Participatory Management Programme: Some Lessons From Haryana. Joint Management Series, 12. New Delhi: Haryana Forest Department and Tata Energy Research Institute.
- Vijn, Rohini, Sham Sunder Arora and V. Varalakshmi. (1993). Pisciculture under Joint Participatory Forest Management Programme in Haryana. Joint Forest Management Series, 10. New Delhi: Haryana Forest Department and Tata Energy Research Institute.
- Watts, Joe, Penny Scott and Jackson Mutebi. n.d. Assessing and Monitoring the Forest Towards Joint Management of Multiple Use in National Parks in Uganda. A Case Study for RDFN Study Guide 4. Rural development Forestry Network, Overseas Development Institute, U.K.
- Weaver, Sally M. (1991). The Role of Aborigines in the Management of Australia's Coburg (Gurig) and Kakadu National Parks. In: Patrick C. West and Steven R. Brechin (eds). *Resident Peoples and Protected Areas: Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation*, pp. 311-333. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Weber, M. (1964). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. (Translated by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. Edited with an Introduction by Talcott Parsons.) New York: The Free Press.
- Weber, Will (1991). Enduring Peaks and Changing Cultures: The Sherpas and Sagarmatha (Mount Everest) National Park. In: Patrick C. West and Steven R. Brechin (eds). *Resident Peoples and Protected Areas: Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation*, pp. 206-214. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Wellings, Peter (1994). Biodiversity Conservation and Community Development in Kakadu National Park, Australia. Paper prepared for Regional Seminar on Community Development and Conservation of Forest Biodiversity Through Community Forestry, October 26-28, 1994., Bangkok. Sponsored by AIDAB, DANCED, UNEP and RECOFTC.
- Wells, Michael P. (1994). Community-Based Forestry and Biodiversity Projects Have Promised More Than They Have Delivered: Why is This and What Can Be Done? Paper for the International Symposium on Rain Forest Management In Asia. Centre for Development and the Environment, University of Oslo. March 23-26,

1994.

Wells, Michael, Katrina Brandon with Lee Hannah. (1992). *People and Parks: Linking Protected Area Management with Local Communities*. Washington, D.C: World Bank, World Wildlife Fund, US Agency for International Development.

West, Patrick C. and Steven R. Brechin (eds). (1991). *Resident Peoples and Protected Areas: Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Western, David. (1984). Amboseli National Park: Human Values and the Conservation of a Savanna Ecosystem. In: Jeffrey A. McNeely and Kenton R. Miller (eds). *National Parks Conservation and Development: The Role of Protected Areas in Sustaining Society*, pp. 93-100. Washington D.C: Smithsonian Institute Press.

Western, David (1994). Ecosystem Conservation and Rural Development: The Case of Amboseli. In: David Western and R. Michael Wright (eds). *Natural Connections: Perspectives in Community-based Conservation*, pp. 15-52. Washington D.C., Covelo CA: Island Press.

Western, David and R. Michael Wright (eds)., Shirley Strum (associate ed.). (1994). *Natural Connections: Perspectives in Community-based Conservation*. Washington D.C., Covelo CA: Island Press.

Wickramasinghe, Anoja (1994). The Evolution of Kandyan Home-gardens: An indigenous strategy for conservation of biodiversity in Sri Lanka. Paper prepared for Biodiversity Outside Protected Areas: Overview of Traditional Agroecosystems. Workshop held at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, April 1994. (Forest Conservation Programme, IUCN, Gland Switzerland.)

WWF Canada (1993). *Protected Areas and Aboriginal Interests in Canada*. A World Wildlife Fund Canada Discussion Paper. Toronto: World Wildlife Fund Canada. WWF Malaysia (1992). *Sabah Conservation Strategy*. A Report Submitted to the Ministry of Tourism and Environmental Development by World Wide Fund for Nature, Malaysia. (2 Vols. Vol. 1: Background and Analysis. Vol. 2: Action Plan.)

Zerner, Charles (1994). Transforming customary law and coastal management practices in the Malaku Islands, Indonesia, 1870-1992. In: David Western and R. Michael Wright (eds). *Natural Connections: Perspectives in Community- based Conservation*, pp. 80-112. Washing-ton D.C., Covelo CA: Island Press.

Suggestions for training sessions in sustainable forest management CBD Programme of Work on forest biodiversity References Contents of the CD. ii. 1 3 5 7 9. 13 17 19 21 23 25 27 29 31 33 35. 37 39 41 47. i. CONTENTS.Â Stewart Maginnis, Director of Environment and Development International Union for Conservation of Nature. iii. INTRODUCTION. UNEP / S. Nazan. i. Purpose and scope of the guide. Forests are essential for human survival and well-being. Explores various approaches including those which are forest-related such as community forestry and joint forest management as well as those concerned with protected areas. Covers key issues of theory and implementation and methodologies for implementation. Note: Language versions issued separately. Also available in French and Spanish. Cogestion des forêts pour la conservation et le développement ; Manejo forestal colaborativo para la conservación y el desarrollo. Includes bibliographic references. Work area: Forests. Focused on Participation, Conservation, and Protection. n n n n. Figure 1 A historical overview of forest management in Nepal.Â Despite early concentration on collaborative forests in the Terai, SFM is now expanding to other potential areas in different forest management regimes and ecological zones. MSFP has been complementing these SFM expansion initiatives and efforts by the GoN through the provision of different kinds of support. Public Administration and Development, Vol. 37, Issue. 5, p. 331. CrossRef. Google Scholar. Musinguzi, Peter Bosselmann, Aske Skovmand and Pouliot, Mariève 2018. Livelihoods-conservation initiatives: Evidence of socio-economic impacts from organic honey production in Mwingi, Eastern Kenya. Forest Policy and Economics, Vol. 97, Issue. , p. 132. CrossRef.Â Differences are emerging in decentralization of forest and community management in Zimbabwe, Mozambique and South Africa. This paper draws on case studies in each country to examine five aspects of their decentralization experience, namely forest tenure, new organizational structures, accountability and livelihood outcomes.