

**COMMUNITY FORESTRY:
PARADOXES AND PERSPECTIVES
IN DEVELOPMENT PRACTICE**

by

JUAN M. PULHIN

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
of the Australian National University



May 1996

DECLARATION

Except where otherwise acknowledged,
this thesis is my own original work.

Juan M. Pulhin

Canberra, 30 May 1996

DEDICATION

To my wife Yay
for her love,
sacrifices,
and unwavering support

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The initial ideas in this thesis took shape during the first year of my PhD studies in the Department of Forestry of the Australian National University. I thank Dr. Neil Byron for stirring up my interest in the role of forestry in development, and for his able supervision during this period.

After fieldwork I transferred from the Department of Forestry to the Department of Human Geography, where I was exposed to various other approaches to the theory and practice of development, through my supervisor, Dr. Doug Porter. Doug inspired me to look beyond forestry and relate my work to the wider debate about sustainable development. Beyond this, his commitment to a high degree of scholarship, matched with conscientious supervision, was both a challenge and a constant source of encouragement. Special thanks are also due to Dr. Bryant Allen and Professor Benedict Tria Kerkvliet for their valuable advise and encouragement during the writing stage. Their insightful comments on the early drafts strengthened the arguments of the thesis. Bryant also provided vital assistance during the final stages of writing.

Many people of many different places and organisations provided assistance during my 15-month fieldwork in the Philippines. I wish to thank them all. The names are too numerous to mention, bar few. In the Central Visayas Regional Development Project, thanks go to John Dalton, Bel Navasquez, Pol Garma and Raul Samson. At the other three projects I thank the staff of the three NGOs — Pag-Bicol Foundation Incorporated, Philippine Association for Intercultural Communities, and the Soil and Water Conservation Foundation. At the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, I express my gratitude to Mayumi Quintos, Belen Sotalbo and Joel and Divine Malicsi, who went beyond their normal workload to facilitate my research. I also wish to acknowledge the warm reception,

cooperation, and patience of the project staff and the local people in the four community forestry projects studied. They made my fieldwork both interesting and enjoyable.

The scholarship provided by the Australian Agency for International Development is appreciated, and Geraldine Cooper deserves special recognition for her efforts in this regard. I thank Professors Gerard Ward and Peter Rimmer of the Department of Human Geography for facilitating the extension of my scholarship, the provision of editorial assistance, and other departmental support. My thanks to the able editor, Barbara Banks. Thanks are also due to my fellow students and the staff of Human Geography for making me feel at home in the Department.

My heartfelt appreciation also goes to Karl Benediktsson for his all-out support during the last phase of this work. I have benefited a lot from Karl's perceptive comments on the initial drafts of this thesis. More than offering constructive critique, Karl's knowledge of mapping and organisational competence played an important part in getting the thesis together in the end.

Ging and Aljoy Abraquez were also around to assist in the proofreading and to cheer me up during the tense moments of the final stages.

The prayers, encouragement and love extended by the members of the Graduate House Fellowship, the Saturday Bible Study Group, and the other Christian brethren is also deeply appreciated. I must mention the special support and encouragement Yay and I received from Roland, Jacob and Mary during the difficult times in my study. Our parents and loved ones in the Philippines also provided a continuous source of inspiration.

Finally, I give thanks, glory and honour to my Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. The blessings and grace we received from Him in the course of pursuing this study is indeed unfathomable.

ABSTRACT

This thesis deals with two related topics: core development objectives in community forestry in the Philippines, and the ‘instruments’ of development practice which have been used to address these objectives. The two topics have currency beyond forestry development and are at the centre of a debate about sustainable development. Community forestry aims to democratise resource access, alleviate poverty, and ensure the sustainability of forest resources. Development practice, however, has often led to contradictory outcomes. This paradox is examined from three perspectives: that of political economy, characteristics of practice, and the theory of rationalisation.

Four government-initiated community forestry projects in the Philippines are analysed. These projects provide an historical trend on the development and refinements of the different techniques from the early 1980s to the present. The relationship between the use of these techniques and improved outcomes in terms of the three core concerns is established. Empirical findings from the cases suggest that there is no necessary relationship between the employment of these instruments and better development outcomes. The attempt to democratise forest resource access through the use of access instruments has benefited the local elite and reinforced the government’s jurisdiction over these resources. Similarly, the use of appraisal and participatory planning techniques has homogenised views of the local community and advanced a centrally determined agenda in forest management that has worked against the alleviation of poverty. Forest degradation is likely to continue, even with the incorporation of social factors into the concept of sustained-yield forest management.

The political economy perspective suggests that contradictory effects can be explained by the country’s historical and political structure which has been shaped by

an economically-driven development model and dominated by a more privileged sector. Despite genuine efforts for reform, this perspective contends that community forestry projects and related development interventions will always be influenced by political forces, and their benefits will be captured by the privileged sector. On the other hand, a focus on the characteristics of practice leads to the conclusion that contradictory effects are results of the limitations of these techniques, including their poor application. This implies that the adverse effects may be addressed through the refinement of these techniques and improvements in their application. Finally, the rationalisation thesis reveals that paradoxical effects are inherent in the use of these techniques. This perspective posits that even with the apparent shift from a state-controlled to a more participatory and decentralised approach in forest management, such as community forestry, the instrumentalist nature associated with the application of these techniques reinforces the characteristics of homogeneity, technocracy, and centralism which are inclined to produced paradoxical outcomes.

Both the political economy and the rationalisation perspectives provide a gloomy prognosis for community forestry. However, the recognition of the dual problems of poverty and environmental degradation in the Philippine uplands, suggests that community forestry should not be abandoned. Through a responsive mode of practice, there is room to move to improve the outcomes of the three central objectives. But responsive practice is not a panacea for all development ills. The process is bound to be slow, strategies will vary from one place to another, and success will be patchy. But because responsive community forestry practice is not amenable to central programming and control, it is more likely to result in sustainable outcomes than the present approaches.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
Dedication	i
Acknowledgments	ii
Abstract	iv
Table of contents	vi
List of Tables	ix
List of Figures	ix
List of Maps	x
List of Boxes	x
List of Acronyms	xi
 CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION	 1
1.1 The Problem	1
1.2 What Is To Be Done	7
1.3 Thesis Structure and Chapter Previews	8
 CHAPTER TWO - THE EVOLUTION OF COMMUNITY FORESTRY	 12
2.1 Introduction	12
2.2 The International Context	13
2.2.1 Industrialisation of the Forestry Sector	13
2.2.2 Forestry for Local Community Development	18
2.2.3 Forestry in Sustainable Development	23
2.3 The Case of the Philippines	25
2.3.1 Forestry in the Colonial Period	26
2.3.2 From 1946 to the 1970s: Logging the Way to Underdevelopment	28
2.3.3 The Emergence of community Forestry	37
2.4 Community Forestry and Sustainable Development	43
2.5 Summary	45
 CHAPTER THREE - COMMUNITY FORESTRY IN THE CONTEXT OF RATIONALITY	 51
3.1 Introduction	51
3.2 Rationalisation and Community Forestry	52
3.2.1 Overview of the Rationalisation Theory	53
3.2.1.1 Weber and Onward: Early Rationalisation Thesis	54
3.2.1.2 Rose and Miller: Rationalisation in Contemporary Context	58
3.2.2 Rationalisation, Philippine Governance and Community Forestry	60
3.3 Instruments of Practice in Community Forestry	62

3.3.1	Techniques and Approaches of Practice	63
3.3.2	Institutional Instruments	66
3.3.2.1	International Institutions	66
3.3.2.2	National Institutions	67
3.3.2.3	Local Level Institutions	69
3.4	Projects as Institutional Frames	73
3.5	Propositions for Analysis	78
3.6	Summary	82
CHAPTER FOUR - CASE OVERVIEW AND RESEARCH METHODS		85
4.1	Introduction	85
4.2	Case Selection and Overview	87
4.2.1	The Central Visayas Regional Project, Social Forestry Component (CVRP-1, SF)	87
4.2.2	The Low Income Upland Communities Project (LIUCP)	95
4.2.3	The Presentacion Community Forestry Project	100
4.2.4	The Claveria Community Forestry Project	106
4.3	Research Methods and Ethics	110
4.3.1	Study Methods	110
4.3.2	Research Ethics	114
4.4	Summary	116
CHAPTER FIVE - DEMOCRATISING RESOURCE ACCESS		119
5.1	Introduction	119
5.2	The Democratisation Imperative	120
5.3	Resource Access Instruments in Community Forestry	123
5.4	Cases of Democratising Forest Resource Access	125
5.4.1	Community Timber Utilisation Permit: CVRP-1-SF	125
5.4.1.1	Stabilising the Project Environment	127
5.4.1.2	Promises Unfulfilled: Realities of Project Implementation	130
5.4.1.3	What Went Wrong With CTUP?	133
5.4.2	Community Forest Management Agreement (CFMA): Presentacion CFP	137
5.4.2.1	Democratising Claimed Areas	138
5.4.2.2	Regulated Freedom, Paradoxical Effects and Resistance	142
5.5	Summary	147
CHAPTER SIX - POVERTY ALLEVIATION AND COMMUNITY FORESTRY		150
6.1	Introduction	150
6.2	The Dimensions of Upland Poverty	151
6.3	Techniques and Institutional Mechanisms for Alleviating Poverty: Experiences from Two Cases	153
6.3.1	Identifying the Community: RRA and the Claveria CFP	154
6.3.1.1	The Community as Viewed Through RRA	154
6.3.1.2	The 'Real' Heterogenous Community	157

6.3.1.3	The RRA/ Poverty Alleviation Connection	160
6.3.2	Planning With the People? The LIUCP	165
6.3.2.1	Participatory Planning and the SEDP	166
6.3.2.2	Fitting Community Needs to Project Components	168
6.3.2.3	Alleviating Poverty Through Bounded Participation	172
6.4	Summary	178
CHAPTER SEVEN - SUSTAINING THE FOREST RESOURCES		182
7.1	Introduction	182
7.2	The Emerging Practice of Sustained-Yield Forestry	183
7.3	Sustaining the Forest Resources: Experiences from Two Cases	188
7.3.1	The Case of Malicon FOSA	189
7.3.1.1	Reforestation and Agroforestry	190
7.3.1.2	Timber Utilisation and Forest Protection	192
7.3.1.3	Beyond Politics and Poor Practice	194
7.3.2	The Presentacion CFP	197
7.3.2.1	Forest Renewal	199
7.3.2.2	Sustaining the Timber Harvest	203
7.3.2.3	Marginalising the Social Dimension	206
7.4	Summary	208
CHAPTER EIGHT - CONCLUSION		210
8.1	Summary of Findings	210
8.2	Should Community Forestry Be Abandoned?	215
8.3	Towards Responsive Practice	217
BIBLIOGRAPHY		223
APPENDIX: PROFILES OF RESOURCE ACCESS INSTRUMENTS		248

LIST OF TABLES

2.1	Licencees number and area, forest cover, and deforestation in the Philippines, 1959-1992	29
2.2	Average annual log production and export, value of export, and extent of underreported exports, 1955-1990	31
4.1	Profile of Four Case Study Projects	89
4.2	Central Visayas Regional Project-1 (Rural): A brief historical account	93
4.3	Summary of fieldwork activities by quarter, 1992-1993	110A
4.4	Research methods and affiliation of informants	111
5.1	Number of claimants within the 268 ha 'old project contracts', Presentacion CFP	140
6.1	Direct beneficiaries, major benefits and degree of dependence on the local forest resources, Claveria CFP, Misamis Oriental	158
6.2	Identified community needs and proposed solutions based on the officially defined LIUCP components, Kabilyan Watershed, Bulalacao, Mindoro Oriental	169
6.3	Physical progress of LIUCP as of 20 August 1993	177
7.1	Characteristics of the community forestry case study projects	188
7.2	Project interventions under different vegetative cover, Presentacion CFP	199
7.3	Annual allowable cut (AAC) from second-growth forest, Presentacion CFP	204

LIST OF FIGURES

2.1	Number of licencees and licenced area in the Philippines, 1959-1992	30
2.2	Average annual log production and export, 1955-1990	33
2.3	Allocation of the 2.8 million ha second-growth forest among the different management models	42
3.1	ADB's project cycle	77
5.1	Sharing of benefits from one bd ft of lumber sold at P6.50, CVRP-1, CTUP operation, 1986-1988	132
6.1	Network analysis of problems in Barangay Mat-i, Claveria, Misamis Oriental	164

LIST OF MAPS

2.1	Changing forest cover of the Philippines	35
4.1	Philippines - Location of the projects studied	88
4.2	The Central Visayas Regional Project - 1, Social Forestry	92
4.3	Low Income Upland Communities Project	97
4.4	Prentacion CFP - Location and vegetative cover	103
4.5	Claveria CFP - Location and vegetative cover	107

LIST OF BOXES

5.1	Barangay leader: “Government projects stink”	127
5.2	The personal circumstances of Pay Belo	138
5.3	History of Forest Occupancy in the Project Site: An Oral Account by Pay Garing	141

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AAC	Annual Allowable Cut
ACIPHIL	Asociacion Ng Mga Consultants Na Independente (Philippines) Inc.
ADB	Asian Development Bank
ANR	Assisted Natural Regeneration
BFD	Bureau of Forest Development
BREDCI	Barangay Resources Environment and Development Cooperative Incorporated
CBA	Cost Benefit Analysis
CENRO	Community Environment and Natural Resources Officer
CFMA	Community Forest Management Agreement
CFP	Community Forestry Program
CFSA	Community Forest Stewardship Agreement
CRMDP	Community Resource Management and Development Plan
CSC	Certificate of Stewardship Contracts
CTF	Communal Tree Farming
CTUP	Community Timber Utilisation Permit
CVRP	Central Visayas Regional Development Project
CVRPO	Central Visayas Regional Project Office
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
ENR-SECAL Loan Program	Environment and Natural Resources Sectoral Adjustment
ESD	Ecologically Sustainable Development
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FDC	Forestry Development Center
FLMA	Forest Land Management Agreement
FMB	Forest Management Bureau
FOSA	Forest Stewardship Association
GO	Government Organisation
IDRC	International Development Research Center
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ISFP	Integrated Social Forestry Program
LDCs	Less Developed Countries

LGC	Local Government Code
LGUs	Local Government Units
LIUCP	Low Income Upland Communities Project
MAGADAI	Mat-i Agroforestry Development Association Incorporated
MNR	Ministry of Natural Resources
NEDA	National Economic Development Authority
NFP	National Forestation Program
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NDF	National Democratic Front
OECF	Overseas Economic Cooperation Fund
PAFID	Philippine Association for Intercultural Development Incorporated
Pag-Bicol	Pag-asang Bicolnon Foundation Incorporated
P. D.	Presidential Decree
POs	People's Organisations
PPMO	Provincial Project Management Office
PSLS	Philippine Selective Logging System
PSSD	Philippine Strategy for Sustainable Development
RDC	Regional Development Council
RRA	Rapid Rural Appraisal
RRSA	Rapid Rural Systems Appraisal
SEDP	Socio- Economic Development Plan
SMU	Site Management Unit
SWCF	Soil and Water Conservation Foundation
TLA	Timber License Agreement
TPSA	Timber Production Sharing Agreement
TSI	Timber Stand Improvement
UN	United Nations
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WCED	World Commission on Environment and Development
WFC	World Forestry Congress
WMU	Watershed Management Unit

ADDENDUM: CORRECTIONS TO TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS

Location		Typographical Error	Correction
Page No.	Line No		
24	10	worlds's	world's
24	11*	ofresource	of resource
61	10	situtation	situation
69	7	Similarly,the	Similarly, the
69	4*	Ganapin,1989	Ganapin, 1989
73	10	Thompson1991:95	Thompson, 1991:95
86	8*	the the	the
95	12*	managements	management
104	14*	commercialy	commercially
116	1	ourdiffernt	our different
147	3*	and.Escueta	and Escueta
160	6	However,the	However, the
177	10*	Bridg./culverts	Bridge/culverts
189	4	dealth	dealt
198	5	thesecond-growth	the second-growth
202	2	pf	of
205	11	supplementary	supplementary
208	4	relisation	realisation
224	18	Causes,and	Causes, and
227	15*	"apid Rural Appraisal	"Rapid Rural Appraisal
227	9*	"ommunity-Based	"Community-Based
228	19	Developemtn	Development
229	3*	Guidelines	Guidelines
231	1	Discusive	Discursive
231	6	Constrainst	Constraints
231	16	Sciological	Sociological
234	16	Postscript	Postscript
235	19	Architechs	Architects
237	1*	Dimentional	Dimensional
239	11*	Resistance	Resistance
240	3*	Agrrement	Agreement
241	4*	Philipine	Philippine
244	7*	Contraints	Constraints

* Counting of line number starts from the bottom