



UNIVERSITEIT VAN AMSTERDAM



---

## Congress on 'Globalisation, localisation and tropical forest management in the 21<sup>st</sup> century'

Amsterdam, 22 – 23 October 2003

---

# FINAL REPORT

*Compiled by Mirjam A.F. Ros-Tonen*

Amsterdam, July 2004

## Colophon

The final report of the congress on 'Globalisation, localisation and tropical forest management in the 21<sup>st</sup> century', held in Amsterdam on 22-23 October 2003, is a publication of the Amsterdam Research Institute for Metropolitan and International Development Studies (AMIDSt) of the Universiteit van Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

Contact address:

Dr. Mirjam A.F. Ros-Tonen  
Amsterdam Research Institute for Metropolitan and International Development Studies (AMIDSt)  
University of Amsterdam  
Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130  
1018 VZ Amsterdam, the Netherlands  
Phone +31 20 5254179) / 4062  
Fax +31 30 2936247  
E-mail: m.a.f.ros-tonen@uva.nl

© 2004

All rights reserved. No part of this publication, apart from bibliographic data and brief quotations in critical reviews, may be reproduced, recorded, published or cited in any form including print, photocopy, microform, electronic or electromagnetic record, without written permission of the publisher.

Text: Mirjam A.F. Ros-Tonen with contributions from Lonneke Bakker, Pieter van Beukering, René Boot, Marcus Colchester, Peter Ho, Willem Jaspers, Ruben Kremer, Judy Lay, Melissa Leach, Michiel de Man, James Meers, Augusta Molnar, Johan Post, Andy White, Yurdi Yasmi, Friede Magloire Ngo Youmba, Fred Zaal and Annelies Zoomers.

Editing and lay-out: Mirjam A.F. Ros-Tonen

Language editing: Howard Turner

Printing: Repro Roeterseiland, Universiteit van Amsterdam

## Contents

List of acronyms .....	4
Introduction .....	5
Organising agencies .....	5
Sponsorship .....	6
The conference theme and objectives .....	6
Theme 1 – The potential of responsible markets and responsible trade .....	7
- The feasibility of payments for ecosystem services .....	8
- Opportunities for forest markets to benefit local low-income producers .....	9
- Greening (trans)national logging companies? Strategies to combat illegal and unsustainable logging .....	10
- Certification and forestry .....	11
Theme 2 – The potential of global-local partnerships .....	13
- Linking global conservation objectives and local use of forest and wildlife resources .....	14
- Global-local partnerships for conservation and sustainable forest use: a Latin- American perspective .....	16
- The impact of decentralisation on forest resource management .....	17
- A learning perspective on partnerships in collaborative forest management.....	19
Conclusions.....	20
Reflections .....	22
Appendix 1 – The programme .....	25
Appendix 2 – List of papers presented .....	27
Appendix 3 – List of posters presented .....	31
Appendix 4 – List of participants .....	33

## List of acronyms

ACM	Adaptive Collaborative Management
AGIDS	Research Institute for Global Issues and Development Studies
AIID	Amsterdam Institute for International Development
AMIDSt	Amsterdam Research Institute for Metropolitan and International Development Studies
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CEDLA	Centre for Latin American Research and Documentation, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
CERES	Research School for Resource Studies for Development
CIFOR	Centre for International Forestry Research
CSA	Canadian Standards Association
EC	European Commission
ETFRN	European Tropical Forest Research Network
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
GIS	Geographical Information System
IAC	International Agricultural Centre, Wageningen, the Netherlands
IIED	International Institute for Economic Development, London, United Kingdom
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IUCN	World Conservation Union
IVM	Institute for Environmental Studies, Free University, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NOVIB	Oxfam-Netherlands
PERC	Pan-European Forest Certification
POEMA	Poverty and Environment in the Amazon Programme, Belém PA, Brazil
SFI	Sustainable Forestry Initiative
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
SLIMF	FSC's Small and Low Intensity Managed Forest certification initiative
TBI	Tropenbos International, Wageningen, the Netherlands
WOTRO	Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Tropical Research
WTO	World Trade Organisation
WWF	Worldwide Fund for Nature

---

# Congress on 'Globalisation, localisation and tropical forest management in the 21<sup>st</sup> century'

## Amsterdam, 22 – 23 October 2003

---

### Introduction

On 22-23 October 2003, the Amsterdam Research Institute for Global Issues and Development Studies (AGIDS)<sup>1</sup> hosted the congress on 'Globalisation, localisation and tropical forest management in the 21<sup>st</sup> century'. The congress theme was new markets and partnerships in a globalising world where rights to forest land and resources are increasingly being devolved to local authorities, communities and forest users. The congress provided a forum for analysis and debate on how tropical forest management evolves in a context where new actors, partnerships and markets arise. Based on the participants' experiences, the discussions focused on lessons learnt, the risks encountered and the approaches, actions and research needed to enhance sustainable and pro-poor forest management.

The congress was attended by about 200 people from 40 countries, including researchers, policy makers, donors and representatives of civil society organisations and international organisations.

This report summarises the outcome of the congress.<sup>2</sup>

### Organising agencies

The congress was organised by AGIDS in collaboration with the following organisations:

- The Centre for Latin American Research and Documentation (CEDLA), Amsterdam, the Netherlands
- The Institute for Environmental Studies (IVM, Free University), Amsterdam, the Netherlands
- The International Agricultural Centre (IAC), Wageningen, the Netherlands
- Tropenbos International (TBI), Wageningen, the Netherlands
- Wageningen University, Wageningen, the Netherlands
- Forest Trends, Washington, USA

---

<sup>1</sup> The department has in the meantime amalgamated with the Amsterdam Study Centre for the Metropolitan Environment (AME) since which time both institutes have operated under the new name of Amsterdam Research Institute for Metropolitan and International Development Studies (AMIDSt).

<sup>2</sup> Thanks are due to the panel reporters, Willem Jaspers, Ruben Kremer, James Meers, Lonke Bakker, Michiel de Man, Judy Lay and Yurdi Yasmi for compiling excellent written reports of the panel sessions; to Pieter van Beukering, René Boot, Andy White, Peter Ho, Augusta Molnar, Fred Zaal, Annelies Zoomers, Friede Magloire Ngo Youmba and Yurdi Yasmi for the way they reported the panel outcomes to the plenary sessions; to Melissa Leach and Marcus Colchester for their synthesising presentations; and to Friede Magloire Ngo Youmba, Grace Nangendo, Andre de Freitas and Purabi Bose for their reflections during the closing section. All their inputs have been used in this final report.

## **Sponsorship**

Core funding for this congress came from the Amsterdam Institute for International Development (AIID) and the University of Amsterdam, while the Research School for Resource Studies for Development (CERES) and the International Agricultural Centre (IAC) in Wageningen provided additional financial support.

Oxfam-Netherlands (Novib) and the Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Tropical Research (WOTRO) financed travel and accommodation grants for paper presenters from developing countries.

The European Tropical Forest Research Network (ETFRN) published the pre-congress background document as ETFRN News No. 39-40 (see [www.ETFRN.org](http://www.ETFRN.org)).

The Municipality of Amsterdam organised a reception for the congress participants.

## **The conference theme and objectives**

Tropical forest management is facing new challenges. Globalisation is making the world 'growing smaller' each day, while new stakeholders are becoming involved in forest management as a result of shifting forms of governance. Actors at multiple scales are finding each other in new partnerships that were unimaginable in a world without internet and e-mail.

It has often been feared that globalisation would be a threat to tropical forests due to the opening up of markets and the boosting of international demand for legally and illegally logged hardwood and other commodities. However, the same globalisation process created niche markets for environmental services and sustainably produced forest products which give an impulse to sustainable forest management and create new opportunities for low-income producers. Examples are payments for ecosystem services and the certification of timber and non-timber forest products.

As a result of decentralisation and the devolution of land rights to indigenous populations and forest users at community level – a process also referred to as 'localisation' – the actors involved in forest management are more connected to the forest resources than ever before. This greater involvement and 'connectedness' provides, in theory, an incentive to preserve the forest and manage it sustainably.

These local actors are increasingly connected with international actors, such as environmental NGOs and research organisations lending support to sustainable forest use. As a result, forest management is no longer in the exclusive hands of a single entity – whether government, private, NGO or local community. New forums for stakeholder negotiations, partnerships, alliances and joint actions for the conservation and sustainable management are being formed at global and regional level. At local level, numerous partnerships for the protection and co-management of forest resources are emerging between international donors, government agencies, national and international NGOs, private sector actors, research organisations and communities. Tropical forest protection and management are increasingly the product of negotiations and joint actions between players at multiple scales.

The question now arises as to the conditions under which the new alliances and partnerships will be able to curb the destruction and degradation of tropical forests in a globalising world. Will they be able to put into effect sustainable forest management – understood as deliberate efforts to maintain the forests' ecological values, production services and their role as source of livelihood for the rural poor? Will new markets and market incentives for sustainable management that emerge as a result of globalisation be able to have a positive effect on the way forests are managed? And how will all these changes affect the livelihoods of forest-dwelling people and poor populations living at the forest fringe and their say in forest management?

Dealing with these questions, the conference aimed to:

- bring together current knowledge on and experience with new market initiatives and international partnerships and their effects on tropical forest conservation, management and poverty alleviation;
- identify 'lessons learnt' and conditions for successful and effective market initiatives and multi-scale partnerships;
- discuss opportunities and bottlenecks in relation to new markets and multi-scale partnerships for the livelihoods of forest-dwelling people and communities at the forest fringe, including potential exclusion of stakeholders under the new management arrangements;
- define recommendations for policy and research on tropical forest management in a globalising environment.

## **Theme 1**

### **The potential of responsible markets and trade**

Day one of the two-day congress programme focused on markets and the potential of responsible trade for forest conservation and the development of sustainable and pro-poor forest management. Several efforts are being made to enhance sustainable forest production through the market, such as the trade in environmental services and forest certification. Such market-related incentives have in common that they seek ways to compete with more lucrative, but also more destructive land uses, with the aim to contribute to forest conservation, sustainable forest use and/or improved livelihoods for the poor in tropical forest areas. Market-related strategies often involve new partnerships between international, regional and local actors, as well as supplementary actions by the state and societal actors to evolve a supportive regulatory framework and 'greener' policies.

Joshua Bishop (IUCN, Switzerland) who co-authored a book titled 'Selling forest environmental services: market-based mechanisms for conservation and development' (Earthscan 2002) introduced the theme of Day 1. He argued that one of the greatest challenges facing the forest sector today is to reconcile the conflicting demands of different stakeholders for the many goods and services that forests provide. Besides valuable timber and non-timber products, these goods and services include important environmental services, such as watershed protection, biodiversity conservation and carbon sequestration. As beneficiaries hardly ever pay for these services, there is little incentive to conserve forests and opportunities for rural development are being lost. Market-based approaches are thought to offer considerable potential as incentives for forest conservation as well as new sources of income for rural communities. Bishop elaborated on the markets for environmental services, their effectiveness in securing forest environmental benefits and the opportunities they hold for the poor. He concluded that market-based incentives for ecosystem services may be the best hope we have of generating significant investment in conservation and sustainable use, but that we have a long way to go before we can say for sure that these initiatives benefit poor countries and resource users and are contributing to 'sustainable globalisation'.

The second keynote speaker, Catrinus Jepma (University of Amsterdam and Groningen, the Netherlands), spoke on possible synergies between carbon crediting and sustainable forest management (SFM). Carbon crediting through forestry is an important option under the Kyoto Protocol that is currently being implemented. Projects enhancing carbon sinks in the form of reforestation and afforestation are now included in the project cooperation between industrialised and developing countries under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). During the past decade, and quite unrelated to the Kyoto Protocol, certification systems for forest management and a chain-of-custody for certified forest and timber products have been introduced based on a set of forest management principles, guidelines, criteria and standards. In his lecture, Jepma put forward the idea that both developments are having a significant potential impact on forest investment, management and stakeholders' interests. There might be scope for synergy between the two. Large amounts of carbon credits under the Kyoto Protocol may only be accepted if generated in SFM certified forests, since either the SFM type of criteria incorporated in the Kyoto Protocol regime or SFM certification will be linked to carbon credits on a voluntary basis. The last option seems preferable, but requires a breakthrough in SFM certification.

After these keynote lectures, four parallel sessions were held on Day 1. These addressed four major themes related to the potential of 'green' markets and responsible trade:

- The feasibility of payments for ecosystem services
- Opportunities for forest markets to benefit local low-income producers
- Greening (trans)national logging companies? Strategies to combat illegal and unsustainable logging
- Certification and forestry

#### **- The feasibility of payments for ecosystem services**

Panel 1 discussed the potential of payments for ecosystem services, such as carbon sequestration, watershed protection and biodiversity conservation. Building on the key issues put forward in the key lecture by Joshua Bishop, the participants addressed such questions as (i) under what circumstances can payment systems for ecosystem services be established; (ii) how effective are they in securing forest environmental benefits; and (iii) what is their potential role in poverty alleviation. A variety of cases were presented, ranging from bottom-up to top-down approaches. The presentations and the debate led to the following issues and 'lessons learnt':

- An integrated approach could be more favourable than having single markets for carbon sequestration, watershed protection, etc. Since all these markets are connected one way or another, it may be worthwhile to strive for an integrated approach (e.g. by establishing a single coordinating institution) in order to lower transaction costs. Some opposed this idea, arguing that a multiple system would be far too complex and a bureaucratic nightmare. Moreover, it would not be desirable from an ecological point of view, since the optimum situation for carbon sequestration might be very different from, for example, the biodiversity optimum. While, as regards biodiversity conservation, the ideal situation is to leave the forest alone, in the case of carbon sequestration, logging the forest once in a while could be beneficial.
- There is some frustration about the fact that the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) does not include avoided deforestation because there are good reasons for doing so. Among these is the enormous potential for carbon sequestration and watershed protection. It is important to address this issue in future negotiations and continue debating the pro and the cons. As a matter of principle there is nothing against including avoided deforestation in the Kyoto Protocol, but technical problems should be resolved like the construction of a baseline to make clear that holding deforestation leads to something additional.
- The actual benefits of payment schemes for environmental services are in some cases smaller than expected, because transaction costs are high in this rather experimental stage in which we are learning. Although these high transaction costs might be discouraging, we need some flexibility in this respect, in order to facilitate this learning process and to allow the different experiments to mature, after which the transaction costs can be lowered.
- Various paper presenters pointed to the leakage effects or indirect effects of carbon sequestration schemes. These indirect effects (such as forest clearing for farming beyond the geographical limits of the project area) often off-set the benefits of a scheme. Although such leakage effects also occur in forestry projects, they highlight uncertainties in CDM projects about which we need to learn more in the future.
- Site-specific circumstances make it difficult to develop a blueprint for payment schemes. Population densities, incomes, land tenure systems, institutional capacity, culture etc. differ across locations and all have major consequences for the type of payment scheme that is feasible in an area. The absence of reliable institutions can be a crucial factor impeding the success of a payment scheme. In this respect it is important to allow for some flexibility in concepts: what works in one country does not necessarily work in another one!
- CDM projects lack sustainability criteria, especially with regard to poverty issues or the allocation of benefits from the scheme that does not necessarily favour the poor (as a case from Brazil made clear). Strengthening these criteria may actually serve the poor much better.
- Given the limited funds available there is need for priority setting. Among many others, possible options are to start with montane forests rather than with all forests, given their important watershed functions or to localise forests using GIS techniques to trace areas that are sensitive to erosion.



## - Opportunities for forest markets to benefit local low-income producers

Panel 2 dealt with the commercialisation of non-timber forest products on international markets and its potential to realise the twin aim of forest conservation and livelihood improvement. Both globalisation and localisation create new market opportunities for low-income producers in tropical forest areas. New niche markets for certified forest products and environmental services arise as a result of globalising markets and environmental concerns. Localisation increases control and ownership of forest through the devolution of land rights to indigenous populations, forest communities and specific groups of forest users. The demand for socially responsible forestry provides an incentive to democratic forest governance and protected land rights (Scherr *et al.*, 2002). The key question for this panel is under which conditions the rural poor in tropical forest areas can benefit from the new potentials of forest markets.

The common theme of the eight presentations covered three questions:

- Are conditions on the market for low-income producers different today than, for instance, ten years ago? Did globalisation and localisation create new market opportunities?
- What then are the conditions for people to participate in these markets and derive an income from these new opportunities?
- What does increased market integration imply for the forest?

Whereas the state was the major owner of forestland in the past, local and indigenous communities now own 22% of the forested area as a result of devolution of land in the past 5-10 years. This gives them more power and a say in how the forest is to be managed, making them more powerful players in the market.

This is, among other things, becoming clear in the increasing number of business-community partnerships. A comparative study of 50 such partnerships carried out by IIED emphasised that two conditions are essential for their success, namely (i) flexible contracts in order to be able to adapt to site-specific conditions; and (ii) the need for a negotiation model that allows people to 'learn-by-doing'.

When assessing the potential of low-income producers to benefit from these new market opportunities, the fact should be taken into account that the 500 million forest-dependent people are not a homogenous group. Those living in remote areas and those living relatively close to urban centres face distinctly different conditions. People who live closer to urban centres and are able to combine various economic activities in a diversified livelihood strategy have better opportunities to get engaged in commercial activities on forest markets. Domestication of successful products is part of that strategy because it reduces the costs of harvesting.

A case study on the Amazon Paper Project of the Poverty and Environment in the Amazon Programme (POEMA) in Brazil – a project set up to promote productive chains for poverty alleviation based on non-timber forest products – learned the importance of having institutions in place, including a facilitating organisation.

Two studies dealing with the effects of integration into the global economy revealed that external interventions aimed at integration into external markets might lead to inequality within the community if this aspect is not properly addressed and also that increased income may imply increased deforestation (e.g. because more land is cleared for agriculture) and intensified forest use.

Success stories like the one about a Brazilian company trading in certified palm heart according to ecologically and socially responsible principles make it clear that such success depends on the species and its ecology. The palm heart species in question (*Euterpe oleracea*) grows in multiple stems and grows well in plantations, which makes it relatively easy to harvest it in a sustainable manner. Bamboo has similar characteristics and a market as well and is also likely to provide opportunities to small-scale producers to benefit from new market opportunities.

In the discussion it was stressed that many projects designed to increase market opportunities for low-income producers in fact follow a top-down approach. Aims like poverty reduction are taken for granted without acknowledging people's aspirations and ambitions. We often speak about the feasibility of commercial activities without taking the role of local people into account. It is difficult in particular to bring market benefits and ownership to indigenous people who are often not organised in communities, live in remote areas and cannot be considered a homogenous category.

The major conclusions with regard to opportunities for forest markets to benefit local low-income producers are:

- Globalisation as well as devolution of forest land to local communities creates new market opportunities for low-income producers. In particular, the fact that people in the South now own much of the forest land gives people a different place at the negotiation table.
- These opportunities are product and location specific and are not the same for all. People living relatively close to roads or urban centres and those who are able to increase densities of commercial species through domestication are the ones that are most likely to benefit from the new market opportunities.
- In successful cases the production and marketing of forest products resulted in improved incomes for local people and forest conservation. However, most of these initiatives rely heavily on financial and technical assistance from NGOs or other entities. The question arises of whether it will be possible to implement similar initiatives on a large scale.
- We need to be realistic about possible win-win situations: poverty reduction and forest conservation might require different strategies because increased incomes may at the same time lead to increased deforestation. We might not succeed if we follow one single strategy. In this case there is no silver bullet that will achieve it all.

#### **- Greening (trans)national logging companies? Strategies to combat illegal and unsustainable logging**

The third panel dealt with strategies to combat illegal and unsustainable logging in relation to a particular effect of globalisation, *i.e.* the global flow of international capital to less-developed countries. Various 'push and pull' factors motivate logging companies to operate in the South: the drive to minimise labour hence operating costs, domestic logging bans, nepotism, and slack environmental regulations and weak institutions in these countries. It is often argued that these transnational companies contribute to unsustainable practices. The global effect is alarming, raising issues that must be addressed through the combined efforts of the formal and informal sector. The critical theme here is how companies can work in a more sustainable manner and which strategies might be used to reverse the current trends of illegal and unsustainable logging. Some suggest that forest environmental services, national regulations, NGO pressure and certification in partnership with logging companies may prove to be the most effective strategy. Others believe international logging companies can potentially contribute to sustainable forest practices in the South as they operate according to international and corporate environmental regulations, thus having a positive 'greening' effect on domestic companies. The debate evolved around the question of whether international business can actually contribute to more sustainable forest operations in the South and what organisational change should be effected in transnational and national logging companies to achieve a 'greener' corporate policy.

Examples came from three continents. A paper referring to the Congo Basin painted a bleak picture of illegal logging and gave an overview of international, regional and NGO initiatives to achieve sustainable forest management in the Congo Basin. Another paper addressed illegal logging in the Far East of Russia, in particular on the Russian-Chinese border, and the recent development of public-private partnerships including international organisations (WWF) and NGOs with law enforcement structures operating in the forest sector. A third paper discussed shifts in the illegal logging discourse in post-Suharto Indonesia, illustrating that the concept of illegal logging is a social construction reflecting social relations between the state, private sector and citizens.

The discussion in this panel focused on three issues, *i.e.* the role of the state and the issue of sovereignty; the role of NGOs; and the issue of legality and illegality. The conclusions were as follows:

- Countries in the South, characterised by unstable political and economic environments, are more vulnerable to illegal logging practices. States torn apart by warfare, weak institutions and corrupt governments fall into this category. In such countries there are three ways of fostering more sustainable forest management, *i.e.* isolation of the forestry sector (analogous to the example of Ethiopian Airlines which continued to operate successfully in spite of Ethiopia being totally torn apart by warfare and the state not being in place); sub-regional cooperation or 'a partnership of the willing', in which various countries work together to establish sub-national management institutions; and international intervention. The latter touches on the issue of sovereignty of the state and inequalities between the North and South, with the North imposing strict forest regulations and norms on the South that were never imposed on the North. In this respect formation of the state can best be seen as the outcome of interaction between NGOs, local companies and civil society organisations, and transnational actors such as the EC and international NGOs.
- NGOs play a specific role in the greening of logging companies, namely as watchdog, in capacity building and in promoting certification.
- What is legal and illegal is defined as the outcome of interaction between various actors involved in forest management (the state, NGOs, international institutions, the private sector and supranational partnerships).

#### **- Certification and forestry**

Last, but not least, Panel 4 debated certification and forestry. While the certification phenomenon is still quite new, with the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) only being created in 1993, progress has been staggering. Over 30 million hectares of forest in over 30 countries have been certified. Over 600 'chain of custody' certifications have been awarded to suppliers of FSC products and the FSC logo can now be seen on more than 10,000 product lines worldwide. The abundance of newly developed certification schemes including the Pan-European Forest Certification (PERC) in Europe, the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) in the US, the Canadian Standards Association's Sustainable Forest Management Standard (CSA) and certification schemes in Indonesia and Malaysia are signs that certification is truly here to stay. Certification has had many effects that cannot be measured in hectares or premiums. It has given a greater voice to indigenous groups who have been historically left out of the forest debate. Certification has made a tremendous contribution to creating space for broad participation and continuous adaptation in forest management and conservation efforts. Regional standard-setting groups have brought together industry, the environmental community and local communities in an unprecedented way. Hundreds of companies, communities and forest landowners have reinvented their businesses, enhanced their products and established new partnerships on the coattails of the certification movement. Several strategic issues need to be dealt with if this new tool is to be developed effectively in the future. Originally designed to respond to unsustainable logging in the tropics, certification has been much more successful in the temperate forest areas.

Among the key questions addressed in the panel was the one about how certification can be more useful in those forest areas where it is most needed (Congo Basin, Brazilian Amazon, Indonesia and the Russian Far East).

The seven papers addressed a wide variety of certification-related subjects, such as the role of smallholders, small enterprises and communities; certification in complex socio-political settings such as those in Russia; the experience of FSC-certification in Brazil; an experience with capacity building for certification; the comparison of standards (criteria and indicators) across different countries; and the role that GIS and remote sensing could play as monitoring tools.

The debate resulted in the following conclusions:

- The FSC national standard-setting process has facilitated participatory forest policy processes, a better policy definition and has had very strong impacts on the ability of civil society and stakeholders to bring to the table issues around worker rights, tenure and health and safety standards in forest management. Stakeholder participation is especially strong at national level.
- There is very big difference between North and South, with the northern standards paying much more attention to environmental standards, while those in the southern countries are

more interested in economic and social and financial aspects. There is also a much greater capacity in the North to apply standards compared to many southern countries where the expertise may not exist or many of the monitoring tools are lacking. There is also an enormous difference in certified area: over 100 million in the North versus 6 million ha in the South. The question is, however, whether we are measuring the right thing and whether it would not be better to look at the number of cubic metres of certified wood entering the market rather than the number of hectares brought under certification.

- An important question is the one about who we want to include in certification and what the rationale for certification is. Currently, many certification schemes are outside the reach of communities, smallholders or small enterprises. The question is whether the current standards and especially the implementation of standards are practical. More flexibility is needed as well as a revision of the scope, goals and rules of forest certification in order to be able to take the reality of smallholders into account and enable group certification. Until now, criteria and indicators have reflected professional standards, not the adequate multiple goals of community management or cultural values and interests.
- Rather than merely looking at end results in the process of establishing sustainable forest management, improvements in forest management should be rewarded. Forest certification is a slow process, requiring much work. A step-wise approach generates cash more quickly and will greatly increase incentives for better forest management. FSC's Small and Low Intensity Managed Forest certification initiative (SLIMF) appears to be an appropriate system to allow for group certification. An alternative to forest certification would be national initiatives to live up increasingly to the standards required in certification schemes. Improvements can then be rewarded by subsidies or other financial policy instruments.
- Certification is a Western concept and imposed by developed countries upon developing countries. This might be a wrong starting point for the mechanism to work, especially where most of the hardwood is sold at domestic markets.
- There is currently confusion amongst producers and consumers due to the proliferation of certification schemes. There is a need for a globally accepted system, to assess the quality and credibility of certification schemes. However, Holvoet argues that harmonisation of standards is not desirable, as schemes will need to be implemented under differential conditions which request specific standards. An alternative would be mutual recognition amongst the different certifying bodies. More South-to-South comparison of experiences could improve certification efforts and standards.
- A solution needs to be found for the current competition between 'cheap' certified timber stemming from plantations and the timber originating from natural forests, where living up to certification standards is more difficult and thus more expensive. Caution should also be taken to ensure that natural forests are not replaced with plantations, which are easier to get certified.
- Illegal logging is the main threat to sustainable forest management. The dump-wood prices provide strong competition for certified wood at the timber markets. Besides that, the threat of illegal logging on concessions makes it more difficult for concessionaires to get certification. To stop illegal logging it is necessary to empower local people and to make them co-responsible for forest protection and management. Account should be taken, however, of the fact that the direct hands-on money from logging companies is very tempting for communities and that these communities require more political and regulatory strength to protect large forest areas.
- Many countries have unjust laws and law enforcement is therefore not possible. However, certification should not be a substitute for poor governance, weak legislation and lack of law enforcement.

The recommendations issued by panel 4 were:

- Forest certification is fairly new and therefore the framework of the system has not yet been clarified. Care should be taken to ensure that the complexity of local people's needs is not generalised.
- A revision is needed of the scope and goals of forest certification. Step-wise approaches and initiatives such as FSCs SLIMF could provide a solution to the standards-gap problem.
- There is a tension between bottom-up standard formulation and top-down standard setting. This tension is related to the flexible standards. It should be taken into account that market mechanisms will influence indigenous people and their needs.

- Smallholder certification has advanced most in Europe where schemes are adapted to the cooperative structure of smallholder markets. Certification schemes need to modify their standards and criteria to reflect the reality of smallholders and advocates of sustainable forest management also need to promote suitable alternatives to certification where this is not appropriate.
- The future significance of tools to simplify certification processes is still unclear. However, remote sensing and GIS have been used as efficient tools to monitor and audit certified forests. Although remote sensing could lead to the empowerment of local communities, it could also lead to the exclusion of certain stakeholders from the process and caution should be taken when applying these new tools.
- Priorities for funding should be set.
- A better balance needs to be sought for donor funding towards enabling conditions as well as the certification process itself.
- Capacity building is still under-funded.
- The private sector has an important role to play.
- More research should be carried out into the differences between standards for the North and the South and on alternative approaches.

## **Theme 2**

### **The potential of global-local partnerships**

Day 2 focused on the potential of multi-scale (global-local) partnerships. An important aspect of forest management in a 'glocalised' world concerns the change of actors involved in forest management and the emergence of new partnerships. These multi-scale and multi-stakeholder partnerships in forest management have the potential to link global conservation objectives with local needs, thus creating synergy. They do not, however, make an end to power imbalances and conflicting interests.

Although terms like 'stakeholder participation', 'partnerships' and 'negotiation' are now commonplace and suggest that the voices of people living in and around forests are increasingly being heard, the keynote speakers on Day 2 made it clear that we need to remain alert in this respect. The first keynote speaker of Day 2, Marcus Colchester of the World Rainforest Movement, put forward the view that over the past 25 years international networks have played a key role in transforming community forestry from being an experimental means of providing wood-fuel for the rural poor to a community-led movement demanding reform of the forestry sector. Based on a review of nine networks involving seven countries, recently carried out for the Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), he presented the main lessons learned from this experience in terms of advocacy effectiveness, communications techniques, network governance, relations with donors and linkage to social movements. His overview made it clear that the degree to which these networks are linked and accountable to communities varies widely. Colchester emphasised that, as strong social movements emerge demanding a restoration of their rights in forests, NGOs need to rethink how they relate to local communities to ensure they are not responsible for new forms of social exclusion.

In the discussion about participation, Melissa Leach shifted the focus to science and knowledge, asking about the relationships between forest governance and how forest dynamics are understood and what questions are asked – and not asked – about them. Recognising that knowledge is never neutral but entwined with power and institutional interests she tracked the unfolding relationships between international perspectives, national research traditions, policy processes, media and local knowledge and livelihood concerns based on examples from Trinidad and Guinea. She argued that participation in forestry and biodiversity planning has frequently become, in practice, an invitation to comply with pre-set objectives within frames of debate that obscure the experiences, perspectives and political and material interests of poorer forest users. To counter these trends, Leach argued, new approaches are required which open up policy processes to a greater diversity of perspectives, including the villagers' own. Science should also encourage the participation of poorer forest users. Here there is a role for participatory research strategies and deliberative procedures in which poorer forest users help to set agendas and questions. The process of facilitating media and educational strategies should focus on making explicit the evidence,

values, and uncertainties underlying particular scientific and policy positions and on enhancing and empowering the public capacity to criticise and engage in scientific and policy debate. Finally, Leach maintains that balancing the dependence on and shaping of national and local research by international agendas and values requires donor support for independent, critical research within national and local institutions. This could enhance the capacity to respond to and engage with forest user's own agendas, and help build alternative discourse coalitions to promote the perspectives of the poor – perhaps linking university researchers, NGOs and citizens' groups. At the same time, building better-informed and more reflexive international scientific and policy processes is important and requires new procedures that allow perspectives from local settings to feed upwards into and shape terms of debate.

Again, four parallel sessions took up these themes, discussing respectively:

- Linking global conservation objectives and local use of forest and wildlife resources
- Global-local partnerships for conservation and sustainable forest use: a Latin-American perspective
- The impact of decentralisation on forest resource management
- A learning perspective on partnerships in collaborative forest management

#### **- Linking global conservation objectives and local use of forest and wildlife resources**

Panel 5 dealt with the link between global conservation objectives and local development needs. The key questions addressed in this panel were:

- Who are the local stakeholders: the local poor or specific groups?
- Who are the stakeholders at global level?
- Are there any linkages between these multi-level actors and if so, how do partnerships take shape and impact on the poor?
- What examples of democratic pro-poor forest management can be found and what are their successes and failures?
- How can conditions be improved for enhancing participatory pro-poor forest management?
- What role can research and researchers play?

Cases were presented from Cameroon, Uganda, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar and Indonesia, paying attention to the local people in these study areas, their expert knowledge, livelihood threats and local resource management practices. The role of international organisations like the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Trade Organisation (WTO) as well as policy issues at various levels were also reviewed. Two paper presenters dealt with technical assessments of biodiversity in the framework of local use of wildlife and forest resources.

While addressing local stakeholders, the need arose to clarify the concept of 'local' and 'local stakeholders'. Do we refer to inhabitants and various social groups in a specific geographical area or consider all those who use and benefit from forest and wildlife resources, irrespective of whether they live in the proximity to the forest or further away? It was concluded that any group with a stake in forest resources should be considered, including those who do not live in the locality. This may have repercussions for the role of government.

At local level, the poor groups are those whose livelihoods depend especially on forest and wildlife resources. The extent to which people depend on the forest varies according to social status and geographical conditions and so does the impact of nationally and internationally driven conservation efforts. In all but one of the cases these impacts were considered negative due to their being associated with the exclusion of actors and the loss of access rights. There is a fierce ongoing debate on the relationship between conservation urgencies in certain (hotspot) areas and the development needs of its population. The conflict between these two factors has often led to a loss of access to resources used by people prior to the establishment of the conservation area without adequate compensation for the foregone opportunities. Neither are people compensated for their management skills in conservation areas.

National and international NGOs are also important stakeholders. The role of local NGOs and whether they really represent the voice of local people is not always clear. They could,

however, play a role in advocacy and lobbying for forest-use rights of rural households and raising awareness among the poor about their rights. Global NGOs should take the lead in conservation alliances. It is crucial in this respect that they develop partnerships and 'good practices' (show that it can be done!). This should unravel how actors are influenced by each other.

Public institutions play a marginal role and even constrain effective partnerships because they are not very well organised. They do, however, formally control forest resources and determine access rules.

The main tasks of global actors like the World Bank, IMF and WTO seem to lie in other fields than the environment. There is a need to gain a better insight into the relationship these international organisations have with countries, NGOs and local actors. It is for example unclear to what extent countries, as parties in the World Bank, can influence the policy of this institution in relation to local resource use and management. Furthermore it is doubtful whether there is really more attention in WTO for sustainable development and better trade rules or whether its policy is being misused.

The presentations made it clear that there are hardly any examples of cases where conservation objectives and local use of forest and wildlife resources are successfully reconciled in pro-poor forest management. This denotes a lack of attention for social, cultural and institutional issues and confronted the panel with the question of conflicting interests and power imbalances in conservation alliances. It seems difficult to control power misuse and unfavourable alliances. Moreover, local people are not sure about future income and how to pass their resources on to the next generation. They therefore maximise short-term gains, with deforestation as a result. Compensation for foregone livelihood opportunities arising from the establishment of protected areas needs attention. The government has an important role to play in this respect.

Many alliances in the conservation arena make it very difficult for local communities to continue using certain forest resources. Even if there are formal ways to have a say in these conservation efforts and influence the power balance, it turns out to be difficult to follow these procedures in practice.

Panel 5 identified the following conditions for participation and a positive link between conservation objectives and the utilisation of forest and wildlife resources:

- Positive feedback mechanisms are in place to put pressure on actors at various levels to consider the development needs of the poor in conservation areas.
- Players willing to reconcile conservation and development objectives have been identified.
- Advocacy and lobbying, in particular of people's rights to forest resources.
- NGOs and civil society organisations that really represent the local population (and not only claim to do so).
- Clear tenure and forest use arrangements.
- Synergy between formal and customary tenure and use rights and management systems.
- *All* stakeholders should be identified.
- Local perspectives, frameworks of reference and perceptions regarding forestry and forest use taken as a starting point.

Research could play a role in:

- Clarify what is 'local' and what are 'local stakeholders'
- Start from social issues if they are a concern in conservation efforts (even if you are a natural scientist)
- Learn from past lessons.

The final conclusion of panel 5 is that the impact of globalisation and localisation is hard to ascertain, but is often negative in terms of exclusion of actors and loss of access rights. It is crucial to learn to think in local people's language and mental frameworks instead of only using western terminology. How local poor people perceive the world is the main question! Self-reflection in the North is needed, too, because European consumers play an important role in deforestation in the South.

## **- Global-local partnerships for conservation and sustainable forest use: a Latin-American perspective**

Panel 6 specifically dealt with global-local partnerships for sustainable forest management in Latin-America. The key question addressed in this panel was to what extent and under what conditions multi-scale partnerships can regulate power imbalances and conflicting interests and give an impulse to democratic governance of forest resources in Latin America.

More specifically, three issues were raised in the discussion:

- What is a partnership?
- What will partnerships do and to what extent can they help to achieve the double goal of biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation?
- What barriers hinder the establishment and effective functioning of partnerships and what can be done to resolve them?

As regards the definition of partnerships there is a need for more precision. Scholz, for instance, distinguishes between alliances, partnerships and networks, but the same terms are used by other paper presenters in another meaning. A remarkable aspect of the discussion is the positive connotation around partnerships. They have to do with alliances, joint action, multiple stakeholders, models of dialogue, consensus, interactions, negotiations, etc. We do not speak about 'people', but about stakeholders, parties and players. Reality on the ground is, however, not always so positive. In practice, 'partners' are embedded in very unequal power relations. We tend to be too positive about partnerships – people do not have the same goals and the same interests and it remains an enormous challenge to 'scale up' the successful experiences.

With regard to the potential of partnerships to reconcile the goals of biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation, seven interesting cases were presented dealing with partnerships in various regions of Latin America. There were papers dealing with partnerships in Brazilian Amazonia, the Guiana Shield, the Chocó district in Ecuador, Costa Rica and Nicaragua. The partnerships were built around extractive reserves, agroforestry with indigenous groups, hydroelectric dams, eco-regional approaches (Guiana Shield Initiative) and industrial forestry. Against these different contexts, the outcomes and the impacts of partnerships might be very different. The outcomes range from money from donor organisations and public pressure (although this might be insufficient to change reality) or land-use plans. Outcomes can also be negative, e.g. when people are excluded from partnerships or certain groups lose access rights to the forest.

As regards the conditions under which partnerships can become successful (*i.e.* lead to sustainable and pro-poor forest management), several aspects came to the fore:

- Partnerships require security, trust, access to information, feedback mechanisms, a transparent dialogue and preparedness to compromise.
- Communication, advocacy and lobby play an important role.
- All stakeholders should be identified. If partnerships exclude people or prevent important actors from participating, negotiations will not be effective.
- Partnerships cannot act as a substitute for the role of government: public investments – and hence the participation of public actors in partnerships – remains crucial.
- There is also a crucial role for external actors such as the Church, foreign donors and NGOs – the more so since power relations are skewed.
- There should be some degree of shared interests. In this respect it is important to take account of the fact that that multiple goals exist and that the reasons for (groups of) people to form a partnership can be very fragmented. For instance, people can form a partnership in favour of a dam not because they are interested in the dam itself, but in the roads that will be built when the dam is constructed.
- The potential success of partnerships cannot be isolated from the macro-economic context. Although economic crises might frustrate the formation of partnerships, the very same crises may help conserve the rain forest. Data from Brazilian Amazonia shows that deforestation slows down in years of financial crisis.

The final issue that was discussed in this panel concerned the bottlenecks to effective partnerships. Among these are the predominance of institutional and donor agendas, the



fragmentation of interests and objectives of parties involved in the partnership and conflicting interests within organisations (e.g. between local and central government). Gender and ethnicity are relevant here as well. Some people might not be able to participate in partnerships because they lack the time or capacity to do so or simply because they are not interested in participating. Furthermore, lack of trust in each other might also frustrate the success of partnerships.

There is still a lot to discuss in relation to partnerships. What, for instance, about the 'bad guys' such as coca growers or *guerilleros*? Or the Europeans and Americans who buy a piece of rain forest via the internet? Should these new actors play a role in partnerships? Local land ownership is changing with the liberalisation of land markets and the devolution of land to communities. It might be useful to define the criteria for the different and newly emerging actors to link up with partnerships.

There is also the question of whether poverty can be alleviated through forest conservation. The majority of the population in Latin America live outside the forest and many of those living in the forest try to escape from poverty by moving out of the forest. These people are not interested in reconciling the objectives of forest conservation and poverty alleviation at all – they simply want development! Ways will have to be found to alleviate poverty among those population groups living outside the forest and those who are not willing to stay there.

The conclusion of this panel is that Latin America provides the ground for successful multi-scale and multi-stakeholder partnerships, but that the up-scaling of successful experiences is a problem. Partnerships should not be romanticised. The political power of large landowners is strong and the public sector is weak. For the time being, the influence of outsiders and international donors remains essential.

#### **- The impact of decentralisation on forest resource management**

This panel discussed localisation processes like decentralisation and the devolution of land, rights and authority over natural resources to local population and user groups and lower level authorities. It has been argued that decentralised systems of forest management can lead to the more sustainable and equitable use of resources, as decision-makers are located closer to, and are more directly involved in, the resource to which their policies and interventions refer. Decentralisation is also supposed to increase local participation in resource allocation decisions, provide for greater accountability and the more sustainable use of natural resources. On the other hand, decentralisation and the devolution of land rights bring new actors into the arena, with potentially conflicting interests, objectives, mandates and values – which contrast not least with those of central government agencies previously responsible for forest and natural resource management. Decentralised power also incites local authorities to raise revenues, thereby creating an incentive to exploit the forest beyond sustainable levels. The central question addressed in this panel was to what extent and under which conditions decentralisation and devolution of forest rights can stimulate more democratic and sustainable forest management.

A total of seven papers were presented which focused on newly emerging opportunities in the area of decentralised forest management in a number of developing countries. Experiences were reported from Indonesia, Pakistan, Senegal, Mali and Cameroon.

One of the central issues raised concerns the question of whether decentralised forest management actually provides the answer to effective management of forest resources by empowering local actors. In Senegal, the transformation of endowments (rights to transform trees into charcoal) into entitlements (economic benefits derived from the revenue generated from the sale of charcoal) has been disturbed due to the structural weakness of the decentralised authorities that manage forestry (the rural councils). Local control in this case does not lead to the effective management of the forest resources. An observation made in the case of Indonesia is that, while there is a decentralisation of public administrative procedures, forest management has essentially remained state-based and local or regional communities have not been empowered.

Discussions and remarks over the papers led to the following observations and conclusions:

- The decentralisation of forest management means it is becoming increasingly difficult for external actors such as governments and private companies to ignore local forest communities. This is probably the most significant achievement of this reform.
- Decentralised forest management often boils down to administrative deconcentration rather than to a transfer of decision-making power and financial control to local communities. Obviously, such local field offices of central or regional governments will primarily be upwardly accountable rather than being accountable to the people living and working in the forest.
- All too often, decentralised structures are imposed from above which disregard existing (informal) community forest management institutions, despite their potential role in sustainable forest management.
- The discussants claimed that meaningful results of decentralisation can only materialise if local actors have the power of rights, both in financial and administrative terms. The two rights need to co-exist within the local community in order for genuine power to actually exist. Furthermore, this transfer needs to be accompanied by a genuine process of local capacity building (enabling local communities to exercise their new rights effectively) as well as a process of internal reform within state forestry institutions (adapting their rules, procedures and working attitudes to suit and support the new system).

A few warnings were also highlighted:

- Decentralised forest management is often not capable of changing existing commercial practices. Granting local communities legal rights to forest resources does not guarantee their ultimate control over such resources, since it also depends on their access to capital, labour and decision-making power. Control is primarily a function of social, economic and political power, which is usually in the hands of actors outside the local community.
- The advocates of decentralised forest management tend to underestimate the strength of established forms of informal management practices and their ability either to paralyse official reforms or to manipulate them in favour of dominant interests.
- In the event that decentralised forest management does provide an effective means of local control over forest land or resources, the benefits do not automatically accrue to the entire community. The main local benefactors of decentralised forest management are usually the local elites (e.g. tribal chiefs), who wield substantial political and social power. Ethnic groups such as migrants and nomads are ignored or not conferred rights, and this tends to result in the increasing marginalisation of minority groups.
- In the event that local communities become actively involved in forest management it is imaginable that global players will see their chances to exploit the system improved since negotiating power and skills on the part of these communities are likely to be less than that of Forestry Departments or state institutions that used to control access to the forest. They may therefore gain a stronger foothold in economically poor areas that are rich in forest resources.
- Decentralised forest management does not necessarily guarantee environmental and ecological sustainability. The local authorities and local people still focus primarily on economic benefits and sustainability and conservation measures will be compromised as a result.

In conclusion, decentralised forest management can empower local communities. However, contrary to its assumed contribution to sustainable forest management, the new institutions often lead to the proliferation of practices directed at short-term economic gains. The sustained use of forest lands and resources is not automatically granted if local communities are in charge. Sustainable forest management requires a 'watchdog'. The question that remains unanswered is who is going to act as such and who is going to be able to ensure sustainability.

#### **- A learning perspective on partnerships in collaborative forest management**

Panel 8 dealt with issues related to collaborative management of forest resources (co-management). The increased involvement and interactions of social actors from different levels (national, regional and local) and their changing roles and responsibilities in natural resource management often result in conflict due to diversity among stakeholders and their interests. The involvement of various (community) groups and organisations, each with their own 'agenda' and interests, imposes special requirements on work processes to ensure

lasting agreements and solutions. Active monitoring and feedback on results need to be accompanied by learning processes among stakeholders and groups, the so-called social or collaborative learning perspective. This process requires participants to develop an appreciation of other stakeholders' interests and perceptions, as well as an awareness of their own 'mental models'. Combined with required flexibility to adjust for the inherent uncertainty and diversity in managing the natural resources, the complexity of such process management requires special attention. This panel explored the potential of social learning as a tool or approach to enhance partnerships at local and regional levels. This is particularly important when considering sustainable forest management in conditions where poverty, land degradation and loss of biodiversity are in a vicious spiral.

An introduction to the concept of Adaptive Collaborative Management (ACM) made it clear that collaborative forest management should be *adaptive* because socio-economic and political contexts change rapidly. It is the adaptive and reflective capacities of stakeholders that need to be triggered in ACM as they play a decisive role for the success of ACM. It should also be *collaborative* because of the complexity of forest management that involves multiple stakeholders and forest products. Forest management can no longer be defined solely as a technical 'business'. Instead, due to the call for participation, democratic process and decentralisation, forest management must be more inclusive in the sense that it allows wider participations from all relevant stakeholders. For that reason, the stakeholders need to make a conscious joint effort to define shared goals and continuously evaluate and adjust them to the changing contexts and needs. To enable stakeholders to do so, several platforms for dialogue and interaction need to be created and these could include village meetings, informal dialogue, meetings, workshops and exchange visits. Trust building, communication within and between stakeholders and knowledge sharing are crucial in the social learning process. Once the stakeholders have found common ground (e.g. local priority problems or shared interests such as the rehabilitation of degraded land), they can start dividing roles and responsibilities.

Social learning, defined as a continuous dialogue and deliberate exploration of problems and solutions, is considered to be the heart and soul of ACM. It encourages the stakeholders to observe and monitor the outcome of their actions and adjust, improve and adapt management accordingly in order to deal with complexities and uncertainties. For social learning to take place, there must be a trigger or motivation for learning. Learning should be deliberately designed: it requires a facilitator and proper skills, capacities, attitudes and behaviour. A conducive or enabling environment for learning and experimentation is also needed to facilitate the emergence of innovation and novelty. It should be realised, however, that learning is a process which does not necessarily produce results over a short period of time.

In the absence of social learning, erroneous decisions are made or existing conflicts among stakeholders may be aggravated. This was exemplified by a case from Papua New Guinea, where there was no effective dialogue between local communities, local and international logging companies and central and local government. Consultation between all relevant stakeholders was recommended here with a view to developing a land-use plan that could form the basis for the reconciliation of conflicting interests, including those of logging companies in need of resources and the government in need of revenues.

This panel's afternoon session focused on ways to promote the participation of various stakeholders and their respective roles and responsibilities in triggering learning.

Two papers specifically dealt with the role of academics and researchers. In Thailand, academic scholars and intellectuals helped to get widespread national attention for a conflict over forest access rights, which led to a legalised Community Forestry Bill that regulates local forest management. Another paper focused on the role of collaborative research, using CIFOR's ACM research as an example. The key strategy in this participatory action research includes joint planning and collective action, mutual learning, social skills development, devising and applying local indicators and collaborative monitoring tools. On the basis of this approach, CIFOR – with the help of its partners – has concluded that community collaborative research appears to be more effective in assisting communities with their forestry projects.

An eco-development project in West India that drastically changed people's livelihood options exemplified that there is a specific role to play for NGOs mediating effectively between villagers and the Forestry Department. NGOs are also essential for securing the participation of women. Clear personal relations are important for participation as well and this means getting close to villagers and making them feel that there is no distance or difference between project implementers and themselves. Law enforcement may have an immediate restraining effect, but it is only temporary. It is also counterproductive and will generate dislike and vindictiveness. The interactive approach pursued in this project has led to people switching from destructive and depredating practices to understanding, appreciation and promotion of the objectives of sanctuary protection and management.

The last presentation specified the respective roles of government, NGOs and research and training institutions. The role of central government is to create a conducive legal and policy framework for resource allocation, while local government can create a discussion forum or platform for stakeholders at local level. NGOs and civil society organisations can play a role complementary to that of the government, facilitating and empowering communities for social learning and linking government, research organisations and communities. The roles of research and training institutions entail the establishment of benchmarks for participatory planning, monitoring and evaluation, plus action research oriented towards relevant topics. They also have a responsibility to make research output user-friendly at different levels while building learning models to help communities understand forest dynamics. It was concluded that to trigger social learning, there is need for attitude, behavioural and institutional change to ensure that multi-stakeholder resources are effectively utilised and that, at the same time, there are multi-stakeholder benefits.

The panel concluded that conditions on the ground are often more complex and that apparently homogenous stakeholders may be socially very differentiated. In many cases, participation is 'invited participation'. There are several conditions under which social learning can be effective, but under very intensive conflicts or when particular technologies are needed but not available, such as in the case of fire fighting, other approaches might be more appropriate.

## Conclusions

This congress dealt with new markets, governance forms and multi-scale partnerships in forest management. Based on field-based examples and experiences, the discussions in the panels evolved around lessons learnt, challenges to be faced and recommendations for policy, action and research.

We have seen that there is increasing awareness of the forests' ecological and livelihood values which one now wishes to increase via new market-based and financial mechanisms.

With respect to the **market for ecosystem services** it became clear that a solution is needed for such problems as 'leakage' (forest clearing outside the project area), high transaction costs and weak institutions. Due to limited funds there is also need for priority setting (e.g. first the forests that are sensible to erosion). Taking these limitations into account, it is encouraging to note the willingness of multiple parties to further develop these markets. In particular when an integrated approach is followed, these efforts hold the promise of being a 'two-edged sword' that secures forest environmental services and alleviates poverty.

Another strategy to combine the twin aims of forest conservation and improved livelihoods for populations living in and around forests is through **sustainable market-oriented forest production by low-income producers**. New market opportunities have emerged for these producers because growing portions of forest land are becoming subject to indigenous and community ownership and an increasing number of business-community partnerships and new (niche) markets for sustainably produced forest products and environmental services are emerging. Successful examples (in terms of forest conservation and higher incomes for poor people) can be found in Latin America in particular, but there is some doubt as to whether these successes can be 'up-scaled' and survive without donor support. People living relatively close to roads and cities, as well as those who are able to increase densities of commercial

species through domestication, are the ones most likely to benefit from the new market opportunities.

A promising market-based strategy to enhance sustainable forest management is **forest (product) certification**. It is fairly new, but is certainly here to stay. Certification has given indigenous and other groups in society a voice in forest policy that they have never had before and it has united governments, the private sector and civil society around the conservation and sustainable management of forests. While it is already successful in the North, the challenge is to extend its implementation further into the South. Developing standards that are adapted to the conditions in the tropics, simplifying the certification process and bringing it within reach of small-scale producers and creating enabling conditions (legally and institutionally) are among the main challenges that have to be met. Research can play a role in developing adequate standards for the South and alternative approaches.

The main threat to sustainable forest management and certification is **illegal logging**. The provision of cheap wood from unsustainably managed sources offers serious competition for certified wood. NGOs can play a role in the 'greening' of the timber industry, by functioning as a watchdog, by building capacity and by promoting certification. Alliances between forestry services, NGOs and progressive timber companies may play a role in combating illegal logging, whereas international companies may serve as an example for domestic industries.

**Alliances and partnerships for sustainable forest management** – the specific focus of Day 2 of the congress – suggest a coalition between parties that often does not exist. Power imbalances, but also donor dependency among NGOs, bear the risk that the poor and less powerful are being excluded.

This is particularly visible in cases presented from Africa, where the demarcation of conservation areas often leads to the exclusion of poor forest users and the loss of their access rights to forest resources. Positive feedback mechanisms, advocacy and lobbying and effective partnerships between various players are needed to enhance the **reconciliation of conservation goals and the development aspirations of the rural poor**. Clear tenure and forest use arrangements, that take customary rights into account, are also important in this respect. In both policy and research it is crucial to think in local people's language and mental frameworks instead of using Western terminology. Self-reflection in the North is needed as well in order to prevent the dominance of donor interests. Science (in particular participatory research) can play a role in clarifying who are the 'local' stakeholders in conservation programmes and what their development aspirations are, thus helping to set the research agenda from a local and pro-poor perspective.

**Latin America**, in particular, provides the ground **for successful multi-scale and multi-stakeholder partnerships**. But here, too, the challenge is to deal with unequal power relations, unclear tenure arrangements and donor dependency. The cases presented show that conditions for successful partnerships include trust, security, feedback mechanisms, a transparent dialogue, proper stakeholder identification, shared interests, participation of the public sector and an enabling environment. The up-scaling of successful experiences remains problematic. Successful examples receive a lot of donor funding, but this does nothing to change the overall picture of politically powerful large landowners and a weak public sector. For the time being, the influence of outsiders (like the church and NGOs) and international donors remains essential.

**Decentralised forest management** is said to empower local communities. Indeed, decentralisation made forest communities visible to governments and private companies. However, the devolution of rights over forests and forest resources does not necessarily mean that local populations automatically gain control over their use – the influence of the local elite and powerful outsiders remains strong. Moreover, the new institutions often lead to the proliferation of practices directed at short-term economic gains. This means that the sustained use of forest lands and resources is not automatically granted if local communities are in charge. Decentralised forest management requires a 'watchdog' if it is to be sustainable. The question that remains unanswered is who is capable of acting and who is going to act as such.

The concept of **adaptive collaborative forest management** (ACM) was coined as a deliberate strategy to unite multiple stakeholders around commonly defined goals. In practice this is no easy task since conditions on the ground are often more complex than anticipated and apparently homogenous stakeholders may be socially very differentiated. Social learning (*i.e.* a continuous dialogue between multiple stakeholders and deliberate exploration of problems and solutions) is key to ACM. This requires trust, communication and knowledge sharing. In practice, however, participation is a top-down approach or 'invited participation'. Science can play a role here through participatory action research that includes joint planning and collective action, mutual learning, social skills development and the development of collective monitoring tools. NGOs and CSOs can play a facilitating role, empowering local communities for social learning and linking government, research organisations and communities. As was also concluded in other panels, the public sector should create a conducive legal and policy framework for equitable resource allocation.

Overall, it can be concluded that the 21<sup>st</sup> century, through processes of globalisation and localisation, brings new market incentives and partnerships for sustainable forest management which focus more than ever before on the forests' ecological values and the livelihood needs of the poor. If power imbalances can be overcome and new forms of exclusion can be prevented, the new partnerships and governance forms should be conducive to the development of **pro-poor forestry**. Whether this will also lead to **sustainable forest management** depends on clear tenure and forest use arrangements, proper standards and monitoring methods and, above all, the political will and capacity of multiple stakeholders to reconcile conflicting interests through social learning. Scientists are faced by the challenge to unravel what these conflicts entail and to be open to a greater diversity of perspectives and concepts, including those 'from the ground'. With respect to the latter there is no time to lose: we must learn by doing, using participatory and collaborative approaches.

### Reflections<sup>3</sup>

Looking back on the conference, Melissa Leach raised four points or dilemmas:

- What implications do new market opportunities and participation in multiple partnerships with multiple agencies have for communities; who is going to bring this about; what kind of transaction costs are involved; and what kind of burdens does it create for people who are basically struggling to make a living in forests?
- Stakeholder analysis is too limited a way to examine issues of representation, multiple and overlapping rights and claims on a number of scales, and overlapping legal orders. Who defines what is legal and legitimate? All this not only creates new forms of uncertainty and insecurity to people, but also opens up a field of enormous power play. Instead of a stakeholder analysis we need something that is more dynamic, *e.g.* 'access mapping' or 'commodity chain analysis' or any other approach that also incorporates power and power relations.
- We have heard lots of calls for more attention to be paid to the 'social embeddedness' of local concepts and ideals. However, sometimes people may not think in terms of forests: they may think in terms of broader livelihoods or sacred questions. We tend to have a romanticised image of a 'pure' local set of concepts, as if there has not already been a long history of hybridisation of the ways local people think and interact with non-local actors. However, more fundamentally, it would seem to deny people the capacity to latch on to global concepts in very creative ways. The international debate about forests may provide a vehicle for people to get a foothold and then make some wider claims about rights and livelihoods and human rights. Other agencies are likewise using forests to pursue much wider political and economic agendas. When the World Bank talks about forests and market opportunities this is really just a kind of a cover to promote much broader agendas. Why not talk straight about the power of the markets and neo-liberalism or human rights?
- Finally, there is the need to recapture ecology as a player. This requires more dialogue between social and natural sciences. A gulf still exists between the discourse in social sciences and the debates that forest ecologists are now having, which are framed very much in non-equilibrium and historical terms. Climate history, for example, reveals that non-

---

<sup>3</sup> Based on the synthesising presentations by Melissa Leach and Marcus Colchester.

equilibrical forces shape environments. One can no longer talk about 'forests as nature' and 'original forest' as criteria against which one can measure degradation – although these concepts ('forests as nature' and 'original forest') are still alive in policy debates on conservation and sustainable forest management. What does this gulf mean? Do conservation and policy debates require this appeal to 'nature', 'origin' or a notion of a baseline because these are rather Western cultural-based notions which continue to pervade these debates or because of the politics of needing something stable to guide management? This brings us to the issue of community autonomy, because if life is rather more uncertain due to uncertainties in ecology and non-equilibrical dynamics intersecting with unpredictable socio-political life and indeed with the vagaries of global markets, we might have to recognise the limits to management and to 'managerialism' and to rethink the goals of forest management as something really rather less embracing, something that has to be much more adaptive and much more learning-based. Or, indeed, to give more autonomy to the communities which are actually living with, and adapting to, such uncertainties all along.

Marcus Colchester put forward the following reflections:

- We talked a lot about 'ownership' of market-based approaches as being vital for local communities, but we know, of course, that people are unable to 'own' markets. So what we are really asking is how do people ensure that the right preconditions are in place to render their engagement in the market effective?
- The market for environmental services will increase the value of land and the chances are that the poor and marginal people who lack secure access to their lands will get squeezed out by the creation of these new markets. So a precondition we all seem to agree on is that people need to have secure access to land. However, what kind of title do people require? The experience of history is that for many indigenous and other marginalised groups the wrong law is almost worse than no law. Indeed, there is a risk of land markets exacerbating poverty and leading to new problems. What titling are we really talking about which would give people the security they want, but also the flexibility that they are seeking in the future?
- With regard to certification, the question was asked of how indigenous peoples' rights are being dealt with by the Forest Stewardship Council. The answer is that it is a requirement of the FSC that issues of tenure are sorted out (under Principle 2) and that the rights of indigenous people are secured (under Principle 3). In both cases, concession management should be subject to the freely informed consent of communities and indigenous peoples. The problem is that certificates are being handed out where these standards are not being recognised (e.g. in Nicaragua) and in fact certificates are effectively legitimising the expropriation of indigenous peoples. So it seems that the preconditions are not effective and this is largely due to the fact that participation in the setting of standards, locally and internationally, is not occurring.
- In the case of the carbon market the prospects for the poor are even more uncertain. It is not even clear what process the carbon markets will take, nor what the standards will be, nor how these standards are going to be applied. It is a matter of concern that carbon forestry may be burdening communities with further risk. In general, the poor have learned to be risk averse and carbon forestry will entail major costs and often-uncertain benefits. It may also impose new land-use choices and new choices of species, which are going to be chosen more to suit the capture of carbon than because of their suitability for fulfilling livelihood needs. What happens when these efforts to capture carbon fail? Who is going to bear the costs?
- One answer to all these dilemmas was for a more bottom-up process of standard setting. But can people cope with all this? Do they have the capacity, time, resources and political space to engage in setting forest management standards that are appropriate considering their priorities.
- Another answer was to have more integrated approaches. This task deserves further exploration. We must ask ourselves first what are we trying to integrate? Are we trying to integrate *our* standards and expectations of what must be done in forests or the expectations of the people who live there? Moreover, how do we deal with the fact that different groups of people have very different expectations and very different priorities as regards what they want to do with forests? How do we globalise differences?
- People cannot afford to wait until these processes are perfected or until these inappropriate and imposed scientific discourses are revised by enlightened scientists. The problem is

that people have to engage now in processes that are sub-optimal; they have to find new ways of 'learning-by-doing'.

- The new requirements of the markets and market-based mechanisms, the new requirements of political mobilisation to counter new threats and the requirements of new partnerships that are being built do often not link up well with the institutions of local communities, their priorities or their customary systems of decision-making. They may exacerbate divisions within the communities based on wealth, on power, on gender, on class and on caste. This is an issue we need to reflect on a lot more.
- Much more reflection is also required on the tensions that exist between NGOs and communities in terms of substitution of voice, imposed agendas and the wrong pace and processes of decision-making. Otherwise we do risk imposing more forms of exclusion.
- We should also reflect on the role of the State and need to appreciate more that 'the State' is an 'arena' and not a monolithic entity. There is a need for more informed engagement with the state. How do we play off the centre against the regions and local governments? How do we play off the different line ministries against each other to find new alliances? How do we play off politicians against bureaucrats? We need to complement more cooperative approaches with state agencies with the confrontational approaches.

In spite of these dilemmas, Colchester found this conference very hopeful: 'The fact that we are confronting these dilemmas is in itself an advance. Even though we did not find the answers we posed at the beginning of this congress, at least it is clear that we are trying to deal with this globalisation problem in a socially sensitive way.'



## Appendix 1 – The programme

Time slot	Wednesday 22 October 2003				Thursday 23 October 2003			
	GLOBALISING MARKETS AND THE POTENTIAL OF RESPONSIBLE TRADE				GLOBAL-LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT			
	Chair: Harmen Verbruggen (IVM, Free University, Amsterdam)				Chair: K. Freerk Wiersum (Dept. of Environmental Sciences, Wageningen University)			
8:30 – 9:30 a.m.	Registration and coffee				Registration and coffee			
9:30 – 11:00 a.m.	<b><u>Plenary session – Room A-A</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opening, welcome and <b>introduction</b> (20 minutes in total)</li> <li>Presentations (20 minutes) Joshua Bishop (IUCN, Gland, Switzerland): <b>Markets for environmental services and opportunities for the poor</b> Catrinus Jepma (RUG/Universiteit van Amsterdam, Groningen/Amsterdam, the Netherlands): <b>Carbon crediting and sustainable forest management</b></li> <li>Discussion (30 minutes)</li> </ul>				<b><u>Plenary session – Room A-B</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentations (30 minutes) Marcus Colchester (World Rainforest Movement, UK) <b>Bridging the gap: communities, forests and international networks</b> Melissa Leach (Institute of Development Studies, UK) <b>Does globalised science work for the poor? Forest perspectives</b></li> <li>Discussion (30 minutes)</li> </ul>			
11:00 – 11:30 a.m.	Coffee break / Poster presentations				Coffee break / Poster presentations			
11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.	Room <u>G.0.03</u> Panel 1 Session 1 3 papers	Room <u>G.0.18</u> Panel 2 Session 1 4 papers	Room <u>G.2.02</u> Panel 3 Session 1 2 papers	Room <u>G.1.03</u> Panel 4 Session 1 4 papers	Room <u>G.0.03</u> Panel 5 Session 1 4 papers	Room <u>G.0.18</u> Panel 6 Session 1 3 papers	Room <u>G.2.02</u> Panel 7 Session 1 3 papers	Room <u>G.1.03</u> Panel 8 Session 1 4 papers
1:00 – 2:00 p.m.	Lunch				Lunch			
2:00 – 3:30 p.m.	Room <u>G.0.03</u> Panel 1 Session 2 3 papers	Room <u>G.0.18</u> Panel 2 Session 2 4 papers	Room <u>G.2.02</u> Panel 3 Session 2 2 papers	Room <u>G.1.03</u> Panel 4 Session 2 4 papers	Room <u>G.0.03</u> Panel 5 Session 2 4 papers	Room <u>G.0.18</u> Panel 6 Session 2 4 papers	Room <u>G.2.02</u> Panel 7 Session 2 3 papers	Room <u>G.1.03</u> Panel 8 Session 2 4 papers
3:30 – 4:00 p.m.	Tea break / Poster presentations				Tea break / Poster presentations			
4:00 – 5:30 p.m.	<b><u>Plenary session – Room A-B</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation outcome panels (10 minutes each)</li> <li>Discussion (30 minutes)</li> </ul>				<b><u>Plenary session – Room A-B</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation outcome panels (10 minutes each)</li> <li>Discussion (30 minutes)</li> <li>Synthesis by Marcus Colchester and Melissa Leach</li> <li>Closure</li> </ul>			
5:30 – 6:00 p.m.	Walk to Town Hall				Drinks and snacks			
6:00 – 7:00 p.m.	Reception organised by the Municipality of Amsterdam							
7:30 – 9:30 p.m.	Congress dinner / boat trip through Amsterdam canals							



## Appendix 2 – List of papers presented

<b>Panel 1 – The feasibility of payments for ecosystem services</b> <b>Chair: Dr Pieter van Beukering (IVM, Free University, Amsterdam, the Netherlands)</b> <b>Discussant: Dr Joshua Bishop (IUCN, Gland, Switzerland)</b>	
Author(s)	Title
Pieter van Beukering (IVM, Free University, Amsterdam, the Netherlands)	Economic valuation of the local and global value of tropical forest
Pita Verweij (Copernicus Centre, Utrecht University, the Netherlands)	Recent trends in financial mechanisms for sustainable forest management and conservation (provisional title)
Peter May (UFRRJ, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil), Emily Boyd (University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK), Fernando Veiga (UFRRJ, Brazil) and Manyu Chang (UFPR, Curitiba, Brazil)	Towards socially and environmentally friendly carbon: learning from pilot projects in Bolivia and Brazil
Arild Angelsen (Agricultural University Norway), Jens Aune (AUN), Stein Holden (AUN) and Solveig Glomsrød (Statistics Norway)	Leakage in CDM projects: are forest and energy projects equally troubled?
Margaret M. Skutsch (University of Twente, Enschede, the Netherlands)	Carbon as a non-timber forest product
<b>Panel 2 – Opportunities for forest markets to benefit local low-income producers</b> <b>Co-chairs: Dr Andy White (Forest Trends, Washington, USA) and Dr Mirjam A.F. Ros-Tonen (AGIDS, Universiteit van Amsterdam, the Netherlands)</b> <b>Discussant: Dr René Boot (Tropenbos International, Wageningen, the Netherlands)</b>	
Author(s)	Title
Sara Scherr (Forest Trends, USA), Andy White (Forest Trends, USA) and David Kaimowitz (CIFOR, Indonesia)	Time for something different: putting markets to the service of the forest poor
Mirjam A.F. Ros-Tonen (AGIDS, Universiteit van Amsterdam, the Netherlands) and Freerk Wiersum (Dept. of Environmental Sciences, Wageningen University, the Netherlands)	The scope for improving livelihoods on the basis of commercial non-timber forest production
James Mayers and Sonja Vermeulen (IIED, London, UK)	Challenges, innovations and principles for multi-scale partnerships between forestry companies and local communities
Kei Otsuki (Amazon Papers, Brazil/ Wageningen University, the Netherlands)	Global commodities with local value: non-timber forest product (NTFP) development in the Brazilian Amazon
Carla Morsello and W. Neil Adger (School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia, UK / PROCAM-USP, São Paulo, Brazil)	Corporate-community partnerships in Amazonian indigenous communities
Han Overman and Josefien Demmer (AGIDS, Universiteit van Amsterdam, the Netherlands)	Indigenous forest owners: does higher income mean higher pressure?
Tinde van Andel (Leiden University branch of the National Herbarium of the Netherlands)	First FSC-certified non-timber forest products from the Brazilian Amazon
Herwig M. Cleuren (INBAR)	Bamboo sector development as a means for sustaining forest livelihoods
<b>Panel 3 – Greening (trans)national logging companies? Strategies to combat illegal and unsustainable logging</b> <b>Chair: Dr Peter Ho (Environmental Policy Group, Wageningen University, the Netherlands)</b> <b>Discussant: Prof. Dr Heiner Schanz (Nature Conservation Policy Group, Wageningen University, the Netherlands)</b>	
Author(s)	Title
Peter Ho (Environmental Policy Group, Wageningen University, the Netherlands)	Greening or greenwash of forest industries? An introduction
F.O.C. Nwonwu (Africa Institute of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa)	The Congo Basin forests at the crossroads of globalisation and localisation conflicts in tropical forest management

Maria Tysiachniouk and Johnathan Reisman (Centre for Independent Social Research, St. Petersburg, Russia)	Global civil society and forest management in the Russian Far East
Paul Gellert (Cornell University, Ithaca NY, USA)	Defining illegal logging in Post-Suharto Indonesia: relative capacities of state, private and citizen actors
<b>Panel 4 – Certification and forestry</b>	
<b>Chair: Dr Augusta Molnar, Forest Trends, Washington, USA</b>	
<b>Discussant: Erik Lammerts van Bueren, ISAFOR, Scherpenzeel, the Netherlands</b>	
<b>Author (s)</b>	<b>Title</b>
Rebecca Butterfield, Eric Hansen and Richard Fletcher (Rainforest Alliance, Vermont, USA)	Forest certification and small forest enterprises: key trends and impacts; benefits and barriers
Michael Richards (Consultant, Ducklington, UK)	Progress and options for forest certification in complex governance and socio-political settings
Gerardo Segura (National Forestry Commission – CONAFOR, Mexico)	Forest certification and its real and potential influence on regulatory frameworks and forest policies
Andre de Freitas (IMAFLOA, Piracicaba, Brazil)	Sustainable forest management in Brazil and the role of FSC forest certification
Augusta Molnar (Forest Trends, Washington, USA)	Forest communities and certification: looking forward to the next decade
Anne C. de Fraiture and Wouter Leen Hijweege (International Agricultural Centre and Foundation Erkend Groen (FEG), Wageningen, the Netherlands)	Capacity building in forest certification: experiences in network facilitation for multi-stakeholder processes
Bart Holvoet and Bart Muys (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium)	Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) throughout the world: an analysis of similarities and differences between SFM standards
Cui Yihun, Yousif Ali Hussin and Ali Sharifi (International Institute for Geoinformation Science and Earth Observation – ITC, Enschede, the Netherlands)	Remote sensing and GIS for supporting sustainable forest management certification in the tropics
<b>Panel 5 – Linking global conservation objectives and local use of forest and wildlife resources</b>	
<b>Chair: Prof. Dr Ton Dietz (AGIDS, Universiteit van Amsterdam / CERES, Utrecht University, the Netherlands)</b>	
<b>Discussant: Dr Fred Zaal (AGIDS, Universiteit van Amsterdam)</b>	
<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Title</b>
Eero Palmujoki (University of Tampere, Finland)	International organisations, civil society and tropical forest management
Jan Joost Kessler (AIDenvironment, Amsterdam, the Netherlands)	Strategic partnerships to combat forest conversion and the role of financial institutions
James Gichiah Njogu (AGIDS, Universiteit van Amsterdam, the Netherlands / Moi University, Eldoret, Kenya)	Beyond community-based conservation: policy and institutional arrangements for partnerships in forest biodiversity management
Yihenew Zewdie (African Studies Centre, University of Leiden, the Netherlands)	Not by maize alone: forest access and rural livelihoods in Southwest Ethiopia
Wario R. Adano (AGIDS, Universiteit van Amsterdam, the Netherlands / Moi University, Eldoret, Kenya) and Karen Witsenburg (AGIDS, Universiteit van Amsterdam, the Netherlands)	Global forest management decisions and local use of forest resources in Kenya: exploring the link
Maija Kaisa Korhonen (University of Helsinki, Finland)	Local people and local benefits in integrated biodiversity conservation: a case study from Ranomafana National Park, Madagascar
Grace Nangendo, Oliver van Straaten and Alfred de Gier (International Institute for Geoinformation Science and Earth Observation – ITC, Enschede, the Netherlands)	Biodiversity conservation through burning: a case study of woodlands in Budongo forest reserve, NW Uganda

Christiaan van der Hoeven, Willem F. de Boer and Herbert H.T. Prins (Wageningen University, the Netherlands)	Pooling local expert opinions to estimate wildlife densities in tropical rainforests
<b>Panel 6 – Global-local partnerships for conservation and sustainable forest use: a Latin-American perspective</b> <b>Co-chairs: Heleen van den Hombergh (Oxfam Netherlands / AGIDS, Universiteit van Amsterdam, the Netherlands) and Dr Mirjam A.F. Ros-Tonen (AGIDS, Universiteit van Amsterdam, the Netherlands)</b> <b>Discussant: Dr Annelies Zoomers (CEDLA, Amsterdam, the Netherlands)</b>	
<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Title</b>
Sergio Rosendo (CSERGE, University of East Anglia, UK)	Partnerships across scales: lessons from extractive reserves in Brazilian Amazonia
Imme Scholz (German Development Institute, Bonn, Germany)	Negotiating solutions for local sustainable development and the prevention of deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon: the role of organised civil society and public actors in the Brazilian Amazon
Sjur Kasa and Lars Otto Næss (Center for International Climate and Environmental Research – CICERO, Oslo, Norway)	Globalisation and the environment: the effects of the financial crisis on tropical forest management in Brazilian Amazonia
Pitou van Dijk (Centre for Latin American Research and Documentation, Amsterdam, the Netherlands) and Wouter Veening (Netherlands' Committee for the IUCN, Amsterdam, the Netherlands)	Prospects for the Guiana Shield: sustainable forest management or exploitation of direct use values
Laura Rival and Nathalie Walker (Oxford University, UK)	Partnerships for sustainable forest management: lessons from the Ecuadorian Chocó
Heleen van den Hombergh (AGIDS, Universiteit van Amsterdam, and Oxfam-Netherlands)	Partnership on paper: discourse and political opportunities to resist industrial forestry in Southern Costa Rica
Mary M. Brook (University of Texas at Austin, USA)	Nicaragua: the rescaling of indigenous forestry
<b>Panel 7 – The impact of decentralisation on forest resource management</b> <b>Chair: Prof. Dr A. de Bruijne / Dr J. Post (AGIDS, Universiteit van Amsterdam, the Netherlands)</b>	
<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Title</b>
Hanna Kaisti (University of Tampere, Finland)	Conflict over access, struggle over meaning: decentralisation and customary land claims in Indonesian forest politics
Maryani, Retno (Wageningen University, the Netherlands)	Management of forest areas in Indonesia following forest policy decentralisation
Sarah Southwold-Llewellyn (Wageningen University, the Netherlands)	Devolution of forest management: a cautionary case of Pukhtun Jirgas in dispute settlements
Maaïke Snel and Johan Post (AGIDS, Universiteit van Amsterdam, the Netherlands)	Entitling local communities in forest management
Laurence Boutinot (CIRAD Forêt, Senegal)	Natural resource management and decentralisation in Senegal: the participation in the centre of actor's competition
Baptiste Hautdidier (ENGREF-Paris/IER), Laure Albigès (Université Aix-Marseille/GRET), Barka Atchoumgaï (IPR Katibougou-Mali/IER) and Denis Gautier (CIRAD-forêt-Montpellier /IER)	Has the establishment of rural wood markets in Mali led to an empowerment of the poor?
Friede Magloire Ngo Youmba	Does social forestry create democracy?
<b>Panel 8 – A learning perspective on partnerships in collaborative forest management</b> <b>Co-chairs: Dr Reinout de Hoogh and Wouter Leen Hijweege (International Agricultural Centre, Wageningen, the Netherlands)</b> <b>Discussant: Yurdi Yasmi, CIFOR, Indonesia</b>	
<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Title</b>
Yurdi Yasmi and Trikurnianti Kusumanto (ACM Programme, CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia)	Learning in adaptive collaborative management of community forests: lessons from Indonesia

Herlina Hartanto (ACM Programme, CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia)	Facilitating joint learning: lessons from adaptive collaborative management in the Philippines
Ruth C.H. Turia (Australian National University, Canberra, Australia)	The dilemma of 21 <sup>st</sup> century forest management in Papua New Guinea
Participants in IAC course on 'Leadership and adaptive management in forest environments'	The social learning process from the perspective of different stakeholder groups in collaborative forest management partnerships
Sacha Zurcher (Roskilde University, Denmark)	Public participation in community forestry policy in Thailand: the influence of academics as brokers
Purabi Bose (CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia)	Influencing the international forest policy: role of collaborative research
S. John Joseph (MS Swaminathan Research Foundation – MSSRF, India)	An impact experience with global-local partnership: an experiment of peoples' participation and partnership in a tiger reserve – KMTR
Participants in IAC course on 'Leadership and adaptive management in forest environments'	The roles for different stakeholder groups in collaborative forest management partnerships

### Appendix 3 – List of posters presented

<b>Poster presentations</b> <b>Coordinators: Mr Jelle Maas and Mrs. Blanca Mendez (Tropenbos International, Wageningen, the Netherlands)</b>	
<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Title of poster</b>
Martina Jung (Hamburg Institute of International Economics, Dept. of International Climate Policy, Hamburg, Germany)	The role of forestry sinks in the Clean Development Mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol – An analysis of policy scenarios
Birgit Habermann (Bangor, UK)	Compensating mountain communities for the conservation of ecosystem services
Dave Zwaan (NC-IUCN, Amsterdam, the Netherlands)	The feasibility of payment of ecosystem services in the Guiana Shield Initiative
Koen Kusters (CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia)	Commercialisation of non-timber forest products: lessons from a World Cases Comparison Project
Alicia Rondon (Georg August Universität, Institute of Tropical Silviculture, Goettingen, Germany)	Non-timber forest use and marketing opportunities among the Huascayacu Native Community
Freerk Wiersum (Dept. of Environmental Sciences, Wageningen University, the Netherlands)	Forest and nature conservation in a governance and community perspective: a research programme
B.H. Hedden-Dunkhorst (University of Bonn, Centre for Development Research, Bonn, Germany)	Agricultural intensification as a way to encourage forest conservation in the Brazilian Amazon region
César Carrillo Trueba (Facultad de Ciencias, México DF, México)	The potential of Camedor palm cultivation as a way to reduce pressure on forests: the case of lowland Chinantla, Oaxaca, Mexico
Claudia Kathrin Zingerli (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Chair of Forest Policy and Forest Economics, Zurich, Switzerland)	Politicisation of environmental resources in Ba Be National Park, Vietnam: the need for partnerships and capacity building





## Appendix 4 – List of participants

Adano, W.R.  
Universiteit van Amsterdam/AGIDS  
Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130  
1018 VZ Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
w.adano@frw.uva.nl

Aderibigbe, G.M.  
University of Agriculture/Forestry  
and Wildlife  
P.O Box 1617  
136 Abeokuta, Ogun State  
Nigeria  
matti\_20@yahoo.com

Adhikari, Rajendra Bahadur  
Rural Area Development  
Programme/NGO dept. (RADP)  
G.P.O. Box: 21003 Kathmandu  
21003 Tanahun  
Nepal  
radp\_rajendra@hotmail.com

Aladenola, V.O.  
GIG Home & Environmental  
Services/Env. Conservation Unit  
31 Oyemekun Road, P.O. Box  
1962  
234 Akure Ondo State  
Nigeria  
pogig2000@yahoo.com

Albigès, L.  
Université d'Aix-  
Marseille/Ethnology  
Le Clos, 55 Impasse des églantiers  
34830 Clapiers  
France  
laurealbiges@hotmail.com

Andel, T.R. van  
National Herbarium of  
the Netherlands  
P.O. Box 9514  
2300 RA Leiden  
The Netherlands  
andel@nhn.leidenuniv.nl

Angelsen, Arild  
Agricultural University of Norway  
P.O. Box 5033  
N-1432 Ås  
Norway  
arild.angelsen@ios.nlh.no

Babili, I.H.  
Sokoine University of Agriculture  
P.O. Box 3044  
Morogoro  
Tanzania  
sua-tu@suanet.ac.tz

Bakker, J.T.  
Latin America Environmental  
Society  
Keizersgracht 421  
1017 DJ Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
julianbakker@wxs.nl

Baud, Isa  
Universiteit van Amsterdam/AGIDS  
Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130  
1018 VZ Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
i.s.a.baud@frw.uva.nl

Bauer, H.  
Universiteit Leiden/Centre of  
Environmental Science  
P.O. Box 9518  
2300 RA Leiden  
The Netherlands  
bauer@cml.leidenuniv.nl

Benneker, C.E.B.  
Wageningen University/Forest  
and Nature Conservation Policy  
P.O. Box 342  
6700 AH Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
charlotte.benneker@wur.nl

Berg, J. van den  
LEI/Public Affairs  
P.O. Box 29703  
2502 LS The Hague  
The Netherlands  
jolanda.vandenberg@wur.nl

Betancur, L.  
Australasia Tropical Consulting  
9 Southerdrn Dr North Lakes,  
Mango Hill  
4509 Queensland  
Australia  
luis.betancur@bigpond.co

Beukering, Pieter van  
Vrije Universiteit/Institute for  
Environmental Studies  
Boelelaan 1087  
1081 HV Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
beukering@ivm.vu.nl

Beusink, I.J.B.M.  
Asterstraat 23  
6708 DH Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
irmabeus@hotmail.com

Bishop, Joshua  
IUCN  
Rue Mauverney  
1196 Gland  
Switzerland  
joshua.bishop@iucn.org

Boot, Rene  
Tropenbos International  
P.O. Box 232  
6700 AE Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
rene.boot@tropenbos.org

Börner, J.  
University of Bonn, Center for  
Development Research  
Walter-Flex-Str. 3  
53113 Bonn  
Germany  
janboerner@uni-bonn.de

Bose, Purabi  
CIFOR/Impact Assessment &  
Research Uptake  
Jalan CIFOR, Situ Gede,  
Sidang Barang  
16680 Bogor  
Indonesia  
p.bose@cgiar.org

Boutinot, Laurence  
CIRAD-Forêts  
37 avenue Jean XXIII, Dakar Etoile  
BP 6189 Dakar  
Senegal  
boutinot@cirad.fr

Boyd, Emily  
University of East Anglia/School of  
Development Studies  
40 Livingstone Street  
NR2 4HE Norwich  
UK  
e.boyd@uea.ac.uk

Brinkman, W.J.  
ETFRN  
P.O. Box 232  
6700 AE Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
Willemine.Brinkman@tropenbos.org

Brook, M.M.  
University of Texas/Geography  
Dept.  
545 South Prospect ST #38  
05401 Burlington, Vermont  
USA  
finleybrook@hotmail.com

Bruijne, G.A. de  
Universiteit van Amsterdam/AGIDS  
Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130  
1018 VZ Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
G.A.deBruijne@uva.nl

Buchy, M.  
ISS  
P.O. Box 29776  
2502 LT The Hague  
The Netherlands  
buchy@iss.nl

Burgers, P.P.M.  
Universiteit Utrecht/IDSUU  
P.O. Box 80115  
3508 TC Utrecht  
The Netherlands  
p.burgers@geog.uu.nl

Butterfield, R.  
Rainforest Alliance/Trees Dept.  
65 Millet St. Suite 201  
05477 Richmond, Vermont  
USA  
rbutterfield@ra.org

Carrilho-Trueba, C.  
Universidad Nacional Autonoma/  
Dep. De Fisica  
Circuito exterior, Ciudad  
Universitaria, Delegacion Coyoacan  
04150 Mexico DF  
Mexico  
cct@hp.fciencias.unam.mx

Chai Yan Chiew, Francis  
Forest Department Sarawak  
Wisma Sumber Alam Jalan  
Stadium, Petra Jaya  
93660 Kuching  
Malaysia (Sarawak)  
francisc@sarawaknet.gov.my

Chen, K.  
Shenyang Agricultural  
University/Forestry  
Dongling Road 120, Liaoning  
Province  
110161 Shenyang  
China  
chenkehan3@sina.com

Chikuruwo, J.  
Ministry of Local Government/Public  
Works & National Housing  
Private Bag 7755, Causeway  
Harare  
Zimbabwe

Clemens, A.  
World Wildlie Fund-Netherlands  
P.O. Box 7  
3700 AA Zeist  
The Netherlands  
AClemens@wwf.nl

Cleuren, H.M.  
INBAR  
P.O. Box 100101-80  
Beijing  
China  
hcleuren@inbar.int

Colchester, Marcus  
World Rainforest Movement/UK  
Office  
1c Fosseyway Business Centre,  
Stratford Road  
GL56 9NQ Moreton-in-March  
UK  
marcus@fppwrm.gn.apc.org

Colson, F.  
Universiteit Antwerpen/PLECO  
Universiteitsplein 1  
B-2610 Wilrijk  
Belgium  
filip.colson@pandora.be

Dam, J.E.  
Global Fire Management  
Calle El Cano 3, 1M  
38612 El Médano, S/C de Tenerife  
Spain  
jelmerdam@hotmail.com

Danso, Daniel Kwadwo  
Greencare and Girlchild Foundation  
Box 149 Legon  
Ilg Accra  
Ghana  
dkdanso@hotmail.com

Dietz, A.J.  
AGIDS / CERES  
Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130  
1018 VZ Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
a.j.dietz@frw.uva.nl

Dijck, Pitou van  
CEDLA  
Keizersgracht 397  
1016 EK Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
vandyck@cedla.uva.nl

Fraiture, A.C. de  
Freelance consultant  
Torenlaan 16  
6866 BS Heelsum  
The Netherlands  
fraiture@planet.nl

Freitas, Andre de  
IMAFLOA  
P.O. Box 411  
13400-970 Piracicaba  
Brazil  
andre@imaflora.org

Gaag, J. van der  
Universiteit van Amsterdam/FEE  
Roetersstraat 11  
1018 WB Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
vdgaag@fee.uva.nl

Gellert, Paul K.  
Cornell University/Dept. of  
Development Sociology  
337 Warren Hall  
14853 Ithaca, NY  
USA  
pkg1@cornell.edu

Glomsrød, S.  
Statistics Norway/Research Dept.  
P.O. Box 8131  
N-0033 Oslo Norway  
sgl@ssb.no

Grit, M.P.  
Netherlands Committee for IUCN  
Plantage Middenlaan 2 B  
1018 DD Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
rietje.grit@nciucn.nl

Groot, Derk de  
Trésor foundation/Management  
Nature Reserve  
Ruysdaellaan 51  
3712 AR Huis ter Heide UT  
The Netherlands  
denr.de.groot@worldonline.nl

Gunning, J.W.  
Vrije Universiteit  
De Boelelaan 1105  
1081 HV Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
Jgunning@feweb.vu.nl

Gupta, U.K.  
Rural Region & Agro-Forestry  
Dev. Centre  
Kalaiya Municipality - 7  
Ghusukpur, District Bara Narayani  
Nepal  
rrafdc@atcmail.com.np

Habermann, H.B.  
Bangor University  
Tan-y-bryn Lodge, Llandegai Road  
LL57 1PZ Bangor, Gwynedd  
UK  
Birgit.Habermann@gmx.at

Hartanto, H.  
CIFOR/Forests & Governance  
P.O. Box 6596 JKPWB  
10065 Jakarta  
Indonesia  
h.hartanto@cgiar.org

Hausler, S.  
DGIS, DML/KM  
van Speykstraat 4  
2518 GC The Hague  
The Netherlands  
s.hausler@inter.nl.net

Hautdidier, B.  
CIRAD-Forêts  
TA 10/D Campus international de  
Baillarguet  
34398 Montpellier  
France  
baptiste.hautdidier@cirad.fr

Helden, B. van  
European Commission/DG  
Development  
Genevestraat 12, Office 6/20  
B-1140 Brussels  
Belgium  
bastiaan.vanhelden@cec.eu.int

Helden, Flip van  
Ministerie Landbouw, Natuur en  
Voedselkwaliteit, Team  
Internationaal  
Bezuidenhoutseweg 73 (Kamer  
3507)  
2594 AC The Hague  
The Netherlands  
f.w.van.helden@minlnv.nl

Hess, S.M.  
Vrije Universiteit/Institute for  
Environmental Studies  
De Boelelaan 1087  
1081 HV Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
sebastiaan.hess@ivm.vu.nl

Heuse, Emmanuel  
World Wildlife Fund/Tropical  
Forest Unit  
Boulevard Emile Jacqmain, 90  
B-1000 Brussels  
Belgium  
emmanuel.heuse@wwf.be

Hijweege, W.  
Int. Agricultural Centre/Sustainable  
Management of Nat. Resources  
P.O. Box 88  
6700 AB Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
wouter.hijweege@wur.nl

Ho, P.P.S.  
Wageningen  
University/Environmental Policy  
Hollandseweg 1  
6706 KN Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
peter.ho@wur.nl

Hoeven, C.A. van der  
Wageningen University  
Bornsesteeg 69, Building 119  
6708 CC Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
christiaan.vanderhoeven@wur.nl

Hofstede, Margreet  
Ministerie Landbouw, Natuur  
en Voedselkwaliteit  
Bezuidenhoutseweg 73  
2594 AC The Hague  
The Netherlands

Holvoet, Bart  
Katholieke Universiteit  
Leuven/Landbeheer  
Vital Decosterstraat 102  
B-3000 Leuven  
Belgium  
bart\_holvoet@hotmail.com

Hombergh, H.G.M. van den  
Novib, Universiteit van  
Amsterdam/AGIDS  
P.O. Box 30919  
2500 GX The Hague  
The Netherlands  
heleen.van.den.hombergh@novib.nl

Hoogh, R.J. de  
Int. Agricultural Centre/Sustainable  
Management of Nat. Resources  
P.O. Box 88  
6700 AB Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
reinout.dehoogh@wur.nl

Hue, Le Thi Van  
ISS/Agriculture & Rural  
Development  
P.O. Box 29776  
2502 LT The Hague  
The Netherlands  
Hue@iss.nl

Hung, Nguyen Phu  
Tropenbos International-Vietnam  
P.O. Box 671  
00844 Hanoi  
Vietnam  
p.hung.tbi@hn.vnn.vn

Hussin, Y.A.  
ITC/Natural Resources  
Hengelosestraat 99  
7500 AA Enschede  
The Netherlands  
hussin@itc.nl

Hutabarat, H.P.  
Yayasan Alami/Program  
Development Dept.  
Jalan Komplek PLN Klender, Rt.  
006/002 52, Jakarta Timur  
DKI Jakarta  
Indonesia  
herda\_pam@link.net.id

Islamiah, Anjorin  
University of Lagos/Geography  
Dept.  
23401 Lagos  
Nigeria  
research2invent@yahoo.com

Ittersum, A. van  
Larenstein International  
Agricultural College  
P.O. Box 7  
7400 AA Deventer  
The Netherlands  
a.vanittersum@larenstein.nl

Jepma, Catrinus  
Rijksuniversiteit Groningen,  
Universiteit van Amsterdam  
P.O. Box 800  
9700 AV Groningen  
The Netherlands  
c.j.jepma@eco.rug.nl

Jeurissen, M.J.C.  
Universiteit Utrecht/Tresor  
Foundation  
Zilvergeldstraat 75  
3513 VP Utrecht  
The Netherlands  
pipasi@hotmail.com

Joseph, S. John  
M.S. Swaminathan Research  
Foundation  
3rd Cross, Taramani Complex  
600113 Chennai  
India  
sjjoseph@vsnl.net

Jung, Martina  
Hamburg Institute of International  
Economics (HWWA)  
Neuer Jungfernstieg 21  
D-20347 Hamburg  
Germany  
martina.jung@hwwa.de

Kaisti, Hanna  
University of Tampere/Political  
Science and International Relations  
FIN-33014 Tampere  
Finland  
hanna.kaisti@uta.fi

Kasa, S.  
Center for International Climate  
and Environmental (CICERO)  
P.O. Box 1129 Blindern  
N-0318 Oslo  
Norway  
sjur.kasa@cicero.uio.no

Kessler, J.J.  
AIDEnvironment  
Donker Curtiusstraat 7-523  
1051 JL Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
kessler@aidenvironment.org

Kim Phat, N.  
Max Planck Institute for  
Biogeochemistry/Global Ecology  
Bundesstraße 55  
D-20146 Hamburg  
Germany  
nophea-kmpt@dkrz.de

Koko Dorcas, Djramedo  
ONG Daruis  
Bouigninvie no. 134  
12263 Lome  
Togo

Kokou, Aziagbe  
ONG Daruis  
65, Rue des Filaos, Tokoin Habitat  
12263 Lome  
Togo  
ongdaruis@hotmail.com

Kop, P.J. van der  
KIT Royal Tropical Institute/  
Development, Policy & Practice  
P.O. Box 95001  
1090 HA Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
p.v.d.kop@kit.nl

Korhonen, Maija Kaisa  
University of Helsinki/Social Policy  
P.O. Box 18  
FIN-00014 Helsinki  
Finland  
maija.korhonen@helsinki.fi

Kruk, E.M.  
Hoofdstraat 15  
9997 PH Zandweer  
The Netherlands  
esterkimo@hotmail.com

Kusters, K.  
CIFOR/Forests & Livelihoods  
P.O. Box 6596 JKPWB  
10065 Jakarta  
Indonesia  
k.kusters@cgiar.org

Kusumanto, T.  
Wageningen University/Forest and  
Nature Conservation Policy  
P.O. Box 6596 JKPWB  
10065 Jakarta  
Indonesia  
t.kusumanto@cgiar.org

Lamain, R.  
Global Forest Management  
Langeveldelaan 1  
2204 BA Noordwijk  
The Netherlands  
Ronlamain@hotmail.com

Lammerts van Bueren, Erik  
ISAFOR  
Burg. Roëllaan 1 B  
3925 BD Scherpenzeel  
The Netherlands  
elvb@isafor.nl

Laven, A.C.  
Universiteit van Amsterdam/AGIDS  
Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130  
1018 VZ Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
a.c.laven@uva.nl

Leach, Melissa  
University of Sussex/Institute of  
Development Studies  
BN1 9RE Brighton  
UK  
M.Leach@ids.ac.uk

Lopez, Pascal  
ECO Consulting Group  
Hersfelder Str. 17  
D-36280 Oberaula  
Germany  
info@eco-consult.com

Lukkien, V.P.A.  
Universiteit Utrecht/Tresor  
Foundation  
P.O. Box 80084  
3508 TB Utrecht  
The Netherlands  
v.p.a.lukkien@bio.uu.nl

M.D. Mizanur Rahman,  
Environmental Development  
Programme  
189, Arambagh Circular Road,  
Motijheel C/A  
1000 Dhaka  
Bangla Desh  
edp@bangla.net

Maas, Jelle  
Tropenbos International  
P.O. Box 232  
6700 AE Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
jelle.maas@tropenbos.org

Macqueen, Duncan  
IIED/Forestry and Land Use  
4 Hanover Street  
EH2 2EN Edinburgh  
Scotland  
duncan.macqueen@iied.org

Mbogga, M.S.  
International Plant Genetic  
Resources Institute  
Via dei Tre Denari 472/a  
Maccarese  
00057 Roma  
Italia  
m.mbogga@cgiar.org

Mohamed, A.O.  
Soprari/Dept. of Forestry Res.  
Jijiga  
Ethiopia  
dhahar\_cirro@hotmail.com

Morsello, C.  
University of Sao  
Paulo/PROCAM  
R. Ministro Godoy, 1353  
05015.001 Sao Paulo (SP)  
Brazil  
morsello@uol.com.br

Namita, P.  
P & T Officers Colony  
Netaji Marg  
Ahmedabad Gujarat  
India  
npriyadarshee@rediffmai.com

Ngala, Ivo Mumba  
PANAFRIC/Agricultural dept.  
PANAFRICAN Institute Buea  
42 Buea  
Cameroon  
ngalajulius@yahoo.co.uk

Norde, D.J.  
Universiteit van  
Amsterdam/AGIDS  
Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130  
1018 VZ Amsterdam  
derk@roomforroom.com

O'Brien, M.  
Duivenvoordestraat 20  
2341 JE Oegstgeest  
The Netherlands  
m.obrien@wanadoo.nl

Man, M. de  
Universiteit Utrecht  
Buys Ballotstraat 33 bis  
3572 ZT Utrecht  
The Netherlands  
M\_de\_man\_studentuu@hotmail.com

Meer, Peter van der  
Alterra, Center for Ecosystems  
P.O. Box 47  
6700 AA Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
peter.vandermeer@wur.nl

Molnar, A.M.  
Forest Trends  
1050 Potomac Street NW  
20007 Washington, DC  
USA  
Amolnar@forest-trends.org

Mulyati, Sri  
Ministry of Forestry/Forest Protection  
& Nature Conservation  
Gunung Halimun Nat. Park, Jalan  
Raya Bipanas, Kabandungan  
34157 Parungkuda, Sukabumi, Jawa  
Barat  
Indonesia  
smad@telkom.net

Nangendo, G.  
ITC  
Hengelosestraat 99, Postbus 6  
7500 AA Enschede  
The Netherlands  
nangendo@itc.nl

Njogu, J.G.  
Universiteit van Amsterdam/AGIDS  
P.O. Box 697  
00206 Ngong Hills  
Kenya  
njogujg@yahoo.com

Nurul Islam, S.K.  
Environmental Development  
Programme  
189, Arambagh Circular Road,  
Motijheel C/A  
1000 Dhaka  
Bangla Desh  
edp@bangla.net

Ogbeide, C.O.  
CLAMOG Ventures  
International/Forestry  
D75, Giwa Shopping Complex, #2  
Kingsway Road  
234 Ikoyi, Lagos  
Nigeria  
ogbeide2000@yahoo.com

Mason, Robin  
USAID/Forestry Team  
729 S. 22nd Street  
22202 Arlington, VA  
USA  
rmason@usaid.gov

Mendez, Blanca  
Tropenbos International  
P.O. Box 232  
6700 AE Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
Blanca.Mendez@tropenbos.org

Moonen, Joep  
Trésor foundation/Management Nature  
Reserve  
CD5, P.K. 05  
97356 Montsinéry  
Guyane Française  
emeraldjunglevillage@wanadoo.fr

Næss, L.O.  
Center for International Climate and  
Environmental (CICERO)  
P.O. Box 1129 Blindern  
N-0318 Oslo  
Norway  
larson@cicero.uio.no

Negash, B.M.  
Ministry of Agriculture/Dept. of Land  
Resource & Crop Production  
P.O. Box 6202  
Asmara  
Eritrea  
b\_negash2@yahoo.com

Noorduyn, R.E.  
Universiteit van Amsterdam/AGIDS,  
CML  
P.O. Box 9518  
2300 RA Leiden  
The Netherlands  
noorduyn@cml.leidenuniv.nl

Nwonwu, F.O.C.  
Africa Institute of South Africa/  
African Unity & Development  
P.O. Box 630  
0001 Pretoria  
South Africa  
francis@ai.org.za

Ogbhemhe, T.O.  
University of Ibadan/Philosophy  
c/o Dr Tunji Oyeshile, University  
of Ibadan  
00234 Ibadan  
Nigeria  
chikin80@yahoo.com

Olsen, Kristin Bye  
LTS International  
Bush Loan, Penicuik  
EH26 0PH Edinburgh  
Scotland  
Kristin-Olsen@ltsi.co.uk

Out, G.G.  
Dutch Center for Indigenous  
People (NCIV)  
Vinkenstraat 143 A  
1013 JP Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
gaia@nciv.net

Palmujoki, Eero  
University of Tampere  
Department of Political Science  
and International Relations,  
33014 University of Tampere  
33014 Tampere  
Finland  
eero.palmujoki@uta.fi

Rajesh Mit, K.  
PRADAN  
Sarai Road, Dumka  
814101 Jharkhand  
India  
pradandumka@rediffmail.com

Rijsoort, J.G. van  
ETFRN; Wageningen  
University/Forest and Nature  
Conservation Policy  
Tropenbos International  
6700 AE Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
jeannette.vanrijsoort@wur.nl

Rosendo, S.F.D.  
University of East  
Anglia/CSERGE  
School of Environmental  
Sciences  
NR4 7TJ Norwich  
UK  
s.rosendo@uea.ac.uk

Schanz, H.  
Wageningen University/Forest  
and Nature Conservation Policy  
P.O. Box 342  
6700 AH Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
heiner.schanz@wur.nl

Schuijt, K.D.  
World Wildlife Fund-International,  
Forests for Life  
Avenue du Mont Blanc  
1196 Gland  
Switzerland  
kschuyt@wwfint.org

Otsuki, K.  
Wageningen University/Rural  
Development Sociology  
De Leewenborch, Hollandsweg 1  
6706 KN Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
Kei.Otsuki@wur.nl

Overman, H.  
Universiteit van  
Amsterdam/AGIDS  
Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130  
1018 VZ Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
h\_overman@hotmail.com

Poshiwa, X.  
Grasslands Research Station  
Private Bag 3701  
Marondera  
Zimbabwe  
xposhiwa@hotmail.com

Retno, Maryani  
Wageningen University/Forest and  
Nature Conservation Policy  
P.O. Box 342  
6700 AH Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
retnomaryani@hotmail.com

Rival, L.M.  
University of Oxford/International  
Development Centre  
21 St-Giles  
OX1 3LA Oxford  
UK  
laura.rival@qeh.ox.ac.uk

Salazar, L.  
ISS/Agriculture & Rural  
Development  
D. Rijkersplein 170  
2518 DG The Hague  
The Netherlands  
lorenasalazar@hotmail.com

Scholz, Imme  
German Development  
Institute/Global Environmental  
Policy  
Tulpenfeld 4  
D-53113 Bonn  
Germany  
imme.scholz@die-gdi.de

Sharifi, M.A.  
ITC/PGM  
Hengelosestraat 99  
7500 AA Enschede  
The Netherlands  
Alisharifi@itc.nl

Oumarou, Coulibaly  
ONG Population & Développement  
(POPDEV)  
Socogin PS II Lot no. 100  
4263 Nouakchott  
Mauritania  
infotoure@yahoo.fr

Ovwigbo, Stephen O.  
17285 Vaughn Lane  
22026 Dumfries VA  
USA  
stepovwigbo@yahoo.com

Rai, Bimala  
ISS  
P.O. Box 29776  
2502 LT The Hague  
The Netherlands  
rai@iss.nl

Richards, Michael  
Independent consultant  
Claywell Cottage, Aston Road  
OX29 7QZ Witney, Ducklington  
UK  
emrichards@ntlworld.com

Ros, Mirjam  
Universiteit van Amsterdam/AGIDS  
Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130  
1018 VZ Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
m.a.f.ros-tonen@uva.nl

Savenije, Herman J.F.  
Expertisecentrum LNV, Biodiversity  
Programme  
P.O. Box 482  
6710 BL Ede  
The Netherlands  
h.j.f.savenije@minlnv.nl

Schoutsen, M.A.  
Gyelloba  
Jhr. v/d Pollstraat 33  
2151 AD Nieuw-Vennep  
The Netherlands  
info@gyelloba.nl

Simorangkir, D.P.  
TBI Kalimantan  
P.O. Box 494  
76100 Balikpapan  
Indonesia  
trobos@indo.net.id

Skutsch, M.M.  
Universiteit Twente/Technology  
and Development  
P.O. Box 217  
7500 AE Enschede  
The Netherlands  
m.m.skutsch@tdg.utwente.nl

Southwold-Llewellyn, S.  
Wageningen University/Rural  
Development Sociology  
Hollandseweg 1  
6706 KN Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
sarah.southwold@wur.nl

Tacconi, L.  
CIFOR/Forests & Governance  
P.O. Box 6596 JKPBW  
10065 Jakarta  
Indonesia  
l.tacconi@cgiar.org

Topper, E.G.  
Hoevebrink 32  
8034 PZ Zwolle  
The Netherlands  
eggertopper@mauritel.mr

Turia, R.C.H.  
Australian National  
University/Human Geography  
Dept.  
Research School of Pacific &  
Asian Studies  
0200 Canberra  
Australia  
ruth.turia@anu.edu.au

Veiga Neto, Fernando  
UFRRJ/CPDA  
Rua Miguel de Frias, 95/103,  
Icaraí  
24.220-001 Niterói  
Brazil  
f.veiga@zaz.com.br

Vliet, G.J.M. van  
CLAT - Nederland  
De Blickestraat 235  
3572 WD Utrecht  
The Netherlands  
gerard.vanvliet@hetnet.nl

Warnholtz, Gerardo Segura  
Comisión Nacional Forestal  
Av. Progreso No. 5. Col.del  
Carmen Coyoacán. 0100  
Mexico  
Mexico  
gsegura@conafor.gob.mx

Snel, Maaiké  
ICCO, Latin America and the  
Caribbean  
Rapenburgerstraat 163 D  
1011 VM Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
maaike.snel@icco.nl

Springate-Baginski, O.  
University of East Anglia/Overseas  
Development Group  
NR4 7TJ Norwich  
UK  
oliver.springate@uea.ac.uk

Taing, L.  
Nature Conservation Agency  
Balai Konservasi Sumber Daya  
Alam, Jalan Cut Nyak Dhien Km  
1,2  
P.O. Box 29 Banda Aceh  
Indonesia  
tainglubis@yahoo.com

Toure, Balla  
ONG Population &  
Développement (POPDEV)  
SOCOGIN PS II Lot n 100  
4263 Nouakchott  
Mauritania  
infotoure@yahoo.fr

Tysiachniouk, M.S.  
Centre for Independent Social  
Research/Environmental  
Sociology  
Kamenooostrovsky 64, apt 272  
197022 St. Petersburg  
Russia  
tysiachn@hotmail.com

Verbruggen, Harmen  
Vrije Universiteit/Institute for  
Environmental Studies  
De Boelelaan 1115  
1081 HV Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
harmen.verbruggen@ivm.vu.nl

Walker, N.F.  
University of Oxford/International  
Development Centre  
21 St-Giles  
OX1 3LA Oxford  
UK  
nathalie.walker@qeh.ox.ac.uk

Werff, Peter van der  
Vrije Universiteit/Institute for  
Environmental Studies  
De Boelelaan 1087  
1081 HV Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
werff@ivm.vu.nl

Snel Rincon, N.  
Kloosterlaan 18  
1861 SE Bergen (NH)  
The Netherlands  
n\_snel@yahoo.com

Sumirat, B.K.  
Forestry Res. & Dev. Inst. of  
Sulawesi/Social Forestry  
Jalan Perintis Kemerdekaan  
90243 Makassar  
Indonesia  
bpkup@telkom.net

Tonneijck, F.H.  
Stichting Face/R&D  
P.O. Box 646  
6800 AP Arnhem  
The Netherlands  
Femke.Tonneijck@facefoundation.nl

Tshering, D.  
Forest Department  
Forest Range Office  
Pemagatshel  
Bhutan

Vaidya, B.  
World Wildlife Fund-Nepal/Terai  
Arc Landscape  
P.O. Box 7660, Baluwatar  
Kathmandu  
Nepal  
bunuvaidya@hotmail.com

Verweij, P.A.  
Copernicus Institute for Sustainable  
Development and Innovation  
Padualaan 14  
3584 CH Utrecht  
The Netherlands  
p.a.verweij@chem.uu.nl

Wanders, T.H.V.  
FORM Ecology Consultants  
Ridderstraat 2  
8021 BE Hattem  
The Netherlands  
info@forminternational.nl

White, A.W.  
Forest Trends  
1050 Potomac Street NW  
20007 Washington D.C.  
USA  
Awhite@forest-trends.org

Wiersum, Freerk  
Wageningen University/Forest  
and Nature Conservation Policy  
P.O. Box 342  
6700 AH Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
Freerk.Wiersum@wur.nl

Witsenburg, Karen  
Universiteit van  
Amsterdam/AGIDS  
Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130  
1018VZ Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
K.M.Witsenburg@uva.nl

Wongtschowski, M.  
Wageningen University/Rural  
Development Sociology  
Hollandseweg 1  
6706 KN Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
mariana.wongtschowski@wur.nl

Wulf, Robert R.E. de  
Universiteit Gent/Forest & Water  
Management  
Coupure 653  
B-9000 Gent  
Belgium  
robert.dewulf@ugent.be

Yasmi, Yurdi  
CIFOR/Forests & Governance  
P.O. Box 6596 JKPWB  
10065 Jakarta  
Indonesia  
y.yasmi@cgiar.org

Zaal, A.F.M.  
Universiteit van Amsterdam/AGIDS  
Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130  
1018 VZ Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
a.f.m.zaal@frw.uva.nl

Zewdie, Yihewew  
African Studies Centre  
P.O. Box 9555  
2300 RB Leiden  
The Netherlands  
Yihewew@hotmail.com

Zingerli, C.K.  
Swiss Federal Institute of  
Technology  
Rämistrasse 101  
CH-8092 Zürich  
Switzerland  
zingerli@fowi.ethz.ch

Zoomers, Annelies  
CEDLA  
Keizersgracht 395-397  
1016 EK Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
zoomers@cedla.uva.nl

Zuidema, P.A.  
Universiteit Utrecht/Plant Ecology  
P.O. Box 80084  
3508 TB Utrecht  
The Netherlands  
p.a.zuidema@bio.uu.nl

Zurcher, S.  
Roskilde Universiteit/Geography &  
International Development Studies  
P.O. Box 260  
DK-4000 Roskilde  
Denmark  
szurcher@ruc.dk

Zwaan, D.  
Netherlands Committee for IUCN  
Plantage Middenlaan 2 B  
1018 DD Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
dave.zwaan@nciucn.nl