The Changing Forest Management Paradigm in Africa: A Case for Community Based Forest Management System

J. A. Odera

Research Programme on Sustainable Use of Dryland Biodiversity (RPSUD), P. O. Box 40658 00100 Nairobi, Kenya email: jodera@rpsud.org

Abstract

The paper presents the state of forests in sub-Saharan African (SSA)countries, salient factors leading to forest loss, the influence of mitigating measures being adopted, and an assessment of the community based forest management systems(CBFM). The study reveals that a number of promising CBFM constructs have been tried and more are being implemented in the region. Implementation progress shows that virtually all countries have enacted supportive policies, legislations, institutional instruments and reforms. Notable trajectories contributing to sustainable forest management, with prospects for enhancing social justice, economic, environmental, social institutions and human capital, are noted. Bottlenecks stifling CBFM's growth, particularly those associated with conflicts, challenges, constraints and threats are examined. In a final chapter, the paper recommends a need to establish an inclusive platform to guide institutional reforms and to mount a comprehensive research programme.

Key words: CBFM: Paradigm shift forest management Africa, community based forest management, participatory, institutional arrangement, Africa

Introduction

The forests of Africa cover about 650 million hectares and constitute more than 17% of world's forests, important for cultural, socio-economic development, and environmental services. According UNEP Geo (2000) forests contribute up to 6% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in forest rich countries. The natural resource bases further support agriculture, wildlife resources, tourism industry and other sectors. Despite this immense status, Africa's natural resources share of global trade is a mere 2% and her people are among the world's poorest: Nearly one in two live on less than one dollar a day.

The present study was part of the intervention on lessons learnt on sustainable forest management in Africa 1(SFM I), undertaken in 2004. The study included assessment of country reports and returns on CBFM's adoption and progress, analysis of field observations and results of discussions with foresters and forest communities from the Gambia, Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania, held at different times.

The Genesis of Community Based Forest Management System in Africa

Forests have been removed and altered since early days of human history to accommodate population growth and economic development. But anxiety over Africa's loss of forests through deforestation and degradation has recently reached alarming proportions (FAO, 1992). Convinced that state controlled natural resources management systems had become obsolete and irrelevant, governments and their development partners, between 1970s to date, have concentrated on a search for remedial measures (Arnold, 1995).

Encouraged by progress reported from traditional natural resources management initiatives, and results of participatory approaches; NGOs, donors and government agencies initiated pilot trials of participatory forestry on degraded forests, in early 1990s (Adams and Hulme, 1999). Much effort has been centered on how to harness sustainable forest management in development. New CBFM models continue to emerge, and more than one model may be practiced in one country. The major CBFM constructs that have been tried out in different SSA countries include:

- **Joint Ventures:** Involve agreements between communities and investors with equity stakes, share costs and benefits (practiced in southern African countries);
- **Leases:** Investor contracts with a community on development and use of a facility on communal land on a fee payment (practiced in southern Africa);

Discov. Innov., 2009; 21(SFM Special Edition No. 1)

The Changing Forest Management Paradigm in Africa: A Case for Community Based Forest Management System

- **Consultation:** Established through agreements between the state and the community (practiced in Cote d'Ivoire or the Forest Committees in Ghana;
- **Contracts:** Developer supports individual growers, who provide land, labour and is conditioned to sell products to the company (widespread in southern Africa);
- **Consigned management:** The community holds operational powers less enforcement, licensing and control (practiced in the Gambia and the United Republic of Tanzania in national forest reserves);
- **Loose confederation:** Members operate in own land area and run nature-based enterprises with NGO and government backstopping (widespread throughout Africa);
- **Co-Management:** A community-state partnership: communities manage the forest in exchange for access to prescribed products (similar to joint forest management (JFM) and buffer zone constructs) (practiced in the Gambia, and Tanzania in state forests); and
- **Community-based forest management:** Jurisdiction including management and control, devolved to communities, may include ownership (practiced in the Gambia, Malawi, the United Republic of Tanzania, and spreading).

What is Community Based Forest Management?

Community based forest management system was defined by FAO (1990) as "any forestry which is carried out by individuals in a community in order to increase benefits they value". Wily (2002) has defined CBFM as "a forest management construct in which jurisdiction is fully devolved and sometimes includes ownership of the forest estate".

This study defines CBFM as "A participatory, people-driven forest management system, decentralized to local community institutions with links between the state, and other partners, and operating under a legitimate framework for sharing roles, responsibilities, authority, control, costs and benefits".

The Spread of CBFM, its Application and Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa

Country reports show that CBFM has built a recognizable base during the last two decades, and is gaining confidence of communities as a promising route for securing sustainable forest management (SFM), (Wily, 2002). Currently, the process is grounding in all countries capturing attention of communities, NGOs/the civil society, governments, and the private sector. The majority of CBFM initiatives begin under patronage of donor

support, often with NGO back-stopping. Many of the pilot initiatives started about two decades ago have paved the way for policies and laws that have in turn introduced the practice in the national forest development agenda, in virtually all countries in the continent (FAO, 2003).

In a historical perspective, by 2002, CBFM was underway in over 35 countries in the region (Wily, 2002; FOSA, 2003). This constitutes a 75% incremental growth within a period of about five years. As of 1999, only about 20 countries were practicing some form of CBFM and had enabling policies and legal instruments (FAO, 1999). Wily (2002) and FOSA (2003) observed that at country levels, by 2002, the process had spread to more than 100 projects, involving about 5,000 communities and working in 1,000 protected areas.

According to FOSA (2003), Sarrazin (2002) and Wily (2002), at the time of the Second International Workshop on Community Forestry in 2002, about 16% of the total area in SSA countries was under CBFM. By the end of 2006, virtually all countries had promulgated pro-CBFM policies and legislations, and established units/sections in the forest service responsible for CBFM (WRM, 2007). Some countries, such as Benin, Burundi, Cameroon, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Ghana, had more than 20% of their total forest areas under some form of CBFM (Wily, 2002). According to WRM (2007) many NGO's are working in partnership with local communities and the government towards instituting CBFM from a pilot project to a national practice.

Rights in CBFM range from temporal agreements or contracts in combination with a management plan for 5–15 years, in Lesotho, Mozambique, Cameroon, Benin, the Gambia and Ghana (Sarrazin, 2003). In Madagascar, a range of programmes promote state-people agreements that transfer power to communities for the first three- followed by ten-year terms (Rabetalliana and Schachenmana, 2000).

The early initiatives on CBFM were linked to provision of access into the forest in exchange for labour, along the models of buffer zones, and co-management approaches. In Cameroon, CBFM may only be established in unclassified forests, apart from a few pilot exceptions; restricted to a maximum size of 5,000 ha on a-10-year agreements (Egbe, 1997). By contrast, Uganda, S. Africa, Ethiopia and Guinea Bissau allow CBFM in forest reserves, including those with high conservation priority (Wily, 2002). But even such occasions, wide gaps occur between policies and practice (Barrow *et al.,* 2002). In Kenya, a late comer into the process, the new Forest Act 2005, and the draft policy show inclinations to a co-management system, under a buffer zone approach. A common practice is for the state to retain most or all control over licensing, live felling and enforcement. Despite this limitation, a growing number of community forest associations involved

The Changing Forest Management Paradigm in Africa: A Case for Community Based Forest Management System

Discov. Innov., 2009; 21(SFM Special Edition No. 1)

in co-management have emerged, and are operating ahead of the policy and forest management rules.

The CBFM experience in the Gambia and Tanzania, the pioneer leaders in this process in Africa, has been discussed widely by different authors (Kajambe *et al.*, 2003; Sonko and Camara, 2000; WRM, 2002). The two countries have made clear advancement in this process, including formulation of by-laws (the latter being restricted to community forests) and other countries are considering possibilities of doing so (Wily, 2002). Few countries, except the Gambia, have moved into national programming. Over all, countries continue to limit the CBFM to community forests and JFM to state forests (Iddi, 2002), although official guidelines for nationwide application increasingly exist, e.g. Cameroon, Tanzania and Senegal (Sarrazin, 2002; Wily, 2002).

Communities in southern Africa, Malawi and Tanzania are involved in industrial plantation programmes under outgrower contract programmes (Wily 2002); addressing forest degradation and selling of forest products in Botswana (Mogaka *et al.*, 2002); Mozambique (Mansur and Cucuo 2002); Niger and Mali (Fries and Heemans, 1992). Malawi has articulated supportive forest policies and a forest act that specify community rights and mechanisms for achieving CBFM (Jones and Mosimame, 2000). Uganda, Lesotho and Namibia are also developing along the same line (Wily, 2002).

Although cases of community ownership and autonomous management mandate, are emerging, overall, countries either limit local tenure in some way, e.g. Cameroon (Djeumo, 2001), Senegal (Wily, 2002), Ethiopia (FarmAfrica, 2000), or reduce local jurisdiction (Kerkhof, 2000). Governments tend to prefer retaining decision-making authority and ownership, generally confining CBFM to unreserved forests or degraded state forests. Many initiatives concentrate on benefit sharing in exchange for access, as opposed to management agreement or power sharing (Wily, 2002), except in a few countries, such as, the Gambia and Tanzania, where communities are empowered to develop forest Rules and By-laws. Under such arrangements, the CBFM is registered at the District Council that also endorses the By-laws.

Other variations include granting commercial rights and subsidized inputs, besides benefit sharing and preferential exploitation rights (Asare, 2002; and Saarela-Karonga, 2001). Communities in Nigeria are empowered to control felling in their forests and to receive 70% of royalty and 50% of the revenue from their reserves (Saarela-Kaonga, 2001). In Ghana, concessionaires provide 5% of the royalty to local communities; are obliged to secure land owners permission prior to felling; and companies aid communities within their concession areas, as part of corporate responsibility (Amanor, 1997).

These developments, notwithstanding, CBFM remains nascent, donor driven, and permissive (Wily, 2002). Most initiatives are less than five years old and the remainder is usually less than 15 years old. However, the process is gaining support from successful pilot trials, attitudinal change, emerging positive community and civil society attitude towards PFM, and enhanced political will and support. The process is evidently acquiring recognition as it moves from a simple arrangement, providing access into the forests, to arrangements that accord ownership rights, managerial roles and control.

Factors Contributing to the Success of CBFM

It is already noted that the genesis of CBFM has been strongly influenced by failure of central forest management systems. The pressure for change from classical forest management system, has been primed further by forces of global environmentalism, influences of international conventions and attitudinal change. Participatory forest management innovation is underway throughout the region, though with mixed results. Different enabling factors are operating in the region, of which the following deserve recognition:

Attitudinal Change towards Adoption of Participatory Forestry

The pressure from attitudinal change has been crucial in driving a shift from the centralized state-driven forest management toward decentralized community regimes, during the last four decades. The change momentum, and preference for participatory forestry, has also gained additive support from countries and global dialogue, at all levels. Indicators of CBFM's support includes the introduction of simplified procedures and guidelines for implementing CBFM (Djeumo, 2001; Malleson, 2001); and the establishment of substantive support units or sections to promote community participation in forestry (Wily, 2002).

The important role of trees and forests in livelihoods, food security and development has also acquired wide recognition and appreciation, with concomitant attitudinal change. Recognizing the dependency on forests, local people have realized that they are the first to suffer from forest degradation, and must, therefore adopt sustainable resource management practices for their own security. The increasing desire by governments to devolve ownership and management of forests to local communities as a strategy for achieving SFM cost-effectively and efficiently, following declines in staff and operating resources, has generated an additional boost.

Discov. Innov., 2009; 21(SFM Special Edition No. 1)

The Changing Forest Management Paradigm in Africa: A Case for Community Based Forest Management System

In Tanzania and the Gambia, attitudinal change by the state came after communities had taken over the management of community forests, on a trial basis, ahead of policy change (FDCU, 1998; Wily, 2002; Iddi, 2002; Kajembe *et al.*, 2003).

The Influence of Policy and Legislative Reforms in the Forest Sector

It is notable that nearly all countries have promulgated CBFM friendly policies, acts, and institutional reforms and tenurial re-arrangements. According to Kowero (2003), enabling policies, legislation and institutional instruments, including clear tenure rights, are important in promoting good governance and leveraging mechanisms for inter-sectoral linkages. Taking advantage of these traits, SSA countries have reviewed and revised relevant institutional instruments, and restructured their agencies to accommodate local community participation, and a voice in making decisions affecting forestry (Wily, 2002; WRM, 2007).

The new policies have further enabled accommodation of additional management objectives, to include production of multiple products, crucial for support to poverty reduction, rural livelihoods; and forestry's integration in land use. Resultant security of tenure, available under this change, is particularly encouraging communities to adopt long-term perceptions, commitment to forest management and use, and creating opportunities for registering traditional land holdings.

Institutional Arrangements Supporting the CBFM Practice

Decentralization and devolution strategies have created essential frameworks and instruments that accord communities access to forest resources and tenure rights. An increasing number of countries are gradually devolving authority and ownership to community institutions within whose spatial spheres the forests fall and who have the interest and capacity to protect and enforce SFM. Shackleton and Campbell (2001), observed that devolving authority directly to the community level, simplifies management, and minimizes ambiguities on rights and responsibilities. Wily (2002) concurring, advises against decentralizing powers to line departments or to district councils, that have neither the interest nor the capacity for forest management away from local communities.

The importance of institutional instruments in supporting change has been re-echoed by Iddi (2002) when he observed that Tanzania's new land policy (1995) and new land legislation (1999) have reconstructed the tenure environment and the nature and expression of rights at the local level. These instruments further provide links between the village and its land; and the people and forests. Tanzania's unique village structure has further empowered local people to be recognized as "owners" of natural forests in their village areas (Wily, 2002).

In this regard, Wily (2002) and Kajembe *et al. (2003)* have observed that local participation is more meaningful and effective where the local population is involved not as co-operating users but as forest managers. Kajembe *et al. (2003)* have referred to such CBFM systems as "forest management by consent". Wells and Brandon (1992), stressed that a combined effect of enforcement and participation in resource management is essential for keeping communities from destroying forests. Under the CBFM, this is implemented by communities, willingly. Despite imperfection, available positive trends are revealing that participation in forest management are emerging when communities are accorded managerial roles.

Other Supportive Factors

Though less recognized, the effects of the changing socio-political climate under the multi-party era, demands for accountability and transparency have greatly bolstered the CBFM's agenda. Additional boost has come from incremental urges from global processes, the civil society and concomitant increased political support and will for CBFM's rooting and growth.

The wave of change in approaches to SFM has been stimulated further by the growing realization that forest management is in itself a matter of governance to be addressed through promoting participatory approaches (Wily, 2002). An overriding influential element from these enabling factors lies on granting community ownership and authority to manage forests without government's hindrance or interference.

CBFM'S Dispensation to Forest Management Objectives

Although youthful, assessment of CBFM's performance reveals positive trajectories that promise good things to come. The main challenge facing CBFM's is how to harness its potential to enhance economic, environmental and social institutions and human capital. Its salient contributions are discussed under the following sections:

Contributions to Livelihood and Development Capital

Today, the viability of the CBFM constructs seem low due to various factors, particularly those limiting the process to product-protection axis, and degraded state and community forests. Notable benefits range from revenue receipts from wood and NWFPs,

The Changing Forest Management Paradigm in Africa: A Case for Community Based Forest Management System

Discov. Innov., 2009; 21(SFM Special Edition No. 1)

employment opportunities, incomes from emerging nature-based enterprises (NBEs), to those accruing from value-addition options.

The CBFM's capacity for enhancing forests' contributions to livelihoods and development is immense and stands to be boosted by on-going introduction of supportive macro and trade policies, such as restrictions on log export, promotion of value addition on wood and NWFPs (UNIDO, 1996), and transparent management. These strategies, when adopted, will enhance benefit capture through employment creation, and generation of premiums from sale of quality products, at source.

Reported benefits from CBFM forests include access to mature trees and poles from fire lines for domestic use and sale from degraded forests during the moratorium on commercial harvesting often imposed to boost recovery (FDCFU, 1998; Wily, 1995). Communities participating in rich forest areas in Central and West Africa are benefiting from the lucrative sale of logs (MINEF, 1998). In southern Africa, particularly Botswana and Namibia, communities participating in CAMPFIRE constructs receive impressive benefits from SNRM under well managed decentralization arrangements (Shackleton and Campbell, 2001). Many communities are further supplementing benefits from forests by engaging in off-farm employment and NBEs.

The contribution of NWFPs to national economies particularly under NBEs has triggered significant advances through diversification of income generating sources, among rural communities. Such revenue sources are receiving additional stimulus from commercialization, and adoption of modern marketing and business drives, especially in low per capita income areas, where they have greater impact in stabilizing the economic environment.

Despite absence of exact statistics, a number of studies suggest that the majority of forest communities depend on forest resources for their livelihoods (de Beer and McDonald, 1989; Arnold, 1994; Townson, 1994). According to Ames (1998) timber and other products provide 350 million people living in or around tropical forests with 50 percent or more of their livelihood needs and also 10 percent of jobs in developing countries. Despite difficulties in quantifying the economic importance of NWFPs, Wollenberg (1998) estimates that they are an important source of cash revenues for local communities.

Contributions to Improved Ecological Capital

Emerging CBFM's paradigm shift, driven by the new philosophy of enforcing sustainable forest management by consent, is fundamentally poised to promote ecological and environmental stability.

This attribute is supported by examples which demonstrate speedy forest restoration, following communities' acceptance of PFM under secure tenure and are convinced that the forest is theirs (Wells and Brandon 1992). The CBFM process further enhances its potential in supporting ecological capital by allowing communities to use their rich knowledge base in management (Campbell and Byron 1996; Madzudzo 1997; Makole 1999).

The principle that condition permit approval to a prior development of forest boundaries, zoning and managing forests by objectives based on forest's potentials, places CBFM at the core of SFM, with prospects for building ecological capital. The consequent setting of performance targets and exclusion of graft and mismanagement through community driven institutional frameworks, further assures effective delivery of multiple products including environmental stability.

Examples of CBFM's potentials in restoration of degraded forests are supported by reports of unimpeded degradation of open access areas not under CBFM (Marrow and Hull, 1996). This is not surprising, because under classical forest management, communities see forests as open access resources, and generally rush for immediate gains through unscrupulous use. Kajembe *et al. (2003)* have observed that a group of proprietors can develop a common property resource (CPR) institution, if they are confident that the CPR is either theirs or they can exercise clear control over it. Wily (2002), stresses that CBFM practice removes CPR from open access ills and thereby assures sustainability.

Specific examples from village forests in Tanzania and CBFM in Cameroon and the Gambia, among others, confirm that degraded forests have been restored, are managed and protected cost-effectively, within a period of about five years under CBFM (Wily, 2002; FDCFU, 1998; Gardner, 2001). Tanzanian's Mgori forests, previously threatened by ivory poachers, shifting cultivation and fire damage were restored under SFM within less than ten years (Iddi, 2002). Gardner *et al.* (2001) have reported an experience from the Kilum-Ijum community in Cameroon, where communities have demonstrated that their forests are more valuable than cash, to the extent that on CBFM's acceptance, they voluntarily invest on long-term forest management. On these instances, forest destruction has been halted in under ten years of CBFM, thus preventing major destruction of biodiversity, and promoting restoration.

Contributions to Social Institutions and Human Capital

The local resource governance institutions have emerged as major pillars for CBFM, leveraging SFM. The current CBFM's local governance structures

Discov. Innov., 2009; 21(SFM Special Edition No. 1)

The Changing Forest Management Paradigm in Africa: A Case for Community Based Forest Management System

vary and range from CBOs, Trusts, Associations, line sponsored village level organizations, to legally constituted and elected village forest committees (VFC), (Shackleton and Campbell, 2001). The membership is open to men, women and the youth, although these may also operate as separate entities. In countries such as Namibia (Jones and Mosimame, 2000) and Malawi (Kayambazinthu *et al.*, 2003) influential persons like traditional leaders, administration officials, the elites and entrepreneurs are involved as *ex-officio* or in non-executive roles (e.g. as patrons) in CBFM. Such strategies are adopted for different reasons, especially to forestall conflicts.

Some CBFM initiatives have built local governance institutions through a superimposition on an administrative or traditional village council or existing user groups. In Cameroon, all sections of the community are consulted and must be equitably represented (Djeumo, 2001). In Sudan, the government appoints the VFCs (Kerkhof, 2000). In some Francophone countries (Burkina Faso, Guinea, Niger, Mali and Senegal), decentralization has been shaped by codes and constitutions (Wily, 2002). Campbell *et al. (2003)* reported that a model involving corporate, legal organizations composed of all rights holders and residents, e.g. Trusts (Botswana), Conservancies (Namibia), communal property associations (South Africa), village committees based on administrative village structure (Tanzania) and range management associations (Lesotho), are popular in southern African countries.

In some countries, the CBFM institutions constitute the only rural platforms for planning. Such institutions are integrating forestry in to rural development agenda, stimulating positive social transformation, forging intra-community cohesion and bridging community-state communication gaps. These structures are therefore crucial in providing bases for empowering rural communities on planning, building competence, cultivation of interpersonal communication skills, and confidence important for advocacy and lobbying.

Emerging Conflicts in CBFM and Conflict Management

Conflicts under CBFM may arise from inter- and intra-community, and community-institutional challenges and failures. Such conflicts may be internal or external to forest management and may have constructive and positive, as well as negative traits. While positive conflicts associated with competition are often beneficial to social capital building, negative conflicts precipitate prejudice, intolerance and retrogression.

Conflicts may be influenced and aggravated by Changing demands and social dynamics. Despite purported homogeneity in local villages, different families, clans, user groups, the rich and the poor,

the elite and the illiterate majority, have distinct needs, aspirations and priority ratings. Some individuals seek patronage from modern leadership or traditional social units to enhance clout (Ainsle, 1999; Amanor, 1997); while the educated elite and the traditional leaders tend to angle for positions, power and influence, in resources management systems (Shackleton and Campbell, 2001). Village heads/ chiefs, traditional rulers and elected representatives tend to dominate the show, appointing their cronies to key positions, and excluding community players. Such powerful groups may further align with the forest service and/or the concessionaires to undermine the interest of community institutions (Amanor, 1997; Wily, 2002).

Needs, aspirations and vision of these groups may further be influenced by age, gender sensitivities, and residence status. Moreover, as Sithole (1995) noted, social groupings, can change rapidly, in relation to commercialization, in-migration and economic dynamics, with concomitant changes in interpersonal dynamics.

Conflicts have also been reported from institutional failure, where these perpetuate weaknesses in local institutions, lack clarity in decentralization/devolution arrangements, allow leniency by the government to concessionaires and bias against communities; inequitable sharing of costs/benefits between government agencies and communities; inter-sectoral mandates and policies over-laps. Conflicts may also arise from latent politics of members that tend to surface with emergence of CBFM's economic stakes.

Many natural resources conflicts are managed and mitigated through traditional conflict resolution machineries and/or modern instruments. Where it is relevant CBFM engages alternative conflict management approaches through informal reconciliation, negotiation and mediation channels. The merits of these approaches may be enhanced through empowerment of grassroot institutions, supported by legislative instruments and competence building on policy analysis, negotiations for sharing roles, responsibilities and teamwork. Widening of local institutional bases through incorporating the traditional rulers, political leaders, as ex-officio or non-executive roles as patrons, capturing a favourable gender and age-structure balances, all helps to minimize conflicts and enhance resolution competence. These avenues work effectively when supported by enabling institutional and governance instruments.

Salient Challenges, Constraints and Threats to CBFM

The development of the CBFM has progressed significantly in most African countries during the last decade as countries recognized the need to

The Changing Forest Management Paradigm in Africa: A Case for Community Based Forest Management System

Discov. Innov., 2009; 21(SFM Special Edition No. 1)

involve communities and other actors in resource management. But its relative under-performance so far, indicates that much remains to be done before its genre can be realized fully.

The following challenges, constraints and threats have been recognized and deserve in-depth attention.

Governance and Forest Management

Currently, forest management and governance institutions are weak, emerging grassroot institutions nascent, under-resourced and lack skills in resource and business management. Grassroot competence for planning, lobbying and advocacy is low and under equipped and deserve immediate intervention.

Mindsets, Grounded Stereotypes and Resistance to Change

Because communities are used to taking instructions, emerging democratic space in forest management, is either hijacked by influential parties or dominated by internal squabbles. On the flipside, foresters are pessimistic and feel threatened with loss of roles, status and employment, hence resist change. Governments' vacillation and back-pedaling, persistent community marginalization, coupled with ambivalent government support and good will, continue to deter progress.

Institutional Framework Associated Failure

Considerable confusion and conflicts continue to surface *inter alia* because forest policies, legislation, and institutional instruments have been developed independently of the CBFM process. Decentralization and devolution of forest management roles to district and community institutions has not been marched by a concurrent shift in resources or competence. Local institutions are weak and lack bases to build upon, a situation worsened by persistent mistrust and non-legally binding agreements.

Persistent silence or vagueness in policies, legislation and associated instruments have left room for:

(i) Open ended development of CBFM concepts, principles and structures perpetuating a permissive character;

(ii) Relegation of CBFM from mainstream forestry left to be promoted by fortuitous donor-community alliances and NGO's support;

(iii) Contradictions in sectoral mandates;

(iv) Lukewarm government attention to the CBFM process, coupled with low political will and support;

(v) Paucity of researched information, knowledge and tested case studies, or proven methodologies and technologies needed to enhance SFM;

(vi) Deficient human capacity and skills for SFM; and

(vii) Lack of specialists and professionals versed in PFM.

Recommendations: The Way Ahead

Community-based forest management dispensations recorded during the last two to three decades have left communities with mixed feelings over its potential to support local development. The major factors impeding its growth and development have been discussed in the preceding chapter. The following measures are recommended for considerations to guide and support progress.

Refining Institutional Reforms

There is an urgent need to establish a standing consultative platform, equipped with an inclusive database to coordinate and spearhead:

(i) Negotiation on roles, responsibilities and modalities for sharing costs and benefits among involved actors;

(ii) Promoting, supporting institutional and partnership building, structural arrangements and networking ;

(iii) Promoting research, training, education and community empowerment;

(iv) Revitalizing the forest agency, and strengthening institutional frameworks to ensure policy, legislation and tenure relevance and legitimacy;

(v) Integrating CBFM in local development agenda and land use.

Research for Development to Support CBFM

A concerted and sustained research effort is required to expand the CBFM's efficient dispensations at all levels. The research component should examine policies, legislation, institutional instruments and guidelines which will significantly contribute to national and regional policy initiative on SFM. In addition, this component should target strengthening the resource-production-consumption chain to enable SFM and associated NBEs enhance local income. Priorities for research themes considered important for enhancing CBFM's contributions are bound to vary between countries. The following is a list of broad themes generated from country reports during the present work:

(i) Participatory methodologies and technology development incorporating local knowledge systems;

(ii) The relative efficiencies of best-bet CBFM constructs against stakeholder interests and expectations, in overall land use practice;

(iii) Options for mainstreaming promising CBFM constructs in all forests and opportunities for strengthening institutional instruments; and

Discov. Innov., 2009; 21(SFM Special Edition No. 1)

The Changing Forest Management Paradigm in Africa: A Case for Community Based Forest Management System

(iv) Guidelines on CBFM governance, commercialization of goods and services, and the management of NBEs, essential for shifting the CBFM process from poverty reduction concerns to wealth creation, and a meaningful paradigm shift.

References

Adams, W.M. and Hulme, D. 1999. Conservation and community: changing narratives, policies and practices in African conservation. Paper for the conference on African environments: past and present. July 1999, Oxford.

Ainslie, A. 1999. When community is not enough: Managing common property Natural Resources in Rural South Africa. *Development Southern Africa* **16:** 375–401.

Amanor, K.S. 1997. Collaborative forest management, forest resource tenure and the domestic economy in Ghana. *IRDC Currents,* **15:** 10–16. Uppsala.

America Verde Publications. The nature conservancy.

Ames, M. 1998. Assessing the profitability of forest-based enterprises. In: Wollenberg, E. and Ingles, A. (eds). *In comes from the forest: Methods for the development and conservation of forests products for local communities.* CIFOR, Bogor.

Arnold, J.E.M. 1994. The importance of tree products in rural income and employment. *Paper presented to Markets for Non-Timber Products Workshop (IFPRI)*, Annapolis, 12–14 December.

Arnold, J.E.M. 1995. *Community forestry: Ten years review CF-Note 7*. FAO 1991 (reprinted)

Asare, 1998. A report on community boundary maintenance contracts in forest reserves. CFMU, Kumasi.

Barrow, E.; Jeanette, C.; Grundy, I.; Kamungisha-Ruhombe, J. and Tessema, Y. 2002. Analysis of stakeholder power and responsibilities in community involvement in Forest Management in Eastern and Southern Africa. *Forest and social perspectives in conservation* No 9. NRIT IUCN.

Campbell, B.M. and Byron, N. 1996. Miombo woodlands and their use: overview and key issues in Campbell, B. (eds). *The Miombo in Transition: woodlands and welfare in Africa*. CIFOR Bogor Indonesia.

Campbell, B.M.; Shackelton, S. and Wollenberg, E. 2003. Overview in Kowero, G; B.M. Campbell, and U.R. Sumalia. *Policies and governance structures in woodlands of South Africa*. CIFOR.

de Beer, J.H. and McDermott, M.J. 1989. The economic value of non-timber forest products in Southeast Asia. Netherlands Committee for IUCN, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Djeumo, A. 2001. The Development of Community Forests in Cameroon: Origins, Current Situation and Constraints. ODI RDFN Paper No. 25b.

Egbe, S. 1997. Forest Tenure and Access to Forest Resources in Cameroon An Overview. No. 6 Forest Participation Series. IIED Forestry and Land Use Programme, London.

FAO. 1999. Pluralism and sustainable forestry and rural development. *Proceedings of an international workshop*, 9–12 December 1997, Rome.

FAO. 2000. Introduction by F. Bojong in F. Bojong and D. Reeb. *Proceedings of the international workshop on community forestry in Africa*. Banjui, the Gambia. 26–30 April 1999. Rome

FAO. 2003. *Proceedings of second international workshop on participatory forestry in Africa*. 18–22 February 2002 Arusha Tanzania.

Farm Africa 2000 Phase II Kefa-sheka project proposal. Addis Ababa Ethiopia. Farm Ethiopia – Farm Africa.

FDCFU (Forestry Department Community Forestry Unit). 1998. Community Forestry Implementing Guidelines. Banjul, The Gambia.

FOSA. 2003. Forestry outlook study for Africa report. The African Forestry Commission and FAO.

Fries, J. and Heemans, J. 1992. Natural resource management in semi-arid Africa: Status and research needs. *Unasulva*, **43:** 9–15.

Gardner, A. 2000. Community forestry in the Bameda Highlands region by Cameroon: a partnership for conservation. Proceedings of second international workshop on participatory forestry in Africa. 18 – 22 February 2002. Arusha, Tanzania.

Gardner, A.; DeMarco, J. and Asanga, C. 2001. A conservation partnership: community forestry at Kilum-Ijim, Cameroon. Rural Development Forestry Network Paper 25H(II), Rural Development Forest Network, Overseas Development Institute, London.

Iddi, S. 2002. Community participation in forest management in the united Republic of Tanzania. *Paper presented at the second workshop on participatory forestry in Africa*, 18–22 February 2002, Arusha Tanzania.

Jones, B.T. and Mosimane, A.W. 2000. Empowering communities to manage natural resources. In: S. E. Shackelton, and B. M. Campbell, editors. *Empowering Communities to Manage Natural Resources. Case Studies fro Southern Africa*. SADC Wildlife Sector – Natural Resources Management Programme, Lilongwe, Malawi. 69–101 p.

Kajembe, G.C.; Monela, G.C. and Mvena, Z.S.K. 2003. Making community management work: A case study of Duru – Haitemba village forest reserve, Babati, Tanzania. In: Kowero, G. and B. M. Campbell and U.R. Sumalia. *Policies and governance structures in woodlands of southern Africa*. CIFOR. Bogor

Kayambazinthu, D.; Matose, F.; Kajembe, G. and Nemarundwe, N. 2003. Institutional arrangements governing natural resource management of the Miombo woodland. In: Kowero, G.; B.M. Campbell and U.R. Sumulia (eds). 2003. *Policies and governance structures in woodlands of southern Africa*. CIFOR, Bogor.

Madzudzo, E. 1997. Communal tenure motivational dynamics and sustainable wildlife management in Zimbabwe, *Zambezi*, **24:** 147–158.

Makole, M. 1999. Community based environmental protection and natural resource management. DIDC. Helsinki.

Malleson, R. 2001. Opportunities and constraints for community based forest management: findings from the Korup forest, S.W. Province, Cameroon. Rural Development Forestry Network Paper 25. Rural Development Forestry Network, ODI London.

Mansur, E. and Cuco, A. 2002. Building a community forestry framework in Mozambigue. Local communities in sustainable forest management. *Paper presented at the second international workshop on participatory forestry in Africa*, 18–22 February 2002, Arusha Tanzania.

Marrow, C.E. and Hull, R.W. 1996. Donor initiated common pool resource institutions; The case of the Yanesha

The Changing Forest Management Paradigm in Africa: A Case for
Community Based Forest Management System

Discov. Innov., 2009; 21(SFM Special Edition No. 1)

forestry cooperative. World development **24**(10): 1641–1657.

MINEF (Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources). 1998. Manual of procedures for the attribution, norms and management of community forests. Government of Cameroon.

Mogaka, H.; Gacheke, S.; Turpie, J.; Emerton, L. and Karanja, J. 2001. Economic aspects of community involvement in sustainable forest management in eastern and southern Africa. Forest and social perspectives in conservation No 8. IUCN Eastern Africa Programme.

Saarela-Kaonga, T. 2001. Community Forestry in Cross River State of Nigeria. Lessons Learnt and the Way Forward. Living Earth Foundation, Nigeria.

Sarrazin, K. 2002. Overview of the second international workshop on participatory forestry in Africa. *Paper presented at the second workshop on participatory forestry in Africa*, 18–22 February 2002, Arusha Tanzania.

Shackleton, S.E. and Campbell, B.M. 2001. Devolution in Natural Resources Management: International arrangements and power shifts: a synthesis of case studies from southern Africa. USAID SADC NRM Project No 690-0251. 12 WWF – SARPO, EU/CIFOR Common property step project CSIR Report.

Sithole, B. 1995. Rethinking sustainable land management in southern Africa: The role of institutions. In Ganry, F. and Campbell, B.M. (eds) Sustainable land management in African semi-arid and sub-humid regions. 329–344. *Proceedings of SCOPE Workshop*, Dakar, Senegal CIRAD. Montpellier.

Sonko, K. and Camara. 1999. Community forest implementation in the Gambia: its principles and prospects. *Proceedings of the international workshop on community forestry in Africa. Participatory forest management in Africa*, 26th–30th April 1999. Banjui, the Gambia.

Townson, I.M. 1994. Forest products and household incomes: a review and annotated bibliography. Tropical Forestry Papers 31. CIFOR and OFI, Oxford, UK. Wolters, O. 1967. Early Indonesian commerce. Cornell Press, Ithaca, NY.

UNEP Geo. 2000. The state of the environment. African biodiversity. Global Environment Outlook.

UNIDO. 1996. *The globalization of the industry: implications for developing countries beyond 2000*. Geneva, Switzerland.

Wells, M. and Brandon K. 1992. People and parks: linking protected areas management with local communities. World Bank/WWF/USAID. Washington DC.

Wiersum, K.F. 1999. *Social forestry: Changing perspectives in forestry science and practice?* The Netherlands, Wageningen Agricultural University.

Wily, L.A. 1995. Collaborative Forest Management (Villagers and Government): The Case of Mgori Forests, Tanzania. Orgut Consulting AB and forest Action Network, Nairobi, Kenya pp. 311.

Wily, L.A. 2002. Participatory forest management in the United Republic of Tanzania. *Paper presented at the second international workshop on participatory forestry in Africa*, 18–22 February 2002 Arusha Tanzania.

World Rainforest Movement. 2007. WRM Bulletin July 27, 2007. Community based forest management.