FOREST CO-MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT: STATUS AND LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE NFMP

"The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of author and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union".
Table of Contents

1 Co-management of natural resources worldwide and in China ..........................................................1
  1.1 COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES ......................................................1
  1.2 COLLABORATIVE CO-MANAGEMENT IN THE PR OF CHINA WITH A FOCUS ON THE PROJECT AREAS ......................................................2
2 Development and implementation of the project co-management proposal .......................................4
  2.1 THEMATIC AND GEOGRAPHICAL SCOPE OF PROJECT CO-MANAGEMENT ................................4
  2.2 THE PROJECT CO-MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL OF SONGPAN ...................................................5
  2.3 PROJECT CO-MANAGEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES ....................................................8
  2.4 MAJOR AGREEMENTS AND DISAGREEMENTS ON ISSUE TO BE TACKLED WITH CO-MANAGEMENT ........9
  2.5 PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF STATUS OF PROJECT CO-MANAGEMENT ................................11
3 Major issues and lessons learned why no project co-management has been negotiated ..................13
  3.1 PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND IMPLEMENTATION FOCUS ..................................................................13
  3.2 PROJECT CO-MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE .................................................................................13
  3.3 ADMINISTRATIVE CO-MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES ....................................................................14
  3.4 FORMAL FOREST SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS ARE NOT PARTICIPATING IN ANY PROJECT CM INDICATIVES 15
  3.5 LEGAL AND POLICY SUPPORT FOR CM .......................................................................................15
  3.6 FINANCIAL SUPPORT ...................................................................................................................16
  3.7 CAPACITY BUILDING ...................................................................................................................16
  3.8 COSTS AND BENEFITS OF CO-MANAGEMENT ............................................................................16
4 Proposed alternative co-management procedure ............................................................................18
5 Recommendations ...........................................................................................................................21
  5.1 PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS ...................................................................................................21
  5.2 FOREST CO-MANAGEMENTS FOR FOREST SECTOR AND BEYOND ............................................21

List of Tables
Table 1: Range of issues to be tackled by project co-management ..........................................................4
Table 2: Village Co-management Members in the two Project Townships of Songpan .............................8
Table 3: Potential costs and benefits of co-management in Songpan .....................................................16

List of Figures
Figure 1: Phases of a co-management process for the natural forests in Songpan..............................7
Figure 2: Natural forest management issues in Daerbian village, Xiaoxing, Songpan ............................10
Figure 3: Proposed co-management procedure .......................................................................................19

List of Annexes
Annex A: Summary of technical assistance on co-management ..........................................................23
Annex B: Summary of key elements for project co-management procedure ........................................24
Annex C: Results of group work of CMC members at AV level in the Project Townships of Muni and Xiaoxing ..........................................................31
Annex D: Legal framework, mandates and responsibilities in forest governance in the project area of Songpan ........................................................................35
Acronyms and abbreviations
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| PMO | Project Management Office |
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| SFDP | Sustainable Forestry Development Programme |
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| SFMP | Strategic Forest Management Plan |
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Introduction

Since 2005 the EU-China Natural Forest Management Project (Project) has promoted the introduction of concepts for co-management agreements in the project area of Songpan County of Sichuan Province. So far not any agreement has been negotiated. This report (I) assesses why co-management has not been successfully implemented; and (ii) formulates recommendations on how the Chinese forestry and other natural resource related sectors can improve and benefit from forest co-management.

Co-management of natural resources is applied worldwide for a wide range of natural resources. In the People’s Republic of China the successful forestry co-management experience is mainly restricted to protected areas. The development of the project co-management proposal followed an established standard procedure, with some fine tuning to the Songpan context. Results of the review of achievements confirm earlier conclusions that the project co-management is still a “vehicle without a road”.

Major issues and lessons learned why no project co-management has been agreed is discussed in the present document. Reasons include: (i) the Project CM concept is not tailored for forestry, but was foreseen for all kind of project field activities; (ii) a thorough co-management preparation phase has been omitted; (iii) relying on a voluntary start-up team without resources and mandate; (iv) establishing administrative village co-management units in all project villages, irrespectively of the demand and local readiness for CM; (v) relying on voluntary elected members of administrative villages with no mandate to negotiate and own resources for the process; (vi) no participation of the formal forest sector stakeholders in any project CM initiatives (missing policy from their respective higher hierarchical level, focus in co-management not in line with their priority tasks); (vii) the legal and administrative systems are not yet structured to recognize these kind of local voluntary organizations; and missing policy to endorse and sustain CM mechanism; (viii) insufficient financial support and capacity building. Potential costs and benefits of co-management have been identified. So far co-management efforts did not have any tangible added values.

Project related recommendations are: (i) in the project dissemination phase the Project should depart from co-management in favor of community forestry, by defining first of all the most appropriate forest management unit for collective naturals forests; (II) the Project might still consider to provide training on how to develop modern forest associations on village and township level; (iii) the Project should encourage the prefecture forest bureau to instruct the County Forest Bureau and the Sichuan Provincial Forest Department to issue policy documents to guide the SFE Unit to enter CM processes; (iv) the Project should also propose to the government of Songpan to consider to establish a Co-management Task Force on “Nature Forest Governance” and review the proposal of implementation local co-management activities (See Chapter 4); (v) in addition, the Songpan government should consider to establish an “Ecotourism Multistakeholder Forum”, as voluntary platform to further promote ecotourism in the county.

Recommendations for the forest co-management for forest sector and beyond: (i) multi stakeholder forest co-management processes should complement and not diminish the government’s key role (negotiate, legislate, regulate); (ii) forest co-management development should be restricted to forestry issues; (iii) a modified co-management procedure to the one used by the Project is proposed (Chapter 4); the proposal links central and local practices, policy with practice, and implementation of local CM activities with incentive schemes; (iv) where sustainable forest related issues are still a public taboo (e.g. illegal wood cutting) the county government should establish and endorse a Multistakeholder Forest Forum, backed up with high policy support (e.g. link to national FLEG process); (v) local and county forest initiatives should network with other natural resource co-management initiatives.
1 Co-management of natural resources worldwide and in China

1.1 Collaborative management of natural resources

Collaborative management (or short co-management) - also known as “joint management”, “management in partnership”, or “shared governance” of natural resources is a management system widely in application for all sorts of natural resources (forests, fisheries, water, wildlife, or rangelands) as well as for protected areas and biodiversity in general. Co-management of natural resources focuses on partnership arrangements between government, the local community and other stakeholders. It represents a decentralized approach to decision-making that involves user groups as partners or co-equal decision-makers with government.

Forest co-management is generally a middle course between government-control and local-level control of forests, allowing local communities to work towards:
- Self-forest governance
- Self-regulation and
- Active participation in sustainable management of forest resources.

Forest co-management has mainly been successfully implemented in protected areas. There exist less co-management initiatives outside of the protected area; most of them are action research or NGO driven actions. For instance the Adaptive Collaborative Management (ACM) - a global research project of CIFOR implemented in 31 countries (1998 until the mid-2005) has played a prominent role in Asia (for working definition see next box). This approach is called adaptive, because it implies that learning in working in partnership might fail and may be reworked.

CIFOR’s definition of adaptive collaborative management “ACM is a value-adding approach whereby people who have interests in a forest agree to act together to plan, observe and learn from the implementation of their plans while recognizing that plans often fail to achieve their stated objectives. ACM is characterized by conscious efforts among such groups to communicate, collaborate, negotiate, and seek out opportunities to learn collectively about the impacts of their actions. Working with a given group of people requires involving other people acting on other scales - usually at least one level down and one level up (e.g. user groups within a community and district officials). Effective facilitation can act as a catalyst to empower communities to improve their own conditions, both human and environmental” (CIFOR NN).

The key elements for successful ACM are:
- Interest of all concerned parties
- Added value for all parties (benefits higher than costs)
- Partners are at least a community; user groups in a community and higher hierarchy responsible for forest governance.

Other related initiatives are multistakeholder forest governance, e.g. the multistakeholder forest forum as implemented in Indonesia.

Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (FLEG): FLEG activities, in which China participates, aim to improve forest governance by promoting greater transparency and accountability, and improving public confidence in how decisions on forests are made and implemented. Key elements are:

---

1 An overview for Asia, see PERSOON et al 2004.
• Building consensus between stakeholders: it is often a degree of common cause but little trust (not least between civil society and industry)
• Stakeholder participation is much more than transparency – it is necessary to lay the foundations for implementation
• Don’t try to attain 100% consensus – “agree to disagree” and focus on moving “possible agreement” to “clear agreement”
• Clear and concise information on the analysis of the problem and the process to be followed
• Multi-stakeholder processes do not diminish the government’s key role (negotiate, legislate, regulate)
• Early action, such as step-wise certification; community anti-corruption committees should be part of the national FLEG processes (DONG KE 2008)

Major implications are:
• CM arrangements work best when they are based on interest and demand and high profile political support in terms of endorsement of the process
• CM initiatives are most likely to be successful when the focus is on concrete local issues, which will add value to negotiating parties in a short period (i.e. transaction costs are less than benefits). Therefore start with topics for which agreements can be achieved most easily in a win-win situation.
• Stakeholder participation does not undermine government’s role – it rather complements it (legislation and regulation)
• Institutionalizing a multistakeholder Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (FLEG) forum on county level would be an opportunity to assist the Chinese FLEG process.

1.2 Collaborative co-management in the PR of China with a focus on the project areas
Co-management in forestry in China has been introduced by international development projects in the framework of protected area projects in the nineties of last century. It is now wildly practiced in national reserves. For instance the Sichuan Provincial Forest Department has supported the implementation of co-management in Songpan (Box).

Co-management in the Bayang National Nature Reserve in Songpan County: The national protected area - established in 1993 - has implemented co-management in the buffer zone. Each CM consists of 10 members (2 reserve officers, 1 member of the township government, 2 members of the village committee and 4 elected members of the village). Agreements were signed in 2003, in which the obligation of villagers is to support protection and to agree on not using the core zone and experimental zones (except for some collection of NTFP); also 12 part-time forest guards from village (90 RMB/months) are employed. The village was also supported with a watchtower for bore control; tree crop development and energy saving stoves (LI ZHENGLIN 2009).

The need for co-management was driven to improve the protection of the national nature reserve by the reserve administration. This is achieved by agreements on rights and obligations of the adjacent villages and by providing an incentives scheme for cooperation. The Co-management Committee is a combination of stakeholders with a mandate (village committee and protected area staff and township government) and voluntary members (elected members).

There also exist co-management agreements between the State Forest Enterprises (SFE) and villagers in many parts of China. This is better known as forest shareholding or joint ventures. Many of these co-management systems have evolved because the SFE could not fully pay the wages for forest workers from nearby-villagers; instead the enterprise promised to give share of the sale of forest products. Nonetheless in the project counties this kind of co-management agreements exist in natural forests (e.g. in project counties in Hunan). (LUDWIG 2009).

Often only oral agreements exist. There are complaints from villagers that they do not know how the value of the forest product is calculated. Nevertheless these co-management configurations are a good starting point to make them more fair and transparent (LI WEIGHANG 2009).
With regard to co-management of natural forest resources this Project is the first one which aims to implement it as a larger scale co-management initiative in China.

**Ancient forest self governance in Songpan County:** In the past the village forest self governance was common (see next box). Elements of this could be translated into a modern form of community forestry.

| Past forest governance under village in a Songpan village: | An elder (70 years old, Tibetan) of Shiraz village of Muni Township recalled that before 1949 the forest around the village was not divided into state and village forest, it all fell under villagers’ direct control managed by a village land use management group. The village had in total 38 households, scattered into four zones. The land use management groups consisted of about 15 households, which took turns to watch over the forest and the land for a period of one year. The village regulations ensured that there was no harvest of timber in the hill at the back or in front of the village. Fuel wood collection was allowed only on the sides of the mountains along the valley. People who did not respect the village rules were fined in yak butter. There were clear boundaries between villages. When farmers of other villages were harvesting illegally in the forest, their harvest would be confiscated (Borrini-Feyerabend & Farvar 2007). |

**Co-management related activities in Songpan County** include:

- **Traditional natural co-management in Songpan:** There still exists some traditional co-management system in Songpan. For instance in Chuanzhusi village of Muni Township, one village has little natural forest and the other village little pastures land. The village heads of both villages made an oral agreement that the one with a lot of forest will supply timber from the household quota to the other village and will receive, as an exchange, access to pasture land (Liu Liping 2009). This co-management system was most likely adapted, since it is not possible to sell commercial timber from collective village forests. The market oriented approach would be that villagers from one village pay a lease for the use of pasture land and the villagers from the other village buy timber.

- **Forest co-management:** Forestry dominated oral co-managements are mainly related to fire protection. The agreement is made between the township forest station and village committees and the village committees with villagers who work as forest guards. Sometimes, as in the case of Guna village in Xiaoxing township, the forest station paid a performance based incentive (e.g. 1000 RMB) if no fire occurred. Also co-management in protected area is practiced in Songpan (see box above).

- In the Muni **Scenario Park, agreements** between the park authorities and villagers who lost the land in Muni Township were reached. Villagers still have the right to pass through the scenic park with their domestic animals, and the village who lost land is compensated in cash once per year (to the community fund and payment to each household) (Zhang Junzuo 2009).

To sum-up:

- The mechanism of past effective self-governance of forests (community forestry) could be translated into modern forms of community forestry (not co-management).

- The driver of the existing forest co-management agreements, as well as new natural resource agreements, has all to come from parties with a concern and mandate to negotiate. They could have been taken as a reference for initiating forest co-management activities. Any Co-management Committee should be a combination of stakeholders with a mandate (village committee and protected area staff and township government) and voluntary members (elected members).
2 Development and implementation of the project co-management proposal

2.1 Thematic and geographical scope of project co-management

Stakeholder and thematic focus: According to the Overall Work Plan of the Project approved by Project Steering Committee in July 2004 the project co-management is understood as a form of management of natural resources, in which the concerned parties share rights, duties, power and responsibility for the management of forest resources.

The Project anticipated that it will be involved in the following co-management processes:
- **Informative co-management** in the case of entry point activities (EPA) and well-known livelihood projects
- **Advisory co-management** for infrastructure micro projects and livelihood projects where technical designs are needed
- **Cooperative management** where the community is to be involved in the legal use of natural forest resources which are currently under the control of government agencies such as the FMB and SFE
- **Consultative co-management** for some communities will be responsible for protection of forest resources in watersheds that impact on downstream infrastructure or contain biodiversity and landscape important to eco-tourism

Acknowledging that there is such a diversity of local circumstances in the project villages, it was anticipated that all the types of co-management are likely to be needed with multi-resources, multi-stakeholders and multi-benefit sharing being common. On the other side it was stressed that the narrower version of co-management that only refers to the sharing between government and local resource users might be the dominant form of co-management in the project villages. The project intended to establish village and township co-management committees for coordination and decision making on implementation of project activities (EU-CHINA NFMP 2004). Consequently the Overall Work Plan did not recommend restricting project activities to co-management of natural forest. (See Table 1).

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The management of all natural forests in the administrative villages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use strategy &amp; plan (specific zoning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demarcation and rules regarding the community forests and the sacred forests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives to prevent and control forest fires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules for collection of firewood, fodder, mushrooms, wild vegetables, medicinal plants and other forest products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights and rules for grazing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife and fishing issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules for the fair sharing of all forest benefits (e.g. water, tourism revenues &amp; timber)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions regarding community development activities (such as community projects, eco-tourism, micro-credit activities, job training)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable timber extraction quotas and allocation for local consumption in the AV (on the basis of existing legislation and ecological analyses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring and supervision of local forest guards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuing local fines and penalties for infractions to the agreed rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying issues in need of attention and relevant responses/actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EU-CHINA NFMP 2007
Geographical scope of project co-management
The Project made the decision to launch co-management only in Songpan County in Sichuan, which is one of the six project countries in three provinces. It should be reiterated that some forestry project experts highlighted that there exists forestry co-management systems e.g. SFE with villages which could be used as reference for further improvement (LUDWIG 2009).

The justifications for selecting Songpan given by the Project are the fact that active commitment and collaboration of several parties is essential for the sustainable management of the natural resources; and the fact that access to the resources is essential for local livelihood security and cultural survival.

From the point of view of the Songpan governmental agencies, it was argued that co-management agreements are essential, because:
- the local communities have historically enjoyed customary and/or legal rights over the natural forests
- the local livelihoods are strongly affected by NRM decisions
- the decisions to be taken are complex and controversial
- the current NRM system at times fails to produce the desired results and meet the needs of all parties.

The Project has selected two townships. In Xiaoxing Township most of the forest (86%) is under the jurisdiction of the SFE and the remaining is collective forest. In Muni Township the SFE is not operating, but a big area is directly managed by the County Forest Bureau (Details refer to Annex D).

2.2 The project co-management proposal of Songpan
As mentioned above, the development of project co-management was guided by the Overall Work Plan of the Project which aims to test and demonstrate a wide range of project related informative, advisory, conductive and cooperative management patterns related to project community development and natural forest management. With this general reference the Co-management Consultants developed a co-management concept and assisted in its implementation. The proposal follows the procedure developed by the International Co-Management Consultants (e.g. BORRINI-FEYERABEND & FARVAR 2004).

Definition of co-management: The final working definition of the project for co-management for Songpan is the following:

Co-management of Natural Forests (shared governance) is a process by which governmental agencies, local communities and other main actors collectively negotiate, agree upon, guarantee and implement a fair share of the functions, benefits and responsibilities for the conservation and sustainable use of the natural forests of their concern (BORRINI-FEYERABEND & FARVAR 2007).

BORRINI-FEYERABEND & FARVAR (2007) recommended as a more appropriate term for co-management the term “shared governance” as from their understanding the approach refers mostly to decision-making authority, responsibility and accountability (governance) rather than specific technical options (management). The discussion on how to find an appropriate term in Mandarin and local languages ranges from “Let’s manage the forest together” to “Solidarity between people and nature”. The first one is the most appropriate with regard to the project objective (testing new options for sustainable natural forest management). The Chinese translation of co-management is now “gong guan” (literately this means “work together for management”).

Co-management procedure:
Based on preparation (start up or entry point) the proposed co-management process consists of the following three phases:
1. **Organizing**: A Start-up Team trusted by all parties, is set-up and undertakes a “social communication campaign” to inform and consult local communities & other actors. The Start-up Team also helps all the parties to organize and select their representatives;

2. **Negotiating**: The representatives of the communities, the government agencies and any other relevant actor, identify a shared “vision” of the desired future for the natural resources and negotiate specific co-management agreements and institutions (e.g. village co-management committees) to move towards that vision. The agreements specify the roles, benefits and responsibilities of each party;

3. **Learning by doing**: The co-management agreements are implemented in practice, their results are monitored and the management activities and rules are adjusted, as necessary.

The phases and activities in each phase are schematically illustrated in Figure 1.

The approach of the proposal foresees:
- A local start-up team lays the foundation for the co-management.
- The key actors (e.g. local communities and government agencies and SFE) establish a meeting place or a negotiation table, which is called in the project co-management committee.
- All concerned actor groups review the situation of the natural resources and the relevant legislation & regulations; identify the problems to be solved and the opportunity for local development.
- On the basis of the review they develop agreements and local rules for the natural forests and related resources and for the development of initiatives to be taken. They define benefits and responsibilities which are fair for everyone.
- The CM Committee implements and enforces its own decisions, monitors the results on the environment and on people and modifies decisions as necessary.
- The administrative village co-management committee is regarded as the main negotiation table which should work out and negotiate issues and propose solutions with the neighboring communities and the adjacent state forest authorities. For topics and proposed solutions which are cross-cutting issues the formation of co-management committees at the township and county levels is foreseen. A general formal structure of such committees is represented in Figure B-2 and Figure B-3 of Annex B.
- General rules and regulations for different levels of committees will be developed in a participatory style with members of these levels.

In the framework of the natural forest forestry planning it is foreseen that township land use planning, multi-resource inventory is followed by a Township Strategic Forest Management Planning (SFMP). Build on the land use strategy, the SFMP will provide an opportunity for the Co-management Committee to draw together the different visions and issues brought forward by participants through the co-management process (Fichtenau 2007b).
Figure 1: Phases of a co-management process for the natural forests in Songpan

A point of departure...

- Identify the preliminary management units and key actors (management parties)
- Assess the need and feasibility of co-management
- Assess the available human and financial resources
- Create a Start-up Team

Phase I: Organizing

- Gather information and tools (e.g. maps) on the ecological and socio-economic issues and problems at stake
- Design and carry out a social communication campaign on the co-management process and the management issues it will deal with
- Contact the communities and facilitate their own ecological and socio-economic analysis in a participatory way (participatory action research)
- As necessary, help all the identified parties to develop an internal consensus on their own management interests, concerns and capacities, to acquire needed capacities and to identify their representatives
- Propose a set of rules for the negotiation phase and, in particular, for the first meeting of parties (co-management committee)

Phase II: Negotiating

- Hold a first meeting of the co-management committee, to agree on the procedures and rules for the negotiation
- Hold further meetings to review the socio-ecological situation and its trends (situation analysis) and develop a consensus on a long-term, common vision for the areas and resources at stake
- Hold a ceremony to ritualize the agreed common vision
- Hold meetings to identify a strategy towards the long-term vision
- Hold meetings to negotiate specific agreements (e.g., management plans, contracts, letters of understanding) for each component of the strategy; mediate eventual conflicts; clarify zoning arrangements and the specific functions, benefits and responsibilities of the parties; agree on a follow-up protocol; modify the principles, rules and work schedule of the co-management committees, as needed
- Legitimize and publicize the co-management agreements and committees

Phase III: Learning by doing

- Implement and enforce the agreements (including management plans for the natural forests) and, if needs arise, clarify the functions, benefits and responsibilities of the parties
- Collect data to monitor social and ecological progress and impacts (as in the follow up protocol)
- Judiciously experiment with management innovations (e.g. by refining technical solutions and/or applying those on a wider-scale)
- Hold meetings of the co-management committees at regular intervals to evaluate the results obtained and lessons learned
- As necessary, modify activities and/or develop new management agreements

Borrini-Feyerabend & Farvar, 2007
2.3 Project co-management implementation activities

Technical assistance: Based on the framework outlined in the Overall Work Plan (2004) the technical assistance was rendered between mid 2005 until May 2008. Procedures for establishment and development of CM followed proposals from international experts’ missions in March and September 2006 and April 2007. Field and technical support was provided by an International Junior Expert based in Songpan, local experts and the NFM Component Coordinator (Annex A shows the chronology of assignments and tasks).

Point of departure: in an informal mini-workshop in Beijing it was outlined how to do further analysis, networking and preparatory work towards a more in-depth policy CM workshop.

The entry point in Songpan was to create a local start-up team which was elected in the county project’s first workshop on co-management concept. The team leader of the team quit his work and was replaced by a new team leader. With the help of the technical assistance team, a social communication campaign was developed and the vision poster of this campaign was widely distributed.

Phase I: Organization: This phase focused on organization of partner for negotiation of co-management agreements. In 2007 in all 11 administrative villages of the two project townships in Songpan administrative village co-management committees were formed (Table 2). Members of each natural village elected three persons (one elder, one man and one woman) to participate as members in the administrative co-management committee. The Vice-head of the Township Government is the only member assigned by the township government to work on township level to facilitate and coordinate the administrative village committees.

Major activities consisted of 11 village meetings, 6 workshops and culminated in a final competition in April 2007 and informal recognition of 71 Co-management Committee Members of all project administrative villages in Songpan by representatives of administrative village, township and county level. (For illustration of the process see Figure B1 of Annex B).

Table 2: Village Co-management Members in the two Project Townships of Songpan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>NV</th>
<th>CM Committee members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nr.</td>
<td>% of HH*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaoxing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only village members; 3 from each natural village

Phase 2: Negotiation phase: After forming the administrative village co-management committees, each of them - guided and facilitated by a technical assistance team - held a first meeting of the co-management committee, to agree on the objective, procedures and rules for the negotiation (See Table B-1 of Annex B). Further meetings were conducted to review the socio-ecological situation and its trends and to develop a consensus on a long-term, common vision for the areas and resources at stake; hold a ceremony to ritualize the agreed common vision and; hold meetings to identify a strategy towards the long-term vision. The outcome of topic issues, problems for improvement and topics for potential agreements are summarized in Annex C.
Since neither SFE nor the FMO assigned any staff to the administrative village or township co-management committee, in spring 2008 a local consultant was mobilized to work out the positions of these parties. A workshop with SFE was held for this purpose. Another FMO Workshop foreseen could not be realized due to temporary canceling of project activities due to the Sichuan Earthquake of May 2008.

**Forestry resource planning:** In 2007 the Xiaoxing Township strategic forest planning was completed and the development of the operational forest management planning commenced in Daerbian village. The involvement of the administrative co-management committees was minimal.

### 2.4 Major agreements and disagreements on issue to be tackled with co-management

On the level of vision i.e. long term outlook, there is not much dispute between the vision of the villagers and the forestry officials (Example see next Box).

**Forest Management Office Vision:** The Forestry Officials have the vision to have a productive and healthy natural forest, which can balance the social, environmental and economic needs of the community. In particular we need a forest with a better ecological and stand structure. Our vision also is that barren land has been restored. We need more flexibility from government authorities in order to better manage our forest (FichtenaU 2007).

The position of the county government of Songpan is not clear, since only the vice-governor has openly committed himself to the co-management process. However, there is not any written agreement or action plan in what aspect the government would endorse the multistakeholder process. A multistakeholder eco-tourism forum on county level would be most likely (Zhang Junzuo 2009).

The position of the SFE of Songpan is that there is no need for co-management. In case the SFE is requested to implement government programs, the SFE prefers to contract small businessmen who would subcontract workers to implement the work. The SFE considers more important the activities in the forest under its jurisdiction rather than the ones done by neighboring villagers (e.g. in terms of fire hazards). The SFE would be ready for piloting co-management agreements with adjacent villages in case the provincial level in charge of policy direction in the Sichuan Provincial Forestry Bureau would require doing so. Piloting sustained timber production in natural forests as an alternative to logging ban is welcome.

**Illegal wood cutting - still a taboo theme:** Related to natural forest management of wood and NTFP, the issue of controlling outsiders and settling boundary conflicts with the SFE is a top priority. The challenge of how to overcome the illegal commercial timber and firewood harvesting was not mentioned as an issue by any party in the formal co-management meetings. Also the commercial timber harvesting - based on sustainable forest management principles - is welcome by villagers working in the forest, but it is beyond their imagination how and when this could be realized (Figure 2).

The case of Daerbian village shows that the village has sufficient forest resources, which can be utilized in a sustainable way for timber and fuel wood production while even improving the ecological functions and quality of ecological forests. Yet a special permit provided recently to the adjacent SFE was used to continue with clear cutting (the most profitable logging approach). The best solution for Daerbian would be to allow limited commercial timber production based on the sustainable village forest plan in the collective forests, and make an agreement with the adjacent SFE, for the part of the village which has depleted its fuel wood resources near-by its settlement but is located next to the SFE forest. The agreement could be made with regards to rational fuel wood harvesting by using the material form required thinning which has been approved for improving and maintaining the forest quality during the logging ban.

An important issue for any negotiations would be to clarify the boundary line between the SFE and the villages. In Daerbian and many other villages there are claims by the villagers, that part of the forest land
(which is on the map of the SFE) belongs to them. In Daerbian, de facto a larger area (some 100 ha) is utilized by the village, because they remember that this area is the one marked within boundary stones. The estimates of the collective forest area based on the maps of the FMO and the one of the Project differ up to 200% (see Table D-3 of Annex D). Any entry for sustainable natural forest management must start with clarifying the boundaries of the forest management unit. This must be to the top agenda of forest co-management agreement with villages. The project missed the change to take one of the cases, facilitate the collection of all the evidence of the claiming parties and sit together on a negotiation table. The collective forest reform, which is currently under implementation preparation, must also tackle this.

Figure 2: Natural forest management issues in Daerbian village, Xiaoxing, Songpan

Recently the SFE Management Unit of Xiaoxing has got a special permit to clear cut some 5 ha. This shows that in the time of the logging ban since 1998, not alternative sustainable forest management practices (selective cutting; permanent forest cover) is in place, allowing timber harvesting on steep slopes without jeopardizing the ecological functions (like soil erosion control). According to Liu (2009), the view that clear cutting is not only financially the best approach but also it does not harm ecological functions is still the pediment view of the FMO.

Also forest regulations must be worked out for recognizing the needs of the forest-dependent poor. Otherwise, their enforcement is the worst form of violation of equity and justice. However, any subsistence needs must be based on principles of sustainable forest product harvesting.

If agreement on sustainable natural forest can be reached depends also on weather the driver for illegal logging (including timber cutting for fuel wood) is “need-based” for subsistence, or “greed-based” for profit. Both situations seem to co-prevail in the project area. Unfortunately, forest crimes often go without punishment and, in the few instances where there are prosecutions, the poor are often targeted. In case the greed-based for profit is the driving force of illegal wood cuttings, than simple agreements on village level might not work. It must be back-up with some kind of county FLEG process and beyond. Once the subsistence needs and long-term tenure of the villagers are ensured, experience of many other places showed that villagers are keen to protect their forest resources. If they are permitted to make money from the forest, the immediate added value of a negotiation with the government would be in the case of Daerbian, to pilot limited commercial timber harvesting without jeopardizing the quality of the

---

2 For instance, a newly married young couple who cut trees without permission was caught by the FMO in 2003, which fined them over 3,000 RMB and confiscated their motorbike. And put them into custody (DENG WEIJIE 2006).
natural forests. This must be accompanied with forming of new forest management units, capacity building and compliance monitoring.

2.5 Preliminary assessment of status of project co-management

A preliminary assessment using a SWOT analysis by BORRINI-FEYERABEND (2007) can be summarized, as follows,

**Initial strengths** include:

- All 35 natural villages in Xiaoxing and Muni are mobilized. Their members for the CMC structures at AV level, township level and county level have been identified and trained and are eager to work.
- The community CMC members at administrative village, township and county levels have demonstrated their capacity for situation analysis for natural resources, have elaborated their vision for a conservation based livelihood system for their future and have charted a course of co-management agreements with the government to help them resolve natural resource (especially forest and water) issues they are facing now. In short, they are now capable partners for co-managing their natural forests. The members of the Start-up Team are now experienced in discussing and facilitating CM concepts and processes. Among them one “champion” has emerged and has great potential to facilitate future CMC activities.
- A number of officials from various government agencies in Songpan have been made aware of the role and potential of co-management for their agencies, they are ready to assign personnel to the CMCs subject to instructions by the Office of the County Governor.
- The need is understood to concentrate on government support and involvement.
- The final competition for the CM artistic expression in Songpan has delivered a great deal of publicity and awareness-raising about the Project in the County.
- A mini-workshop in Beijing has provided the initial agreement on which to base further analysis, networking and preparatory work towards a more in-depth policy CM workshop in the mid-term.

**Weaknesses include:**

- The lack of good communication between Chengdu PMO and FMO, particularly over budgetary issues has not been conducive to building trust and confidence and has severely hampered the activities.
- FMO staff has hardly participated in the CMC member training. County level staff from other sectors (e.g. water and tourism) has also not participated in the training.
- The Project CM component is not yet well integrated with other project components, despite CMCs’ potential to deliver transparent community governance, grassroots mobilization, negotiations and agreements with other stakeholders; this lack of integration promotes the “opportunisti” behavior of some partners.
- The maps so far provided to the CMC members do not appear entirely appropriate or useful for the detailed planning by the CMCs. Plasticized maps, at higher scale and with fewer colors and symbols could be used as a basis to plan at administrative village level – keeping as guide and comparison the land use maps already produced by the Project.
- The Start-up Team members’ time as well as the CMC members’ time and CMC operations are not yet generally valued as well as not properly supported/compensated.
- Networking and joint policy analysis with Chengdu-based and Beijing-based forestry researchers and officials are still insufficient to promote CM relevance in China.

**Opportunities seen include:**

- CMC Funds are one possible avenue to integrate project activities in community development and forestry management through co-management agreements.
- At the local level, the CMC members appear eager to try out natural resource management issues through CM.
• Both the Vice-governors of Xiaoxing Township and Muni Township are core members of the Start-up Team and (particularly the latter) have been instrumental to the success of CM preparation so far.
• There is potential for much stronger practical support from the Vice-governor in charge of forestry, hydro-power and agriculture in the People’s Government of Songpan who promised support to co-management from the government.
• A number of Chinese rural and forestry policies provide potentially excellent, enabling conditions to CM, but those need to be reviewed, clarified and “spelled out” to highlight the linkages with co-management.

**Threats** include:

• The township forest strategic plan may be seen as substitute/alternative to the co-management approach and not as a support to it, as intended by the project.
• The Songpan County Forest Bureau and Field Management Office keep de facto boycotting the CM activities, as they have little motivation to support them (CM just means more work, more transparency and an increased potential of making mistakes without clear political support from above); they may also lack the capacities to fully play their CM role (providing competent technical support and well argued backing to all the rules and regulations they propose).
• Lack of continuity and follow up in the CM activities may hamper the willingness of CMC members to work and develop specific CM agreements for the management of their natural forests.
• The highest priority assigned by project administrators to budgetary details without establishing clear rules once and for all and the (possibly consequent) low priority assigned to co-management by the Songpan FMO may damage relations and the prosecution of the work to the point of effective blocking it.

Based on the findings of the Consultant, the optimistic view of opportunities and strengths could not be sustained in 2009. The threats are much greater and none of the issues raised have been tackled so far. The project co-managements is still a **vehicle without a road** (Li Bo 2007) under the circumstances it was developed. Therefore, the national consultants recruited for negotiation of co-management in 2008 could only suggest a “roadmap for co-management” (LIANG WEIZHANG 2008).

The next chapter will highlight major factors, why the expectations held by the Project in co-management could not be fulfilled.
3 Major issues and lessons learned why no project co-management has been negotiated

3.1 Project objective and implementation focus

Issue 1: Project focus: It should be reiterated that the project objective is to contribute to environmental stability and the sustainable development of communities through testing and demonstrating an increased range of options for sustainable management of natural forest resources for a variety of beneficiaries. The project has two components (natural forest management and community development). Forest co-management development is one of the activities of the NFM component. The driver in project implementation has been the community development component in terms of decision making where to implement and at what speed. The 2006 Project Mid-term evaluation already reiterated that, e.g. PRA used in community development does not reflect issues of land use and conflicts relevant to forest management, and hence the project should integrates project activities to recognize cross-cutting themes including co-management. They must be translated into an integrated participatory approach at village and township level (AGRECO CONSORTIUM 2006).

Meantime local forestry planning (multi-resource inventory, township strategic forest planning, village forest planning) have been mandate or are progressing and it was assumed that co-management committees on administrative village, township and beyond would be in place as capable units to negotiate and implement agreements. The contrary is true; there are still missing capable local forestry configurations (forest management units on collective forest land; forest user groups, effective forest village regulations and incentive and compensation schemes) to support for sustainable natural forest management.

Lesson learned: With the limited project resources and the project mandate of “testing and demonstrating alternative to logging ban”, the project would have required allocating more resources in capacity building in support to the collective forest reform (i.e. the Chinese expertise available under the heading of community forestry in China). In this context co-management is only one tool among others.

3.2 Project co-management procedure

Issue 1: Co-management as a panacea: The Project Overall Work Plan calls to consider using co-management agreements for all project field implementation activities. The CM concept advisors even considered co-management as a form of self-governance, not restricted to improve forest governance. The attention of development co-management was therefore less geared towards concrete joint local activities in natural forest management.

Lesson learned: Forest co-management needs to focus first of all on concrete needs and opportunity to practice a relatively easy local joint forest working; this should result in simple agreements or contracts. If it is focused on too ambitious vision or many topics like it happened in this Project, it may achieve no added value because the efforts and the trust in the concept is at risk.

Issue 2: Co-management preparation phase: The time for preparation for co-management development in the project was too short. The quick start-up phase followed the organizing stakeholders without sufficient assessment of the policy, legal and incentive requirements for which formal forest stakeholders would join the co-management negotiating tables. The political feasibility was assumed based on talks with the Vice-governor and some line agencies in Songpan, an informal workshop in Beijing and talks to Chengdu forestry professionals.

Lesson learned: There is a need to include a proper preparation phase for co-management in the procedure in which sufficient time and resources are allocated to assess which are the best options to complement the government and private sectors’ efforts to move towards improvement of forest governance; identify priority opportunities for co-management and the work on improving the enabling policy to pilot new forms of negotiation tables.
**Issue 3: Co-management units:** The project assumes that the best co-management unit is the administrative village (small socio-administrative unit) and started to form co-management committees in all 11 villages - in which the community development project activities were implemented.

**Lesson learned:** The co-management unit should be decided case by case, starting with more simple local conflicts and interest of parties to solve them; then move towards more complex co-management units.

**Issue 4: Organizing of co-management: Start-up team:** The project relies on a voluntary start-up team without resources and mandate. The discontinuity and replacement of the team leader is an indicator of the challenge of such an approach.

**Lesson learned:** Although volunteers can be crucial for any new initiative, capacity building in modern co-management skills (conflict resolution, legal issue, moderation) takes a longer time. This makes best sense when a formal start-up group will work for a longer period in this kind of co-management.

**Issue 5: Organizing - Communication campaign:** The social communication campaign of the project was an excellent event for awareness creation on co-management, and the poster increased the visibility of the Project. Yet there is not any agreement implemented, which might reduce the trust in this concept.

**Lesson learned:** With limited project resources it is better to work on simple cases to show the co-management can work and to disseminate the results later. This is not against environmental awareness campaigns (which were included in the communication campaigns), but they might divert limited resources from organizing concrete local co-management.

### 3.3 Administrative Co-management Committees

**Issue 1: The administrative village CM Committee mission** is “to develop the best possible solutions for the sustainable management of natural forests and other natural resources and for community livelihoods in the AV”. For a voluntary, non mandated group of villagers this is a huge task (see Annex C).

- CMC members have low level of understanding of the environmental problems of their village and are unclear about their specific roles and responsibilities in co-management
- CMC does’ not have any administrative authority to regulate the behaviors of the villagers towards sustainable resource utilization. Due to the slow progress of co-management and absence of political recognition from the government agencies, the CMC members are gradually losing confidence and enthusiasm
- During the past two years, CMC members have inputted a lot of time in attending the project workshops / meetings. Since the co-management has not yet resulted in any direct reward to them this has undermined their motivations. The situation could be much worse if the potential of eco-tourism development was not present

**Lesson learned:** A more restricted focus on resolving some concrete forest management issues between a village, neighboring villages and the SFE by a concrete on-the-job training about how this could be approached, would be less time consuming and might lead to quicker added values.

**Issue 2: Administrative co-management committee are established:** it is a misleading claim by the Project since only members of villages, coordinated by the vice-heads of each project township participated in the project committees as members. By definition at least one other party (e.g. SFE) would be required to justify the term co-management committee.

**Lesson learned:** The 11 administrative village committees could now be supported in better organizing and exchanging their common interest as – shortly legalized - collective forests stakeholders.
Issue 3: AV Members without mandate to negotiate: The administrative members were elected by the villagers in each natural village. The village committee is the only empowered democratic body to manage the village affairs including forests. The village head gets remuneration from the government for services rendered to the community; the role of the CM committee is ambiguous. Interesting to note, that in project counties in which no CM committees were established, village heads or other appointed members of the villager committee participated in village forest planning, while in the case of Daerbian, neither the village head nor the CM was committed. Village heads underlined that the CM committees have no mandate to negotiate with outsiders, but could best collect information about which to negotiate.

Lesson learned: Any CM village committee should use the well established CM composition in protected area in which representatives of the village committees are obligatory members of the CM committee. In addition the voluntary members along the project proposal are an excellent mechanism to ensure the views of the elder and women. The tradition in the Tibetan village that some households - on an annual rotational basis - are in charge of affairs which is not sufficiently covered by the villager committee needs further attention in the design of CM committees.

3.4 Formal forest sector stakeholders are not participating in any project CM indicatives

Issue 1: FMO and SFE are not members of any CM committee. This very serious issue was highlighted in several project documents. One major reason is that the county SFE director cannot make any policy decision on entering co-management with administrative villages without instructions for respective authorities in the Provincial Forestry Department. The staff of the County Forestry Bureau can only pilot measures outside the existing legal framework (e.g., preparation post logging ban pilot activities) in case stipulated by policy documents on prefecture level. The work performance of county forestry personnel is assessed by the next hierarchical level. Therefore without amendment of their job descriptions they are less motivated to work in co-management pilot measures.

Lesson learned: Prior to expecting formal forest stakeholders to participate in co-management negotiation tables they need a confirmed mandate. Hence, work with the relevant level of administration in assisting to amend job description and linking good performance in co-management to rewards (professional promotion; awards in cash and kind) is a must.

Issue 2: CM focus is not forestry oriented: The project focus on general co-management development is not in line with major tasks of the forestry profession. For instance last year the major task on county level was rezoning; currently the staff is trained for the implementation of the collective forest reform. They are interested to practice sustained wood production and not in being requested to participate in many village meetings which deal with general issues of natural resource protection and management.

Lesson learned: A sustainable natural forest management project should see the new opportunities (rezoning of forest classes, need to clarify forest unit boundaries and decision of new modern forest units on collective village forest land) as important. In these tasks there is much scope to demonstrate how to negotiate and reach agreements or where other means (like going to the court) might be the only solution (See case study of Daerbian above).

3.5 Legal and policy support for CM

Issue 1: No legal mandate for co-management: The legal and administrative systems on county level are not yet structured to recognize local voluntary organization for natural resources, hence the co-management of natural resources (conflict management). A rapid evaluation of political feasibility carried out in March 2006 by the CM Consultants by discussing the co-management option with the local Vice-governor, the key governmental agencies in Songpan, and the representatives of local communities in Muni and Xiaoxing, cannot replace the policy advice and assistance in how to endorse this new tool by the government.
Lessons learned: There is a clear need to get an endorsement from the county government that this co-management should be piloted as one mechanism in support of the current 5-Year Plan which focuses on harmonization between social groups, sectors and environment.

3.6 Financial support

Issue 1: Financial support: In principle, the community CMC members work as volunteers. Long time input combined with no achievements has resulted in frustration, and most of the engaged members will not continue their work. The project has articulated the issue on how to directly support the co-management committee through some kind of community fund, either as compensation or remuneration for services provided.

Lessons learned: The role of different stakeholder groups must be clearly defined. Especially if they should provide any service and could be reimbursed. Community funds and other types should be available for incentive for implementation of agreements with a conservation component.

3.7 Capacity building

Issue 1: Co-management is a new modern way of conflict management of natural resources. This requires more than short introduction to conflict management and facilitation skills during brief workshops.

Lessons learned: Modern conflict management and facilitation skills training should be offered though longer training units for key co-management stakeholder institutions.

3.8 Costs and benefits of co-management

Issue 1: Co-management to be accepted by participating stakeholders and the government must have higher added values than costs. So far the transaction costs were very high. Potential benefits and cost of the co-management are summarized in next Table.

Table 3: Potential costs and benefits of co-management in Songpan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential benefits</th>
<th>Potential costs and obstacles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CM can harness the management capacities and comparative advantages of different actors and, in particular, the traditional knowledge and skills conveyed by the local elders</td>
<td>• CM needs early and substantial investments of time, financial and human resources (high ‘transaction costs’) in both the preparation of the partnership and the negotiation of agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CM allows the sharing of management responsibility, lessening the burden of FMB and SFE</td>
<td>• CM can encounter the opposition of individuals unwilling to share their authority, substantially change their livelihood systems and/or forego some of their current advantages and benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CM agreements may enhance the local forest benefits and revenues of local communities</td>
<td>• CM can bring to the fore some conflicts that may end up worsening the situation of the weaker parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The alliance between governmental agencies and local communities can fend off resource exploitation by non-local interests and related environmental damages</td>
<td>• CM may be hampered by a “negotiation stall” if a co-management agreement cannot be achieved without compromising in a substantial way the interests and concerns of some parties (e.g. some key conservation or development goals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CM can reduce enforcement expenditures because of agreed, voluntary compliance</td>
<td>• Some CM agreements cannot be respected because of underestimated problems or new intervening factors (e.g. changes in the economic and/or political context)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CM can enhance the trust between governmental agencies and local communities</td>
<td>• CM can promote a shared ‘ownership’ of the management process and the commitment of the parties to implement the decisions they have taken together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CM can promote a shared ‘ownership’ of the management process and the commitment of the parties to implement the decisions they have taken together</td>
<td>• CM can enhance the local sense of security and stability leading to increased confidence in investments and adoption of a long-term, sustainable management perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CM can enhance the local sense of security and stability leading to increased confidence in investments and adoption of a long-term, sustainable management perspective</td>
<td>• CM can promote better communication and understanding among the parties, preventing or minimizing conflicts and disputes due to miss-communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CM can promote better communication and understanding among the parties, preventing or minimizing conflicts and disputes due to miss-communication</td>
<td>• CM can enhance awareness about conservation issues and the integration of conservation and sustainable use efforts within local development initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CM can enhance awareness about conservation issues and the integration of conservation and sustainable use efforts within local development initiatives</td>
<td>• CM provides an occasion for citizens to get involved in participatory democracy by developing and enforcing rules via their direct involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CM can enhance the trust between governmental agencies and local communities</td>
<td>• CM can reduce enforcement expenditures because of agreed, voluntary compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BORRINI-FEYERABEND & FARVAR  2007
In Songpan County the annual logging ban cost are estimated at around 150 RMB (15.8 EUR0) per capita. The SFE annual loss is some 7 million RMB (740,000 EURO). On the other hand, the county government has received from the state 5 million RMB (528,000 EURO) per year for forest protection and 3 million RMB (317,200 EURO) per year for planting and tending young trees. The Land Conversion Program is another means devised by the government of China to prevent the over-cultivation of steep land and soil erosion (BORRINI-FEYERABEND & FARVAR 2007). Recently also a subsidy for the partial grazing ban has been introduced to the project townships.

Although the government is channeling large sums to compensate for the logging ban, these funds have not been utilized for testing post logging ban forest management. The co-management scheme accompanied with capacity building for sustainable collective natural forest management would have the double advantage of being cheaper than the current approach and could at the same time produce sustainable forest products. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that part of these funds be linked directly to the co-management and community forestry development and implementation process.
4 Proposed alternative co-management procedure

The key conclusion of the previous analysis is that any sustainable co-management action should be embedded in ongoing government reforms and technical programs (i.e. complement but not replace them). Three key challenges in implementing co-management concerning natural forest management must be resolved at the entry point:

- The legal and administrative systems at county level are not yet structured to recognize local voluntary organizations which are not formed solely for the purpose of profit-making. Hence government support is the key for any innovative local co-management initiative. The current Five Year Plan calls for harmonizing sector, social groups and environment.
- Innovative sustainable natural forest management solutions are impeded by the current legal and policy framework (logging ban does not allow commercial timber harvesting) and hence must be backed up by policy documents on respective level of policy decision making (see Annex D).
- Any proposed county level co-management team will not have sufficient initial capacity to effectively implement the co-management procedures which they are developing. Official sources of technical support or extension for them are not in place, hence, endorsement of this kind of team and securing sufficient support in terms of resources (funds) and capacity building is required. This is else true for the contract partners who are supposed to implement agreements.

Approach and stakeholders

The current project proposal (Figure 1) has underestimated these challenges, and hence a different focused approach (Figure 2) is proposed. This will be exemplified in the case of co-management of natural forests in Songpan. It is proposed to call this committee at county level **County CM Task Force** (or CM Working Group). It should be established for clearly narrow defined natural resource governance (e.g. natural forest governance). It may be also considered to create a **Multistakeholder Forum** on topics which still need broader consensus building first (e.g. clean watershed management for drinking water supply of a city). The co-management committee should also be renamed to "**Negotiation table members**", to underline that they have the primary task and mandate to negotiate agreements. The implementation agencies of the agreements should be called **contract partners**.

The approach will be further illustrated for the case of natural forest governance. In Songpan county natural forests are mainly under the jurisdiction of the SFE or administrative villages (collective forest). The Forestry Management Office has the overall responsibility of administration of the forests according to the current forest policy. Hence any change of the work of staff of the FMO requires the policy approval from the prefecture level (backup by higher hierarchical level) and for SFE it is the provincial level (Annex D). Only if relevant policy documents are issued both forest stakeholders can work together in an innovative co-management arrangement with representatives of village forests (i.e. the village committee plus any other endorsed member of the community). For that reason the following new procedure is proposed. It is characterized by a strong link between central and local level, between policy and new sustainable practice.

**County CM Task Force**: It is proposed that through capacity building by an outside technical assistance team (focusing on potential and practical examples of co-management knowledge gaps) the county government will endorse a specific Co-management Task Force to act as the local umbrella institutions.
Task force for natural forest governance could have the goal “Manage harmoniously the natural forest in the county together, for today and tomorrow needs of local people and the public”.

The aim of the task force is:
- Facilitate and monitor co-management arrangements among concerned stakeholders
- At a later stage, to handle the scaling-up of co-management activities in the county.

A team may consists of 8–15 persons, headed by the county governor or vice-governor and including representatives from respective other parties (at least FMO and SFE and later incorporate representatives of local CM initiatives). The team must prove that it complements government efforts; the team usually meets twice a year or as necessary. It coordinates county level co-management through consensual decision-making processes. Each participating stakeholder group, which is assigned to the task force, is officially endorsed by its institution and reports to the institution.
Through regular meetings of township heads and line agencies with the county government, the CM task force could inform about new opportunities to launch local CM activities. Guidelines for conditions and incentives must be in place. One condition to participate in a government supported local CM activity is that there is interest and local demand to solve conflicts or strengthening existing informal cooperation over natural forests.

Based on local requests a start-up CM Team (with its own resources and endorsed by the CM Task Force - which could also compose the start-up team) will review existing documents and will conduct PRA and special local case studies on sites where requests have been made. This can be supported by capacity building through a technical assistance team.

**Co-management unit and negation round table members:** Decisions on the negotiation table level will be decided case by case. For instance in some cases two administrative villages and one SFE management unit will form the co-management unit. It is recommended that in case of administrative village the example from protected area is applied: representatives from the village committee and voluntary members will form the negotiation table. The example of the project to elect one elder and one man and woman from each natural village is appropriate. The other party will also appoint representatives who are authorized to negotiate agreement.

The procedure for organization and negotiation can follow the one proposed by the project proposal.

**Financial support:** It will be important that all participating stakeholders of the CM process will have sufficient access to information and resources in case conservation restriction must be followed. Some kind of community funds should be mobilized as an incentive and compensation for compliance with conservation agreements. The existing funds (grazing ban fund in Songpan and public benefit forest funds and other government or development aid funds) could be considered as one source.

**Co-management agreements:** Based on the results of discussions and negotiation obligations, roles and responsibilities should be reviewed by line agent. If they are in line with policy documents the implementing parties should enter co-management contracts (e.g. county government, forest township station and administrative village committee). Contents of co-management contracts will consists of rights and responsibilities of community members and other parties stated in the contracts. The roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders, as agreed upon in previous community meetings and discussions, are also included. At the stakeholders' meeting also financial support and other support given by government is stated; as well as the validity of agreement (e.g. 4 years) and annual assessment.

**Up-scaling:** The task force will monitor the lessons learned and upscale positive local co-management agreements activities or change it in case it is not successful.

The cross cutting task will be capacity building. The implementation of forest management plans of the forest management units must be checked by an independent third party to see if they comply with the agreements (compliance monitoring, e.g. through partial timber certification, code of conduct, etc).

---

3 A Chinese timber certification stander is not yet in place, others like Forest Stewardships could be applied. For status of certification see HINRICHS 2009.
5 Recommendations

5.1 Project recommendations

1. Considering that the project assisted co-management committees are not in place and that the village development planning initiated by the project can also be implemented without CM committees in support of acceleration of the collective forest reform in Songpan, it is strongly recommended that the Project should depart from further direct co-management activities in favor of community forestry by defining first of all the most appropriate forest management unit for the collective natural forests in the project administrative villages of Songpan (especially in Xiaoxing). The village committee members together with the administrative co-management members should work with the FMO and the township government to agree on villager forest boundaries with the SFE. Policy support from the prefecture and provincial level is a pre-condition.

2. The Project might also consider providing training on how to develop modern forest associations at village and township level.

3. The Project should encourage the prefecture forest bureau to instruct the County Forest Bureau and the Sichuan Provincial Forest Department to issue policy documents to guide the SFE Unit in Xiaoxing to enable them to enter discussions on joint forest activities (Preparation of post logging ban).

4. The Project should also propose to the government of Songpan to consider establishing a “Co-management Task Force on Nature Forest Governance” and review the proposal of implementation of local co-management activities. This would also be an opportunity to re-mobilize the expertise of the start-up team and some of the still committed administrative village CM members. The Vice-governor which strongly supported the launching of the project CM process could lobby for such a proposal within the Songpan Government.

5. In addition the Songpan government should consider establishing an “Eco-tourism Multistakeholder Forum” as voluntary platform to further promote eco-tourism in the county.

5.2 Forest co-managements for forest sector and beyond

- Multi stakeholder forest co-management processes should not diminish the government's key role (negotiate, legislate, regulate) but complement it.
- Forest co-management development should be restricted to forestry issues and only include other project activities which are essential for achieving sustainable forest management (e.g. complementary grazing measures to exclude grazing in natural regeneration zones).
- A modified co-management procedure is proposed which links central and local practices, policy with practice, and implementation of local CM activities with an incentive scheme. Salient proposed features are:
  a. A thorough preparation phase to develop the co-management scheme (including review of strengths and weaknesses of existing local co-management systems, identification of potential partners, preparation of policy documents of CM partner organizations and securing resources (personal and funds)).
  b. Establishment of a County Forest Governance Task Force as the officially endorsed umbrella organization to facilitate, monitor, up-scale or phase out local CM activities.
  c. Publicize to township governments, line agencies and the public the conditions about how to request for support in launching local CM initiatives. The co-management units are based on levels, CM parties agreed to work together.
  d. Negotiation round table parties are only the ones with mandated members; in the case of villages it is the appointed members of the village committee and additional members endorsed by the Village Representation Assembly.
  e. Translation of results of negotiation tables into co-management implementation contracts, which also include government support (funds, rewards, training. etc.) and compliance monitoring criteria.
• Where sustained forest related issues are still a public taboo (e.g. illegal wood cutting) the county government should establish and endorse a Multistakeholder Forest Forum, backed up with high policy support (e.g. link to national FLEG process).
• Local and county forest initiatives should network with other natural resource co-management initiatives.
Annex A: Summary of technical assistance on co-management

Up to April 2008, the progress in assistance on co-management approaches was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July to September 2005.</td>
<td>A first mission to assess the potential for co-management in project townships was carried out by an international short term expert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2006</td>
<td>A second mission for selecting an appropriate site and size for a pilot area in Songpan and for setting up a first co-management start-up team was conducted by two international experts (one for co-management concept development and one for training) and a local short term expert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2006</td>
<td>A third mission was carried out by the same team of two international and three local experts to elaborate a detailed working plan for the start-up team, initiate the production of sensitization material and design an awareness raising campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2007</td>
<td>A fourth mission was carried out by the same team of two international and one local experts to give first support and training to the newly elected Co-Management Committees and to further promote Co-Management at higher political levels through meetings and workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2006 to June 2007</td>
<td>An international junior expert was permanently based in the Songpan pilot area to support the start-up team and the county FMO in implementation of the developed work plan and schedule to establish Co-Management Committees and Co-Management agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2006 to January 2007</td>
<td>In 4 short missions a local expert provided training to the start-up team on how to conduct village based awareness raising events, using the material and information provided by the project. The last mission in January 2007 provided further instruction on the election process for establishment of Co-Management Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March to April 2008</td>
<td>A new national consultant on co-management training and workshop facilitation conducted a mission as a moderator and communication advisor in the negotiation and discussion process to the villagers and the FMO/SFE staff. He conducted with the SFE a workshop on co-management; the FMO workshop was postponed to May 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancelled (May 2008)</td>
<td>Due to the Sichuan earthquake and other restrictions, no consultant was remobilized until this mission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex B: Summary of key elements for project co-management procedure

Figure B-1: Village co-management organization in practice in Songpan

1st Event
Outreach and awareness raising about co-management at administrative villages meetings

2nd Event
Village ecological capacity day and competition for the best traditional performance on co-management

3rd Event
Participatory action research and selection of community representatives for the Co-management Committees

4th Event
Final competition and recognition of representatives by the governor

Paul Wilson; Notes on co-management committees, May 2007 quoted after FICHTENAU 2007a
**Mission and Terms of Reference of the Co-management Committee at AV level**

The CMC’s mission is “to develop the best possible solutions for the sustainable management of natural forests and other natural resources and for community livelihoods in the AV.”

The CMC is concerned with the following Terms of Reference:

- The management of all natural forests in the administrative villages
- Land use strategy & plan (specific zoning)
- Demarcation and rules regarding the community forests and the sacred forests
- Initiatives to prevent and control forest fires
- Rules for collection of firewood, fodder, mushrooms, wild vegetables, medicinal plants and other forest products
- Rights and rules for grazing
- Wildlife and fishing issues
- Rules for the fair sharing of all forest benefits (e.g., water, tourism revenues & timber)
- Decisions regarding community development activities (such as community projects, eco-tourism, micro-credit activities, job training)
- Sustainable timber extraction quotas and allocation for local consumption in the AV (on the basis of existing legislation and ecological analyses)
- Hiring and supervision of local forest guards
- Issuing local fines and penalties for infractions to the agreed rules
- Identifying issues in need of attention and relevant responses/ actions

**CMC Procedures and Rules**

**CMC composition:** Each Administrative Village in the pilot townships of Muni and Xiaoxing has a chance to create a Co-management Committee (CMC) composed of 3 members from each Natural Village (1 elder, 1 woman and 1 man) + one government official from the FMB or SFE, as appropriate. These “core members” are integrated— as necessary and agreed by the core members— by government officials from other agencies and/or other members of the local communities, or any other concerned actor, according to the specific issues to be discussed.

**Temporary members of CMC:** The core members of the CMC decide together by consensus if they would like to invite other participants to take part in a CMC meeting where a specific topic will be discussed. The invitees can be government officials, experts, business people, members of the local communities and/or any other person recognized as knowledgeable and useful for the sound management of natural resources in the relevant AV. Invitees are divided into two categories: advisors, who will not participate in decision making, but will provide important information and advice; and “invited members” for a particular issue, meaning that they can be allowed to participate in decision making for that issue.

**Facilitation**

At least during the first meetings, the CMC may be assisted and facilitated by one or more members of the Start-up Team. Following this, the role of the facilitator may be taken up by any person who is widely respected in the AV and considered as “independent” and interested in the wellbeing of the local communities and their environment.

**Meeting agenda:** In close consultation with the CMC members, the facilitator proposes the key topic and agenda of the first CMC meeting; the key topic of any future meeting will be agreed upon before the closure of the preceding one, following proposals by the CMC members.

**Meeting records:** The facilitator assigns the role of note keeper to one of the members of the CMC, a member of the Start-up Team or any other capable resident of the AV. The approved minutes of meetings are kept in the administrative AV building, and are posted for public viewing and made available to anyone wishing to see them.

**Time and venue:** The CMC convenes at designated meeting places, dates and times, and those are communicated to its members as much in advance as possible, and in any case with no less than a 3-day notice.

**Quorum**

The meetings of the CMC are formal if 50% or more of the members are present. If the quorum is not reached, the CMC meeting shall be adjourned to a new date.

**Attendance**

If a member has no valid reason to miss a meeting or if s/he, even with a valid reason, fails to participate in 3 consecutive meetings, s/he will be substituted. The relevant village (in case of community representatives) or forest authority (in case of FMB or SFE representative) will be asked to substitute him/her.

**Logistics**

On a rotational basis, one of the CMC members is assigned to arrange the logistics of the next meeting as follows:

- Arrange the meeting room and make sure that it is clean, has enough seats, has a table, at least one board
and convenient toilets;
• Prepare paper, pens, notebooks, flipcharts, maps, information documents and all other support needed by participants;
• Timely remind the members about the meeting (possibly with the help of the Village Link Workers);
• Prepare for tea and possibly snacks for the breaks;
• Prepare for food and lodging of members, if and as necessary.

Reimbursement of costs
On a rotational basis, a CMC member is assigned as responsible for the reimbursement of transportation costs, as applicable.

Speaking in meetings:
During the meetings the CMC members should:
1. feel free to speak his/her own mind but be always respectful of others’ views;
2. speak one at a time and listen to others attentively;
3. never harass, belittle or marginalize another member or someone absent from the meeting.

Facilitator is neutral: The facilitator takes a neutral position on all substantive issues discussed in the CMC meetings. S/he never speaks her/his mind on substantial issues and never decides about substantial matters.

Open atmosphere for discussion: The facilitator promotes a friendly atmosphere conducive to open and free discussion. It organizes the seating around a round table or in other non-hierarchical ways.

Communicating in meetings: The facilitator encourages every member to speak and make sure that they have a chance to do so. If some people do not appear at ease with speaking Chinese, s/he makes sure that someone is available for a simultaneous translation. By posing relevant questions, the facilitator promotes good communication among all the CMC members and makes sure that the weaker interests are heard and taken into account.

Consensus building: The facilitator keeps alert and underlines any new idea able to get people out of conflicts and closer to consensus. S/he summarizes and confirms with the participants any achieved consensus.

Keeping up the vision: The facilitator emphasizes the common vision of the desired future agreed upon by all CMC participants and uses that vision to get out of conflicts on short-term interests and positions.

Sound information & criteria: The facilitator helps the CMC members to base their analyses on sound information and to compare different options for action on the basis of some broad criteria.

Decision by consensus:
β Decisions in the Co-Management Committee are taken by consensus. Consensus does not mean that everyone gets what they want, nor that there has been a vote and the majority prevailed. Consensus means that an agreement has been developed with the contribution of everyone and that everyone "can live with" the agreement.
β Lack of consensus: If a consensus cannot be reached, the CMC can choose to take the case to be arbitrated by the CMC at higher level.
β Legal framework: The CMC decisions are subject to the Chinese Rural Organic Law. The Village General Assembly may ratify or contest the decisions of the CMC if it chooses to do so.

Transparency of meetings
The discussions in the CMC meetings are open to be public as observers, but the public must refrain from intervening or disturbing the procedures in any way.

Informing the community and forest authorities
The CMC decisions are diffused as soon as possible after the meetings. One of the community representatives in the CMC is assigned the task of informing the community and will report about it at the next meeting. The representative of the FMB or SFE will inform the relevant authorities. It is also possible that one or more members of the CMC may wish to consult with the communities or authorities before expressing their positions on a specific issue. In that case, the discussion is adjourned to a next meeting.

Monitoring and evaluation
The implementation of CMC decisions is monitored and evaluated regularly on the basis of some agreed indicators.

Duration of service
β The community CMC members (1 elder, 1 woman and 1 man per natural village) are freely elected by their villages every two years.
β The Forestry and other government members are appointed by their respective agencies as they deem appropriate.
Voluntary service

In principle, the community CMC members work as volunteers. This is in line with the fact that they do not respond to the needs of any specific project but are at the service of the sound management of natural resources for both local and non-local benefits. Their role should thus be independent of any project and sustainable after the closure of any project. It is possible, however, that a relevant AV decides to set up a Community Fund nourished by the common property natural resources managed by the CMC, or by some other income generating enterprise. In such cases the CMC members could be compensated from the community revenues under the supervision of their respective

Note: Developed and agreed in Songpan in 2007

SOURCE: BORRINI-FEYERABEND & FARVAR. 2007

Table B-2: The Co-management Committees at township level

Co-management Committees will also be needed at township and the county level to take care of all natural resource management issues that cannot be solved at AV level. In April 2007 the community members of such Committees have been identified / elected by the existing CMC members at AV level. Their Terms of Reference have been only preliminarily developed, and so far include the following:

- Providing advice and possibly management decisions and supervision for the territories beyond control of local AVs, such as the international scenic spot in Mu Ni, now under exclusive control of Ministry of Tourism
- Harmonizing rules with the Monastery and other autonomous entities
- Supporting the local CMCs, for instance in developing by-laws, obtaining needed infrastructures, etc.
- Linking with higher level authorities in the Township, the County, the Prefecture and the Province
- Promoting the acquisition of specific governance and management capacities at AV level
- Attracting funding and project opportunities at AV level
- Diffusing the CMC experience and achievements to other townships and counties
- Influencing national policies in favor of co-management
- Resolving conflicts if they arise at lower CMC level.

SOURCE: BORRINI-FEYERABEND & FARVAR. 2007
Figure B-2: Possible composition of a co-management committee at township level

Borrini-Feyerabend & Farvar. 2007.

Figure B-3: Possible composition of a co-management committee at county level

Borrini-Feyerabend & Farvar. 2007.
### Table B-3: Proposed members for CMC on different hierarchical levels in Songpan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMC Level</th>
<th>CMC Members*</th>
<th>No. of CMC members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Village</td>
<td>3 village reps from all natural villages + government stakeholders according to topic</td>
<td>45+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>6 Villagers + government stakeholders according to topic</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3 Villagers + government stakeholders according to topic</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province/national</td>
<td>2 Villagers/government stakeholders according to topic</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FICHTENNAU 2007a

### Table B-4 – Example of strategic agreement to tackle a priority issue / problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad aims</th>
<th>Specific objectives to be pursued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Improved conditions of the pasture in common village uplands | ◆ preventing and controlling grassfires  
 ◆ restoring the waterways that used to feed our pasture  
 ◆ closing off to grazing the badly eroded areas until they will have recovered  
 ◆ facilitating the germination of productive and animal-praised grass species in zone X of our pasture  
 ◆ making sure that the onset of summer grazing is better timed to optimize the condition of the pasture  
 ◆ diversifying the type of animals that use the same pasture;  
 ◆ making sure that the entry of animals from other villages is regulated and agreed upon by our village  
 ◆ diminishing the total number of animals allowed to graze also from our village [this may require some form of compensation for the people whose livelihoods is very dependent on grazing] |
| Improved community benefits from the pasture | ◆ improving the health of our animals (e.g., through timely vaccination)  
 ◆ improving the income of herders by organizing commercial opportunities for milk, wool and other animal products  
 ◆ providing for the surveillance of the pasture (against trespassers, to prevent fire, etc.) on behalf of the community  
 ◆ identifying a respected person to play an arbiter role in case of inter and intra community conflicts regarding the common pasture  
 ◆ organizing a community festivity to mark the onset of summer grazing in the common pasture and the return to lower elevations |
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Table B-5: Proposed village forest issues at various CMC levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Admin. Village Level</th>
<th>Township Level</th>
<th>County Level</th>
<th>Provincial/national Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fuel wood consumption of local population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Timber consumption of local population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grazing of Yaks, goats and sheep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Forest Productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reduction of fuel wood consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Timber extraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eco Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Forest Fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Forest diseases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Non timber forest products (NTFP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wildlife Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Annex C: Results of group work of CMC members at AV level in the Project Townships of Muni and Xiaoxing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Village</th>
<th>Issues and problems</th>
<th>Strengths and opportunities</th>
<th>Traditional mechanism in support of NRM</th>
<th>Priorities for improvements</th>
<th>Content of related agreements to be developed in the CMCs</th>
<th>Expected benefits from the agreements</th>
<th>Expected difficulties in developing &amp; enforcing the agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MUNI TOWNSHIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SANLIAN</strong></td>
<td>1. The protection of the community forests in Mt. Zengka and Gujiu</td>
<td>1. Rational use on forest resources</td>
<td>The concept of sacred mountains and lakes today still works pretty well. Each member in the society should be responsible for the development of the community livelihood.</td>
<td>1. Protection on community forests and CM agreements</td>
<td>1. To apply for some policies from the forest bureau to be paid by planting seedlings provided by the forest bureau</td>
<td>1. Fuel problem can be solved</td>
<td>1. Ignorance from the relevant agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The recovery of the ecology in Rongkan Valley</td>
<td>2. Good relationship with Muni management bureau to share resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Damage on ecology after the recovery of logging</td>
<td>2. To negotiate with Muni management bureau on co-managing Zhaga forests and share the problem on fuel.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. No support from the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The management on Zhaga forest and waterfall</td>
<td>3. Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. CM agreement on Zhaga forests</td>
<td>3. To improve villager’s livelihood</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. It would be harmful to the ecology if fuel problem is unsolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The protection on sacred mountains</td>
<td>4. Initiating villagers to highlight the importance of CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Fires made by people from outside of Sanlian to collect medicinal herbs and fungus</td>
<td>5. There are several hundred mu of lands for developing eco-tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZHONG ZHEI</strong></td>
<td>1. We get no benefits from our scenic resources</td>
<td>1. Supports from NFMP</td>
<td>To praise our culture, we protect our sacred mountains and lakes</td>
<td>1. With the support of CMC and the government to reach the agreement with government via CM</td>
<td>1. Benefits to the community</td>
<td>1. Whether we can reach an agreement with the government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. We need to have negotiations with horse trekking people</td>
<td>2. The fund, technical support, training from NFMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. To cultivate our handicrafts talents with the help of PMO and government</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Whether we can reach an agreement on this issue with the government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. We need regulations on collecting our medicinal herbs, fungus from other places</td>
<td>3. Villagers are passionate and active in CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Whether PMO and government are willing to make market for our handicrafts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The communication ability in exercises is weak</td>
<td>4. The pasture lands are large; abundant in forest resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Fuel problems</td>
<td>5. There are several hundred mu of lands for developing eco-tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHANG ZHAI</strong></td>
<td>1. We should share the benefits from Erdao Hai (entrance fee)</td>
<td>1. Abundant in natural forest resources</td>
<td>Since the democratic reforming, our villagers have been organized regularly to guard the administrative area in our village. We charge the people who come to Wudao hai and Erdao hai to cut woods and graze cattle. We inspect the mountain 3 times per year. which protects the natural resources effectively. That’s the strength of CM.</td>
<td>1. The distribution of Erdao Hai’s tourism income</td>
<td>1. To sign agreements to solve the problem of the distribution of Erdao Hai</td>
<td>1. To improve villager’s income</td>
<td>1. Problems between Mu Ni Management Bureau and us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The first issue to be tackled is cutting woods for heating</td>
<td>2. Abundant in scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The fuel firewood</td>
<td>2. To sign agreements with relevant agencies to solve the fuel problems</td>
<td>2. To protect the natural forests better</td>
<td>2. Problems between relevant agencies and us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Concrete management regulations</td>
<td>3. Villagers are active in CM</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. We need concrete rights entitled by the government to manage the pasture land better</td>
<td>3. To sign agreements with government on resources management and use</td>
<td>3. To protect pasture resources better</td>
<td>3. Issues on how to manage outsiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Concrete rights to manage natural forest resources and pasture lands</td>
<td>4. Nice ecological resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. The administrative area of the village is too large to manage well</td>
<td>5. with strong Tibetan Buddhism characteristics and folks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Village</th>
<th>Issues and problems</th>
<th>Strengths and opportunities</th>
<th>Traditional mechanism in support of NRM</th>
<th>Priorities for improvements</th>
<th>Content of related agreements to be developed in the CMCs</th>
<th>Expected benefits from the agreements</th>
<th>Expected difficulties in developing &amp; enforcing the agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAOZUO</td>
<td>1. Communication</td>
<td>1. Abundant in tourism resources</td>
<td>In our traditions wildlife and forests should be protected.</td>
<td>1. Water pollution</td>
<td>1. Government funds to purify the water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. We only have management rights but no practical rights on Zhaga waterfall</td>
<td>2. The pasture lands are of good quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Landslide</td>
<td>2. Government helps us to solve fuel problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The pasture land is taken over by other township</td>
<td>4. Collecting fungus, caladium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Water supply</td>
<td>5. Abundant in horse resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. The houses on the eco-lodge site need moving but no funds for this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIBAZI</td>
<td>1. The average education villagers received is relatively low; villagers can hardly absorb the essence of every conference;</td>
<td>1. A large area of forests</td>
<td>Due to the belief and tales about the sacred mountains around Shibazi, all villages abide by the rules of forest protection. In order to prevent natural disasters such as floods, hailstones, there are village regulations about where we can collect firewood, where we can cut trees, where we can recover the forest and where we should forbid logging etc.</td>
<td>1. To harden the village road</td>
<td>1. Labour input from the community: financial support from the government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Villagers need all kinds of ability construction;</td>
<td>2. A wild variety of medicinal herbs; mushrooms; animals, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Damage on forest resources</td>
<td>2. To prevent natural disasters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The income resources are mainly from agriculture, which lack diversities.</td>
<td>3. Villagers and the village committee are actively involved in CM;</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. To tap the tourism of the stone forest</td>
<td>3. To improve villager’s income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The villagers’ awareness needs improving.</td>
<td>4. Supports from NFMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Resources should be co-managed and shared by all.</td>
<td>5. Supports from agencies of all levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Village</th>
<th>Issues and problems</th>
<th>Strengths and opportunities</th>
<th>Traditional mechanism in support of NRM</th>
<th>Priorities for improvements</th>
<th>Content of related agreements to be developed in the CMCs</th>
<th>Expected benefits from the agreements</th>
<th>Expected difficulties in developing &amp; enforcing the agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XIAOXING TOWNSHIP</td>
<td>1. Inconvenience in transportation 2. Housing 3. No clinic 4. Inconvenience in communication</td>
<td>1. Natural forest protection 2. Eco-tourism 3. Wildlife protection 4. Taping the tourism in Baihuualou park 5. Medicinal herbs</td>
<td>Traditionally once man hurt sacred mountains and lakes, he will be punished, so we have to protect these resources.</td>
<td>1. Poor housing condition 2. Pasture taken over by outsiders 3. Inconvenience in transportation</td>
<td>1. Timber quota given by forestry bureau 2. To reach an agreement with husbandry bureau 3. To reach an agreement with traffic bureau</td>
<td>1. Better housing condition 2. Protection on grass mountain 3. Transportation will be easier</td>
<td>4. Unable to get timber quota for civil use 5. Financial problems 6. Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUNA</td>
<td>1. The management of the forest is weak 2. The management of collecting forest products 3. Inconvenience in communication 4. The water quality isn’t good 5. Villagers who lead a life on agriculture and grazing have financial problems</td>
<td>1. Abundant in natural forest resources 2. Abundant in non-timber products 3. Good grass resources 4. Villager’s awareness of CM is strong 5. The contributions from NFMP</td>
<td>The concept on sacred mountains and lakes is still applied in CM of natural forest. There should be a set of regulations for the collecting of non-timber products.</td>
<td>1. waste on forest resources management on grass mountain purification on water pollution</td>
<td>1. CMC needs recognition from government 2. To fence the grass mountain 3. Support from hydro-agency to purify the water</td>
<td>1. Landslide control 2. Desertification control and better management on outsiders 3. Clearing river and flood prevention</td>
<td>1. CM is a new concept. Some stakeholders may misunderstand or not support it 2. Financial support from the husbandry bureau 3. Financial support from hydro-agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XINFENG</td>
<td>1. Lacking natural resources 2. We are unable to make use of our community forests 3. Problems in woods for civil use and firewood 4. More woods should be replaced and added 5. We are in urgent need for CM with SFE, Guna and Pingan.</td>
<td>1. We are situated along the road 2. We have the ability to regulate stealing or cutting woods 3. The villagers are in harmonious relationship with each other 4. Villagers are very responsible and we can distribute some labour to guard forests 5. Once CMC established, people can communicate and negotiate to reach agreements when facing with problems and issues</td>
<td>We moved here due to the earthquake in 1976, so we had no knowledge of the local history in this area. We have never done any damage to forests under the supervision of the village party and committee.</td>
<td>1. To replace the community forests 2. To purify water resources 3. Flood bank</td>
<td>1. To reach an agreement with the forestry bureau on replacing community forests 2. To negotiate with health bureau; the waste water from SFE shouldn't be poured into river 3. To reach an agreement with the governmental agencies</td>
<td>1. With the management we can solve the problem of firewood using 2. Hygiene 3. No flood</td>
<td>1. Expected goals may not be reached 2. Hard to carry out 3. Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Village</th>
<th>Issues and problems</th>
<th>Strengths and opportunities</th>
<th>Traditional mechanism in support of NRM</th>
<th>Priorities for improvements</th>
<th>Content of related agreements to be developed in the CMCs</th>
<th>Expected benefits from the agreements</th>
<th>Expected difficulties in developing &amp; enforcing the agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEIZIZI</td>
<td>1. Villagers who lead a life on agriculture and grazing have financial problems.</td>
<td>1. Abundant forest resources</td>
<td>The sacred mountains and waters are useful to natural forest protection and co-management</td>
<td>1. Clear boundaries between villages</td>
<td>1. To reach an agreement between husbandry bureau and CMC to fence the pasture land</td>
<td>1. To increase the income of peasants</td>
<td>1. Financial problems;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Drinking water supply</td>
<td>2. Abundant NON TIMBER PRODUCTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Damage on pastures lands</td>
<td>2. Regulations on cutting woods</td>
<td>2. To protect our ecology</td>
<td>inconvenience in transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Floods</td>
<td>3. Villagers are active in CM</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Landslide</td>
<td>3. To reach an agreement between hydro-agency and CMC</td>
<td>3. Hygiene</td>
<td>2. Timber quota for building houses is limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Firewood supply</td>
<td>4. The arable land is large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. No fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Grazing</td>
<td>5. Benefits brought about by the EU-CHINA NFMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAERBIAN</td>
<td>1. Villagers who lead a life on agriculture and grazing have financial problems.</td>
<td>1. Abundant forest resources</td>
<td>To destroy forests is bound to be punished by Buddha, so people all participate in forest protection</td>
<td>1. Protection on pasture</td>
<td>1. To get support from husbandry bureau to fence the pasture</td>
<td>1. To control the coming of the outsiders</td>
<td>1. Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Roads are in bad conditions.</td>
<td>2. Abundant non timber products</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Inconvenience in communication</td>
<td>2. To install telephone wire by telecom.</td>
<td>2. More convenience to the community</td>
<td>2. Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Having difficulties in accessing water supply</td>
<td>3. Villagers are active in CM</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Better management on forests</td>
<td>3. To reach an agreement with the forestry bureau to co-manage the forests</td>
<td>3. More protection on forests</td>
<td>3. Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Having difficulties in communication/information</td>
<td>4. The arable land is large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Having difficulties in fire control</td>
<td>5. Benefits brought about by the Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINGAN</td>
<td>1. Contamination in the water supply (Due to the hydro-power station)</td>
<td>1. Abundant forest resources</td>
<td>The sacred mountains and lakes are useful to natural forest protection and co-management. There should be a set of regulations for the collecting of non-timber products</td>
<td>1. Damage on forest resources</td>
<td>1. To reach an agreement with FMB and SFE on the issue of cutting woods</td>
<td>1. Better protection and management on the forests</td>
<td>1. Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Damage on the forest; The rules for the hydro-power station to dump the waste aren't regulated.</td>
<td>2. Abundant non timber products</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Damage on pastures</td>
<td>2. To suggest that the pastureland should be fenced</td>
<td>2. To increase the income</td>
<td>2. Firewood and building houses in village make it very hard to manage forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Inconvenience in communication</td>
<td>3. Villagers are active in CM</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Pollution in water supply</td>
<td>3. To apply to the hydro-agency about the water supply</td>
<td>3. We can have clean water</td>
<td>2. Whether we can reach an agreement with forestry agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Damage on pasture lands</td>
<td>4. The arable land is large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Barren lands-mountains because of historical reasons.</td>
<td>5. Benefits brought about by the EU-CHINA NFMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled from BORRINI-FEYERABEND & FARVAR. 2007
Annex D: Legal framework, mandates and responsibilities in forest governance in the project area of Songpan

1. Basic information

The project is working in the two townships of Muni and Xiaoxing of Songpan County of the Ngawa Tibetan and Qiang Autonomous Prefecture. It comprises an area of some 60 sq km, out of which nearly 60 % is classified as forest land. The total farm population is around 3,000 people (less than 600 rural households) plus some 400 workers in the State Forest Enterprise (SFE). Forestry is very important for the livelihood activities for many villagers and the SFE. The logging ban of 1998 has affected very negatively income opportunities in the logging sector and firewood sell from collective forest (Details refer to Table D1 and D2).

In Xiaoxing Township the operating unit is the SFE. In Muni the forest state land is directly managed by the CFB (county forest farms) or contracted (LIU LIPING 2007). According to the estimate of the Project the total forest area in Xiaoxing is 20.258 ha out of which 86%, or 17.433 ha, is state forest and 14% (2.825 ha) are collective forests. The large amount of pasture area in connection with uncontrolled grazing practices is an area of serious concern and management issue (FICHTENAU 2007a).

Table D-1: Basic data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Ethnic groups</th>
<th>Administration AV (Nr.)</th>
<th>Farm HH (Nr.)</th>
<th>Population (Nr.)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Forest land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaoxing</td>
<td>Qiang, Tibetan ; some Hu and Han &gt;90% Tibetan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>30,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muni</td>
<td>&gt;90% Tibetan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>66,666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Township Vice Heads
2) No SFE, direly managed by the CFB) LI PING 2007
3) FICHTENAU 2007a

Table D-2: Social economic situation of villages in Xiaoxing Township of Songpan County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Village</th>
<th>Natural Villages</th>
<th>Number of households (HH)</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>% HH where majority income from forestry (pre-log ban)</th>
<th>Average income pre-log ban (RMB/cap/yr)</th>
<th>Current Income 2004 (RMB/cap/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aixi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Tibet, Qiang</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2874</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beizizi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Tibet, Qiang</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2510</td>
<td>1308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daerbian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>Tibet, Qiang</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2691</td>
<td>1393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Tibet, Qiang</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>1452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pingan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Tibet, Qiang</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2420</td>
<td>1481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xingfeng</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Han</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>2732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFE Headquarter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>~ 400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Han</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1694 + SFE</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FICHTENAU 2007a

The information regarding size and area of the jurisdiction of the administrative village land and collective village forests is weak: The data used by the FMB is totally underestimating the real area (Table D-3). Also there are disputes over the border between villagers and the SFE in Xiaoxing, some of them already exists for more than 20 years; some are relatively new (e.g. a special permit of the SFE to clear cut 5 ha on forest land claimed by the village of Daerbian village to belong to them. Assuming that 4,500 cu m were logged, the selling value would be around 4,500,000 RMB (equivalent to 475,680 EURO. This seems more a case for the court than simple negotiation.)
### Table D-3: Jurisdiction of territory and forest resources in Xiaoxing Township

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Project GIS (ha)</th>
<th>FMO statistics (ha)</th>
<th>Difference in %</th>
<th>Project GIS (ha)</th>
<th>FMO statistics (ha)</th>
<th>Difference in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aixi</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>122%</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beizisi</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>226%</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>227%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daerbian</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>177%</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>224%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guna</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>324%</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>320%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pingan</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>174%</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>186%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xinfeng</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>141%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>163%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5083</td>
<td>2557</td>
<td>199%</td>
<td>2825</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>205%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Natural forest tenure and forest classification

The forest type classification of the new Chinese Forest Law differs only between commercial forests and public benefit forests. Broad zoning of these categories have been complemented in the project area of Songpan in 2007. Most part of the area under the jurisdiction of the SFE is classified as ecological forests. It is foreseen that the central government will transfer 120 RMB/ha/a compensation from the Forest Compensation Fund.

Natural forests are either state-owned (State Forests) or collective-owned (Local Collective Forests). The jurisdiction unit of the collective forest is the administrative village, unlike in many other places in China where it is the natural villages. Before liberation nature village were the sole caretaker of forests, and co-management mechanism occurred between these hamlets.

Until now no legal Land Use Right Certificate (LURC) has been issued for collective natural forest. However, recently a special office was established in the County Forest Bureau of Songpan to accelerate the collective forest reform; the deadline is 2010. Training on prefecture level on forest land allocation and issuing of title is currently conducted. Principally three options for LURC of collective village forests are possible:

- Collective administrative village
- Group
- Individual households or other entities (like professional associations)

The Law on Professional Farmers’ Cooperatives (LPF) - effective on July 2007 – was also developed for modern agricultural associations (HEYDE 2009) and can be used as the legal base to establish professional associations of collective entities on administrative village, township level, and beyond. The community development component of NFMP provides organization training in this field.

It is often stated that the Tibetan and Qiang ethnic minorities only accept collective user rights. This was also reconfirmed in discussions with village leaders (Party secretaries and village heads). However, in individual interviews and group discussions it become clear, that villagers do not trust the collective land title under current institutional arrangement, and prefer individual forest title or small group titles (relatives of the same natural village).

The New Chinese Forest Law (effective since 1998) in Article 3 respects customary user rights as per of Forest Law (1998). There may include grazing rights or rights to collect non-timber forest products (NFTP) within state land.

In short, all communities have rights to access a collective forest assigned to them by the state under common property. Within a village, however, different interests exist with respect to the natural forests. For instance, some families may be more concerned about timber and the related rules and regulations,
while others may be keen on ensuring a sustainable collection of mushrooms or medicinal plants, or on the quality of pasture for their animals or timber (BORRINI-FEYERABEND & FARVAR. 2007).

In Songpan, the SFE has carried out large-scale timber exploitation and used to employ many villagers as labour, especially in the Xiaoxing Township. The FMB and SFE are also very involved, ensuring the enforcement of state management policy. Overall, this means that the decision-making power of local villagers over “their” forests is relatively limited.

Forest areas for management in the sense of **timber and fuel wood harvesting** are ‘all areas stocked with trees with a minimum of 20% crown cover. Areas which are considered as pasture land (grassland, shrub land, herbage etc.) are NOT considered as potential Management Forest for timber harvesting (but may play an important role for other forest functions, e.g. grazing, as will be discussed later) (FICHTENAU 2007a).

### 3 Mandate, responsibility and rights of stakeholder groups in forest governance

During Strategic Forest Management Planning in Xiaoxing Township 13 stakeholder groups have been identified, with a stake in forest governance, including the county environment department and hydro-power station and water resource department. Table D-4 provides an example for Xiaoxing Township before, during and after lifting of the logging ban of 1998.

Responsible agencies for the management of forest resources in counties and townships are as follows:

- **The Songpan County Forestry Bureau** (representing the county government) is the responsible administrative department for the management of forest resources in the county. It is responsible for the management of collective forests in Xiaoxing township.

- **The State Forest Enterprise (SFE)** is responsible for the management of the state forests in Xiaoxing Township.

**County Forest Bureau:** The FMB does not own any forest but is the administrator of State Public Forests and can enter into management contracts with other owners of the non-state forest. The Bureau is mainly responsible for forest policy formulation, forest management and determination of quotas, granting forest right licenses, tax collection and forest protection. At township level, the responsible forest station for the management of the collective forests in Xiaoxing is located outside the township, namely in Rewu River. One part-time forest guard has been assigned for protection in each township and a total of 11 inspectors are assigned to 3 different timber inspection stations, which have been set up at crossings of key forest areas (FICHTENAU 2007a). In Muni there exists no SFE and hence the Forest is directed under that CFB (forest farm or contracted out).

The Forest Management Office is particularly important in the Muni Township, together with the Township Government. In Xiaoxing the importance of the FMB is much smaller as it has no jurisdiction over State Private Forests, which have their parallel governance system with the SFE, usually reporting directly to province level.

The CFB is directly supervised by the autonomous prefecture.
### Annexes

**Table D-4: Responsibility, authority and forest user rights before during and after the logging ban - The Example of Xiaoxing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Main responsibility</th>
<th>Authority / function</th>
<th>Forest user rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Forest Bureau</strong></td>
<td>Administration of county forests resources</td>
<td>Forest county policy formulation and national policy enforcement, forest management (e.g. in Muni) and determination of quotas, granting forest right licenses, tax collection and forest protection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Township forest station</strong></td>
<td>Protection and forestry extension</td>
<td>Collective forest protection (1 part time guard) Timber inspection ion special checkpoints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County SFE Songpan</strong></td>
<td>Business administration*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Xiaoxing SFE Station</strong></td>
<td>Management of state forests</td>
<td>Implementation of forestry programs Forest management (logging) and protection; reforestation</td>
<td>Logging Only maintenance thinning to improve the ecological functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Township government</strong></td>
<td>TA governance</td>
<td>Governs the towns territory, link between AV and county government; boundary demarcation on TS level, and conflict resolution and coordination among villages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Village committee</strong></td>
<td>Implement govern forest policies</td>
<td>Forest protection, timber quota distribution among households</td>
<td>Same Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Village assembly</strong></td>
<td>Represent the interest of the villagers</td>
<td>Consensus building on forest issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Villager</strong></td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Timber for subsistence needs approved by village committee; Fuel wood for subsistence and market; NTFP collection in collective forests; Dead wood and NTFP also in SFE areas Only firewood collection Only some limited commercial timber harvesting based on sustainable forest management principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State Forest enterprise:** This governmental body is responsible for administering forest management programs - in particular for timber extraction. It has a jurisdiction of 160,000 ha in four townships including Xiaoxing. Before the logging ban of 1998 the SFE has carried out large-scale forest exploitation.
and used to employ many villagers as labour, especially in the Xiaoxing Township. The agency has been the major loser after the logging ban. It is still however, a key factor in Xiaoxing Township, together with the Township Government. The future main task will be the management of public benefit forests. The SFE of Songpan is directly supervised by the Sichuan Provincial Forest Department. Before the logging ban it also got the quota approved from this department.

Higher hierarchies of public forest agencies
Chinese government line agencies operate under the rule that the higher agencies can only address to the issues of its lower level agencies through its immediate lower agencies. Therefore, it is important to build-up linkages at both levels and every opportunity should be used to enhance the government understanding about the significance of co-management, and streamline their support to allow pilot access to forest for co-management committee’s entries and practices (LI BO 2007).

Prefecture in forest management: Songpan County is under the direct jurisdiction of the Aba Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture (Capital is Maekang). The forest prefecture bureau is important because:
1. All forest management plans - including the foreseen village forest development plans - must be approved by the prefecture level (Liu LIPING 2009).
2. The prefecture approves the timber quota - also for no-commercial timber use (FICHTENAU 2007a).
3. It is responsible directly for the assessment of performance and promotion of officials in county government (LI BO 2007).

So far, NFM co-management cooperation with government agencies has by-passed prefecture government. Any change in tasks of the county forest staff requires an approval of amended job description on prefecture level.

Village administration
Village committee: The “Organic Law” of 1998 provides the legal framework to village self-government. Each administrative village has its own village committee, typically comprising three to seven members headed by a Chair. All the members are directly elected to a fixed term (generally three years). The committee manages the village’s finances; it is in charge of developing the local infrastructure, environment improvement and forest affairs; it is also in charge of conflict resolution which can be settled within the village, enforcement of government forest polices and assistance in protection of collective and adjacent state forests.

The village committees provide services that are very important to residents, including care dispute resolution environmental improvements, and public safety and security. Some committees also manage local neighborhood enterprises and lobby the district or municipal government on behalf of residents to solve specific problems or undertake repairs. The village committee can apply and receive from the Forest Management Office the timber quota for non commercial timber use. It is responsible for distributing the quota among infidel village households.

The village head receive government remuneration for the services he or she is rendering for the village. The village committee reports to the Representative Assembly, composed of 25-50 people from the village.

The local Communist Party Secretary is at the core of village leadership and carries the responsibility of "leading the community". However the village committee, as a self-governing organization, is empowered to manage public affairs in the community including making the legal forest restrictions be respected.

In village dominated by the Tibetan ethnic minorities in Muni there is another traditional institution still in place, which is responsible for affairs that are not or not sufficiently covered by the village committee.
Each year a few households - on a rotation basis - are selected for tasks (information provided by local leaders in Muni). This can also include taking care about the village forests.

The government bodies at township and county level
The township authorities serve as a communication bridge between the villagers and the state, and have a number of important responsibilities, including land demarcation. The county government has authority over several decisions over the whole county, including establishing the annual allowable timber quota. The County Land Resources Bureau has authority over the boundaries between various administrative units.

Other government sector agencies
Other government sectors agencies of relevance for the management of natural forests include the Scenic Spot Authority in charge of the Muni valley with the scenic waterfall and the Tibetan Monastery (direct under the administration of the County Tourist Bureau), the County Agriculture and Animal Husbandry Bureau with township stations, and the Land Resources Bureau and the Hydropower Bureau.

The Animal husbandry station is also current implementing a partial county grazing ban and manages grazing ban compensation subsidies.

3. Present quotas for firewood and timber
Wood quotas are usually determined on a yearly basis and differ from township to township according to population size and forest resources. The quota for self-consumption timber for house construction, repair, fences, animal stable, etc, seems to remain the same over the last few years. In the collective natural forest of the administrate villages there was a logging ban for commercial timber extraction even before the logging ban.

Quotas have been determined for timber only at present, but not for fuel wood, because it is assumed by the County Forestry Bureau that fuel wood demands are satisfied through collection of branches and waste from timber cutting operations. Field observation indicated that due to the logging ban, fuel wood can only be collected for self-consumption. However there are indictors that in some villages like Daerbian the current felling of value timber trees to make fuel wood is the major driver for destruction of timber resources. The recent fuel wood survey by the Project (see SICHUAN ACADEMY OF FOREST INVENTORY AND PLANNING. 2007) – based on stacked fuel wood - indicated that the consumption of fuel would be 36 cum per household: this is 3 times of the estimate in similar situations. Even in the busy farming season people is cutting firewood, on a larger-scale destroying trees that are excellent timber resources. Some villagers stated that it is easy to transport in minibuses fuel wood hidden under vegetables outside to the market (For the general situation and the operational forest management for Dearbian see SCHADE 2009a and 2009b).

Quota approval and supervision are as follows:
- The FMB receives quota from the Prefecture Government in Aba and only has collective forest. Fuel-wood quota is not allocated (either to township or village) and self-consumption timber quota is allocated to villages, not individuals.
- The SFE receives quota from the Provincial Forest Department.
- A timber quota for each village is given by the township forest station. In theory, within the village the villagers submit an application to the head of the natural village, then the application will be submitted to the administrative village committee; if over half of the village agrees, the village head will submit the application to the township forest station for final decision
- In some villages in Muni there is a kind of exchange between villages with sufficient forest and limited pasture, and others. This might happen because self commercial timber is not allowed.

Some of the present quotas in SFE areas, even though allocated, are often not used. This is especially important since the existing official quota for non-commercial timber harvesting for maintenance
purposes, is not used. This quota should be used for urgently needed thinning operations in timber stands and/or as measure for future fire prevention (cutting of fire lines, thinning of young conifer plantations etc.). Since this quota is legally approved, it presents the opportunity to carry out urgently needed thinning and felling operations, and there is no reason to not make use of it (FICHTENAU (2007a).

Village forest rules and regulations:
Most forest regulations are instructions by the government. In Guna village and other project villages they have their own regulations and in case of violation the villagers are only educated. No one is punished with a fine and no illegal cutting is brought to higher authorities. It seems that some Tibetan communities still implement forest regulations with clear rights and responsibilities (see Annex D).