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1. Community forestry (CF) allocates rights & responsibilities, builds capacities and rewards performance

- CF programs in Asia-Pacific. Much diversity; characterised by:
  - Informal customary arrangements / Formal arrangements for private and collective forest rights
  - Long-term tenure / resources rights
  - Management institutions set up (management body/constitution)
  - Capacity building/facilitation/monitoring provided by local forest offices, etc.
  - Community responsible for sustaining the resource
  - Economic benefits to communities / shared with govt.
Progress with community forestry in the region and globally

- In Asia – Pacific, major regulatory reforms and national support programs for community-based forest management
- In developing countries ~25% of all forest lands community owned or administered. This figure has doubled in 20 years, could reach 40% by 2050 (Kaimowitz 2005).

Some examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Community Forestry in Forest Law (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Collective forests, farmer engagement in afforestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Private forests, village forests <em>(Hutan Desa)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>JFM, PFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Satoyama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Many communities collectively managing forests for commercial production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Several models, Community Forest User Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>CBFM from 1990s onwards, IPRA 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Community forests (Royal Forest Dept.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>700,000 ha managed by households and collectives (contracts, community regulations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community forestry support in PNG

- Mostly scattered NGO and church driven initiatives
- Some international support for community woodlots
- No concrete objectives for CF in national policy
- PNGFA Community Forestry Branch - 3 CF coordinators at 3 Regional offices
- PNGFA partnering with NGOs to implement ITTO CF project
Basic NGO approach

- Rights stay with the communities
- NGOs provide technical inputs training and facilitation
- Communities organise themselves to participate and take lead
- Activities include
  - Land use plans, forest inventory and forest management plans
  - Training on SFM principles, milling (set-ups, equipment operation/maintenance, safety), good governance, business & money management
  - Financing of equipment
  - Ongoing extension services
Maximising community engagement
Land use plans

Milling
2. Community/locally-based forestry can provide significant & sustainable socio-economic benefits

- In many countries, 50% or more of forest-related employment from community-based forestry enterprises (CBFE)
- Globally, SMFEs generate over 90% of forest revenues, account for 50–90% of forest sector employment
- With tenure secure and enabling environment in place, in 20 tropical-forest case studies, CBFEs showed returns of 10–50% from wood-based and NWFP activities.
- Important contributions to conservation & carbon stocks: in Africa, Asia, and Latin America 370 million ha under community protection
- CBFEs can improve governance, the broader sharing of benefits of economic growth, and long-term viability of forest sector.

Source: (Molnar et al 2011)
Example of what is possible: Nepal Community Forestry Programme

- CF 2nd largest forest management regime after state-managed forest
- ~25% of the national forests managed by ~19,000 Community Forest User Groups (CFUGs).
- User groups constitute about 35% of the country’s total population
- CFUGs spend ~28% of their income on forest protection and management, 36% on community development activities, about 3% on pro-poor programmes (Kanel 2004)
- In purely financial terms, benefits outweigh costs 7 times (Bhattarai 2011)
- Large benefits for governance & restoration of landscape functions
Local impacts of community forestry in PNG

- Construction of community infrastructure
- Construction of houses
- Accumulation of CTE assets
- Wages (Chainsaw / sawmill operators; Timber carriers; CTE staff; Women’s / youth groups)
- Use of income: Basic goods from trade store, school fees, donations, shared with relatives, transportation fees, medical expenses, consumption goods, cultural events
• Customary values / teachings maintained
• Forest remains intact – ecosystem services, subsistence, sale of NTFPs
• Good governance / high levels of participation
• Solidarity & power to negotiate
• Security
Challenges

- Communities need time to work through issues
- Transportation of timber and supplies difficult / costly from remote areas
- Pragmatic business models needed (working capital, supplies, adding value)
- Threats posed by agricultural leases & illegal logging
3. Suggestions for a national PNG community managed forest programme

- Prerequisite: Wider governance concerns (illegal logging, forest clearance under SABLs) must be addressed for community and locally-based forestry (and the whole forestry sector) to have a future

- Make national community managed forest programme a central element of forest policy (community forestry to be presented as an option for customary landowners)

- Provide sufficient resources for full extension programme (for both natural forests and woodlots)
- Align / integrate the CF programme with REDD+ and biodiversity conservation (Protected Area / PES) initiatives
- Situate community-based forestry within community/Ward level sustainable land use planning, and a wider landscape framework for natural resource management
- Utilise expertise built by grassroots NGOs
4. Suggestions for APEC Meeting of Ministers Responsible for Forestry (linking with 2013 Cusco Statement)

- To ensure / maximise socio-economic benefits of forestry
  - Share & promote best practices across APEC countries for value-added community and locally-based forestry, with view to developing diverse & resilient forestry industries & sustainable trade
  - Support member states in acting against illegal logging and illegal land conversion
  - Actions to promote not only sustainable timber trade, but also responsible agricultural trade
What PNG’s community forests do and can look like!
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