

# **Chairperson's Summary**

---

Session 1  
Day 1: In the morning of 21 July 1998  
Country Reports on Underlying Causes of  
Deforestation and Forest Degradation in the Asia-Pacific Region  
Chairperson: Dr. Bishnu B. Bhandari  
Reporter: Mr. Martinus Nanang

Summary of the Session

1. Mr. Yoichi Kuroda presented an overview of efforts to address underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation which included background, goals and objectives, NGO initiatives and major projects. He pointed to increased crises and conflicts facing forests globally, failure of the UNCED and IPF to meet this challenge, and the need to treat root causes as the focal points of any environmental agenda. The goals and objectives of NGO/IGES initiatives are (1) to address underlying causes through case studies, in-depth studies, and regional and global workshops, (2) to raise public awareness on underlying causes, as well as (3) to build partnerships for solutions. The main activities include regional workshops and global workshops (Costa Rica, Jan 1999 and IFF 3 in Geneva Jan 1999).

2. Dr. Germelino M. Bautista, director of the Institute of Philippine Culture (IPC), in presenting "the nature of environmental problems in the Philippines" emphasized that deforestation in the Philippines is related to the land tenure management system, economic status of the people, timber preference, government policy, and the limitations of the existing economic structure. Government initiatives since President Aquino include the establishment of protection areas and wildlife sanctuaries, suspension of logging licenses, ban or restriction on the sale of endangered species, delineation of ancestral land, participation of communities/democratization, promotion of equitable management, and the funding and establishment of a market-based incentive system. These initiatives have been hampered by the difficulties encountered in trying to sustain a large scale market based approach, the fact that they have been conducted on a micro-level that ignore the larger connections that a more holistic approach might address as well as being, on a whole, disconcerted.

3. In response to Mr. Herman Hidayat's question, Mr. Bautista mentioned that companies are remiss in replanting trees because the penalty is minimal. Three million ha. of land have been designated for indigenous people. Market participation is open to indigenous peoples but they have not benefited much from the process.

4. Ms. Mia Siscawati talked about deforestation and forest degradation in Indonesia where forests fall under the legal protection of the government and fire is the direct cause of deforestation. In 1997/98 million hectares of forest were burned. Other causes of deforestation are commercial plantation, transmigration, infrastructure development, mining, and logging activities. Underlying causes include the national forest land use system, state corruption, and failure of

government intervention.

5. In response to Mr. Y. Seki's question about the economic reason for deforestation Ms. Siscawati explained that exploitation of natural resources is closely related to macro and micro economic policy. In Irian Jaya, for instance, 7 million ha. of forest are to be converted to an internationally funded large scale venture. As an answer to Mr. Pankaj she said that the process by which corporations acquire land is not transparent; and open to question. The military has acquired vast tracks of land.

6. Mr. A.L. Joshi was talking about deforestation and participatory forest management in Nepal. Unlike Indonesia, the Philippines and India, community forests in Nepal are nationally regulated. The forestry staff simply administers national laws in regard to determining policies that will benefit local communities and granting forest use permits. This process was implemented in 1978 and amended in 1993/1995. The main thrust of the law stipulates that any part and any amount of forest can be handed over to local communities. The local communities in turn can establish forest priorities, determine commercial development policies, spending, establish price regulations, transportation plans as well as amendments to the existing law.

7. In response to Dr. Alonso he said that half a million hectares of forest are for production and communities are empowered to export timber. Mr. Hidayat was told in response to his question that originally community forests were on degraded land. Then it shifted to sustainable forests with watersheds and buffer zones within protected areas. Community forestry focuses on protection of land and the use of only indigenous plants.

Session 2  
Day 1: In the afternoon of 21 July 1998  
Timber Trade Policy for the Sustainable Forest Management  
Chairperson: Prof. Ruperto P. Alonzo  
Reporter: Dr. Yeo-Chang Youn and Mihoko Shimamoto

Summary of the Session

1. Mr. Jairo Castano, ITTO presented from the perspective of trade and the environment. In his presentation, he introduced ITTO, including its background, objectives, activities and accomplishments, Target 2000 and seven priority actions for the target, ITTO's concern with timber certification and sustainable forest management, market transparency as a means to achieve SFM, evaluation of their activities for SFM, and future perspectives of ITTO.

2. Panel discussion was contributed by Mr. Osam Hashiramoto(Director of Timber Trade Division, Forestry Agency of Japan), Mr. Eishi Maezawa(Forest Conservation Officer, WWF Japan), Mr. Yoichi Kuroda(IGES), Ms. Mia Sasciwati(RMI/Bioforum, Indonesia), Mr. Jairo Castano(ITTO) and Prof. Ruperto P. Alonzo(Philippines).

3. Ms. Sakuma (People's Forum 2001, Japan) commented on the ITTO's activities and policy. She criticized ITTO's orientation toward more promotion of tropical timber trade and further liberalization rather than the promotion of sustainable management of tropical forests. She questioned about the way of harmonization for different countries to the common objectives of sustainable forest management.

4. Mr. Jairo Castano agreed with Ms. Sakumo's opinion on the difficulty in harmonizing the international consensus to different country's situations.

5. Mr. Hashiramoto commented on the WTO's free trade policy of commodities including forest products. According to him, the Committee of Trade and Environment of WTO should recognize the positive and negative sides of trade liberalization in forest-based products. He also mentioned the pressure from the on-going APEC's free trade promotion trend, whose demands for the abolition of tariffs as well as non-tariff barriers on timber products would produce severer conditions for Japanese domestic forestry which may not promote real sustainability of the region's forest management.

6. Mr. Eishi Maezawa explained WWF policies especially with regard to their timber certification initiative. He argued that the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)'s scheme is an actual performance level standard compared with the management system level standard of ISO. He talked about the important roles that Japanese consumers could play in the favor of forest products certified for supporting sustainable forest development.

7. Ms. Mia Siscawati reviewed the history of Indonesian forest destruction after 1967 mainly by timber harvesting, and some attempts for the development

of timber certification schemes by different parties in Indonesia, including multi-stakeholder process as well as industry. She stressed the importance of the democratic process in timber certification. She said that the ITTO target 2000 is too ambitious to be realized. She mentioned the potential of traditional, community based forest management in timber certification.

8. Mr. Kuroda presented a model framework, which can explain the process of forest destruction by transnational forestry corporations both in domestic and international dimensions which can serve as a parallel process. He expressed the need for development of a new kind of model, which could explain the links of direct and underlying causes and ultimately their connections to the SFM both from the quantitative and qualitative aspects.

9. Ms. Siscawati suggested that all stakeholders should be involved in review processes for the criteria of certification.

10. Mr. Joshi suggested the potential roles of community forestry as a means of better and more effective implementation for timber certification.

11. Mr. Maezawa questioned the possibility of accomplishing the ITTO Target year 2000 and the orientation of ITTA.

12. Mr. Castano agreed, to some extent, that ITTA supports the situation of producer's countries and stressed the harmonization of systems of member countries.

13. Mr. Kuroda questioned policies of the Japanese government which permit an ever increasing inflow of foreign forest resources while nevertheless there is a growing domestic forest stock in Japan allowing that European countries support domestic forestry in more direct manners such as the " De-coupling" policy.

14. Mr. Hashiramoto stressed that the Japanese forest management and ownership scale is generally too small to survive in such an international free trade regime situation, despite of the government supports.

15. Ms. Shimamoto didn't agree with Kuroda's argument that implied the absence of sufficient government support for domestic forestry communities, and she mentioned that Japanese forest management costs are actually much higher than those in, for example, the UK are.

16. Mr. Castano questioned the potential of timber certification advocated by WWF for SFM in the tropics.

17. Prof. Makarabhirom suggested the importance of local people's inputs for SFM.

18. Mr. Castano said ITTO has already incorporated participatory approaches for SFM in their member countries in tropics and that ITTO has been organizing some training courses for producers' countries on this aspect.

19. Mr. Kuroda mentioned that in many countries timber production exceeded the annual allowable cut (AAC) both in the North and the South and expressed a

need for international political efforts and wills addressing necessary changes of timber and other commodities' production and consumption patterns in the region as well as in the global level.

20. Mr. Hashiramoto commented on the limitations of ITTA, and said ITTO's target year of 2000 might be too idealistic.

21. Ms. Sakuma suggested a need to introduce some measures for controlling imports of foreign forest resources produced from unsustainable sources.

22. Mr. Hashiramoto answered that it would be impossible under WTO rules.

Session 3  
Day 2: In the morning of 22 July 1998  
Discussion and Conclusion of Underlying Causes,  
NGO Regional Process  
Chairperson: Mr. Yoichi Kuroda  
Reporter: Mr. Li Xiaoping

Summary of the Session

1. Dr. Pearmsak Makarabhirom explained his view that deforestation in Thailand is caused by multiple factors such as forestry and agricultural policy, including the growing teak production and agricultural plantation of such products as rubber, cassava and sugar cane. He pointed out that policies in certain sectors have resulted in wide scale destruction causing serious heavy erosion and loss of the soil. He then elaborated on the role of community forests act, coastal natural resource management, watershed protection and management, and new cabinet decision concerning on forest management in Thailand.

2. International trade, tourism, and agricultural expansion in Thailand were discussed in a historical context as leading causes for deforestation.

3. Ms. Mia Siscawati reported the conclusions from the informal meeting on the UC/NGO process held in the evening of July 21 after session two. This meeting confirmed that 1) the regional workshop in Indonesia will be held on November, 1998 (and later rescheduled for December 4-6 due to fund raising reasons), 3) that those who will present case studies, guest speakers (CIFOR and others), senior government representatives, international agencies such as The World Bank, ADB, UNEP, UNDP, IFF, other interested groups and researchers will be invited for the regional workshop, as well as 4) the proposal for case studies of India, Nepal, Thailand, Indonesia and Japan was proposed.

4. In a brainstorming session for the UC case studies, Ms. Sudha Vasan stressed the importance of case studies. She suggested that researchers should select case studies that can best represent and demonstrate some common factor nation wide and that they should adopt methodology that can cover all levels and scale of the issue.

5. Mr. Yoshiki Seki presented his case study from research in the Philippines stressing historical and political perspectives. He concluded that main forces of deforestation are the exploitative management of timber licenses and pasture leases, which are owned mainly by Chinese businessmen, military and politicians.

6. Mr. Jin Satoh gave a brief presentation of his fieldwork in Thailand. He presented some conceptual framework of the land tenure system. There are national forests, of which such as protected forests and privately ownership of the forests as two main forest ownership. He argued that overlapping land ownership by government and community is widely observed and this tendency causes greater pressure on these lands. Local communities and landless

populations are getting pushed into the buffer areas of good forests, called the "rich forest, poor people paradox".

7. Ms. Mia Sicawati outlined the plan for Indonesian UC case studies. Due to time constraints, there would be no new research but input would be provided from the several different networks such as; 1) agrarian land reform, 2) mining network, 3) agricultural plantation network, 4) community forestry network, and 5) network of lawyers.

8. Mr. Pankaj Sekhsaria pointed out the difficulties in practicing a case study that can be generalized nation wide in India mentioning the large areas and diverse situation in his nation.

9. Mr. Yoichi Kuroda underlined that fund and time for the regional workshop is limited and stressed necessity to give explanations on the relation among the factors of local, national and international levels. He also pointed out the importance of case studies for Japan to compare historical perspective of forest degradation process in pre-modern Japan and its exploitation of resources overseas in the modernization and post-war period.

10. Prof. Ruperto Alonzo referred to the "Diagnostic Framework of the UC Case Studies" and suggested that its criteria could be applicable to distinguish the different situations to be chosen within one country.

11. Ms. Mia Siscawati and Mr. Yoichi Kuroda reminded that it is important for the case study participants to incorporate guidelines provided by the global secretariat and regional focal point within the diagnostic framework provided by the IPF. Because these guidelines are new to everyone, careful considerations of specific local conditions are necessary to determine how to best utilize them.



Session 4  
Day 2: In the afternoon of 22 July 1998  
Political Ecology of Sustainable Forest Management  
Chairperson: Mr. Herman Hidayat  
Reporter: Mr. Pankaj Sekhsaria

Summary of the Session

1. Ms. Sudha Vasani of Yale University in the USA presented "Rights and Relations: Political Ecology of Timber Rights in Himachal Pradesh, India". She introduced "Forest Rights and Forest Management" including the general situation and ownership of forest resources in India, a story about house building, "The Anderson's Forest Settlement (1886)" which has been the basis for forest rights of Himachal Pradesh. "T.D (Timber Distribution)," describing changes in increments due to increasing population, land-fragmentation, economic growth and increasing timber price. "Timber Harvest and Tree Planting in Himachal Pradesh", "Process of T.D. Sanction and Organization Structure of DFFC (Government Agency) Himachal Pradesh" was also introduced. In conclusion, Ms. Vasani suggested a holistic management of natural resources, inter-sector cooperation and a greater focus on administrators before policy formulation.

2. Mr. J. Sato questioned the difference of the utilization of forest products between the villagers and common society. Prof. P. Makarabhirom asked about the definition of forest management for the community and foresters. Mr. Joshi, Nepal, inquired about implementation and policy making, and attitudes about local involvement among the people who live along flatlands. Forest exploitation during the British era of colonization, the differences in responsibilities, laws on forest practices between the villagers and officers, migrants attention to forest management, timber distribution for local people and their markets were also questioned and discussed.

3. Dr. B. Bhandari presented "Participatory Resource management in Nature Reserves, A Case Study of Ghodaghodi Tal (Lake) System in Nepal". He introduced the "Causes of Deforestation and Degradation," "Conservation Approaches" as well as "Participatory Processes, its Advantages and Lesson Learnt".

4. Prof. Makarabhirom asked about the illegal timber trade in Nepal. Prof. Inoue asked about local forest management practices, and Sandra from Indonesia asked about how the PRA method is being used for facilitating community participation in forest policy reform. Mr. Joshi joined the discussion about the debates in parliament over empowerment of local people and allowing them to manage forest resources.

5. Ms. Sandra Moniaga from the Institute for Policy Research and Advocacy, Indonesia, presented "Politico-legal Constraints and Civil Society Movement in Promoting and Advocating the Community-Based Forest-System Management in Outer Island of Indonesia". The presentation discussed the rapid deforestation and violations of indigenous and other local peoples' rights, and evaluated the

local indigenous resource management as a "Sustainable Community-Based Ecosystem Management". The report suggests that there is no respect for indigenous knowledge natural resources management and advocates more rights be granted to indigenous people's for forest management and land use in an effort to promote a suitable community based resource management policy in India

6. Mr. Seki commented on the concept of social forestry as a method of participatory management. Mr. Sam from Vietnam commented on the difficulties of forest management and the conflicts between governments and local people. Dr. Youn from Korea suggested indigenous rights over land use must be encouraged with the support of parliament members, central government and local governments. Dr. Bhandari of IGES questioned the ability of local peoples to challenge the power of the government on forest resource management. Prof. Inoue commented that local people have to learn forest management initiatives concerning resource monitoring, managing and marketing. Mr. Kuroda commented on forest management in Indonesia regarding big companies, the role of the government and the responsibility of the international community to stem the tide that is eroding natural resources in Indonesia. Dr. Youn responded with encouraging results of research that promotes a new forest paradigm.

7. A General Discussion also chaired by Mr. Hidayat was held by the above three speakers and other participants about

- Legal issues in forest management
- Political democracy and natural resource management
- NGO's role and their participation in Forest management
- Actions for sustainable forest management through community forestry and local peoples' empowerment

Session 5  
Day 3: In the morning of 23 July 1998  
Country Reports of Forest Policy  
Chair Person: Ms. Sudha Vasan  
Reporter: Dr. Jin Satoh and Kimihiko HYAKUMURA

Summary of the Session

1. Mr. Li Xiaoping presented on the Forest Policy in China, The Past, Present and Future.

2. A participant pointed out the lack of information about local knowledge. A participant asked the reason for the closing down of small-scale factories. Mr. Li Xiaoping commented that our ancestors have developed extensive local knowledge. But, generally, people have exploited resources more than conserving them.

3. A participant asked about the place for obtainment of medical herbs. Mr. Li Xiaoping answered that scientists teach plantation techniques for herb production, instead of allowing people to exploit forest resources. They try to restrict small-scale industries since they are responsible for so many illegal dealings and consumption. Pollution created during the production process has also become a problem. That's why they try to close down factories.

4. A participant asked who monitored the plantation activity. Mr. Li Xiaoping answered that plantation is compulsory. People have to either plant or offer labor. The government allocates specific locations for planting. Another participant commented that there seems to be more of an emphasis on planting, rather than conservation. He doubted the reason that the government gave for not more often emphasis to the conservation of natural forest as well. Mr. Li Xiaoping reiterated that they have a plan to minimize the cutting of trees in the natural forest area. There is a government initiative to do so.

5. A participant asked what forest policy in China at the general level is successful. Mr. Li Xiaoping commented that for bio-diversity conservation, the establishment of nature reserves and national parks are the most effective policies. However, there are people living inside those areas. There are many other examples of successful plantation.

6. A participant asked what China's cultural appreciation towards Chinese old growth forest is and how the Chinese people's attitudes and government policy towards conserving nature including the civil society's ability to criticize the government is. Mr. Li Xiaoping answered that there has been very little international movement of forest industries to foreign countries. The demand for old growth forest is very large of course. But we cannot provide more of those domestically, though there is illegal cutting of forest.

7. Mr. Khampha Chanthirath presented on the outline of Forest Policy Development in Lao P.D.R.

8. A participant inquired about the role and system of shifting cultivation and kinds of non-timber forest products in Lao P.D.R., Mr. Khampha answered that shifting cultivation is the major cause of deforestation in Lao P.D.R.. Because of the growth in population, the cycle of shifting cultivation has been shortened. In addition, there are indirect effects of forest fire caused by shifting cultivation. They have many non-timber forest products, such as Cardamon, Ratan and some traditional medicinal plants. But they have problems in marketing them abroad.

9. Mr. Herman Hidayat presented on Empowering Communities through Social Forestry.

10. A participant suggested that a successful implementation of Shorea javanica is dependent on the Market demand and asked for the reason for the success in this place and how they implement it in other places. Mr. Herman Hidayat answered that local people have their own Market network. In this case, as a result of negotiation with a middleman, the price of Shorea javanica stays very high. If other people try to implement it to another place, it may be difficult because of land ownership.

11. Mr. Martinus Nanang commented that in other cases there is no demand at all and thus there is no market. This was my experience with a community in a remote area of East Kalimantan.