

**EXIT REPORT FOR THE SECOND MISSION
OF THE UPLAND LAND USE PLANNING AND FOREST
MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST**



**Submitted by:
Patrick C.H. Dugan, Jr.
February 2002**

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. MAIN TASKS	1
3. ACCOMPLISHMENTS	1
3.1. FIRST MISSION (JANUARY 1 – MAY 15, 2001)	1
3.2. SECOND MISSION (SEPTEMBER 17, 2001 – JANUARY 25, 2002)	3
A. <i>First Field Data Gathering Activity</i>	3
<u>Result:</u>	5
<u>Findings:</u>	5
B. <i>Second Field Data Gathering Activity</i>	7
<u>Results:</u>	8
<u>Findings</u>	8
3.3. FOREST MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS TRAINING (FEBRUARY 6 –8, 2002)	10
4. PROBLEMS, ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	10
5. PROPOSED UDP FMS GOAL, STRATEGY AND APPROACHES	11
5.1. GOAL:	11
5.2. STRATEGY	12
5.3. APPROACHES AND METHODS	12
6. FMS IMPLEMENTATION	13
6.1. RESPONSIBILITY.....	13
6.2. PREREQUISITE TO IMPLEMENTATION.....	13
6.3. IDEAL UPLAND VEGETATION AND MANAGEMENT METHODS.....	13
6.4. SUPPORT AGENCY ROLES.....	13
6.5. POINTERS ON TENURES.....	13

1. Introduction

This report covers the second mission of the consultant and focuses on the Forest Management aspect of the Terms of Reference (TOR). Tasks on the Upland Land Use Planning were fulfilled during the first engagement.

2. Main Tasks

The Terms of Reference cite the consultant's main tasks as follows:

- Conduct assessment of existing forest management systems in the uplands of Southern Mindanao with the purpose of gathering experiences, which could be adopted by the Program
- Develop Forest Management System Model including strategies and approaches for consideration in the implementation of the resource Management component.
- Advise the Programme Management and concerned staff of effective Forest Management and Systems for Programme areas.
- Coordinate with related agencies like DENR and NCIP in developing and implementing the forest management systems.
- Assist in ensuring that Land Use Plans are formulated and adhered to by the beneficiary communities.
- Assist stakeholders particularly LGUs and Line Agencies in the integration of Community Land Use Plan and Programme Forest Management activities into their plans.
- Undertake other activities as may be required by Programme Management related to Land Use and Forest Management for areas covered by UDP.

Expected outputs on Forest Management are; a) reports on existing forest management systems, b) forest management system models including strategies and approaches, c) training/orientation on Forest Management System, d) establishment of one Forest Management System per province.

Per discussions with management on the Forest Management Systems aspect of the TOR, the expected outputs for the second mission is a *field guide on appropriate forest management systems and recommended strategies and approaches*.

3. Accomplishments

3.1. First Mission (January 1 – May 15, 2001)

At the start of the mission the consultant reviewed several Community Watershed Plans (CWP) to assess forest management directions UDP-assisted communities were

taking. However, the documents did not cite any clear objective and most proposed projects simply had to do with planting trees.

The documents review was followed by visits to one site per province from late December 2000 to early January 2001. This basically was an orientation to field activities but likewise served as a venue to assess community forest management intentions through discussions with community members/beneficiaries.

Initial findings from the fieldwork were documented (see *Attachment I*) in mid February and presented during the management committee meeting in the succeeding month.

It was observed that forest management is practiced to some extent in UDP-assisted sites and this provided an indication of the basic forest management schemes that the program may adopt.

It was established that communities are willing to plant trees or protect existing natural forest growth for the following reasons:

- a) boundary between claims/farms;
- b) firewood or construction material source;
- c) protection of water source (spring); and;
- d) stream bank protection.

The conclusion drawn from the initial observations is that formulating and instituting **forest management models must arise from a felt need** by the community for goods (construction material, fuel) or a service (protection of water source, erosion control). Forests were also spared from conversion to other use by virtue of consequence, as in the case of areas that cannot be cultivated.

Possible models that emerged at that time were:

- a) rows of fruit trees for farm boundary delineation;
- b) woodlots or strips (along boundaries) of timber species for construction or firewood production;
- c) reforestation along riparian zones and in the vicinity of domestic water sources through assisted natural regeneration treatments, and;
- d) nurtured patches of natural regeneration in areas unsuitable for agriculture.

Based on what was gathered in the field the approach that emerged in formulating forest management systems was to base it on what the community needs are. The proposed means was to incorporate such assessment into the data-gathering phase of the SCDP.

The tool proposed for initial planning on forest management was the upland land use planning process. This was to determine the extent and location of land that is and will be allocated to forestry. Each site was therefore expected to evolve its own forest management model. However, lack of understanding and skill in facilitating the process, on the part of field project staff, resulted in very limited success.

As called for in the TOR, the consultant likewise coordinated with DENR to gather information on recent forest management policies. However, agency officials disclosed that aside from CBFM there, are no recent policies or developments in forest management.

For the same purpose, talks were also held with NCIP and tribal leaders to identify traditional forest management practices and whether these are still in existence. However, information from this organization and tribal leaders revealed that, other than designation of sacred areas and hunting grounds, the major Southern Mindanao tribes had no such customs.

This difference with the distinct woodlot system of the Ifugao and Bontoc cultures in the Cordillera lies in the fact that Mindanao ethnic groups practice shifting agriculture and do not form permanent settlements. Besides, bio-physical conditions assure many alternative food sources in the large rivers, coastal areas and availability of large tracts of land. The extensive forests then also guaranteed a sustained supply of fuel.

A report on these discussions was submitted mid-March 2001 (*Attachment 2*).

3.2. Second Mission (September 17, 2001 – January 25, 2002)

Before commencing on the second mission the consultant submitted a proposed workplan that exceeded the budgeted contract time by one month (*Attachment 3*). The reason for such a timeframe was that a participatory approach was deemed the best way to determine the common basic motivation of the communities to engage in forest management. Such crucial information was needed to prepare a thorough forest management system (FMS) design. To further save time, it was likewise proposed that field offices conduct the data gathering beforehand. However, this proposal was not given favorable consideration.

A. First Field Data Gathering Activity

Soon after the consultant came on board, a meeting with the Deputy Director and RM Coordinator was held on September 19, 2001. The result was an agreement that the primary output of the FMS Specialist would be a guide on how to implement forest management systems (FMS) that should be imparted to field staff through training. As was done for Upland Land Use Planning. It was also agreed that design of FMS models should give **emphasis on individual woodlots more than communal endeavors.**

Following the aforementioned session, the consultant proposed the immediate conduct of data gathering in the field from September 26 to October 11, 2001 (*Attachment 4*). Information to be collected was location, extent and general purpose of forest management. The main source of this data was to be community land use plans. As scheduled, the activity started late September 26th and ended October 10, 2001.

The objectives were the following:

- a. To discuss with RMO and other PPO staff selected Community Watershed Plans (CWP), Land Use Plans (LUP), farm plans and sitio development plans and draw out forest management (FM) directions;
- b. If possible, visit LUP test sites to review and validate proposed FM directions;
- c. Discuss other FM directions not identified in documents reviewed;
- d. Assess and discuss PPO staff understanding of FMS and conduct short orientation, if needed;
- e. Meet with DENR field offices and assess FM capability building programs for CBFM communities.
- f. Briefly discuss LUP experiences with PPO staff and provide clarification on issues that may be raised.

While arrangements with the provincial offices were being made for the proposed fieldwork, forest management related information was gathered from documents on file at the PMO. The scope of this information was; a) the existing forestry related situation, b) forest projects proposed by the communities, and c) why such projects were proposed. Information collected on existing situation covered extent of natural forest, forest plantations and grasslands, count of water resources (springs, creeks, river and other water bodies) and types of tenures (labeled as agrarian reform in sitio profiles). In the case of proposed projects, those ascertained as agro-forestry were not included.

During the fieldwork, site visits were not carried out due to lack of time and the fact that most PPO staff were busy with previously scheduled activities. Nevertheless, data collected from PMO files were further refined by comparing against updated PPO records. Most of the documents reviewed were of first 1st barangays since majority of those for the 2nd, were still being finalized. Provincial office and some MPT staff provided data clarification wherever needed.

More accurate figures on extent of forests and plantations were to be extracted from completed land use plans (LUP). However, only few were completed and these mostly were poorly done and unreliable. Hence, data from the profiles and CWPs were recorded in tabular format and analyzed using simple statistical computation of count and average.

Result:

A total of 105 sitio plans were reviewed in the course of this first data gathering activity. The information validated the findings made during the first mission. More important, it **brought to light the context and approach in designing forest management systems**. This is contained in a memorandum dated October 25, 2001 (**Attachment 5**) to wit:

- a. Context of FMS: Though forests provide for almost all the basic human needs, it was necessary to exclude the aspect of food production as agro-forestry models covered this. This was to avoid confusion during implementation. Hence, situations where fruit trees are mixed with forest trees are not covered.
- b. Design Approach: Forestry conflicts with other land uses, primarily agriculture. As such, upland communities normally resist unfamiliar ideas. Hence, in addition to the finding during the first mission that **forest management models must arise from a felt need**, it became clear that the appropriate design approach should also be to **avoid introducing a new system or practice but to build upon or improve what already exists**.

Findings:

Documents of one hundred twenty eight (128) sitios were reviewed but one hundred eighteen (118) covering about 59,323 hectares were examined since only these had CWPs.. Significant findings were:

- a. Sixty-nine percent (67%) of the sitios have natural forest (second-growth dipterocarp, old fallow or brush) covering approximately 15,018 hectares or 25% of the total area;
- b. Thirty-three out of the 118 sitios (28%) have forest plantations mostly resulting from DENR initiatives in claims covered by Certificates of Stewardship Contract (CSC). It could safely be assumed these were planted with the intention of commercial timber production, although not stated in the profiles or CWPs. Per sitio profiles, there are 1,774 of this type of tenure estimated to cover 8,870 hectares;
- c. There are roughly 14,000-plus hectares of grassland, or 24% of the total area. There is no information as to how much is actually under fallow. A clearer picture on the subcategories of this land cover will be available once all existing land cover information are digitized and printed;
- d. The data indicates there are 355 springs, 377 creeks 118 rivers and eight lakes within the 118 sitios. However, only three out of the 355 springs (or 0.8%) within the sitios were targeted for protective tree planting. Twenty riverbank projects were identified covering 3.5 hectares and a length of 45 kilometers. No interventions were proposed around the lakes;
- e. One-hundred three (103) forestry type projects were proposed in the CWPs. These come in the form of communal reforestation or individual tree planting activities, riverbank stabilization, spring or water source protection and roadside plantings. Except where LUP maps were finalized in GIS format, it

was not possible to determine how these are located relative to land use issues in the sitios, and how reliable area estimates are.

- f. Accepting the figures at face value, reforestation targets are only about 1,607 hectares or 11% of the open (grassland) areas within the sites. The CWP's indicate that about half of the communal reforestation projects are for protection purposes while an equal portion of the individual tree planting projects are for production. Only one community proposed for a rattan plantation.
- g. Field staff and management perceptions and understanding of forest management ranges from delineation between protection and production uplands, natural forests, and reforestation activities.

Taken within the context of the design approach, the additional data gathered also provided a clear indication of what forest management models exist in UDP sites relative to the existing vegetation. The following table illustrates this association relative to management objective, expected economic benefit or intended product and possible intervention/treatments.

Model type/Existing Vegetation	Management Objective/Use	Expected Economic Benefit/Intended Product	Intervention/treatments
Second growth forest	Stabilization of waterways and protection of water sources (springs)	Water and non-timber products	Protection from destructive influences (fire, harvesting, pest & disease) and enrichment planting with economically viable non-timber species (i.e. rattan)
	Production of timber	Water, timber and non-timber products	Forest protection and timber stand improvement
Brush along and around water bodies	Stabilization of waterways and protection of water sources (springs)	Water and non-timber products	Protection from destructive influences (fire, harvesting, pest & disease) and enrichment planting with economically viable non-timber species (i.e. rattan)
Fallow (grass)	Reforestation for Erosion control	Water	Protection from destructive influences (fire, harvesting, pest & disease) and assisted natural regeneration
Fallow (brush)	Preservation for Slope stabilization/erosion control & limited economic benefits	Water and non-timber products	Protection from destructive influences (fire, harvesting, pest & disease) and enrichment planting with economically viable non-timber species (i.e. rattan)
Established Forest species plantation	Timber production	Timber and fuel	Tree improvement, selective harvesting and replanting
	Preservation for Slope stabilization/erosion control	Soil conservation	Conventional reforestation
Communal tree planting	Establishment of permanent vegetation in denuded areas	None	Assisted natural regeneration
	Roadside stabilization	Continued accessibility	Conventional reforestation

Forest tree planting in individual farms	Boundary delineation and production	Timber and fuel	Tree improvement, selective harvesting and replanting
--	-------------------------------------	-----------------	---

It became clear at this point of the data collection that, given the findings on the significant extent of natural forests in UDP sites, the protection and proper management of this type of vegetation should be a major program endeavor.

Although a reliable picture of what exists emerged, the FMS purpose and intentions gathered from UDP and LGU staff remained to be validated with the communities. It also was evident proposed projects were not made along a logical process. It became necessary to conduct on-site interviews/consultations with site residents so as to bring this to light.

On the basis of the data gathered, a draft was started on the guide on forest management for field staff. The initial output forms an attachment to the aforementioned October 25, 2001 output. This was discussed with the RM Coordinator and revised accordingly.

B. Second Field Data Gathering Activity

Given time constraints and in order not to disturb normal community activities, it was decided to conduct the consultations through focus group discussions (FGD) that should last no more than 3 hours. Per suggestions from PPO management and staff, the selection criteria was based on the following characteristics; i) must have gone through a planning activity (sitio plan, CWP or LUP); ii) population must be comprised of either predominantly indigenous people or of migrants; iii) should have natural forest, plantations and possibly A&D lands.

The third set of fieldwork was carried out between November 6 –29, 2001. Results were presented in a memorandum to the Directors date December 13, 2001 (**Attachment 6**).

Objectives of the fieldwork were the following:

- a) Establish the purposes and intentions of communities in terms of forest management;
- b) Gather information on forest products and services enjoyed by communities.
- c) Establish difference in forest management perceptions and practices between migrant and indigenous communities.
- d) Gather information on market outlets for existing and potential forest products, particularly non-timber, from marketing specialists and other local key informants.

Results:

The data gathering method used was individual interviews with key informants and focus group discussions with community members. In accordance with the aforementioned site criteria, the communities visited were selected according to ethnic composition. The following table summarizes basic items of the field visits.

PPO	Community/ Municipality	Date	Predominant Ethnic Composition	Key informants (No.)
1	Longanapan, Laak	Nov. 7	Visayan migrants	MSO, AT, residents (8)
	Libudon, Mabini	Nov. 8	Mansaka	MSO, AT, residents (6)
5	Palo 19, Tampakan	Nov. 12	Visayan migrants	MSO, AT, residents (4)
	Glandang, Tupi		Blaan	MSO, residents (7)
	Lower Matimos, Tantangan	Nov. 13	Maguindanao	MSO, AT, residents (3)
4	La Union, Maitum	Nov. 15	T'boli	MSO, AT, residents (6)
	Gassi, Kiamba	Nov. 16	T'boli	AT, residents (20)
3	Zone II, Sta. Cruz	Nov. 21	Mixed	MSO, RMO, MSO, residents (45)
2	P.F. Sobrecarey, Caraga	Nov. 26	Mandaya	MSO, AT, community facilitator
	Calapagan, Lupon	Nov. 28	Mixed	MSO, residents (7)

Following this set of data gathering the logical forest management planning flow emerged as follows:



On the basis of the information gathered an improved version of the Guidebook on Forest Management was completed. This version was extensively discussed with the RM and further refined. Finalization was withheld until it could be field tested.

Findings

Significant findings made during the second fieldwork are:

- a) After consolidating information gathered, the earlier version of FMS models were refined to the following:

FMS Models, Objectives and Benefits

Model type/Existing Vegetation	Management Objective/Use	Main intended Benefit/Product
Natural forest	Waterway embankment, steep slopes and water sources (springs) protection	Water and non-timber products
	Production	Water, timber and non-timber products (rattan, herbal medicine, wildlife for meat and sale, honey)
	Shading for agricultural crops (i.e. coffee)	Improved agricultural production, soil & water conservation

Brush or fallow	Waterway embankment and water sources (springs) protection	Water and non-timber products (rattan, wildlife for meat and collection, herbal medicine)
	Slope stabilization/erosion control	None
Forest species plantations (trees, bamboo)	Production	Construction material, fuel, industrial product (rubber)
	Shading for agricultural crops (i.e. coffee)	Improved agricultural production, soil & water conservation
	Slope stabilization/erosion control	Construction material and fuel
	Roadside embankment stabilization	Protection of infrastructure, soil & water conservation
	Individual farms boundary delineation	Construction material and fuel

- b) Apparently, **most of the remaining natural forests are found in areas dominated by indigenous peoples**. These communities exhibit broader use (water, food, non-timber products) the forest than migrants. The resource is viewed more as a life support system than for revenue generation. Where the culture and tribal leadership is still strong, traditional rules on utilization are retained and these are based on sustenance rather than commercial use.
- c) Communities with predominance of **migrants are oriented toward the commercial aspect of forest management**. There are more titled lands in such settlements but much less natural forests.
- d) Both indigenous and migrant communities prefer planting fruit trees rather than timber crops.
- e) Natural forests are generally intended as protection areas, a source of goods (meat for food, water) for local consumption or shade for industrial agricultural crops like coffee and abaca.
- f) Most forest plantations were established through DENR initiatives with the intention of timber production. Some of these plus others established through individual efforts are being used to shade crops like cacao.
- g) *Gmelina arborea* is the predominant plantation species but is no longer desired by most communities since it is perceived to have negative environmental effects (allelopathy, skin rashes, groundwater depletion, etc.). African mahogany (*Sweitenia macrophylla*) and Falcata (*Albizia falcataria*) are more preferred. The latter species has been observed to naturally regenerate in logged-over areas converted to farms. Such phenomenon represents a means toward cheap rehabilitation of degraded areas.
- h) Riverbank stabilization, tree groves as protection around existing springs and boundary planting for markers and future timber source are the common forestry projects planned by the communities.
- i) There are a good number of products from natural forests and plantations that provide decent income to community members. Example are rattan harvesting from which an individual can earn up to ₱ 180/day. Charcoal is produced from ipil-ipil plantations and, wherever there is a good and accessible market, farmers can normally net ₱ 125/day.
- j) In many communities, other products from the forest with economic potential are not being tapped because residents are not aware of a market, or whatever exists offers unattractive prices and terms. Examples of potential products are bamboo, tree ferns, exudates like pili resin and rubber latex, lumbang seeds, abaca hemp, honey, spagnum

- moss, anahaw leaves, medicinal herbs, kaong and other palm fruits, birds nest in caves, ornamental plants, essential oils, live animals and meat from wild boar or deer. Some communities are aware of the potentials for eco-tourism (Blaans around Mt. Matutum).
- k) Existing handicraft such as rattan basket and bamboo mat making also provide good supplemental income for some upland residents. Depending on the size, rattan baskets are sold for ₱16 – 20/piece. A skilled weaver can produce up to 20 pieces a week, thereby grossing from ₱320 - 400. Returns from bamboo mats are about half. Such revenues can be increased with improved quality and market access.

3.3. Forest Management Systems Training (February 6 –8, 2002)

This activity was held in Calapagan, Lupon, Davao Oriental. Participants consisted of Resource Management Officers and their LGU counterparts from the provinces of South Cotabato, Sarangani, Davao del sur and Oriental numbering eight (8) persons. Of these, three were non-foresters.

The objective of the training was to orient the participants on the relationship of FMS planning with CWP preparation and instruct them on the different procedures and steps on preparing a Forest Management Framework as described in the Guidebook on Forest Management Systems. Result of the activity was very positive. For the non-foresters it was an eye opener while for the foresters it served as a refresher course.

The activity also served as a test of this instruction manual. Experiences during the training and comments provided by the participants were very useful in finalizing and further improving the Guidebook. The final version is provided herewith as **Attachment 7**.

4. Problems, Issues and Recommendations

Problems/issues	Recommendations
The main issue facing forest management is that it is not a felt need of program beneficiaries. Caring for the environment always takes a back seat to livelihood considerations. However, in some cases, forested areas are spared from conversion to agricultural use where these serve to protect such resources as domestic water sources.	Since improved income is a prime concern of UDP communities, forest management should be tied in to this aspect so as to make it worth upland farmers' effort to allocate land for this purpose.
Allocating land for forestry is the very first step in forest management and is supposed to be done during land use planning. However, this process is itself hampered by slow progress of the sitio perimeter surveys and inability of most project technicians to properly facilitate planning sessions.	Refresher sessions followed by coaching on proper land use planning must be effected with project site staff (MSO and AT). They should also be taught how to survey a perimeter using UTM readings from GPS receivers and directly plotting these into a GIS-generated base map. The same technique could also be used for incorporating as many landmarks and features into the same map.

<p>The area covered by natural forests is significant at 25% of the total. Yet, only 29% of the sitios indicated some means of managing this resource. Most likely only upon their own initiative and probably due to encouragement by planning facilitators. The root of this issue is the absence of a Program policy in support of community intentions/plans and efforts at managing (and protecting) these areas.</p>	<p>A program policy should be made wherein protection of an existing natural forest by an upland resident will give such person additional qualification for farm and livelihood assistance from the program. This should be sustained through a similar incentive to be institutionalized by the LGU (i.e. deductions from property taxes or reduced sales taxes aside from financial and technical assistance).</p>
<p>There are numerous water bodies (springs, creeks, rivers and lakes) in the project sites. Conversations with residents and proceedings of land use planning training sessions, indicate a predominant desire to protect these with permanent vegetation (i.e. trees). But only 17% of the sites proposed riverbank and spring protection projects. As in the case of natural forests, there likewise is no Program policy and support encouraging preservation of existing protective vegetation in such portions.</p>	<p>A good incentive to this would be granting of a water system to communities that have clearly protected or rehabilitated recharge areas of water sources or the surroundings of water bodies.</p>
<p>Many community members are disappointed with tree planting. This is because they were encouraged to plant gmelina several years ago on the belief they would earn one million pesos from one hectare of trees. However, the <u>expected market never materialized and they were forced to sell these at lower prices as fuelwood or charcoal.</u> A similar case was also noted with bamboo for banana props. This issue highlights the fact that without an economic incentive, people will not invest in permanent crops like trees.</p>	<p>This issue is a very good opportunity for the marketing component to assist the communities with profitably disposing a mature product. It should place effort in identifying outlets for products from natural forests and plantations. Particularly non-timber products in order to discourage cutting of trees.</p>

5. Proposed UDP FMS Goal, Strategy and Approaches

5.1. Goal:

Given the Program's objective of ensuring environmental stability in the uplands and relating this to the situation in the field, it becomes obvious that the Program's main FMS objective is **protection and expansion of existing natural forest (primary, secondary, brush or fallow).**

This is the most appropriate type of vegetation for a watershed and even increasing the existing 15,018 hectares by 20% is attainable by the Program. This equals 3,000+ hectares and is only 25 hectares each if spread over the current 120+ sitios. As a rehabilitation target, this can be achieved in less than two years.

The program's FMS efforts should not only be limited to the natural forest but also include established and proposed plantations.

5.2. Strategy

Findings from the data gathering stressed the fact that forest management is tied in closely with what benefits the communities get or expect to get from the forest. People will not take care of this resource if they see no gain from doing so. Given this fact and the above goal, the best strategy would be to **encourage** protection and expansion of existing natural forests, through an incentive package of policies, marketing support and non-forest based livelihood assistance. In terms of forest plantations, the strategy should be to **foster** their establishment and management by **tailoring these to local needs and commercial specifications in order to assure a return on investment**.

5.3. Approaches and Methods

Attaining the FMS goals in consonance with the foregoing strategy would have to be approached from three aspects – attitudinal change, economic enhancement and institutional strengthening. Undertaking these would require close coordination among three program components.

RM and CIDE can share the responsibility of effecting attitudinal change in community members and key LGU officials and staff. The means would be through continuous environmental IEC campaign and training program that would bring about a change in perception and also empower them with appropriate knowledge and skill. The aforementioned forest management goal of **protecting remaining natural forests should be a clear message in every environmental awareness activity**. An effective tool in fostering proper environmental awareness and skill are well-facilitated visits to learning sites elsewhere in the country. Suitable sites can be selected from DILG list of LGU-initiated environmental projects under the “Galing Pook” awards program.

Marketing would take on the responsibility of enhancing the economic value of the resource and community income levels by improving access to profitable markets of forest products. The component can also help to discourage timber production by promoting non-timber products. RM would facilitate the identification of such goods through the resource evaluation process described in the Guide on Forest Management Systems.

CIDE and RM would collaborate on institutional strengthening by urging and assisting the LGU establish a foundation of policies and a sustainable support structure that would encourage communities to carry out the desired forest management practices. One means is by correlating incentives for protection with long-term institutional assistance that UDP can leave behind with the LGUS, like tie-up with PFIs.

6. FMS Implementation

6.1. Responsibility

The people's organization should be responsible for planning forest management in their respective community. The unit directly responsible would be the resource management group of within the Technical Working Committee. The **FMS models are intended for implementation by individual farmers/claimants** but can be applied to communal endeavors as well. As such, those so tasked are to work with individual land owners/claimants in evaluating existing resources and collectively assess needs and formulate a community forest management framework.

6.2. Prerequisite to Implementation

The allocation of lands for forestry as set forth by the land use plans is the first step in forest management. The objective of the farmer or community, and purpose of each forest block, will dictate the management model to be implemented. This would be spelled out in a Forest Management Framework as described in the Guidebook on Forest Management Systems. Hence, preparing this, whether on an individual farm or communal basis, cannot be done unless land use plans are properly completed.

6.3. Ideal Upland Vegetation and Management Methods

Where the object is purely protection, the method of management will be simply to prevent any man-made and natural destruction or damage to the resource. If rehabilitation is needed, this should strive to achieve as **diverse a vegetative condition** as in the natural state. One proven treatment that results in such is **Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR)**. The practice of growing trees is more applicable where the aim is timber production or other similar **extractive and commercial** endeavors.

6.4. Support Agency Roles

LGU involvement is very important in the interest of sustainability. Their future role in providing funds, technical assistance, establishing a favorable policy environment and support structures is crucial.

DENR can always provide technical assistance or financial support, whenever available. The biggest role the agency will play is on tenurial award and providing community access to resources on public land (timber and non-timber).

6.5. Pointers on Tenures

Tenurial security is a prerequisite to sustained and proper upland resource management. In terms of tenures, the Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title (CADT) actually offer better

tenurial status than CBFMA's. This is because the IPRA law backs it while CBFM exists only by virtue of a Presidential Executive Order.

The mistake in promoting CBFM lies in highlighting resource utilization and not management. On the other hand, most indigenous communities misinterpret a CADT as a license to go into real estate brokering. In both cases, thorough social preparation is a must. It must highlight the legal, environmental and socio-cultural responsibilities first before the privileges.