GATEKEEPER SERIES NO. 108

Collaborative Forest Management in Kyrgyzstan: Moving From Top-Down to Bottom-Up Decision-Making

Jane Carter, Brieke Steenhof, Esther Haldimann and Nurlan Akenshaev

2003

International Institute for Environment and Development
Natural Resources Group and Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods Programme

THE GATEKEEPER SERIES *of the Natural Resources Group at IIED is produced by the Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods Programme. The Series aims to highlight key topics in the field of sustainable natural resource management. Each paper reviews a selected issue of contemporary importance and draws preliminary conclusions for development that are particularly relevant for policymakers, researchers and planners. References are provided to important sources and background material. The Series is published three times a year – in April, August and December – and is supported by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida). The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s), and do not necessarily represent those of the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), or any of their partners.*

JANE CARTER is a forester specialising in community forestry. At the time of writing this paper, she was a Programme Officer (Asia and Eastern Europe) for Intercooperation, based in Switzerland. She is now Senior Adviser in Natural Resource Management for SDC/IC (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation/Intercooperataion), PSMU, No. 49, 3rd Cross 10th Main, Indiranagar Stage II, Bangalore 560 038, India. Tel: +91 80 521 4944; Fax: +91 80 5215744. Email: janecarter@sify.com

BRIEKE STEENHOF is also a forester specialising in community forestry. Since early 2001, she has been based in Kyrgyzstan as CFM Project Leader, LES-IC, Ul. Jamasheva 1, Sputnik, Djalal-abad, 714611, Kyrgyzstan. Tel/fax: +996 3722 5 31 69; Email: jalabad@mail.elcat.kg

ESTHER HALDIMANN worked in Kyrgyzstan from 1998 to 2000 as CFM Officer based in Djalal-abad. She is now Programme Officer (Agriculture), Intercooperation, PO Box 6724 CH-3001 Bern, Switzerland. Tel: +41 31 382 0861; Fax: +41 31 382 3605; Email: ehalidimann@intercoop.ch

NURLAN AKENSHAEV, who grew up in Ortok *leshoz*, is an MSc Researcher (Economics) belonging to the CFM Research Group, c/o LES-IC, Ul. Jamasheva 1, Sputnik, Djalal-abad, 714611, Kyrgyzstan. Tel/fax: +996 3722 5 31 69; Email: kschmidt@swissonline.ch

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper describes one of the first attempts to introduce a collaborative approach to forest management in a former Soviet-governed country. It highlights some of the challenges raised in developing a more participatory approach in a country accustomed to top-down, centralised decision-making and outlines some lessons for similar efforts in other nations in transition.

A Swiss-funded project supported the introduction of collaborative forest management (CFM) in Kyrgyzstan at two levels:

1. Through a pilot project in two trial areas, focusing on the walnut-fruit forests in the south of the country, which are of exceptional interest for biodiversity conservation and also often important for local people's livelihoods.

2. At a national policy and legislative level, giving legal recognition to CFM across the forestry sector.

As a result of the country's Soviet past, there are strong reservations about group or community based work. Instead, the most acceptable mechanism for collaborating with local people in forest management has been through long-term leases taken by households or small household groups. Four years on, the number of CFM leases agreed is over 200, covering roughly 1,500 hectares of forest land. Significant progress has been made with legislation (CFM is now backed by a sound legal framework), in human resource development (at least amongst key individuals), and in establishing institutional mechanisms to promote equity. Recognised weaknesses of the project are a lack of orientation to poverty alleviation and to gender issues; these are beginning to be addressed.

Introducing the concept of collaborative forest management to a country in transition poses many fundamental challenges. Particular issues likely to be shared are the difficulty of promoting participation; a possible resistance to group work; a context in which forests are becoming more important to rural livelihoods than they were; a potentially growing disparity between rich and poor; and a possible need for new forest management techniques. Although in many countries, forest departments have a reputation for hierarchical decision-making, the degree to which this is found in countries in transition is exceptionally strong and difficult to overcome. Changing working practices from a system of centralised planning and highly top down implementation structures to local level, participatory planning and implementation may take years to come about. We argue that it is important to work as far as possible with local preferences and norms, whilst bearing in mind lessons already learned from community forestry in other countries.

COLLABORATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT IN KYRGYZSTAN: MOVING FROM TOP-DOWN TO BOTTOM-UP DECISION-MAKING

Jane Carter, Brieke Steenhof, Esther Haldimann and Nurlan Akenshaev

Kyrgyzstan is a small, mountainous country in the midst of Central Asia. Formerly part of the Soviet Union, Kyrgyzstan gained independence in 1991 and has since experienced over a decade of major social, economic and political change. Unlike its larger (and richer) neighbours Kazakhstan and Usbekistan, the country has embarked upon a policy of democratisation and decentralisation. However, the reorientation to a free market economy has been difficult for a variety of reasons, and the years since independence have brought economic hardship for many, and a growing disparity between rich and poor.

This paper documents the experience of introducing a collaborative approach to forest management to Kyrgyzstan. It highlights some of the challenges raised in developing a more participatory approach in a country accustomed to top-down, centralised decision-making, and outlines some lessons for similar efforts in other nations in transition.

THE FOREST SECTOR IN KYRGYZSTAN

Kyrgyzstan's forests are few (covering a mere 4% or so of the territory, or roughly 794,000 hectares), but their limited 'quantity' is more than compensated for by their genetic interest (Blaser *et al*., 1998; Hemery and Popov, 1998). Of particular renown are the walnut-fruit forests in the south, occupying the lower mountain slopes at an altitude of roughly 1,300–1,800m. These forests comprise both naturally occurring and human-modified (planted, grafted) walnut (*Juglans regia*), apple (*Malus* species), *Prunus* species, and other fruit-bearing tree species, and are widely considered to be of global significance for biodiversity conservation (Blaser *et al*., 1998).[1]

1. The other main forest types found in Kyrgyzstan, spruce (*Picea schrenkiana*); juniper (*Juniperus species*) and riverside forests (mainly various willows, *Salix* species) are of less immediate interest in the context of this paper.

Box 1. The *leshoz* as a territorial and social unit for forest management

Set up during Soviet times to manage forest land on a productive basis, the *leshoz* was, and still is, both a territorial entity and a 'community' of people living in and working for the organisation. The *leshoz* once served as a complete unit of social organisation (providing shops, primary health care, nursery care, schooling, and social amenities), but the severe cuts in the state budget following independence meant not only that these social benefits disappeared, but many people also lost their permanent jobs.

During Soviet times, *leshoz* operations were dictated in a highly top-down manner, with ten-year management plans for the walnut-fruit forests being prepared thousands of kilometres away in Moscow. *Leshoz* staff then had to implement them, in a contractual manner. Today, each *leshoz* has a certain amount of autonomy in the preparation of its ten-year work plan, which is based on a national forest inventory. Decisions regarding implementation of the plan are an internal affair for the *leshoz*, and in this respect it is significant that *leshoz* staff are also a part of the community (and thus in some ways more answerable to it).

During Soviet times, all land was owned and managed by the state through collective enterprises. Following independence, the state-owned agricultural lands were divided up into private shares. However, forest land was not privatised, but continues to be state-owned, managed by what is currently the State Forest Service.[2]

At the local level, forest management is organised through (Soviet instigated) state forest enterprises or *leshozes* (Box 1), of which there are some 14 in the walnut-fruit forest area. It is important to note that the *leshozes* have legal responsibility for forest territories and their management – a fact that is viewed by the authorities as non-negotiable, and which rules out any transfer of ownership *per se* to local people. For most *leshoz* inhabitants, independence has brought many disadvantages: they enjoy neither the former advantage of salaries and good social facilities, nor the new benefit of private shares of land.[3] Furthermore, they feel little ownership of the forest, as up to now it has simply been a means of gaining paid labour. Forest products are only now becoming part of livelihood strategies.

Why Collaborative Forest Management?

In 1995 an international workshop on the walnut-fruit forest was held in Kyrgyzstan. Reflecting current international trends towards participatory forestry (eg. Dove, 1995; Fisher, 1995; Victor *et al*, 1998; Arnold, 2001), workshop partici-

2. This agency has been through a variety of incarnations since independence. For much of the period covered by this paper, it was GOSLESAGENTSTVO, the State Agency for Forests and Wildlife, with a status independent of any Ministry. It was re-organised in 2001 into the Department of Forest Development under a new Ministry of Ecology and Emergency Situations, but regained institutional independence in 2002 as the State Forest Service.
3. Although many *leshoz* residents did receive small shares from the break-up of nearby collective State farms, it was not a significant amount (generally well under 0.5 ha).

pants recommended testing a more collaborative approach to forest management (Box 2). This idea was taken up under KIRFOR,[4] a programme that, through Swiss collaboration, has been supporting the forestry sector in Kyrgyzstan since 1995.

Box 2: Collaborative Forest Management

Various justifications for a collaborative approach to forest management are suggested in the literature. To quote Brown (1999) (with minor adaptations), these include:

Proximity: local people are closest to the forest and therefore best placed to manage it;

Impact: their livelihood activities have a direct effect on the condition of the forest; their involvement in its management makes sound practical sense;

Equity: community-based forest management can increase resource flows to rural populations, helping to alleviate poverty and distribute income more equitably;

Livelihoods: given that forests are often an important source of rural livelihoods, CFM has the potential to strengthen livelihood security;

Capacity: recent experience of community forestry (eg. in Nepal and West Africa) suggests that it can improve forest quality and condition to a greater extent than governments can when acting alone;

Biodiversity: CFM is often viewed as a means of supporting biodiversity conservation (although arguments are made for and against this);

Cost-effectiveness: governments often perceive local forest management as an effective means of cutting forest management costs;

Adaptation: almost by definition, flexible and adaptive management cannot be delivered centrally; local circumstances and interests must be incorporated (clearly this is a more cogent argument where government policy favours decentralisation);

Governance: involving communities and community institutions in forest management (a sector often noticeably lacking in 'good governance') may help to introduce discipline into the management of the sector and offer significant checks and balances on otherwise unregulated public services.

Development philosophy: CFM tends to fit well with the wider development assistance strategies of the international community, stressing local participation, decentralisation and 'subsidiarity' (the view that decisions should be taken as close as possible to the affected citizens), as well as the promotion of civil society.

In Kyrgyzstan, the decision to collaborate with local people in the management of the walnut-fruit forests was primarily made out of the recognition – by Kyrgyz and Swiss decision-makers alike – that the future of the forests was intimately linked to the large number of people living in and around them. For the Kyrgyz authorities, the overwhelming justification, or expectation at the beginning, was a reduction in forest management costs. Other factors included:

■ the necessity for a change (due to the lack of finances);

4. KIRFOR is managed by Intercooperation on behalf of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), in partnership with various Kyrgyz agencies, most notably the SFS.

- the need to continue implementing *leshoz* plans (particularly planting targets);
- concern about increased pressure on the forest by local people for agricultural land, fuelwood (especially given the reduced availability after independence of other energy sources), illegal felling of timber and (highly valuable) walnut burls, and the overcollection of walnuts; and
- a view that local people should be educated about the importance of forests.

For the project staff, CFM was particularly seen as a means to promote:

- biodiversity conservation, through the active, productive management of selected stands (CFM was never viewed as an approach applicable to all forest stands, but rather one management option);[5]
- the empowerment of local people, giving them greater responsibility for forest management (and potentially other aspects of their lives), and increasing motivation to conserve the forest;
- equity, as far as possible, through group management of forests (looking for opportunities to build on traditional systems); and, eventually
- the improvement of local livelihoods through sustainable resource utilisation and income generation opportunities arising from this.

CFM was introduced in two ways. Firstly, through a pilot project in two trial *leshozes*; and secondly, at a national policy and legislative level. These two levels of activities are described in turn in the sections that follow.

FIELD EXPERIENCES

Early investigations indicated that a number of important prerequisites for a collaborative approach were met in the walnut-fruit forests, notably:

- heavy local dependence on the forests for livelihoods (an assumption that was in fact later questioned);
- recognition by local people that the forests were being degraded;[6] and

5. This was both because it was anticipated that local people would probably not be interested in all forest areas; and also because there are some ecologically or economically sensitive areas (eg. watershed catchments, areas containing many valuable walnut trees with burls, etc.) which the authorities were unwilling to give up. The idea was that local people could manage areas defined as suitable for CFM (essentially productive forests within reasonable access of settlements or summer pastures). Limited *leshoz* resources could then be focused on managing the smaller areas considered unsuitable for CFM.

6. Common property resource theory suggests that local people are more likely to be interested in managing a natural resource if they perceive it to be in decline, as long as it has not been degraded beyond the point of it being of use (Ostrom, 1999).

- willingness by local people to become involved in forest management, and willingness by the state authorities to try a new approach.

The basic concept behind CFM was "*a working partnership between the key stakeholders in the management of a given forest, in particular the immediate, local users and the relevant forest authorities*". This, however, can be interpreted in different ways. Partnership with local people was a totally new concept in Kyrgyzstan, where past patterns of management and communication were strictly top-down. In Soviet times, personal initiative or questioning the relevance of orders were strongly discouraged, and this still influences behaviour today (Carter *et al*., 2001). The Kyrgyz authorities were clear from the beginning that the most appropriate form of 'partnership' would be leasing forest land to individuals in exchange for forest-related work. The project was open to trying different mechanisms for CFM, and stressed that leases should be viewed as only one option. However, project activities rapidly became focused entirely on leases, with no other mechanism being viewed by partners as feasible.

For the first three years of the project (1998–2000), activities were focused in two trial *leshozes*, Ortok and Usgen. The basic idea of a CFM lease was for local individuals to take responsibility for the management of a forest plot, performing certain forest activities in return for permitted forest harvests (mainly of walnuts and other fruits, as well as deadwood for fuel; felling trees for timber is not allowed). No money was expected to exchange hands – this in itself is a major innovation. It became apparent that seasonal leases have actually been in use for some time, even during the last years of Soviet rule. (This was especially the case for *leshoz* staff members, as a work benefit, and included seasonal access to harvesting of nuts, hay, grazing areas, etc.).

A six-month anthropological study for the project in 1999 (Marti, 2000), had some important findings which helped shape the project (Box 3).

The project aimed to work with groups, rather than individuals. This was both because it was perceived that equity aspects could be more easily addressed through groups; and also because many forest management activities are more efficiently organised through group action. However, a strong resistance to group work became increasingly evident. Although this might at first seem unexpected after years of communism, there are a number of reasons for such an attitude. The most commonly given explanation for a lack of interest in organised group

Box 3: Key findings from the social anthropology study

1. The Kyrgyz are, in essence, culturally distant from the forest, being traditionally nomadic pastoralists. During Soviet times, forest management became a source of paid employment, but not a task for which people took real interest or responsibility. In fact, it is often only where forest resources are scarce that greatest use is made of forest products. The implication (not entirely borne out by experience to date) is/was that CFM is only likely to succeed in areas of highly degraded forest.

2. At least in some *leshozes*, there is a distrust of current *leshoz* management, which is seen as inefficient and highly corrupt. In such management regimes, there is great potential for inequity in lease distribution. In response, the project has placed strong emphasis on equity issues.

3. Any original traditions in resource management (including those concerned with pastoralism) have been heavily eroded over the Soviet period, to the point that there is little community memory of them.

4. There is a significant, even cultural, lack of any sense of value in written contracts. Most Kyrgyz (particularly rural citizens) place far more faith in personal relations and verbal agreements. It is common for both a written agreement and an oral agreement to exist, with the second usually being much more favourable for both parties (to date, the project is not aware of this happening with CFM contracts). There are no ready 'solutions' to this reality; all the project can do is constantly reinforce the need for written documents given the long time period covered, and thus the strong likelihood that *leshoz* staff will change many times over the contract's duration.

Source: Marti (2000)

work is that, following the experience of forced collective work, people are acutely aware of the unequal contribution made by individuals in a group, and thus now have a strong preference for individual or family-based enterprise. A second reason (especially early in CFM implementation) is that *leshoz* staff are more comfortable agreeing leases with known, trusted individuals than with groups. A third probable reason is that during the Soviet period, the traditional adhesion to tribes and clans was so strongly discouraged that it is now very weak.

To date, the only group leases that have proved possible have been those based on a small group of two to four households that are either closely related, or have strong friendship ties.

Leshoz staff tended to have unrealistic, excessive expectations of what tenants could achieve under lease contracts. More surprisingly, tenants often proved willing to agree to work that they could not fulfil. The latter was partly because tenants were not used to arguing for their rights, but also because they often trusted the *leshoz* management (at least in the case of individuals with close ties to *leshoz* staff). In some cases, they also lacked a real appreciation of the amount of work entailed in a given task (determining a 'fair' workload for a given forest

plot has been an important role of the CFM Boards – see below). Another reason was probably a belief that what was written in the contract was in any case unimportant (see Box 3). It also became clear that the main concern of *leshoz* staff was tree planting (fulfilling targets in the *leshoz* plan), rather than forest management. More generally, it appears that one inheritance of Soviet times is a wealth of data that bears little resemblance to present (and possibly past) reality. Probably many plans were only fulfilled on paper, and not on the ground, but even today it is difficult for such matters to be openly admitted.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR CFM

At national level, important developments (also supported by KIRFOR) were also taking place. A participatory review of forest policy resulted in a new forest policy concept, and, based on this, new forest legislation was pushed through parliament at exceptional speed by the then Head of GOSLESAGENTSTVO, who had a strong personal ambition to see the law passed within his time in office. Approved in 1999, the new law gave legal recognition to CFM (Republic of Kyrgyzstan, 1999), and resulted in a need for appropriate CFM Rules and Regulations. A National CFM Working Group was formed.[7] The project expressed concern that this was too early, with not enough field experience having been gained; however, the momentum at the time was unstoppable. Thus the project helped develop the new rules and regulations, although recommending strongly that they be left open to regular revision.

At first, the emphasis placed by GOSLESAGENTSTVO was on:

- promoting tree planting (using 'free' labour);
- developing CFM in all types of forest (not just walnut-fruit forests, but also forests with less obvious benefits to local people); and
- expanding its area of influence beyond state forest land (GOSLESFUND) to other legal land categories potentially available for tree planting.

However, this emphasis changed somewhat during the process of drawing up the rules and regulations, undoubtedly influenced by a number of field trips conducted within the country (providing a 'reality check'), and a study tour for seven key persons to Pakistan in June 2000.

7. The Working Group included representatives of GOSLESAGENSTVO, the Forest Institute (a forest research body) and project staff. A clearly mixed group, with often varying opinions and objectives, they have nevertheless managed to develop a document that satisfied all parties concerned.

In their final form, the guidelines state the goals of CFM to be to:

- ensure the sustainable use of forests resources;
- improve local livelihoods;
- increase forest cover;
- support private tree growing initiatives; and
- expand local people's participation in forest management.

Provisions include an upper limit on the amount of land that can be leased by one household,[8] and (rather weak) criteria as to who is eligible to take a lease (mainly with the intention to exclude non-local residents).

The National CFM Rules and Regulations were approved by Decree 377 on 27 July, 2001 – a major achievement after such a short period of time. Inevitably, certain points are better covered than others. Lease agreements have become the only possible approach under CFM, with an emphasis on contracts with individuals. Furthermore, some principles have been formulated in a less concrete and concise manner than first intended. The early attempts to gain influence over areas belonging to the State Reserve Fund (non-forested State land) proved over-optimistic. It was also found impossible to exempt tenants from taxation, a matter that may prove significant in the long run.[9]

It is recognised that the CFM Rules and Regulations need further testing and modification. Thus the National CFM Working Group has a mandate from the SFS to continue to meet and review progress regularly, and to recommend policy/legislative modifications should this be appropriate.

ACHIEVEMENTS

The project is now in its second phase, expanding to a number of new *leshozes* whilst maintaining support in Ortok and Usgen (KIRFOR, 2000). With the issue of Decree 377, CFM can now be implemented by all *leshozes*, including those beyond the walnut-fruit forest area. The project focus will nevertheless remain in the latter area, now including the open canopy natural (and planted) pistachio

8. In walnut forests, 5 hectares; in riverside forests, 2 hectares; and in mixed fruit forests, including pistachio, 20 hectares.

9. Official taxation rates in Kyrgyzstan are very high, and most people practise avoidance strategies. So far, tenants have not been taxed on the income (in forest products) that they gain from their plots, but if they were to be, the benefits that they gain from the plots might be dramatically reduced to the point that CFM contracts would no longer be of any interest.

and almond forests that occur nearby, since these are also of significance for local livelihoods. However, in the north of the country, two *leshozes* have begun using CFM regulations on their own initiative to implement afforestation activities with poplar (*Populus* species).

By the end of December 2001 there were 192 CFM lease contracts officially in operation in the two trial *leshozes*, of which 19 were group leases of two to four households. The total area under lease was some 1,100 hectares. In 2002, considerable progress was made in the new *leshoz* of Kochkor Ata, where some 35 leases were negotiated in pistachio and almond forests. Further lease contracts were also negotiated in Ortok and Usgen, and in four other new *leshozes*.

Given the low demand for group leases, strong emphasis is being placed on allocating contiguous areas for lease plots. Thus, if in future tenants start appreciating the benefits of group activities (such as for road construction, protection, transport and the sale of harvested products), the location of their plots should make this easy.

Awareness of *leshoz* staff

Leshoz staff, especially Forest Rangers, have become more aware of the position of tenants. Being local residents, many *leshoz* staff have taken up leases themselves. While this needs to be closely monitored from an equity point of view, it has at least highlighted the practicalities of work demands. *Leshoz* staff are now tending to propose a lower workload to tenants, and to pay more attention to allocating areas suitable for them (close to their homes or summer pastures).

Adaptive planning

Under the Kyrgyz Forest Code, an inventory of each *leshoz* forest is required every 10 years to underpin a Forest Management Plan. In the past, such plans were highly detailed and inflexible, with management prescriptions for every stand. It was not possible to adapt these prescriptions to changing conditions over the planning period. KIRFOR's framework supports the development of a more participatory, multi-functional and adaptive planning system using modern techniques of inventory and data processing (Scheuber, Müller and Köhl, 2000). A highly significant feature of the new plans is that rather than setting out detailed management prescriptions for all stands, they merely categorise areas into three broad categories (non-exploitation; productive activities allowed, but with restrictions due to inaccessibility; and productive activities fully allowed). This means that for the first time, *leshozes*

will have the freedom to define the details of forest management activities; and tenants and rangers can discuss and decide management activities together.

Conflict resolution

Lease implementation brought latent conflicts in forest use to the surface, particularly over conflicting demands for grazing, hay-making, ploughing and tree planting (Fisher, 1999). This was predictable (Skutsch, 2000), and demonstrates the need for preliminary investigations into plot use to identify potential conflicts of interest, as well as the need for regulatory bodies. Although the need for investigating prior land uses is now well accepted by staff, it remains a fairly low priority with rangers, given the numerous other demands on their time.

The CFM Rules and Regulations provide for three regulatory bodies at *leshoz* level:

1. a *Leshoz* level (First) Commission, overseeing the broad allocation of land for CFM purposes;
2. a variable number of Range level (Second) Commissions (in those Ranges implementing CFM), with the task of overseeing the specific allocation of plots; and
3. a CFM Board, serving as an independent arbitrator for disputes and complaints.

The CFM Boards have been operating since 1998 in the two pilot *leshozes*; they have gradually become more independent and accepted as a genuine regulatory and arbitration institution. In several cases, complex problems have been resolved at board meetings (often held at the site in question) in a manner acceptable to all stakeholders.

The Commissions came into being with the approval of Decree 377, and have only recently begun work in a number of *leshozes*. In all the regulatory bodies, membership comprises appropriate *leshoz* representatives, a tenant's representative, and representatives from the village administration (*ail okmöts*) and the traditional authorities, the village elders (*ak sakals*). The latter two are expected to play a significant role as neutral, unbiased parties in overseeing equal opportunities for all members of the community to participate in CFM. It remains to be seen if this intention is fulfilled.

Service providers

The project encourages specialists, such as economists, to provide their services on

a consultancy basis (rather than being employed directly by the project). This builds business skills that will eventually make such specialists independent and self-sufficient. Two service providers established by former staff are now contracted by the project for CFM activities, such as facilitating meetings, demonstrating participatory techniques, promoting awareness about CFM, providing advice to present or future tenants about lease agreements, verifying field work and collating data. An element of competition between them helps to maintain standards. However, since neither provides CFM services for any other organisation, it cannot be claimed that they have yet developed any independence from the project. At present, the service providers are generally welcomed by *leshoz* staff, who see them as additional (and free) support, performing an intermediate role between tenants and *leshoz* staff. In the long term, it is hoped that tenants or *leshozes* will pay them for specific tasks, but it is likely that their funding will come from donor agencies for some time, although hopefully not just from the project.

Increased self confidence of tenants

It is noticeable that tenants are more self confident, and more able and willing to express themselves in meetings than when the project started. Study trips for them (and some middle-level *leshoz* staff) to local sites of forestry interest, as well as meetings and seminars, have had a significant positive impact. Besides improving tenants' understanding of forestry and living conditions in other areas, the main benefit has been the exchange of experiences between the tenants themselves. This exchange has in some cases resulted in tenants actively demanding their rights.

CHALLENGES

Two issues, in particular, have been identified for greater attention in future: poverty alleviation and gender awareness.

Poverty alleviation

While both SDC and Intercooperation have poverty alleviation principles, at the time of project planning, poverty alleviation was felt to be a lower priority than in other countries.[10] Thus the project focused more on sustainable forest management than local livelihoods. Preliminary indications are that, although many of those who took the first CFM leases came from wealthier households, with the

10. At project commencement, informants dismissed any enquiries about wealth differentials amongst *leshoz* residents with the standard response (no doubt reflecting Soviet dogma) that "*everyone is the same*". Possibly there was more justification for this in *leshoz* areas, where land was not divided into private shares, than elsewhere. However, even over the short period of five years, socio-economic differentials within the general population have become increasingly evident, and are now recognised as a fact throughout the country.

expansion in lease numbers, poorer households are now becoming included. However, far more needs to be done to systematically identify and consider the needs of the poor in relation to land use in the *leshozes*. In future, poverty alleviation will become an issue in the selection of CFM tenants in supported lezhozes.

Gender

Gender aspects were also not specifically addressed in the first few years of the project. In some ways, Kyrgyz women appear quite emancipated (during Soviet times, they had equal access to education, were encouraged to become professionals, and had ready access to child care facilities). Indeed, there is a widespread perception that there is "*no gender problem*" (Coles, 2000). Nevertheless, in rural situations, women's roles are starkly differentiated from men's. They are responsible for the household and many agricultural tasks (including in the forest), but are not expected (and do not themselves expect) to play an active role outside the home such as attending public meetings or signing important papers (Messerli, 2000). In the south, this role differentiation is accentuated as a result of stronger Islamic influence (particularly amongst the Usbek population) and adherence to traditional values. Indeed, the first female CFM tenant (greatly welcomed by the project) proved to be rather an accident – her husband had been absent when the document had to be signed, and many jokes were made at his expense afterwards.

In this project phase, particular efforts are being made to promote gender awareness – by insisting on women participating in meetings and study tours, and actively seeking their opinions (mainly to the puzzlement, rather than opposition, of men). This is gradually producing results, with more women becoming actively involved and expressing themselves openly in mixed gatherings. Nevertheless, without explicit invitation, women generally do not attend meetings, whilst the regulatory bodies on CFM (as they exist at present) do not favour women's involvement.

LESSONS FOR OTHER COUNTRIES IN TRANSITION

Introducing the concept of collaborative forest management to countries in transition poses many fundamental challenges. Particular issues likely to be shared are the difficulty of promoting participation; a possible resistance to group work; a context in which forests are becoming more important to rural livelihoods than they were; a potentially growing disparity between rich and poor; and a possible need for new forest management techniques. Although in many countries, forest departments have a reputation for hierarchical decision-making, the degree to which this is found in countries in transition is exceptionally strong and difficult

to overcome. Changing working practices from a system of centralised planning and highly top down implementation structures to local level, participatory planning and implementation will take years to effect.

Significantly, the Swiss government is the only major donor in Kyrgyz forestry, and thus has a very substantial influence. This has increased over the years as state funding for forestry has declined and mutual understanding between the Swiss and Kyrgyz partners has grown. This situation undoubtedly facilitated the introduction of collaborative forest management (CFM) in Kyrgyzstan; to our knowledge the first such attempt in the former Soviet Central Asian states with very few parallels in the vast forests of the entire ex Soviet Union. A particularly favourable factor was the openness of certain key individuals within the Kyrgyz forest authority to experiment with CFM; they acted as effective 'champions' of the new approach. The strong donor influence has, however, raised dilemmas between sticking to principles (such as promoting genuine local participation and equity) and building local, Kyrgyz ownership of the CFM concept. This could have also arisen if more than one donor had been involved, but is highlighted in the present case.

The resistance to group work that we encountered also exists in some other countries with a comparable past (eg. Vietnam – Howard, 1998), although not in others (eg. Albania – Peter Kampen, pers. comm.). Working with individuals can, if not carefully facilitated, be inequitable and favour the more resource-endowed and powerful members of the community. Of course, working with groups can also have the same effect, but may be easier to avoid through facilitation. As far as the project is concerned, this is a particular issue in that the project's primary goal is sustainable forest management, rather than equitable livelihoods. *Leshoz* staff are concerned (and legally responsible) to ensure that those entrusted with forest management are really able to carry it out. Given that poorer households are more likely to lack forestry experience (judged on the basis of past work for the *leshoz*) or the available labour to take up CFM lease contracts, they can sometimes be considered unsuitable tenants.

The Soviet system of technical forest management was highly developed, but very inflexible. The techniques prescribed are often unsuitable, especially, in Kyrgyzstan, for the small-scale management of lease plots for multiple products. More research is needed into such techniques (Schmidt, 2000). It is likely that in other countries in transition, a move towards collaborative forest management will also require major changes in technical forestry matters, and possibly appropriate research.

Swiss bilateral assistance tends to promote a multi-partnership approach. However, this is a major challenge in a country such as Kyrgyzstan where civil society is weakly organised, and those NGOs that are beginning to be established are often only representative of a very small segment of the population (Abramson, 1999). Although these days it is generally considered preferable to build on existing institutions rather than establish entirely new ones, the project has adopted the latter strategy. This is because there simply were no existing institutions that could be expected to regulate CFM in an equitable manner. Nevertheless, the project has sought to include the traditional authorities (the *ak sakals*) as far as possible (recognising that they may have their own biases, and are certainly not gender sensitive). Again, there are interesting comparisons that can be made with other countries in transition; in Albania (Peter Kampen, pers. com), it is reported that traditional forest management systems are still remembered and are being revived.

CONCLUSION

Four and a half years is a very short time to draw many conclusions about a completely new, collaborative approach to forest management in a country – especially given the specific past of Krygyzstan. Really fundamental changes to the way that people think and act are required to bring about true local participation in forest management. Nevertheless, significant progress has been made, both in terms of the new legal framework and regulations for CFM implementation, and in field experiences in the *leshozes* involved (which fed into the former). In many ways, Collaborative Forest Management in Kyrgyzstan is not comparable with similarly titled approaches in other countries, especially as long as the strong reservations about group/community based work remain. We argue that it is important to work as far as possible with local preferences and norms, whilst bearing in mind lessons already learned from community forestry in other countries. Clearly many challenges lie ahead for the implementation of CFM in Kyrgyzstan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to Bob Fisher for his helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper, and to Kaspar Schmidt for his timely assistance in coordinating with Nurlan Akenshaev – as well as to Nurjan Matraimov for his translation skills in the same regard. We would like to acknowledge the financial support of SDC for the CFM Project in Kyrgyzstan; nevertheless, this paper reflects the views of the authors and not of SDC.

REFERENCES

Abramson, DM. 1999. A critical look at NGOs and civil society as means to an end in Uzbekistan. *Human Organization* 58(3): 240-250.

Arnold, JEM. 2001. *25 Years of Community Forestry*. United Nations Food & Agriculture Organization (FAO), Rome.

Blaser, J., Carter, J., and Gilmour, D. (eds) 1998. *Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of Kyrgyzstan's Walnut-fruit Forests*. [English version] IUCN, Gland and Cambridge and Intercooperation, Bern, Switzerland.

Brown, D. 1999. Principles and practice of forest co-management: evidence from West-Central Africa. *European Union Tropical Forestry Paper 2*, Overseas Development Institute, London, UK and European Commission, Brussels.

Carter, J, Haldimann, E. and Kamytov, M. 2001. From top down Soviet planning to local forestry decision making: coping with change in Kyrgyzstan. *Forests, Trees and People Newsletter* No.44 April 2001.

Coles, A. 2000. *Exploring Gender in Kyrgyzstan*. INTRAC, UK.

Dove, MR. 1995 The theory of social forestry intervention: the state of the art in Asia. *Agroforestry Systems* 30: 315-340.

Fisher, RJ. 1995. *Collaborative Management of Forests for Conservation and Development*. Issues in Forest Conservation. IUCN, Gland (Switzerland) and WWF, Gland, Switzerland.

Fisher, RJ. 1999. *Collaborative Forest Management in Kyrgyzstan: Exploring a new approach*. INTERCOOPERATION and GOSLESAGENTSTVO. CFM Report 4/99 on a mission to Kyrgyzstan 3 - 23 October 1999, submitted to the Environment and Forestry Sector of the SDC.

Hemery, GE. and Popov, SI. 1998. The walnut (Juglans regia L.) forests of Kyrgyzstan and their importance as a genetic resource. *Commonwealth Forestry Review* 77 (4): 272 – 276.

Howard, C. 1998. Forestry in transition in Vietnam. *Commonwealth Forestry Review* 77 (4): 249-253.

KIRFOR. 2000. *Master Plan 2001–2003 for the Third Phase of the Kyrgyz-Swiss Forestry Sector Support Programme*. The partners of the programme, the Team of LESIC, Bishkek September 2000. LESIC, Bishkek and Intercooperation, Switzerland.

Marti, A. 2000. *Stakeholders and Local Resource Management in the Walnut Fruit Forests of Southern Kyrgyzstan*. A report on fieldwork June–December 1999, submitted to Intercooperation and SDC.

Messerli, M. 2000. *Gender Study in Southern Kyrgyzstan. A preliminary study of women's opinions concerning forest leases in four leshozes*. Final report on fieldwork conducted in the *leshozes* of Kara Alma, Achy, Usgen and Ortok, April – December 2000. Intercooperation, Switzerland.
Ostrom, E. 1999. Self-governance and forest resources. *CIFOR Occasional Paper* No. 20

Republic of Kyrgyzstan (1999) Forest Codex

Scheuber, M., Müller, U. and Köhl, M. 2000. Wald und Forstwirtschaft Kirgistans, *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Forstwesen* 151(3): 69-74.
Schmidt, K. 2000. *Knowledge and Strategies of Local People in Forest Management. A research project contributing to the development of collaborative forest management in the walnut-fruit forest in Kyrgyzstan.* Proposal approved by the Research Fellow Partnership Program for Forestry SDC-ZIL, Switzerland.

Skutsch, M.M. 2000. Conflict management and participation in community forestry. *Agroforestry Systems* 48: 189-206.

Victor, M., Lang, C. and Bornemeier, J. (eds.) 1998. *Community Forestry at a Crossroads: Reflections and Future Directions in the Development of Community Forestry*. Proceedings of an International Seminar, held in Bangkok, Thailand, 17-19 July, 1997. RECOFTC Report No. 16, Bangkok, Thailand.

SUBSCRIBING TO THE GATEKEEPER SERIES

To receive the Gatekeeper Series regularly, individuals and organisations can take out a subscription. Subscribers receive nine Gatekeeper papers a year. Subscriptions are reasonably priced to subscribers based in OECD countries, and are free to individuals and organisations based in non-OECD countries.

For more details or to subscribe contact: IIED,

3 Endsleigh Street, London WC1H 0DD, UK
Email: subscriptions @iied.org
Tel: +44 020 7388 2117;
Fax +44 020 7388 2826, or complete the online order form at http://www.iied.org/

OTHER IIED PUBLICATIONS

For information about IIED's other publications, contact: EarthPrint Limited, Orders Department, P.O. Box 119, Stevenage, Hertfordshire SG1 4TP, UK
Fax: +44 1438 748844
mail to:
orders@earthprint.co.uk

There is a searchable IIED bookshop database on: http://www.iied.org/bookshop/index.html

1. **Pesticide Hazards in the Third World: New Evidence from the Philippines.** 1987. J.A. McCracken and G.R. Conway.
2. **Cash Crops, Food Crops and Agricultural Sustainability.** 1987. E.B. Barbier.
3. **Trees as Savings and Security for the Rural Poor.** 1992. Robert Chambers, Czech Conroy and Melissa Leach. (1st edition, 1988)

4-12 **Out of Print**

13. **Crop-Livestock Interactions for Sustainable Agriculture.** 1989. Wolfgang Bayer and Ann Waters-Bayer.
14. **Perspectives in Soil Erosion in Africa: Whose Problem?** 1989. M. Fones-Sondell.

15-16. **Out of Print**

17. **Development Assistance and the Environment: Translating Intentions into Practice.** 1989. Marianne Wenning.
18. **Energy for Livelihoods: Putting People Back into Africa's Woodfuel Crisis.** 1989. Robin Mearns and Gerald Leach.
19. **Crop Variety Mixtures in Marginal Environments.** 1990. Janice Jiggins.
20. **Displaced Pastoralists and Transferred Wheat Technology in Tanzania.** 1990. Charles Lane and Jules N. Pretty.
21. **Teaching Threatens Sustainable Agriculture.** 1990. Raymond I. Ison.
22. **Microenvironments Unobserved.** 1990. Robert Chambers.
23. **Low Input Soil Restoration in Honduras: the Cantarranas Farmer-to-Farmer Extension Programme.** 1990. Roland Bunch.
24. **Rural Common Property Resources: A Growing Crisis.** 1991. N.S. Jodha.
25. **Participatory Education and Grassroots Development: The Case of Rural Appalachia.** 1991. John Gaventa and Helen Lewis.
26. **Farmer Organisations in Ecuador: Contributions to Farmer First Research and Development.** 1991. A. Bebbington.
27. **Indigenous Soil and Water Conservation in Africa.** 1991. Reij. C.
28. **Tree Products in Agroecosystems: Economic and Policy Issues.** 1991. J.E.M. Arnold.
29. **Designing Integrated Pest Management for Sustainable and Productive Futures.** 1991. Michel P. Pimbert.
30. **Plants, Genes and People: Improving the Relevance of Plant Breeding.** 1991. Angelique Haugerud and Michael P. Collinson.
31. **Local Institutions and Participation for Sustainable Development.** 1992. Norman Uphoff.
32. **The Information Drain: Obstacles to Research in Africa.** 1992. Mamman Aminu Ibrahim.
33. **Local Agro-Processing with Sustainable Technology: Sunflowerseed Oil in Tanzania.** 1992. Eric Hyman.
34. **Indigenous Soil and Water Conservation in India's Semi-Arid Tropics.** 1992. John Kerr and N.K. Sanghi.
35. **Prioritizing Institutional Development: A New Role for NGO Centres for Study and Development.** 1992. Alan Fowler.
36. **Out of Print**
37. **Livestock, Nutrient Cycling and Sustainable Agriculture in the West African Sahel.** 1993. J.M. Powell and T.O. Williams.
38. **O.K., The Data's Lousy, But It's All We've Got (Being a Critique of Conventional Methods.** 1993. G. Gill.
39. **Homegarden Systems: Agricultural Characteristics and Challenges.** 1993. Inge D. Hoogerbrugge and Louise O. Fresco.
40. **Opportunities for Expanding Water Harvesting in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Case of the Teras of Kassala.** 1993. Johan A. Van Dijk and Mohamed Hassan Ahmed.
41. **Out of Print**
42. **Community First: Landcare in Australia.** 1994. Andrew Campbell.
43. **From Research to Innovation: Getting the Most from Interaction with NGOs in Farming Systems Research and Extension.** 1994. John Farrington and Anthony Bebbington.
44. **Will Farmer Participatory Research Survive in the International Agricultural Research Centres?** 1994. Sam Fujisaka.
45. **Population Growth and Environmental Recovery: Policy Lessons from Kenya.** 1994. Mary Tiffen, Michael Mortimore and Francis Gichuki.
46. **Two Steps Back, One Step Forward: Cuba's National Policy for Alternative Agriculture.** 1994. Peter Rosset and Medea Benjamin.
47. **The Role of Mobility Within the Risk Management Strategies of Pastoralists and Agro-Pastoralists.** 1994. Brent Swallow.
48. **Participatory Agricultural Extension: Experiences from West Africa.** 1995. Tom Osborn.
49. **Women and Water Resources: Continued Marginalisation and New Policies.** 1995. Francis Cleaver and Diane Elson.
50. **New Horizons: The Economic, Social and Environmental Impacts of Participatory Watershed Development.** 1995. Fiona Hinchcliffe, Irene Guijt, Jules N. Pretty and Parmesh Shah.
51. **Participatory Selection of Beans in Rwanda: Results, Methods and Institutional Issues.** 1995. Louise Sperling and Urs Scheidegger.
52. **Trees and Trade-offs: A Stakeholder Approach to Natural Resource Management.** 1995. Robin Grimble, Man-Kwun Chan, Julia Aglionby and Julian Quan.
53. **A Role for Common Property Institutions in Land Redistribution Programmes in South Africa.** 1995. Ben Cousins.
54. **Linking Women to the Main Canal: Gender and Irrigation Management.** 1995. Margreet Zwarteveen.
55. **Soil Recuperation in Central America: Sustaining Innovation After Intervention.** 1995. Roland Bunch and Gabinò López.
56. **Through the Roadblocks: IPM and Central American Smallholders.** 1996. Jeffery Bentley and Keith Andrews.

57. **The Conditions for Collective Action: Land Tenure and Farmers' Groups in the Rajasthan Canal Project.** 1996. Saurabh Sinha.
58. **Networking for Sustainable Agriculture: Lessons from Animal Traction Development.** 1996. Paul Starkey.
59. **Intensification of Agriculture in Semi-Arid Areas: Lessons from the Kano Close-Settled Zone, Nigeria.** 1996. Frances Harris.
60. **Sustainable Agriculture: Impacts on Food Production and Food Security.** 1996. Jules Pretty, John Thompson and Fiona Hinchcliffe.
61. **Subsidies in Watershed Development Projects in India: Distortions and Opportunities.** 1996. John M. Kerr, N.K. Sanghi and G. Sriramappa.
62. **Multi-level Participatory Planning for Water Resources Development in Sri Lanka.** 1996. K. Jinapala, Jeffrey D. Brewer, R. Sakthivadivel.
63. **Hitting a Moving Target: Endogenous Development in Marginal European Areas.** 1996. Gaston G.A. Remmers.
64. **Poverty, Pluralism and Extension Practice.** 1996. Ian Christoplos.
65. **Conserving India's Agro-Biodiversity: Prospects and Policy Implications.** 1997. Ashish Kothari.
66. **Understanding Farmers' Communication Networks: Combining PRA With Agricultural Knowledge Systems Analysis.** 1997. Ricardo Ramirez.
67. **Markets and Modernisation: New Directions for Latin American Peasant Agriculture.** 1997. Julio A. Berdegué and Germán Escobar.
68. **Challenging 'Community' Definitions in Sustainable Management: The case of wild mushroom harvesting in the USA.** 1997. Rebecca McLain and Eric Jones.
69. **Process, Property and Patrons: Land Reform In Upland Thai Catchments.** 1997. Roger Attwater.
70. **Building Linkages for Livelihood Security in Chivi, Zimbabwe.** 1997. Simon Croxton and Kudakwashe Murwira.
71. **Propelling Change from the Bottom-Up: Institutional Reform in Zimbabwe.** 1997. J. Hagmann, E. Chuma, M. Connolly and K. Murwira.
72. **Gender is not a Sensitive Issue: Institutionalising a Gender-Oriented Participatory Approach in Siavonga, Zambia.** 1997. Christiane Frischmuth.
73. **A Hidden Threat to Food Production: Air Pollution and Agriculture in the Developing World.** 1997. F. Marshall, Mike Ashmore and Fiona Hinchcliffe.
74. **Policy Research and the Policy Process: Do the Twain ever Meet?** 1998. James L. Garrett and Yassir Islam.
75. **Lessons for the Large-Scale Application of Process Approaches from Sri Lanka.** 1998. Richard Bond.
76. **Malthus Revisited: People, Population and the Village Commons in Colombia.** 1998. Juan Camilo Cardenas.
77. **Bridging the Divide: Rural-Urban Interactions and Livelihood Strategies.** 1998. Cecilia Tacoli.
78. **Beyond the Farmer Field School: IPM and Empowerment in Indonesia.** 1998. Peter A. C. Ooi.
79. **The Rocky Road Towards Sustainable Livelihoods: Land Reform in Free State, South Africa.** 1998. James Carnegie, Mathilda Roos, Mncedisi Madolo, Challa Moahloli and Joanne Abbot.
80. **Community-based Conservation: Experiences from Zanzibar.** 1998. Andrew Williams, Thabit S. Masoud and Wahira J. Othman.
81. **Participatory Watershed Research and Management: Where the Shadow Falls.** 1998. Robert E. Rhoades.
82. **Thirty Cabbages: Greening the Agricultural 'Life Science' Industry.** 1998. William T. Vorley.
83. **Dimensions of Participation in Evaluation: Experiences from Zimbabwe and the Sudan.** 1999. Joanne Harnmeijer, Ann Waters-Bayer and Wolfgang Bayer.
84. **Mad Cows and Bad Berries.** 1999. David Waltner-Toews.
85. **Sharing the Last Drop: Water Scarcity, Irrigation and Gendered Poverty Eradication.** 1999. Barbara van Koppen.
86. **IPM and the Citrus Industry in South Africa.** 1999. Penny Urquhart.
87. **Making Water Management Everybody's Business: Water Harvesting and Rural Development in India.** 1999. Anil Agarwal and Sunita Narain.
88. **Sustaining the Multiple Functions of Agricultural Biodiversity.** 1999. Michel Pimbert.
89. **Demystifying Facilitation in Participatory Development.** 2000. Annemarie Groot and Marleen Maarleveld.
90. **Woodlots, Woodfuel and Wildlife: Lessons from Queen Elizabeth National Park, Uganda.** 2000. Tom Blomley.
91. **Borders, Rules and Governance: Mapping to catalyse changes in policy and management.** 2000. Janis B. Alcorn.
92. **Women's Participation in Watershed Development in India.** 2000. Janet Seeley, Meenakshi Batra and Madhu Sarin.
93. **A Study of Biopesticides and Biofertilisers in Haryana, India.** 2000. Ghayur Alam.
94. **Poverty and Systems Research in the Drylands.** 2000. Michael Mortimore, Bill Adams and Frances Harris.
95. **Forest Management and Democracy in East and Southern Africa: Lessons From Tanzania.** 2001. Liz Alden Wily.
96. **Farmer Learning and the International Research Centres: Lessons from IRRI.** 2001. Stephen Morin, Florencia Palis, Karen McAllister, Aida Papag, and Melina Magsumbol.
97. **Who Benefits From Participatory Watershed Development? Lessons From Gujarat, India.** 2001. Amita Shah.
98. **Learning Our Way Ahead: Navigating Institutional Change and Agricultural Decentralisation.** 2001. Clive Lightfoot, Ricardo Ramírez, Annemarie Groot, Reg Noble, Carine Alders, Francis Shao, Dan Kisauzi and Isaac Bekalo.
99. **Social Forestry versus Social Reality: Patronage and community-based forestry in Bangladesh.** 2001. Niaz Ahmed Khan.
100. **Global Restructuring, Agri-Food Systems and Livelihoods.** 2001. Michel P. Pimbert, John Thompson and William T. Vorley with Tom Fox, Nazneen Kanji and Cecilia Tacoli.
101. **Social Networks and the Dynamics of Soil and Water Conservation in the Sahel.** 2001. Valentina Mazzucato, David Niemeijer, Leo Stroosnijder and Niels Röling.
102. **Measuring Farmers' Agroecological Resistance to Hurricane Mitch in Central America.** 2001. Eric Holt-Giménez.
103. **Beyond Safe Use: Challenging the International Pesticide Industry's Hazard Reduction Strategy.** 2001. Douglas L. Murray and Peter L. Taylor.
104. **Marketing Forest Environmental Services – Who Benefits?** 2002. Natasha Landell-Mills.
105. **Food Security in the Context of Crisis and Conflict: Beyond Continuum Thinking.** 2002. Benedikt Korf and Eberhard Bauer.
106. **Should Africa Protect Its Farmers to Revitalise Its Economy?** 2002. Niek Koning.
107. **Creating Markets with the Poor: Selling Treadle Pumps in India** 2003. Frank van Steenbergen.
108. **Collaborative Forest Management in Kyrgyzstan: Moving from top-down to bottom-up decision-making.** 2003. Jane Carter, Brieke Steenhof, Esther Haldimann and Nurlan Akenshaev.
109. **The Contradictions of Clean: Supermarket Ethical Trade and African Horticulture.** 2003. Susanne Freidberg.

SUBMITTING PAPERS TO THE GATEKEEPER SERIES

We welcome contributions to the *Gatekeeper* Series from researchers and practitioners alike. The Series addresses issues of interest to policy makers relating to the broad area of sustainable agriculture and resource management. *Gatekeepers* aim to provide an informed briefing on key policy issues in a readable, digestible form for an institutional and individual readership largely comprising policy and decision-makers within aid agencies, national governments, NGOs and research institutes throughout the world. In addition to this primary audience, *Gatekeepers* are increasingly requested by educators in tertiary education institutions, particularly in the South, for use as course or seminar discussion material.

Submitted material must be of interest to a wide audience and may combine an examination of broad policy questions with the presentation of specific case studies. The paper should conclude with a discussion of the policy implications of the work presented.

Style

Gatekeepers must be short, easy to read and make simple, concise points.

- Use short sentences and paragraphs.
- Keep language simple.
- Use the active voice.
- Use a variety of presentation approaches (text, tables, boxes, figures/illustrations, bullet points).
- Length: maximum 5,000 words

Abstract

Authors should also include a brief summary of their paper – no longer than 450 words.

Editorial process

Please send two hard copies of your paper. Papers are reviewed by the editorial committee and comments sent back to authors. Authors may be requested to make changes to papers accepted for publication. Any subsequent editorial amendments will be undertaken in consultation with the author. Assistance with editing and language can be provided where appropriate. All illustrations and graphs, etc. should be supplied separately in their original format (e.g. as jpeg files) as well as being embedded within documents. This will allow us to modify the images where necessary and ensure good reproduction of the illustrations in print.

Papers or correspondence should be addressed to:
Gatekeeper Editor
Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods Programme
IIED, 3 Endsleigh Street,
London WC1H ODD,
UK
Tel:(+44 020) 7388 2117;
Fax: (+44 020) 7388 2826;
e-mail: sustag@iied.org

International
Institute for
Environment and
Development
Natural Resources Group
and Sustainable Agriculture
and Rural Livelihoods
Programme

THE NATURAL RESOURCES GROUP (NR Group) at IIED was set up as a way to bring together the work on natural resources being done by different parts of the institute, and to serve as a fertile ground for going beyond departmental or sectoral boundaries on these issues. The NR group comprises the following programmes at IIED: Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods; Forestry and Land Use; Biodiversity and Livelihoods; Climate Change; Strategies, Planning and Assessment; and Drylands. The NR Group works on a gamut of natural resources issues, including water, assessment of natural resources, co-management, international conventions, and urban issues. The Group seeks to explore the development of socially and environmentally aware natural resources management through policy research, training and capacity strengthening, networking and information dissemination, and advisory services.

The **SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE AND RURAL LIVELIHOODS PROGRAMME** coordinates the editorial process for the Series. The Programme seeks to enhance and promote understanding of environmental health and equity in agriculture and food systems. It emphasises close collaboration and consultation with a wide range of institutions in the South. Collaborative research projects are aimed at identifying the constraints and potentials of the livelihood strategies of the Third World poor who are affected by ecological, economic and social change. These initiatives focus on the development and application of participatory approaches to research and development; resource conserving technologies and practices; collective approaches to resource management; the value of wild foods and resources; rural-urban interactions; and policies and institutions that work for sustainable agriculture.

The NR group receives funding from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency.

International Institute for Environment and Development
3 Endsleigh Street London WC1H 0DD
Tel: (+44 020) 7388 2117
Fax: (+44 020) 7388 2826
E-mail: sustag@iied.org
Website: http://www.iied.org/

March 2003
Design by Andy Smith
Printed by Russell Press, Nottingham, UK

ISSN 1357-9258