Sustainable livelihoods

Ashok Khosla

The modern economy would appear to be creating a world where cheap machines produce ever-cheaper products for other cheap machines to use. As a consequence, human beings have less and less to do. It is common to see more and more automation in the face of more unemployed people – followed by more and more products chasing less and less purchasing power. Today’s labour saving technologies and mechanistic economic structures can only lead to growing supply and stagnant demand – until, of course, we reach the catastrophic environmental transition when supplies collapse altogether and both human populations and their demands collapse with them.

Ever increasing consumption and ever more “efficient” production systems also spell ever greater demands on the resources of nature. Under particular threat from this run-away consumption are those that are non-renewable or capable of being lost irreversibly – like minerals, life-support systems or biodiversity. Rapid growth of population, largely associated with poverty, has its own impacts on natural resources, particularly those that are classified as renewable, such as forests, rivers and soils. Extremes of affluence and poverty inevitably lead not only to economic and social breakdown but also to ecological and biospheric catastrophe.

The economies of the world are not entirely without achievement. The lives of some people, in almost every country, and in many different ways, are better than they have ever been in history. Unfortunately, the lives of many more are much worse. Either way, human welfare, whether at the level of the individual, the household or the community, does not appear to be improving much overall in the world.

The economic and political theories on which our current systems of production and distribution rest just do not work. Unfortunately, the assumptions underlying neo-classical economics and the machinery of the modern marketplace that they naturally lead to are not sufficiently solid to support the common platforms of human values on which societies must stand to benefit collectively and equitably. Growth, they have claimed, must come first, even at the expense of distributive injustice and human misery. Efficiency above equity; machines over people; the rich before the poor.

But the global economy, which is based on these assumptions, is in a mess. And getting messier. No fine tuning of the neo-classical doctrines, no more of the same medicines that, after all, are causing the problems in the first place can get us out of it. When the social, environmental and natural resource costs of the past century’s experiments with “modernisation” are all counted, it will become obvious that the current form of “development” is not sustainable.

The widespread social and economic ills of today are just the early symptoms of a terminal disease that human society can avoid not by a change of dosage or even a change of the medication, but by a fundamental change to an altogether different system of social (and economic) medicine.

Sustainable livelihoods

The central issue facing society, North and South, East or West, is the need to create sustainable livelihoods – large numbers of sustainable livelihoods.
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Letter from the Chair

Dear Colleagues,

I wish to start by welcoming Pascal Girot as the new CEESP representative in Central America. Pascal has worked with IUCN on a range of issues, including land-use planning, and co-management of protected areas. He is a geographer by training, a member of the CMWG, and fluent in all three IUCN languages (!) – English, French, and Spanish. Indeed, he has translated several IUCN documents. Already, under his leadership, CEESP-Mesoamerica has co-sponsored (with the IUCN regional office) the regional policy network meeting for Mesoamerica, on July 6, 1999.

The Mesoamerica meeting is one of the initiatives taken in response to advice provided by IUCN senior staff at the brainstorming meeting of March 19 1999. The meeting discussed the integration of the social science agenda into the work of the Union. Participants at the meeting were supportive of the idea of a workshop on social and economic policy for conservation, but felt that it needed to be developed in consultation with the regions. We are trying to identify possible regional events in which CEESP experts would make one or more presentations on themes of interest to the region. Possible events include regional meetings in Asia (Colombo in October 1998, and Delhi in March 1999), Mesoamerica, and Southern Africa. Other possibilities are being explored.

A linked initiative is a project on environmental ethics proposed for funding to the IUCN Innovation Fund. The project will entail the circulation of two background papers (by Amalric-Marglin, and McNeely), and a questionnaire to IUCN staff and members, and oral presentations at up to three regional events. Its goal is to produce a paper on environmental ethics for the Amman Congress.

In a separate development, a conference entitled Beyond Governance is being organised in Murree (near Islamabad), Pakistan, on August 25-28, 1999. The conference will include leading historians and political scientists, as well as experts from the CEESP-Ring network, and IUCN staff and members. The goals and structure of the conference are described in more detail in the following pages.

CEESP has also been involved in support for the IUCN initiative on environment and security (E&S). A consultative meeting, organised at Harare by the IUCN Regional Office for Southern Africa, set out the broad goals of the initiative, and endorsed the idea of a CEESP Task Force on E&S to serve as its Advisory Body. The Task Force will form the beginning of a proper North-South network on E&S at the service of IUCN, and a team to conduct selected regional case studies. Mark Halle is co-ordinating this work on behalf of CEESP.

CEESP has also provided input for consideration by IUCN regional and country offices on the global initiative on Climate Change. The initiative is led by IUCN-US. The CEESP input was based on the deliberations of an expert meeting on climate change and sustainable development, held in Colombo, April 27-29, 1999, and co-organised by me in my capacity as a Co-ordinating Lead Author in the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The theme of the expert meeting, and of the advice provided to IUCN, is the centrality of sustainable development as the goal of climate action. We hope to follow the pattern established for commission-secretariat interaction in the environmental security initiative.

In a separate development, the CEESP web site has been designed and is ready to be launched as soon as a few administrative formalities are ironed out. In the meantime, you may wish to visit the site at its temporary address, www.sdpi.org/ceesp. Your comments and suggestions for improvement are most welcome.

Finally, let me say a few words about the theme of this issue, sustainable livelihoods (SL). As the accompanying papers illustrate, SL provides a theoretical framework for the integrated pursuit of ecological sustainability, social justice (and poverty eradication), and participation and empowerment – in other words, sustainable development. It asks, not what the poor lack, but what they possess – namely how they cope and adapt to unanticipated shocks. It recommends not how to correct deficiencies, but how to ensure that policy and science enhance coping capacities.

While the SL approach is often referred to in the context of local problems, its insights are most relevant for the global environmental crisis. The key is a shift in emphasis from deficiencies (income levels or environmental resources) towards vulnerability to unanticipated shocks. This shift is implicit in the traditional instruments used by IUCN programmes. These programmes seek not only to overcome deficiencies, but also to enhance capacity for coping and adaptation. They have sought to ensure that government policy (including trade policies, subsidies, use of market-based instruments) serve rather than undermine sustainable development. The term “crisis” refers not merely to the loss of natural capital but to the increase in uncertainty and vulnerability. It refers to the fact that the unique situation of the poor may well be the fate of the entire human community tomorrow.

In other words, SL provides an insight of considerable value to the IUCN community, namely that while the traditional focus of our work is at the local level, its underlying framework and approach are just as relevant for the global or national problems as for the local ones.

Tariq Banuri
Sustainable livelihoods

Any simple solution proposed for a complex set of social and economic problems must inherently be suspect. Yet, if there is a One-Point agenda for sustainable development, it surely has to be the large scale introduction of sustainable livelihoods.

Sustainable livelihoods create goods and services that are widely needed in any community. They give dignity and self-esteem to the worker. They create purchasing power, and with it greater economic and social equity – especially for women and the under-privileged. And they do not destroy the environment.

In short, a sustainable livelihood is a remunerative, satisfying and meaningful job that enables each member of the community to help nurture and regenerate the resource base.

Sustainable livelihoods, and the human security they engender, underlie the one set of issues that is common to all nations and societies, at all stages of development. They provide a powerful synthesising, unifying concept that can bring the most disparate interests together to design more viable economic systems for the future in any country, rich or poor.

Neither today’s economic policies, nor our current technological choices are geared to promoting sustainable livelihoods. The capital cost of creating one workplace in the modern industrial sector in a country like India is well over $100,000 – often including a significant component of imported technology and equipment. (In Europe and North America it is more than one million dollars). At this rate, just the creation of the fifteen million jobs needed each year would by itself cost eight times the GNP of the country. It simply cannot be done.

Clearly, a better mix of large, small, mini and micro industries is now needed. Given the continued failure of policies to address the needs of the small, mini and micro sectors, a proper balance will require greatly enhanced encouragement and incentives to such industries. There are, of course, sectors for which the economies of scale favour large, mechanised production units. These probably include steel-making, oil-refining, petrochemicals and automobile manufacture. But there are many sectors where economies of scale are not relevant. Most industries producing basic goods for rural populations are commercially viable even at quite small scales. And because of the low capital requirements, they can have high returns on investment – in some cases even double those for their larger counterparts.

“Global competitiveness”, “comparative advantage”, “economies of scale”, “environmental externalities” and other such shibboleths, the ultimate being the “free” market – based on simplistic (and entirely unrealistic) assumptions – are concepts of neo-classical economics that do not easily translate into the language of sustainability. In fact, they do not translate at all, since economists have been unable to recognise the issue of sustainability in the first place – presumably because it would complicate the mathematics of their elegant models.

The theories of global trade and comparative advantage have no meaning unless the full environmental and resource costs of transportation are included in factor and product prices. Till today, such costs have been ignored, as have the social and human benefits of widespread employment. To complicate these calculations, barriers to trade in various guises today (under such pretexts as human rights, child labour, low wages, lack of environmental standards) distort international transactions to an extent that was not envisaged even in Mr. Ricardo’s rich, original framework.

The economies of scale depend directly on the technological, organisational and infrastructural choices available to a production unit. It is easy to show that with a small change in any of these choices, the economies of scale can be quickly turned into diseconomies of scale. Recessions in some of the industrialised countries have forced many large corporations to learn this lesson the hard way, a process Japanese and American companies these days often refer to euphemistically as “downsizing”.

By definition, sustainable livelihoods bind people to their communities and to their land. Not only do they thus have a positive impact on health, fertility reduction, migration and other demographic behaviour, but they also permit a far more effective use of resources for the benefit of all.

But without improved productivity, better management and marketing systems, they can never lead to the quantum shifts in lifestyle that people everywhere now desire. For this, the large-scale success of sustainable livelihoods will depend on our ability to design:

• sustainable technologies
• sustainable enterprises
• sustainable economies
• sustainable institutions of governance

Sustainable technology

The poor have many basic needs – food, water, energy, shelter, clothing, transport, health care, education and productive employment. Above all, they need income and the means to satisfy their other basic needs in a manner best suited to them.

Almost all these needs have a close relationship with environmental values, and all have largely been left unmet by past development strategies. The cycle of poverty is made more vicious by the lack of access by the poor to financial capital, to raw materials, to technology that is appropriate to their needs and skills, and to infrastructure and institutional support systems.

With the evolution of societal perceptions, aspirations and conditions, and with recent developments in science, design, new materials and production processes, technological innovation is becoming increasingly important for
solving the problems of poverty. New products and technologies, many with significant, positive social and environmental spin-offs, are now possible for mass distribution as a result of the application of sophisticated scientific and technological knowledge.

Technology that serves the long-term goals of development is defined as “sustainable technology”.

Sustainable technology springs from endogenous creativity, in response to local needs and possibilities:

- It is relevant and ready for use by the common people, and aims to improve the quality of their lives directly;
- It derives maximum leverage from the local cultural environment by drawing upon the existing managerial and technical skills and providing the basis for extending them;
- It uses the physical potential of an area, and maintains harmony between people and nature.

Sustainable technology is the offspring of the marriage between modern science and traditional knowledge: a method, a process, a design, a device or a product which will open up new possibilities and potentials for improving the quality of life. It requires frameworks for innovation and delivery very different from those that exist today, either in the global economy or in the village. Throughout the Third World, there is an evident and pervasive need among both rural and urban poor for a whole variety of technologies ranging from cooking stoves and lamps to producer gas plants and windmills.

Why have these needs not led to a more widespread demand?

Moreover, tens if not hundreds of designs are available for each such technology, scattered in laboratories, workshops and archives throughout the world.

Why has the existing technical capacity not led to supply?

The answers to these two questions are complex, and interlinked. A combination of economic, social, political and cultural – not to mention scientific, technical and institutional factors have greatly inhibited the supply and demand for sustainable technology. They apply, in varying mixes, to all rural technologies. The more important among these factors are:

capital/operational costs; efficiency of the technology; evidence of improvement over traditional methods; ease of operation and ergonomic design; availability of spare parts and ancillaries; ease of repair and maintenance; problems of production adaptation to local conditions; existence of marketing organisations; availability of information promotion, training and extension services; management skills and social organisation; social, class, political and cultural attitudes.

Above all, the “appropriateness” of a technology must be measured by how well it satisfies the needs of the end client and with what success it takes advantage of the opportunities and constraints of the production and marketing processes. Contrary to past development understanding, sustainable technologies need to compete in the marketplace. To design technologies that can reconcile the conflicting requirements of the market, nature and people, requires systems for innovation and delivery comparable in sophistication with those of the most successful multinationals.

Governments, private sector and universities have shown little interest in the innovation of appropriate technologies. Most of the work in this area has been done by independent sector organisations. Development Alternatives, a member of IUCN and a close associate of CEESP, is one that has had some success with a wide range of technologies. Examples of Development Alternatives products include building materials, water pumping and water purification systems, recycling of waste materials, energy from renewable fuels and local infrastructure such as sanitation, communication and transportation.

Sustainable enterprises

Sustainable livelihoods using sustainable technologies will require sustainable enterprises. Sustainable enterprises produce goods and services that are needed to better the lives of the great majority of people, including those who have been left outside the mainstream economy. At the same time, being environment-friendly, they minimise waste, use renewables and residues and generally conserve resources.
To break out of the present poverty-pollution-population trap, we need to create new kinds of corporate institutions that integrate considerations not only of economic efficiency, but also of environmental soundness and social equity into business decisions. Neither the current policies for national development, nor the activities of the corporate sector are geared to achieving this kind of goal.

The way needed lies far outside the imagination of our planners and decision-makers. Much of it lies in small-scale, decentralised industries of a new kind. Such (mini or micro-) industries use good technology to raise productivity and local resources to make products and services that satisfy the needs of local people without destroying the environment. To be viable, they will need to evolve substantially modified market mechanisms that can take account of full-cost pricing and social impacts.

Traditionally, corporate response to social issues has largely been driven by fear – the fear of jail, of markets lost or of financial liability. This must change, and the broader social good has to be internalised in decision-making at a level no less than the bottom line of cash profit. To bring about this change, the sustainable enterprise will have to strike a radically new synthesis across sectors and institutions, either by redesigning itself or through partnerships with other entities that have complementary strengths.

Taking the complete cycle from biomass generation to end-product use, entire jobs can be created at costs of a few hundred dollars, the environment can be enriched at no cost at all, and the basic needs of whole communities can be met through the additional purchasing power created. The handmade, recycled paper unit of TARA demonstrates the possibilities in this direction. In comparison with a large-scale paper mill, the TARA unit has been able to show that the small paper enterprise has many environmental, social and even economic advantages:

- Cost of creating a workplace = 1/10
- Capital investment per Kg of paper = 1/3
- Energy consumption per Kg of paper = 1/4
- Water consumption per Kg of paper = 1/2

All that the small enterprise needs to beat the large corporation at its own game is better access than it has today to technology, finance (not necessarily cheaper finance), and marketing channels. The primary role of the public sector in facilitating these is to provide basic infrastructure for financing, communication and transportation.

The myth of the “economies of scale” that justifies the bulk of national investment going into urban infrastructure and institutions is as hollow as it is deeply embedded in a bankrupt theory of development economics.

The design and operation of rural enterprises is a complex, still unfamiliar business. They have to master the technology-environment-finance-marketing linkages, while keeping their overhead costs low. They must do this without access to highly qualified engineers, management specialists, marketing experts or to friendly bankers or market infrastructure, either for buying raw materials or for selling products.

An interesting solution to these seemingly insuperable obstacles lies in building franchised networks of small, private enterprises capable of growing and processing biomass to manufacture products for both the urban and local markets. To be successful, the franchise arrangement will have to provide high technological and marketing inputs and access to capital. Technology and Action for Rural Advancement (TARA), the commercial wing of Development Alternatives, actively franchises mini enterprises based on appropriate, sustainable technologies.

Sustainable economies
The possibility of improving equity, efficiency, ecological harmony and self-reliance – and thus of achieving sustainable development – rests on how quickly and effectively innovations can be introduced into the economy.

Given the size, spread and poverty of the rural population, which must now comprise the primary target of any effort aimed at sustainable development, it becomes immediately clear that any viable approach must be:

- highly replicable
- locally accessible
- self-financing
These criteria imply that the strategies of development must now turn many of the earlier paradigms upside down: technologies must be economically viable, institutions must be decentralised, and the environment’s capacity to supply resources must be conserved. To achieve these attributes, we will need whole sets of new concepts: participation, networks, appropriate technologies, the diseconomies of scale, environmental and social appraisal of projects, rapid resource surveys, corporate research and development, and non-governmental action.

Yet development of sorts has taken place in some parts of the world, and management approaches that have succeeded can yield valuable ideas which, appropriately generalised and adapted, can also be made to work in the rural business environment. Among these, the most important for effective organisation of rural technology efforts are:

- Organisation of innovation in high technology industries, such as the manufacturers of electronics components;
- The decentralisation of production and marketing through franchising, such as the fast food chains;
- The management of complex systems and projects, such as space programmes.

The urban markets of a developing country like India have so far provided highly attractive business opportunities to entrepreneurs and have prevented them from fully appreciating the possibilities offered by the rural areas. However, the huge and untapped potential for profits in lower income “peripheral” or village markets will soon necessitate and produce a more systematic corporate approach to generating both supply and demand through innovative technologies and marketing systems.

These initiatives will have to come from the non-government sector and, more widely, the “Independent Sector”, hopefully with direct encouragement and support from Government.

**Sustainable governance**

For development to be sustainable, people must acquire a sense of ownership and responsibility for their resources – economic, social and natural. And they must be able to oversee and correct the actions of their elected representatives on a continuous basis. Such a sense of ownership can in the long run come only from actual ownership – enshrined in institutions of local governance involving the entire adult population. Such bodies should collect revenue from local resources, decide on local priorities and authorise higher level institutions to co-ordinate activities that involve other jurisdictions or skills and knowledge not available at the local level. And for such citizen supervision to be effective, it needs certain basic prerequisites such as transparency, accurate information and the right to be consulted in all matters that affect the citizen.

In the minds of many people, democracy is synonymous with elections, held periodically at the national or state level. By themselves, however, elections are not sufficient—or even the most important—features of democratic systems. The success of Jeffersonian democracy lies largely in the existence of strong institutions of local governance, a hawk-eyed media and a flourishing civil society, all of which America has, painstakingly, built up and nurtured over the past two hundred years.

The institutions of the marketplace, which are both the products and the prime supports of this democracy, also underpin much of its success. But in their present, capitalist form, they are also the cause of its greatest failure—extraordinarily profligate and wasteful consumption patterns on the one hand, and the consequent, unprecedented inequity and poverty on the other, which now threaten the very survival of the planet.

As the work of People First, the advocacy wing of Development Alternatives, continues to show, a true democracy, of the type that can support sustainable development and generate sustainable livelihoods, is actually an inversion of today’s highly centralised, top-down systems of government. People First aims to bring about, in India, a bottom-up form of democracy that assigns the primary decision-making responsibility to the local community, that is, the entire adult population of a village or city neighbourhood. The local community will retain the portion of the tax money collected in its jurisdiction to implement these decisions. These bodies and the ones above them devolve successively upwards only those decisions and activities that cannot be handled at a given level of governance, together with the residual funds to implement these.

Ashok Khosla is the Director of Development Alternatives, and Chair of the CEESP South Asia Committee.
Land use and sustainable livelihoods: 
The example of Upland Vietnam

Olivier Dubois and Elaine Morrison

Land resources play a key role in rural livelihoods. This article illustrates the links between land and forest resources and sustainable livelihoods in the specific case of upland Vietnam.

Upland and midland areas constitute three quarters of Vietnam’s land area. Forest resources are concentrated in these areas, but have become impoverished over the last fifty years. During the 1990s, the spread of plantations has tended to offset the escalation in forest loss, but yields are very low and the diversity of natural forest is lost.

It is estimated that 85 per cent of these upland and midland areas are very poorly developed, with poor infrastructure, poor health care, relatively low levels of literacy and education, and poor information on improved technologies. The perceived (but declining) natural wealth of Vietnam’s uplands contrasts with the poverty of many of its inhabitants: about one third of the population inhabits upland areas, and the majority of those are poor and suffer food insecurity. Whilst there is little outright starvation, such food shortages contribute to the malnutrition that afflicts an estimated 40 to 45 per cent of children under 5 years of age in the uplands. Thus food production is a driving force in farmer decision-making.

Government attempts to improve upland livelihoods

Vietnam’s forest sector is currently undergoing a transition to “people’s forestry”, with the multiple objectives of regreening the hills, alleviating poverty and developing the upland economy. This transition involves the transference of management authority for forest lands from the State to the household unit. Of various attempts by the Government of Vietnam to reduce forest loss and enhance livelihoods, allocation and contracting of land to households represents the most ambitious and radical. Forest land without tree cover is allocated to people using land use certificates, whilst forest land with tree cover is contracted to people for protection via State Forest Enterprises.

So far, the outcome of people’s forestry has been disappointing. Less than 5 per cent of the total forest land has been allocated to households, and less than 2 per cent of the households in the uplands have received forest land. Of the land allocated, only 20 to 30 per cent has been developed by farmers according to agreed land-use plans.

Hence not only has “people’s forestry” failed to achieve its objectives, but land-use following allocation is not found to be sustainable. Despite some encouraging achievements such as better protection of selected forest areas, benefits to the environment are slow to result, whilst poverty and food insecurity remain. Allocation of forest land is time-consuming, expensive and complex. Despite frequent adaptation of land-use legislation, it is not clear whether the Government of Vietnam has the capacity to implement its policies or the resources to sustain the process financially and in a cost-effective manner.

However, there appears to be great potential for the process to become a useful means of fostering improved land-use and, as an economy in transition, the Government is clearly willing to learn from experience elsewhere. Vietnam is introducing a market economy which is progressing rapidly in some sectors. But concerning upland natural resources, it is progressing cautiously out of fear that further liberalisation will encourage increased and unsustainable exploitation – and thus loss of natural resources and further social inequity.

The main issues

Issues pertaining to livelihoods in upland Vietnam can be broadly grouped according to two land categories, each of which implies different decision-making processes:

- On forest land with trees, the decision is one of forest management, and thus involves other stakeholders besides farmers.

The main issues relating to land and livelihoods in upland Vietnam are summarised in Table 1. They revolve around the following questions:

Technical matters:
How to shift from sectoral to more holistic approaches in a cost-effective way?

Economics/ Markets:
How to make the market work (incentives) without risking overuse and more inequity?

Institutions:
What roles for the State, the private sector and civil society?

What institutions should be in charge after the shift from an ineffective state command-control system, to reduce the risk of unsustainable use and increased inequity?

Relationships:
How may confidence between the State, State Enterprises and local communities be restored and improved?

This article is based on the following paper, available from IIED:

Table 1: Key land-use issues affecting livelihoods in upland Vietnam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Type of Issue</th>
<th>Land-Use Planning/ Land Allocation as a basis for land development</th>
<th>Land development aiming at sustainable livelihoods and sound environmental management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land without trees / fallow land – farmer’s decisions</td>
<td>Land with trees – forest management decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Tendency for land-use planning to be seen as one-off exercise rather than as an adaptive long-term process</td>
<td>How to move from a top-down approach to co-production of improved farming techniques</td>
<td>How to move from forest protection and plantations to forest management, including natural regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down approach fails to recognise current land uses as an indication of local people’s needs</td>
<td>Need for priority to be given to food security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic/Market</td>
<td>Few incentives for farmers to apply for allocation, given lack of clarity on user rights and benefits</td>
<td>Support for land development has increased in global terms but lacks cost effectiveness</td>
<td>Existing mechanisms to finance local forestry bodies do not go beyond forest protection and plantations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How to move from subsidies to market-based incentives</td>
<td>Consider what are incentives for sustainable forest management by farmers and/ or communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need for promotion of off-farm activities</td>
<td>What are the comparative advantages of individual exploitation versus protection of forest resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need for access to fairer credit than that of middlemen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions/Governance</td>
<td>Lack of negotiation in land-use planning prior to land allocation</td>
<td>Need for mechanism that complements the current government-led – but not very cost-effective – assistance to farmers</td>
<td>Unclear user rights regarding land allocated for protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing loopholes in official procedures favour corruption</td>
<td>Unclear roles for the State, private operators and farmers under these new arrangements</td>
<td>Current functions of State Forest Enterprises are unclear: need to consider how to replace/complement them by more responsive supporting institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to consider how to develop opportunities for community forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Need for restoration and improvement of trust between the State, State enterprises and local communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need to move from a government-led towards a two-way communication flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 ‘Uplands’ are generally defined as the land above 600m. altitude, whilst the ‘midlands’ are between 300m. and 600m. altitude.
3 In Vietnam, legally defined forest land may or may not possess tree cover.
Sustainable livelihoods can be described as strategies by local communities to eke out a living through the direct exploitation of the natural resource base. Such strategies can also seek to reduce the risk and uncertainty brought about by the cumulative effects of various pressures acting on their daily lives. These can be in response to the whole range of pressures which include natural disasters such as droughts and floods, socio-economic forces such as increasing population pressures and macro-economic forces such as globalisation trends. The dynamics of livelihood strategies are affected by a number of variables. One such critical variable is land tenure. This paper attempts to explore the relationship between sustainable livelihood strategies and land tenure arrangements. The discourse is guided by experiences from southern Africa in particular. The discussion however is not meant to be exhaustive, but to highlight what the author visualises as key issues, as well as stimulating debate and the sharing of ideas on the theme of land tenure and sustainable livelihoods.

Lars-Erik (1993) described natural resources tenure as the terms and conditions on which natural resources are held and used. A tenure system is then seen as a functional relationship between individuals and groups of individuals in which rights and obligations with respect to control and use of land are defined and enforced. Such enforcement is often backed by a legal and institutional framework.

The predominant tenure systems in Southern Africa are private/freehold property, state property, communal property and the open access systems. The supremacy of freehold title has, to a large extent, remained unchallenged for the whole region of southern Africa. The sanctity of the concept of freehold property has been the major contributor to the slow implementation of land reforms in countries such as Zimbabwe. Yet land remains the chief source of earning a livelihood for the greater percentage of southern Africa’s population, both urban and rural. The lack of investment in the communal areas has often been attributed to lack of a secure title that can be used as collateral for raising funds from financial institutions to invest in these areas. The high prevalence of severe environmental problems which affect the communal areas has also been largely attributed to the failure of a communal tenure system. Such views and notions are, however, beginning to be challenged. The major question is: is it really the lack of titles that is eroding the land resource base and thereby negatively affecting the livelihood opportunities of rural populations?

It has already been noted that the notion of private property rights has been, and continues to be, viewed as “the ideal tenure system”. As a result land tenure arrangements have remained fixed and have not been adaptive to the increasing socio-economic demands. Private property has remained too “exclusive and insensitive” to the changing social environment of southern Africa. The same can be said of state property. This has negatively affected the livelihood opportunities available to rural communities. Munzer 1990 (as in Fourie 1998) has argued that the concept of ownership is not finite and should therefore change with history. The fact that private property suited the dictates of colonial regimes in southern Africa does not make them the best tenure arrangements in the post-independence period. The major question that one would want to pose is: why should private property rights be allowed to supersede both universally and in perpetuity the indigenous people’s traditional rights over land (Marongwe and Matowanyika 1998)? The practicality of having titles in the communal areas has been brought into question. Experiences from other countries, particularly Kenya, have indicated how land title registration can increase the insecurity and risk of the vulnerable groups of society. Katerere and Guvheya (1998) observed that emerging issues in environmental management such as water management, biological diversity and ecological diversity transcend individual property boundaries, a situation they describe as challenging the supremacy of individual rights to land and natural resource decision-making. The major issue, then, is one of developing an appropriate tenure arrangement that promotes sustainable livelihoods in the rural communities of southern Africa. Such a tenure arrangement needs to marry the aspects of private property and traditional (indigenous) tenure systems.

As a result of the rigidity of both private and state tenure systems as observed above, resource-sharing arrangements, particularly between the state and private property, on one hand, and the communal farmers, on the other, have not been exploited. This has compromised the livelihood opportunities available to the communal people. Flexible land tenure arrangements that seek to promote the sharing of resources between the various tenure systems need to be developed as one way of improving the livelihood opportunities available to the communal farmers. The point of emphasis is that
both the private and the state land tenure systems cannot continue to operate as closed systems which are completely exclusive if they are to survive for long. Some of the options that need to be considered include the following:

- Leasing of unused agricultural land for either crop production or grazing purposes by freehold large-scale farms;
- Dead-wood collection from both private and state land for use as firewood;
- Wild fruits collection from both state and private land,
- Direct exploitation of other forestry products. Examples include honey collection, harvesting of the mopani worm, cutting and collection of thatch grass, collection of mushrooms, and sustainable exploitation of wildlife and fish; and
- Collection of traditional medicines from state and private forests (Marongwe 1998).

Such initiatives will greatly enhance the livelihood opportunities of the rural communities. The modalities of implementing such activities will need to be carefully thought out. Critical issues that may need to be considered include:

- Development of constitutions and written agreements between the concerned parties;
- Stipulating and agreeing on rules and regulations that guide the exploitation of natural resources; and
- Developing incentives and disincentives that promote the sustainable utilisation of resources.

Lessons on how best to implement such strategies can be borrowed from experiences from other countries within and outside the region that have initiated related activities.

In most cases, access to land determines access to other key natural resources such as water, forests, wildlife and other biological resources. This has not largely been the case with mineral resources. For example in Zimbabwe, mineral resources belong to the state and any revenue (mining royalties) that accrues from mineral exploitation belongs to the state. The major question that has been posed is how far should land rights of individuals go? Should they extend to mineral rights over the land? In certain cases, local authorities in Zimbabwe are beginning to question the central government’s continued collection of mining royalties at their expense. As a way of improving the livelihood strategies of rural communities, one such strategy would be to promote the sharing of benefits between the state and local government structures so that the financial resources raised will be ploughed back directly into the community through various forms of community assistance. This goes hand in hand with the calls for greater decentralisation of most state functions.

In the context of southern Africa, the debate on land tenure and sustainable livelihoods needs to be discussed in relation to land reforms. The land question remains unsolved in almost all of the countries in the region. The problem of landlessness seems to be growing daily in most countries. There are also a number of processes that have contributed to and are leading to the displacement of rural populations. The denial of access to land for the landless effectively means denial of livelihood strategies. Land is central to all debates on sustainable livelihoods in southern Africa. The acceleration of land reforms then emerges as one clear strategy that will assist in enhancing the livelihood opportunities of rural communities. The major issue that still remains unresolved is the development of appropriate tenure systems that will promote sustainable utilisation of the land and management of the natural resources. One option that has been proposed to assist in the promotion of proper management of natural resources is the development of co-management arrangements between the state and the local level institutions. This comes as a result of the growing realisation of the importance of community participation in natural resources management and the overwhelming evidence of state failure in the management of these resources.

Katerere and Guvheya (1998) noted that southern Africa is characterised by polarised land property rights and differential access to other key productive resources such as finance and technology. This has its roots in the colonial history of the region. The resultant tenure arrangements have often been seen as the principal cause of conflicts in individual countries. Such conflicts have seriously eroded the ability of communities to engage in a wide range of survival strategies. Putting in place effective conflict resolution mechanisms becomes a relevant intervention. Land debates have also tended to revolve around tenure debates, much to the neglect of other wide ranging issues (Moyo 1995, Marongwe and Matowanyika 1998). These issues need to be addressed if the survival strategies of local communities are going to be improved.
The notion of group rights is one option that is being considered in some individual countries in the region. It is a direct initiative meant to revive traditional and community-based resource management practices. Growing and competing demands over land and other key resources such as water suggest that community-based approaches and land tenure arrangements that promote group rights might be the best way forward. Marongwe and Matowanyika 1998 have noted that countries such as Zimbabwe, South Africa and Mozambique are presenting notions of group rights such as those of local communities, villages and farm labourers. South Africa provides some striking examples of the group rights notion in its land reform programmes. The sharing of experiences and scaling up of successful initiatives, thereby increasing people’s access to land is one way of promoting sustainable livelihoods.

Moyo et al 1998, in case study in Shamva District, Mashonaland East province in Zimbabwe, have observed a new form of relationship between a few large-scale commercial farms (freehold property) and some communal and resettlement farmers in the district. This relationship was in the form of contractual farming. Communal farmers were contracted to produce certain crops. Some large private enterprises were also noted to be engaged in this practice. In a fair environment where communal farmers are more enlightened about the market practices of their produce, such initiatives are bound to increase incomes available and their way of living. This is the kind of interaction that can be encouraged between the various land tenure arrangements in the region.

In conclusion, one can observe that southern Africa has been hit by a series of droughts over the recent past. This has caused severe stress on the rural communities (communal), given the fact that most of them were forcibly moved into marginal regions which are drought-prone areas. This reinforces the need for exploration of the various livelihood strategies that can be promoted so as to mitigate the effects of natural disasters such as drought. This article has spoken in favour of the need for greater interaction between freehold land-holders and the communal farmers. Such an initiative can be initiated on a voluntary basis by willing large-scale farmers. The approach has also the added advantage of seeking to promote peaceful co-existence between private land-holders and communal farmers. This helps in distilling some of the natural hatred and distrust between the two types of farming arrangements that have been built and nourished by the past colonial policies. The situation as it is, remains both socially and politically unsustainable.

N. Marongwe is Projects Officer, ZERO-Regional Environment Organisation
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The Sudano-Sahelian ecological zone of the African Continent stretches from Senegal and the Gambia on the Atlantic Coast in the west, to Ethiopia and Somalia in the Horn of Africa in the east. In Nigeria, areas north of latitude 12°N, suffer from varying degrees of desertification or land degradation. It has equally been observed that in view of the continuing southward extension of the desertification process, areas as far south as latitude 9°N are today equally seen to constitute an integral part of regions afflicted by desertification in the country (Okpara, 1997: 4).

It is estimated that about 40% of Nigeria’s population of more than 100 million people live in these areas affected by desertification and drought, which account for 52% of the country’s territory (UNDP, 1998: 10). This fact no doubt implies that about 40 million rural inhabitants of these degraded lands live in conditions of poverty.

The people’s basic needs for food in the right quantity and mix, and of the right quality are seldom met. Their lack of economic self-reliance equally militates against the provision of adequate shelter and clothing. This situation is exacerbated by a high fertility rate of 6.7 (FOS, 1990, p.7) and thus, a rapidly growing population and stagnating economy (Goliber, 1989, p.5).

About 28,000,000 or 70% of the inhabitants of Nigeria’s dry belt, derive their livelihoods from traditional agriculture, involving grains and root crops, which are usually grown during the 3-4 months rainy period on the one hand, and pastoralism, involving the rearing of cattle, sheep and goats, on the other hand. The livestock sector is unavoidably heavily influenced by climate, water resources, technology and lack of adequate rural infrastructure.

In the years of good rains, pastoralists increase the size of herd as a rational economic decision. When there is lack of rain which adversely affects pasture availability, there is over-grazing and ultimate reduction in number of herds to avoid loss. Some are sold for emergency cash. More often, they simply die and nomads lose their livelihood.

The traditional agricultural sector faces the challenge posed by continuously declining soil fertility. This constitutes a serious threat to the sustainability of food security. Thus, the overall pattern of occupational activity in Nigeria’s Sudano-Sahelian zone, which involves over-grazing, over-cropping, de-vegetation, cultivation of marginal lands, inadequate response to drought and the incidence of soil erosion, leads to varying degrees or magnitudes of land degradation or desertification. Poverty in Nigeria’s dry belt is therefore perceived as both a cause and an effect of desertification, which should be addressed in the context of appropriate institutional and policy frameworks for sustainable human development.

Policy issues

The global policy paradigm

Until the 1970s, the global perception of development among most people whose decisions affected the course of human development was in the context of economic indices, such as growth rate of the economy, the Gross National Product (GNP), the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), and per capita income. There was an implicit assumption that growth in these indices automatically translated into improvements in social well being and the quality of human life.

Whereas this may have been the case in most industrially developed countries, it was hardly evident in most developing countries. In the latter, it seems obvious that even today, economic growth has not correlated with human development in terms of improved quality of life (economic self-reliance, access to health facilities, transportation, potable water, recreation and availability of food, shelter, etc.)

This situation has necessitated the call in recent years for a people-centred development in the world’s drylands. Such a development must concern itself with, among other things, the achievement of sustainable food security in the decades ahead (Box 1).

The Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) and the desertification-poverty nexus

The CCD adopts a closely related developmental paradigm by highlighting the linkages between combating desertification and alleviating/eradicating poverty, by involving local populations in programmes/projects designed for the purpose. Hence, the objective of the CCD is to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought in countries susceptible to serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa. Achievement of this objective through long-term integrated strategies is assumed to have the potential of bringing about improved living conditions.

Thus, Article 4.2 (c) of the CCD requires the parties to the Convention, in pursuing its objectives, to integrate strategies for poverty eradication into efforts to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought. Similarly, the Convention in Articles 10.3(d), 10.4 and 19.1(h) recommends the incorporation of alternative livelihood projects in national policy frameworks for combating desertification and thus eradicating poverty and ensuring food security.

Most of the policy issues for eradicating poverty while combating desertification are highlighted as inevitable and integral aspects of the design and implementation of national action programmes (NAPs). National Action Programmes are perceived as the bedrock on which any effective and successful fight against desertification must rest. In addition to the policy
issues (deriving from the Convention) already outlined, others include:

- Sustainable management of natural resources;
- Sustainable agricultural practices;
- Development and efficient use of various energy sources;
- Institutional and legal frameworks;
- Strengthening of hydrological and meteorological services;
- Capacity building, education and public awareness;
- Application of indigenous knowledge, practices, know-how, beliefs, etc, for combating desertification; and
- Funding mechanism.

National policy on poverty alleviation in Nigeria’s dry belt

Nigeria has at no time in the past formulated a policy on poverty alleviation in the country’s drylands. However, various national development plans had at different times since independence in 1960 carried statements of Government’s intent to alleviate poverty nation-wide, without making a distinction among the socio-cultural and ecological zones of the country.

The third and fourth national development plans for the periods 1975-80 and 1980-85, for example, constituted the overall national policy frameworks for raising productivity in agriculture, and providing basic amenities such as water, medical services, schools, access roads and electricity.

The establishment of Agricultural Development Projects (ADPs) nationwide was perceived at one time by government as a strategy for actualising its rural development objectives (Umehali, 1988, p. 514). The project, among other features, involved the identification and mobilisation of farming families who were provided with basic farm inputs and other facilities at subsidised rates. Technical and management support, extension services, as well as complimentary credit facilities were also provided to farmers under the scheme, irrespective of the ecological zones in which they were located.

Some other ad hoc public policy measures aimed at the alleviation of rural poverty since the 1980s (with varying degrees of success), include the following:

- The establishment of a national Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI), for enhancing food security and improving the quality of rural life (Asiabaka and Onyiuuka, 1989, pp. 260-266);
- The launching of a programme on mass mobilisation for social justice;
- Economic self-reliance and economic recovery, code-named MAMSER (Umehali, op.cit. p.517);
- The Better Life for Rural Women programme, put in place in recognition of the marginal position accorded women in national socio-economic development. Launched in 1987 and co-ordinated by a National Committee, it was a women-specific programme for poverty reduction (Eboh, 1989, p.50), and was in accord with the argument that a successful attack on poverty can never be realised if women do not constitute a central element in the effort (Loutfi, 1983, p.8);
- The Family Support Programme which was launched in 1994 as a modified version of the Better Life for Rural Women Programme which was terminated about the end of 1993.

It is in the context of some of these national policy measures (particularly DFRRI and MAMSER), which pre-date the UNCCD, that a number of government-initiated and anti-desertification programmes/projects have been undertaken in Nigeria’s Sudano-Sahelian belt, without necessarily focusing on and giving prominence to poverty reduction. Many activities in this regard have been carried out under the auspices of the Drought and Desertification Control Units established in the various Ministries of Agriculture and Natural Resources of the eleven affected states of the Federation in the Sudano-Sahelian zone.

In this respect, projects have focused largely on the conservation of renewable natural resources. They have included seedling production for tree planting; shelter belt establishment; farm forestry; community and private woodlot establishment; roadside tree planting and establishment of plantations (cf. Okpara, 1995, p. 8).

Institutional issues and poverty alleviation

Indigenous or traditional knowledge systems and related sustainable livelihood activities in the study area have long constituted effective mechanisms and strategies used by populations affected by desertification to address the poverty syndrome. This is brought about by the application of indigenous knowledge to the production, exchange and consumption of a wide range of goods and services (both traded and non-traded), which enhance food security and alleviate poverty.

Such indigenous knowledge systems include, among others, the following:

- Storage of fodder/farm residue and household waste for feeding animals in the dry season;
- Use of cow dung/organic manure as farm inputs;
- Practice of agro-forestry;
- Adoption of zero tillage in the planting of such crops as millet, groundnuts and maize;
- Resort to strip cropping or cropping across slopes to check rapid water run-off and thus enhance the rate of soil water retention for ultimate utilisation by crops; and
- Inter-cropping cereals such as maize with nitrogen-fixing legumes such as pigeon pea and mucus for the improvement of soil fertility and the provision of fodder.

Sustainable livelihood activities which represent coping strategies against widespread poverty may be divided into two broad categories, made up of:
• Activities having direct bearing on and linkages to the agrarian sector. Such activities either yield primary agricultural products or add value to such products in consequence of secondary processing, or constitute tertiary service support to the agricultural sub-sector. The major activities include crop-farming; agricultural input supply; primary products processing; manufacture and repair of farm tools; vegetable gardening, etc.

• Activities that are independent of the agricultural sector. These include repair services (shoe, wrist watch, bicycle etc); metal/iron works; brick and block making; craft work; street trading; practice of traditional medicine; scavenging from refuse dumps; etc. Bee-keeping has also been identified as having tremendous potential for alleviating poverty.

The collection and sale of products of the doum palm (Hyphaene thebaica) also represents an important poverty-alleviating enterprise in northern Yobe State in the study area. Processed and unprocessed products of this natural resource, including mats, fans, brooms, ropes etc., are traded both locally and internationally. For Adiani village in Yobe State, the annual market value of mats woven from doum palm fronds has been estimated at close to N6,000,000 (US$73,000) (Adaya et al, 1997).

The traditional knowledge systems and sustainable livelihood activities so far outlined have developed and taken root in the context of the socio-cultural and economic institutions of the study area. It has been through such institutions that indigenous knowledge systems and sustainable livelihood activities have acquired their inter-generational relevance. Prominent structures or institutions in this regard include:

• The family, whose members may possess specialised knowledge or skills, which may be handed down from generation to generation;

• The village administrative set-up which ensures a system of governance at the local level that is stable enough to create an enabling environment for indigenous knowledge and sustainable livelihood activities to flourish;

• Occupational associations such as the Miyetti Allah (Fulani for "I thank God" and Alhaya Shuwa (Arabic for "life"). These are pastoralist organisations who encourage among fellow pastoralists, the maintenance of good relationships with their farmer counterparts. This minimises the incidence of farmer-pastoralist conflicts that lead to the destruction of crops and livestock;

• Local credit or thrift associations that help to finance small-scale investments in sustainable livelihood activities, thus facilitating the reduction of poverty; and

• Non-governmental organisations (NGOs), some of whom have programmes and projects at the grassroots level to empower the people to become economically self-reliant.

Conclusion
The United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) is both a multilateral environment agreement (MEA) and a framework for addressing a number of socio-economic problems which have afflicted areas prone to desertification over a number of decades. One of the most critical of these problems has been identified as widespread poverty.

The UNCCD therefore requires Parties to the Convention (particularly developing countries) to integrate strategies for combating desertification. In order to achieve desired results in this direction, such action programmes should accord appropriate space to sustainable livelihood activities. They should be seen as an indispensable mechanism for alleviating poverty in areas affected by desertification.

Enoch Okpara is part of the Nigerian Environmental Study/Action Team (NEST), Ibadan, Nigeria.
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The interactions and linkages between city and countryside are increasingly recognised as central factors in processes of social, economic and cultural change. Despite this, most development theory and practice is implicitly based on a dichotomous view of urban and rural areas, populations and activities. This is reflected in the prevailing division of policies along spatial and sectoral lines: urban planners usually concentrate on urban nodes, with little attention to agricultural and rural-led development, while rural development planners define rural areas as consisting only of villages and agricultural land and exclude urban centres from this landscape.

However, this does not reflect the reality of households’ livelihoods, which often include both rural and urban elements. In both cities and countryside, a significant proportion of households rely on the combination of agricultural and non-agricultural income sources, often involving the migration of one or several members over varying periods of time, or commuting between built-up and peri-urban areas. In addition, many urban enterprises rely on demand from rural consumers, and access to urban markets and services is crucial for most agricultural producers.

Interactions between urban centres and their surrounding regions

The areas surrounding cities have been attracting increasing attention in recent years. Sometimes defined as “peri-urban areas”, they are described as the transition zone between fully urbanised land in cities and areas in predominantly agricultural use. Although the interactions between cities and countryside are by no means restricted to the areas immediately surrounding cities, this is where the process is most intense. These areas are characterised by changes in land use and farming systems, changing patterns of labour force participation, social change, changing demands for infrastructure, and pressure on natural resource systems to absorb urban-generated waste (Rakodi, 1998).

Spatial policies of regional development have repeatedly attempted to build on the interactions between rural and urban areas. The positive view of the “virtuous circle” of rural-urban development underlies most of the different models of regional development (such as “growth centres” policies in the 1960s, integrated rural development programmes and the “urban functions in rural development” approach in the 1970s, and more recently the “rural-urban linkages” market-based development strategies). The “virtuous circle” model emphasises efficient economic linkages and physical infrastructure connecting farmers and other rural producers with both domestic and external markets. This involves three phases:

1. Rural households earn higher incomes from production of agricultural goods for non-local markets, and increase their demand for consumer goods;
2. This leads to the creation of non-farm jobs and employment diversification, especially in small towns close to agricultural production areas;
3. This in turn absorbs surplus rural labour, raises demand for agricultural produce and again boosts agricultural productivity and rural incomes (Evans, 1990; UNDP/UNCHS, 1995).

Box 1. Market access and control in Senegal’s charcoal trade

In Senegal, forests are officially owned by the state and managed by the Forest Service, which allocates commercial rights to urban-based merchants through licences, permits and quotas. Village chiefs control direct forest access, ultimately deciding whether to allow merchants’ woodcutters into the forests. Despite their control, villagers reap only a small portion of the profits from commercial forestry. More substantial benefits accrue to merchants and wholesalers who, through their social relations, control access to forestry markets, labour opportunities and urban distribution, as well as access to state agents and officials. Local control and management of natural resources is therefore weakened because of the lack of economic incentives (Ribot, 1998).

However, the assumption that proximity to markets and availability of infrastructure would benefit all farmers has proved to be misguided. In Paraguay, for instance, smallholders within the area of influence of the capital Asunción do not seem to benefit from their proximity to urban markets. This is because their low incomes make it difficult to invest in cash crops such as pineapples and tomatoes, let alone compensate for their lack of land through intensification of production (Zoomers and Kleipenning, 1996). Patterns of attendance at periodic markets in Mexico also show that distance is much less important than rural consumers’ income and purchasing power in determining demand for manufactured goods, inputs and services (Morris, 1997). Indeed, there are few examples of “virtuous circles” of rural-urban development. The important role of specific factors, ranging from a relatively equitable landownership distribution to high-revenue crops, infrastructure and location, means that the possibilities of supporting “virtuous circles” are obviously limited if these are among the necessary conditions for such circles to develop.

In addition, markets are better described as social institutions rather than perfectly competitive realms of impersonal economic exchange. More complex conceptualisations of markets show that in most cases some actors are able to enforce mechanisms of control which favour access for specific groups and exclude others (see Box 1). In South Asia, for example, grain markets tend to be dominated by large local merchants who control access to the means of distribution (transport, sites, capital, credit and information). Even in the petty retail subsector, gen-
der and caste act as major entry barriers (Harriss-White, 1995).

Another aspect which characterises these peri-urban areas is intense competition and sometimes conflict around land control, as land markets and land uses become increasingly influenced by real-estate developments. In some rural areas, intensive land development, subdivision and sale may be taking place although with little building construction, as many urban households make speculative purchases in anticipation of increases in land value, because of the expanding city. This type of land conversion, from agricultural to urban-industrial use, including residential or leisure use (for example golf courses) is often the cause of conflict between rural and urban sectors, and is associated with processes of negotiation between urban and rural actors at the national and municipal levels.

Increasingly, intense competition for land in both urban and peri-urban areas can also be at the origin of changes in “sectoral” interactions, such as urban agriculture. Its growth since the late 1970s was largely understood as a response to escalating urban poverty and to rising food process or shortages, which in turn were exacerbated by the implementation of structural adjustment policies in the 1980s (Drakakis-Smith, 1992; Lee-Smith et al., 1987). However, while it is often assumed that the poor account for the majority of urban farmers and that they engage in this activity essentially on a subsistence basis, recent empirical evidence suggests that this is not necessarily the case. Some studies have shown that high and middle-income households constitute a significant and growing proportion of urban farmers, who often engage in this activity for commercial purposes. Consequently, in several cases the poorest groups (often including newly arrived migrants) are excluded from access to land as a result of both formal and informal gate-keeping processes in the city (Mllozi, 1995; Mlozi et al., 1992). At the same time, as better-off strata increasingly dominate urban farming through privileged access to urban and peri-urban land, they may hire waged agricultural labour, thus contributing to significant changes in the urban labour force (Bryceson, 1996).

Migration

Although little is known about the scale and nature of internal migration, it is usually seen as a significant contributing factor to uncontrolled growth and the related management problems of many large cities in the South. This has often resulted in policies aiming to control or discourage movement. Many countries have sought to make cities relatively inhospitable, for example by bulldozing informal low-income settlements or making it difficult for new migrants to secure property rights to land or access to public services. These measures have generally little impact aside from lowering welfare, especially for the poor. Since urban-to-rural migration is fastest where economic growth is highest – as migrants tend to move to places where they are likely to find employment opportunities – it is not really as problematic as it is often made out to be (UNCHS, 1996). For instance, secondary urban centres, especially in Latin America, have recently attracted new investment and industries which would have previously been directed to large cities and, as a consequence, their role as migration destinations has also increased.
Changes in migration types and direction

“Push-pull” models of migration inherently assume that migration’s direction is essentially from rural to urban areas, with the income gap between the two as an important explanatory factor. However, recent research in sub-Saharan Africa has pointed out that, since the mid-1970s, economic decline has greatly reduced the gap between real urban incomes and real rural incomes in the region (Jamal and Weeks, 1988). It thus appears that the rate of urban growth in some African cities has slowed significantly, and that there are new forms of “return” migration, from the urban to the rural areas (Potts, 1995). Following the implementation of structural adjustment programmes and economic reform, it is thought that a number of retrenched formal sector urban workers may engage in urban-rural migration and return to “home” areas where the cost of living is lower. Although little research has been conducted on return migration, it is likely to have a significant impact on destination areas as returnees may compete with the local population for scarce resources while at the same time possibly facilitating the introduction of innovations, both technological and socio-cultural.

In many cases, urban-to-rural migration is an ongoing movement involving the urban population with the least assets on a temporary or seasonal basis. For instance, in Colombia, much of the temporary agricultural workforce employed during the harvest is urban-based. During that relatively short period of the year, these workers, who usually have only daily-term contracts, tend to stay on the farm over the week and return home for the weekend. Seasonal agricultural employment is usually combined with jobs in the urban informal sector, and urban residence is preferred because of the availability of services such as children’s education and medical services (Hataya, 1992). Urban-to-rural temporary migration is one important aspect of the complex web of relationships linking urban centres with their surrounding regions, and which can be a crucial resource for both the urban and the rural poor (see Box 2).

Linkages between urban-based and rural-based household members

Since the 1980s, a growing body of empirical research has pointed out that migration involves more than just the individual who moves, and that migrants are enmeshed in a web of social and economic relationships that influence decisions to move. The domestic unit is one fundamental structure which embodies such relationships. The household strategies approach to migration therefore attempts to link the micro (individual) level with the macro (structural) level by focusing on the household as the unit of analysis. In it, the domestic unit is defined as a social institution which organises resources (land, capital, labour and so on) and recruits and allocates labour in a combination of productive and reproductive tasks (Wallerstein and Smith, 1991). In response to economic stress, households adopt a variety of compensatory measures, including intensification of production, redistribution of available food, changes in fertility and modification of the unit’s structure. Migration, either of some members or of the whole unit, is an important element of household strategies (Wood, 1982).

For example, remittances from urban-based members can be an important source of income for the rural-based members, who in turn may look after migrants’ children and property. These linkages can be crucial in the livelihoods of the poor, but are not usually taken into account by policy-makers (see Box 3).

Accounting for these strong ties between rural- and urban-based household members also increases the understanding of the impact of economic reform programmes on the poor. For example, in Zimbabwe the outcomes of the Economic Structural Adjustment Policy (ESAP) have been more acutely felt in the city than in the countryside. However, rural populations have also suffered from increases in the prices of basic commodities and in public service fees. Retrenchment and increasing poverty in the cities affect rural households as well, as remittances decline and migrants return to their rural homes, increasing the burden there. Due to the economic interdependence between city and countryside, and to the strength of the ties between members of multispatial households, the impact of structural adjustment is not clearly geographically defined, but increases hardship in both locations (Potts with Mutambirwa, 1998).

Gender, generation and rural-urban linkages

Complexity in migration direction and type is matched by that in the composition of the flows, which in turn reflects wider socio-economic dynamics. Although regional variations can be

---

**Box 2. “Interlocking livelihoods”: farm and town employment opportunities in Zimbabwe**

The town of Banket, in Zimbabwe, is surrounded by commercial farms to which it is linked by complex two-way interactions. The hinterlands are an important source of livelihood for the urban low-income population which is predominantly employed in the informal sector. Farms provide supplies such as foodstuffs, firewood and construction materials, often obtained illegally, which are then resold in town at more than double the cost price. Some products are also sold to other rural areas by urban-based members who can be an important resource for both the urban and rural-urban linkages.

Their importance can be measured in terms of their contribution to household incomes, which originate from urban employment. Income from household members working in the town and their earnings from remittances can be crucial for the household’s capacity to meet its consumption needs. In response to economic stress, households adopt a variety of measures, including intensification of production, redistribution of available food, changes in fertility and modification of the unit’s structure. Migration, either of some members or of the whole unit, is an important element of household strategies (Wood, 1982).
important, the number of migrant women has increased in many countries in the South.

In many contexts, socio-cultural expectations of gender imply that women are more likely to feel responsible for the well-being of other household members. For example, in the Philippines parents may encourage their daughters to migrate, as they are seen as more likely to abide to parental authority and less likely to spend money on themselves than their male counterparts, and thus to be a more reliable source of remittances (Trager, 1984). That said, migration can also provide an escape from social and family constraints and give women a level of independence they may not easily achieve in home areas (Gaido and Rakowski, 1995; Ouedraogo, 1995). Although the importance of remittances as a proportion of migrants’ income tends to decline with time, and especially with marriage and the onset of parental responsibilities (Chant and Mcilwaine, 1995; Fall, 1998), the financial commitments and obligations of single and particularly female migrants towards their relatives in home areas (including migration), as well as on the mechanisms which regulate access to employment opportunities for different groups, whereby diversification can be an “accumulation” strategy for those with more assets and a “survival” strategy for others (Baker, 1995; Bryceson and Jamal, 1997; Ellis, 1998). For urban-based people, diversification may involve seasonal or temporary migration to rural areas, urban subsistence farming and urban wage agricultural labour. Changes in land use in peri-urban areas may also affect opportunities and constraints for diversification.

Multispatial households: diversification can also involve a spatial dimension within the household. The urban-based member or unit can then rely on assets (such as productive assets but also household relations and social capital) in the rural area. This is often counter-balanced by commitments and obligations towards the rural-based members, such as sending remittances and/or hosting relatives in the city. In turn, this may contribute to the increase in the proportion of extended households in low-income urban areas.

Gender-selective migration: since migration is a socially-embedded process, it is likely to reflect wider socio-cultural transformations as well as to have its own specific impact on the livelihoods of urban low-income groups. The general increase in the number of migrant women may have two distinct consequences: first, young single female migrants are often likely to have strong financial commitments toward their relatives in home areas. They may therefore rely on a low proportion of their earnings for personal expenditure in the city. Second, it is likely that at least in some socio-cultural contexts, migration is a contributing factor to the increase in the number of women-headed households in urban areas. Although recent research shows that these units are not necessarily the “poorest of the poor” (Chant, 1997), it is nevertheless important that policies recognise the diversity of household structures and organisation in the design and implementation of poverty reduction policies.

Cecilia Tacoli is research associate with the IED programmes on Human Settlements and Sustainable Agriculture.
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Collaborative management of protected areas in India
A country perspective

Kishore Rao

The term collaborative management (or co-management) as used in the context of protected areas (PAs), refers to joint decision-making by all stakeholders on policies guiding the management of these areas. Some have argued that co-management must go beyond mere consultation and participatory planning and should entail a conscious and official distribution of responsibility, with formal vesting of some authority. The current literature on the subject promotes the concept almost as a panacea, which would resolve all the prevailing interface conflicts between PA authorities and the local resident populations.

The need for integrating local peoples’ interests into the policies and programmes of PA planning and management cannot be denied or disputed. However, many advocates of co-management view it as a part of a wider social agenda, and raise related issues of social justice, self-determination, and democratisation. In pursuing an over socialised viewpoint the essential need for integrating environmental and human concerns is frequently overlooked. Consequently, the social agenda eclipses and overrides all concern for nature. Therefore, clarity has to be introduced into the PA co-management concept, particularly in relation to its application in different country and site-specific situations. This paper seeks to review the various policy, legislative and management initiatives for local peoples’ participation in PA conservation in India through the ecodvelopment approach, and presents a perspective on further building upon the experience.

The context
India’s PA network comprises 84 national parks and 447 sanctuaries, covering about 150,000 sq.km. which is nearly 4.5% of the country’s geographical area. Most PAs are small, below 500sq.km. in size, and subjected to a variety of resource-use pressures from nearby human and livestock populations. The people too have to contend with wild animal depredations and reduced access to biomass resources. Although much of the use of such forest-biomass resources is livelihood dependent, the distinction between bona fide and commercial use has progressively become blurred with rapidly growing populations and increasing resource demands. Conversely, being mostly located in the interior forested regions, these people have also been deprived of even the basic amenities of life and the benefits of rural development programmes. This further accentuates their dependence on the forest resources for their sustenance and subsistence. The resulting vicious cycle of resource dependence and resulting degradation has contributed to the continuing impoverishment of these peoples. It is ironic that some social policy makers advocate the perpetuation of such precarious existence and keeping the people alienated from the mainstream, ostensibly in the interest of preserving traditional knowledge and lifestyles.

India’s PAs belong mainly to two categories, national parks and sanctuaries, which correspond to Categories II and IV respectively of the IUCN classification. Under the Indian law dealing with PAs, consumptive use of wildlife resources is prohibited. Livestock grazing is, however, allowed within a sanctuary in a regulated manner. Proposed changes in the relevant law would also provide for all vegetation extracted from a PA, as a result of habitat management effort to be made available to the local communities. The foundations of co-management in PAs in India, were in fact, laid as far back as in the 1970s when enlightened managers initiated small-scale mitigatory efforts in some areas (e.g. Kanha National Park).

At the same time, another innovative resource management strategy was evolved by the Indian forester, which is known today as Joint Forest Management (JFM). The experience gained under this programme, which now extends over 1.5 million ha. of forestland in 10 states, has provided many useful lessons for co-management of PAs, particularly in relation to aspects of participatory, institutional and usufruct sharing arrangements.

The response
Realising the importance of gaining the support and involvement of local people in the PA conservation effort, the Government of India incorporated it as an important objective into the National Wildlife Action Plan (NWAP), which was formally adopted in 1983. The NWAP continues to guide all major programmes for wildlife and PA conservation in the country. The relevant objective calls for the need to develop appropriate management systems for protected areas, with due regard to the needs of the local people and ensuring their support and involvement. Further, the action required under this objective reads: “To ensure compatibility between the protected areas and their surroundings, the latter should be identified as Special areas for Eco-Development (SAEDs), where conservation oriented community development programmes should be undertaken”. A listing of some priority projects to realise the identified objective follows this: “Identify the surroundings of protected areas for ecodevelopment and undertake community development programmes through concerned agencies to elicit the support and involvement of the local people”. In doing so, the recommendations of the Task Force of the Indian Board for Wildlife set up for this purpose should be kept in view.

It is noteworthy that concurrently with the development of the NWAP a task force was appointed by the Indian Board for Wildlife (the highest advisory body on wildlife which is headed by the Prime Minister) to recommend measures for eliciting public support for wildlife conservation. These recommendations were also built into the NWAP. Thus, people-oriented conservation became a firm basis for wildlife conservation policy in the country. The task force recommended that while protection must be enforced in the core-buffer complex of the PA, the multiple-use surrounds should be subjected to rapid multilateral eco-development capable of enhancing the agricultural, pastoral and forest productivity of the area to provide supplementary...
The Indian Government launched a centrally sponsored scheme of extending financial assistance to the states for PA ecodevelopment. The basic components of the scheme include: undertaking fuelwood and fodder plantation in community and private lands; promoting the use of fuel-efficient stoves and other alternative energy sources; extending health and veterinary care, drinking water and irrigation facilities; preventing and mitigating damage to wildlife. The scheme also supports the promotion of alternative livelihood practices, including training for this purpose, so that biomass dependent livelihoods are gradually phased out. At the same time capacity building of PA agencies for ecodesvelopment planning and implementation is being carried out through regular training programmes at the Wildlife Institute of India.

The centrally sponsored PA ecodesvelopment scheme has so far been extended to some 80 PAs, but due to resource constraints, the interventions have been on a relatively small scale. A recent independent evaluation of the scheme has not only established this limitation but also advised against spreading the available resources too thinly. Therefore, steps have been taken to resolve this problem by covering a smaller number of areas more intensively and by co-ordinating targeted inputs from various government agencies and sources. PA ecodesvelopment is now also a component of several externally aided forestry projects that are being implemented in the different states.

The Indian Government has also launched an ambitious ecodesvelopment project with World Bank assistance. The project covers 7 PAs and is partly funded through a grant from the GEF, credit from the IDA and contributions from the Central and State Governments, and beneficiary communities. The project planning and design process at each site has involved extensive consultation with a large number of village communities, NGOs, local and state level institutions and organisations. This has resulted in the strengthening of village groups and the formation of village ecodesvelopment committees to sustain and formalise participation of local people in detailed micro-planning for ecodesvelopment and monitoring of various project activities.

There has been unqualified acceptance of the ecodesvelopment programme by the people in every area where it has been introduced. PA ecodesvelopment supports and reinforces the developmental aspirations of communities, who are eking out a marginal existence in the forest hinterland of the country. A complementary centrally-sponsored Beneficiary Oriented Tribal Development Scheme (BOTDS) supports voluntary village relocation from PAs, for rehabilitation in outside areas where all rural development benefits can be extended to them. Unfortunately, adequate financial resources are currently lacking to cover all the PAs and villages, which need to be brought into the ecodesvelopment programme. Nevertheless, tangible benefit has accrued to the communities wherever the ecodesvelopment scheme has been introduced.

In the Sunderbans Tiger Reserve, for example, the ecodesvelopment programme comprises ecologically sustainable livelihood practices such as aquaculture, apiculture, horticulture and farm-forestry for which vocational training is also being given. Energy alternatives, energy-saving devices, drinking water facilities, primary health and veterinary services are being extended. For this purpose 16,000 families have been organised into 27 Forest Protection Committees and 13 Ecodesvelopment Committees.

Ecodesvelopment committees have been constituted in all the 32 villages on the fringe of the Jaldapara Sanctuary for executing ecodesvelopment activities. The work undertaken includes: construction and deepening of irrigation canals, introduction of drinking water schemes, formation of village approach roads, construction of dug wells for irrigation, planting of areca nut palms and silk-cotton trees to act as a buffer and yield a commercial crop, promotion of handloom weaving as an alternative vocation, etc. The people have responded to these initiatives with great enthusiasm and have successfully enforced PA protection regulations.

At Bharatpur, the value of grass fodder alone, which is harvested from the Keoladeo National Park and supplied to the local people, is estimated at US $ 100,000 annually. A large number of people from the local community are also engaged in tourism and related service sectors. This is in sharp contrast to the prevailing situation of conflict in the mid-1980s. Even in the Manas Tiger Reserve, which has witnessed unprecedented ethnic disturbance in the region, an ecodesvelopment strategy has been initiated to gain the confidence of the local community. The package of measures includes providing drinking water facilities, construction of irrigation channels and village roads, organising health-care camps, training of tourist guides, and forming Eco-clubs in local schools.
Local community leaders and organisations are actively contributing to this effort.

Any number of such examples can be cited from around the country, but that is not the intention here. The validity of the PA ecodevelopment approach is clearly recognised and established. The concept, however, continues to evolve, as experiences are fed-back to improve and strengthen various aspects of the programme. At the same time, it retains enough resilience to adapt itself to different site-specific situations.

Concerns
Although it has taken time to take off, ecodevelopment has now been established as a strategy for biodiversity conservation within PAs, by linking it with the livelihood concerns of the forest dependent communities. A definite momentum has been created, which has to be maintained by timely deployment of adequate financial resources in the selected areas.

Another concern is that of capacity within the PA agencies to implement ecodevelopment, which is largely a rural development-type programme. While training is being provided to the officer levels, it is the more junior staff who provide the actual interface with local communities. Much more training is required to equip them for this task. On-site training through visits to ecodevelopment implementing sites would be particularly valuable. However, it is gratifying to note that forest department personnel have excelled themselves in the District Rural Development Agencies in many states and are in great demand. The experience gained in such assignments is proving to be an asset for ecodevelopment work.

Conclusion

India has charted a certain course of eliciting people’s participation in biodiversity conservation through PAs with maximum synergy. This approach has been planned for a few PAs on a pilot basis. Based on the experience, appropriate institutional arrangements will be formalised to implement the strategy on a larger scale in the coming years.

Sustainability of the systems established and assets created under the PA ecodevelopment programme has to be ensured. This can happen only when there is a high level of participation and ownership of the project by the local people. This is a responsibility of the village ecodevelopment committees, for whose formation and functioning guidelines have been established. In addition, the constitution of PA advisory committees will be mandated by changes in the law.

Proposals for amending the PA legislation also include two additional categories of PAs, the Community Reserve and the Conservation Reserve, which would correspond to categories V and VI of the IUCN classification. These changes would provide the necessary legal framework and facilitate people’s participation in ecodevelopment planning and implementation.

PAs have the potential to develop into demonstration sites from which other countries in the region could benefit and mutual sharing of experiences can take place among the practitioners. The PA agencies are already “learning by doing” and need to proceed along the established path to consolidate the ecodevelopment experience.
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Sustainable livelihoods – from vision to reality

Franck Amalric

How do we envisage a world that combines ecological sustainability with social justice? How do we conceptualise that vision, and how do we define a path of transition that takes us there?

To address these questions, we start from two premises. Firstly, we are searching not for a universal model of how to live and organise society, but rather for a way of combining diversity – not a monochrome painting, but one in which many different colours are combined harmoniously. Secondly, the process of transition needs to rely on the energies of the various constituencies, stakeholders and organisations of the society in question. However the co-ordination of the different processes involved cannot be carried out through a simple co-ordinating agency, or by following some predefined blueprint. On the contrary, the challenge is to link up with the various processes, and to generate feedback between them in order to orient them in a direction compatible with one another.

The mosaic we imagine – our vision of diversity with ecological sustainability and social justice – is thus composed of basic elements (the touches of colour), and relational elements which ensure the harmony between the basic elements.

The basic elements would include, for example:

- A vision of regenerated rural communities;
- A vision of sustainable cities;
- A vision of how the North can be re-organised in order to reduce its colonial tendencies towards the resources of the South.

The relational elements, on the other hand, would comprise:

- A vision of appropriate rural-urban relationships;
- A vision about the structure of the state and of market economies compatible with the basic elements;
- A vision of international relations that can promote sustainable livelihoods in the South and self-restraint in the North.

Clearly these lists can be made much longer and more detailed.

The sustainable livelihoods approach

In setting out to imagine the mosaic, we may in theory begin from any starting point – that is, from any one social reality that we find in the world today. The challenge is to be able to finish the mosaic while respecting the rules set for ourselves at the start – i.e. to achieve harmony while using all the colours on the palette.

The sustainable livelihoods approach starts with rural areas of the South. There are many reasons for this choice, the first being that this is where most people in the world live today. The vision there is to strengthen people’s capacity to sustain their own livelihoods, and empirical evidence suggests that this process involves a regeneration of local communities, with the following characteristics:

- Democratic control of production and of natural resources (regenerating local economies);
- Highly democratic local governance systems (high degree of direct participatory democracy);
- Production and consumption patterns that ensure a relatively high level of self-reliance, and that allow the expression of cultural diversity, as well as respect and care for nature (cultural assertiveness).

This is our foundation stone, the basic element of the vision – the first sketch we put down on paper and around which we try to imagine how other elements can evolve towards a harmonious whole.

Note that this basic element is not Utopian. There exist in many parts of the world rural communities organised in this manner. They provide examples of the vision, and it is important to ensure that these are known, documented and celebrated.

However, for this vision to become a reality on a larger scale, we raise such questions as: how do we go from where we are to where we want to be? And what are the processes that should be promoted and supported? This is the issue of transition.

The question of “scaling up” can be broken down into a number of smaller issues. First, we may note that while there are few real examples of our vision, there are many more rural communities in the South that have at least one of the three characteristics mentioned above (for example, cultural assertion of indigenous groups; local democratisation initiatives in Latin America; collaborative management of natural resources; etc). What kind of processes are necessary to move towards the vision described above? In other words, how do promising innovations become “seeds of change” towards the vision described above?

These questions are of particular salience when we think about the possible role that external actors can play.

Secondly, how do the various “seeds of change” relate to one another? How can they learn from each other’s experience?

Thirdly, how are these processes of change affected, positively or negatively, by national and international circumstances? What are favourable conditions or obstacles? How should we think about the political organisation of society (i.e. governance) from the perspective of that vision?
The SID sustainable livelihoods programme

The Sustainable Livelihoods Programme of the Society of International Development (SID), has been developed as a space to explore collectively a new path towards social justice in the South (and by extension world-wide), building on recent people’s movements, local initiatives, and the work of citizens’ organisations. The activities of the programme find coherence and reference in the sustainable livelihoods approach to social change. This approach is the combination of a vision and a method of inquiry, i.e. a way of looking at reality that seems appropriate to discover a path of transition between the current state of things and the vision.

SID’s programme aims at promoting the sustainable livelihoods approach through action research, analysis, advocacy and catalysing new forms of organisation within civil society. It pursues the following objectives:

- Identification and documentation of images of the vision (of village communities in the South), and identification and analysis of seeds of change towards that vision;
- Linking together seeds of change as a way of strengthening them, and of generating new forms of governance compatible with the sustainable livelihoods approach and vision;
- Promotion of the sustainable livelihoods approach among large donor agencies, and reflection on the role these organisations can play in its promotion (specifically at present: WFP, and the African Development Foundation);
- Linking-up of different political spaces (across borders and local-national-global levels) in order to strengthen the capacity of local communities to protect their local democratic spaces.

Franck Amalric is based at the Society for International Development in Rome, and is co-chair of the CEESP working group on ethics.

Sustainable institutions for sustainable communities

Matthias Finger

Unsustainable development patterns characterise many of the developed and developing countries alike. Such patterns are generally maintained and reproduced by unsustainable public institutions and institutional arrangements, some inherited from colonial times, others simply outdated. Donor countries and multilateral agencies are currently pressing for reform of these institutions. At Atelier Habitat, we seek to take up this challenge by supporting the transformation of public institutions and institutional arrangements, so that they will contribute to, rather than obstruct, the development of sustainable communities and societies.

In doing so we use a bottom-up and people-centred approach, including concerned individuals in the analysis, redesign and subsequent daily management of organisational structures. This approach is grounded in participatory action research and the more recent public sector reform movement. Ultimately, we feel, the responsibility for sustainable communities lies with the members of those communities, but such endeavours should receive the support of both public and private institutions.

Communities, however, are generally embedded in larger (public) institutions which are currently undergoing deep structural reforms themselves. Indeed, the development of sustainable institutions at the local level cannot be separated from the larger reforms of the public sector, the network industries, and the State more generally. Indeed, many developing and developed countries have recently initiated profound public sector reforms, thereby encouraging decentralisation, customer orientation, efficiency and so on.

At Atelier Habitat we have the expertise and skills to monitor such processes of public sector reform and to foster the development of sustainable institutions at the local level. In doing so, we seek to integrate participatory development objectives into institutional and public sector reforms under the overall objective of sustainable development.

Matthias Finger is a professor of public management in Lausanne, Switzerland and is Atelier Habitat’s focal point on institutional and public sector reform. For more information on Atelier Habitat, contact him at email: mfinger@isp.fr or info@atelier-habitat.com
Women are, on the whole, the most disadvantaged and neglected group in Pakistan, and are accorded a lower status in all spheres of life and society than their male counterparts. Since independence in 1947 successive governments have periodically focused on specific projects and programmes for raising women’s socio-economic status without tangible results. Consequently, the development status of women, their literacy, health and participation in the labour force are amongst the lowest in the world.

Currently the overall female literacy rate is dismally low at around 28 per cent, with a meagre rural female literacy rate of 12 per cent (Pakistan Economic Survey, 1998). Nearly 50 per cent of women, particularly those of reproductive age, are malnourished and anaemic (Pakistan Medical Research Council, 1998). In the area of employment, official statistics indicate a low female participation rate in the rural areas (13.26 per cent) compared to urban (7.04 per cent). These figures show a declining trend of 1.76 per cent when compared with the participation rate in 1992-1993 (Pakistan Economic Survey, 1998). One reason for this declining trend is the restructuring of the economy through structural adjustment policies, demanding government sector down-sizing and pushing people to the already expanding informal sector. Women, in the course of this process, have been the hardest hit and even further marginalised. However, a large majority of the rural women are engaged in agricultural activities, which fall within the ambit of unwaged employment. As a result, they are neither recognised as major contributors to economic development, nor do they reap the benefits of the long hours they spend in sustaining their families’ livelihoods.

Women’s status is related to three main factors at the social, legal and policy levels. Firstly, the patriarchal nature of Pakistani society and the rules of Purdah serve to constrain women’s mobility in the public sphere and restrict their access to sources of knowledge and information, health, education, gainful employment and political participation. The practice of patriarchy and continuation of traditional roles ascribed to women are reinforced and supported at the national level through existing laws and government directives, which fly in the face of measures taken to empower women and improve their development status. Thirdly, government measures aimed at economic growth and women’s development are usually implemented without addressing the needs for participation and social development. Most economic activities are viewed as exclusive to men, and women’s contribution to national development is ignored. Specific government programmes for women are also marred by ascribing to them traditional roles which keep them segregated.

In recent years there has been a general recognition of the need to clarify the role of women and improve their situation. This has led to a number of policy initiatives aimed at ameliorating their status. However most of these programmes are urban-based and have benefited the education professionals and those in skilled jobs in the industrial sector, rather than the agrarian-based rural women who form the majority (67%).

Women’s empowerment and sustainable livelihoods in Pakistan

Jennifer Bennett

However, rising poverty, unemployment and economic crises have pushed a large number of poor women into the labour market. Most of these women are illiterate and unskilled and are forced to accept low paid and menial jobs. Increasing mechanisation and technological changes have also disproportionately affected women’s traditional roles in rural production and have transformed many activities into male jobs, although poor families with fragmented landholdings or those working on leased land have remained largely unaffected by these developments. For these poor families (the majority) there is no evidence to suggest that women’s participation in the agricultural sector has been reduced.

Despite the key role played by women in resource management and involvement in productive activities, they generally have inadequate or no major decision-making powers, no control over the financial gains, nor the autonomy to determine the course of their actions or lives. Ironically while women manage livestock and agricultural produce, social stigmas deny them access to markets and thus the economic benefits.

The alternative

In the midst of the government’s failure to involve women in mainstream development activities and to take effective measures to enhance their socio-economic status, various NGOs have initiated steps, albeit small-scale, to address the inter-related issues of women’s lower status, their right to justice, the repeal of discriminatory laws, and the provision of shelter to destitute women. On the economic front, these NGOs are meeting the challenge...
through participatory development with the underlying aim of collectively empowering men and women to manage their own resources through self-help initiatives. In particular, these NGOs have launched different working systems of socio-economic development, especially in the rural areas, on the basis of two key criteria: that responsibility for all aspects of development programmes should be shared by local people and institutions; and that a decentralised organisational structure is one of the most effective means of achieving this.

In Pakistan, the Rural Support Programmes (RSPs) are perhaps the most outstanding examples of NGO-managed development programmes. The Aga Khan Rural Support Programme (AKRSP) was the front-runner, and its success led to the replication of its community participation model in other support programmes.

In line with the needs of the people, the specific aims of the RSPs are to promote the productive capacity of agriculture and other resources by: developing and demonstrating integrated technology packages to improve agricultural productivity and natural resources management for a wide range of agro-ecological conditions; expanding and improving rural infrastructure; horticultural and livestock production extension; forestry and range preservation and protection; strengthening the institutional capacity to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate development programmes; and involving the rural population in the planning and implementation of project activities. The two founding pillars of these programmes, however, are the productive investments and savings and credit schemes which are aimed at gearing community members towards a sustainable path.

The basis for implementing any project activity depends on the formation of community-based organisations. In each village, co-operating household members are motivated to form one or more Community Organisations (COs) and Women’s Organisations (WOs). These organisations are created with the commitment that each member contributes a certain amount of money, depending on individual capacity, to start a joint account. Each organisation maintains its own savings pool. The ultimate objective of savings is to develop the community’s own credit pool to provide collateral to banks. Member savings also provide eligibility to the credit facilities offered by the project. This provides a very strong incentive to participate, and it has generated numerous alternative sources of income. Equally important, the credit-saving scheme is a way of mobilising the community, after which collective undertakings are carried out to implement other important productive and capacity-building components.

Through these participatory development programmes, women have been organised into strong village organisations which focus on various aspects of raising women’s productivity and welfare. Social organisers and extension workers bring to women improved varieties and cultivation techniques for crops that can be grown in the area. Other productivity-raising technologies include vaccination for poultry and livestock, and better technologies for processing and storing agricultural produce such as, for example, huskers, fodder choppers, cracking machines, and butter churners. Social organisers also teach women how to use the new technology and also train village women, most of whom are illiterate, to deliver services for which they can earn an income.

Through the programme’s credit and savings schemes, many rural women today are managing micro-enterprises independently and single-handedly. In addition the social organisers, through RSPs help the village organisations to get access to institutional credit by acting as guarantor, and promote members’ savings, which serve both as a form of security and as collateral for credit. Many of these also provide marketing services, so that the additional output is not wasted or sold too cheaply. The village organisations, however, are key to mobilising resources, for maintaining the project activities, ensuring reasonably equitable distribution of gains, and providing a channel for the delivery of other services like education, health, water and sanitation.

In an overall context of increasing poverty, unemployment and glaring disparities in income distribution, these participatory initiatives have provided alternative mechanisms to help people, particularly women, meet their sustainable livelihood requirements. The government seriously needs to adopt, implement and institutionalise such participatory mechanisms at the national level, particularly considering that total absorption of the unemployed is, perhaps, beyond the productive capacity of any developing country.

Jennifer Bennett is a research fellow at SDPI, Pakistan. This article is based on a longer paper available from the author; email: jenny@sdpi.org
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Supplying water to rural communities
The role of government and NGOs

Sharukh Rafi Khan

This essay is based on field research conducted to explore the factors underlying sustainability of rural water supply schemes. The two complementary hypotheses explored were that demand and social mobilisation are positively correlated with scheme sustainability. One view is that if there is community demand for a social service, they will pay for the service and, given this, will own the scheme and participate in its maintenance.

There are several macro implications of this public policy perspective. Firstly, given limited resources, it provides a policy rule for selecting communities for service delivery. Secondly, it lightens the fiscal burden on the cash-strapped government by making rural communities wholly or partially responsible for providing their own social services. Thirdly, it implicitly makes a statement that communities which are not able to express demand for a social service, out of apathy or impoverishment, need not be catered to. Fourthly, it accentuates the urban bias since urban communities continue to receive highly subsidised social services. We believe that provision of social services is a government responsibility and that the urban bias should be redressed.

This research was part of a larger World Bank multi-country study. In each of the six countries, two projects have been selected and data collected for fifteen schemes in each project. In Pakistan, given our interest in social mobilisation, we argued for the inclusion of the National Rural Support Programme (NRSP) in the study as one of the projects. NRSP is an autonomously run, government-funded organisation that has adopted the community mobilisation approach of development NGOs. The second project in our sample was the IDA (International Development Association) -funded Local Government and Rural Development Department (LGRDD). We also included five IDA-funded Public Health Engineering Department (PHED) schemes in the sample. The government line departments are naturally of interest due to their much wider coverage for social sector delivery. While the focus of our report is on RWSS, there are general lessons obtainable from this sector for other social sector delivery.

The report on which this essay is based relied on field reports written by two trained teams, after a discussion based on a two-day field investigation, and on analyses based on data collected from village focus group meetings, household interviews, interviews with the project field staff and technical evaluations of the RWSS. Apart from observations of the field team, we also had three data sets generated from the structured community, household and technical interviews.

Based on the field reports, our main finding was that RWSS were more likely to be sustainable when the community is mobilised to make them work. This is not a new finding. It accords with both common sense and a gut feeling of those who endorse community participation. However, this study adds to scarce systematic evidence, based on empirical research, on the functioning of government line departments compared to that of development NGOs.

In principle, due to donor pressure, the project rules and implementation procedures of the donor-supported government projects now also endorse participation and are very similar to those of NRSP. The real question, therefore, is why they were less successful in realising participation than NRSP. We found that one critical difference is in the way NRSP and the government projects approach social mobilisation. The NRSP social mobiliser is more often genuinely concerned about mobilising the community, which is very painstaking work. The government projects were concerned with form and not substance. Thus the LGRDD and PHED officials were generally satisfied with the formation of a community organisation (CO) or a water committee (WCOM). It did not seem to matter that this was achieved by working with the influentials in the community and that the general body of the community had little or no say in the decision-making.

One should not downplay the complex political realities in a rural setting. It is much easier to approach a community via the influentials. However, we found that doing so is likely to mean that the influentials will appropriate the major benefits of the scheme and that the community as a whole will not own or support the scheme. We found this to be the case even when NRSP’s social mobilisers approached the community through influentials. All five out of the fifteen NRSP schemes that the field observers found to be non-sustainable had influentials dominating decision-making, appropriating the major benefits from the scheme and hence alienating the general body of the community. The only one of the five PHED schemes that was clearly found to be sustainable had a mobilised community with exposure to several of the most prominent capacity-building NGOs in the country. In three of the four LGRDD schemes found to be sustainable, an individual activist essentially played the role of an effective social mobiliser.

Of course, one could argue that some communities have more proclivity towards becoming mobilised. This may well be true. The more interesting policy issue is that NRSP staff managed to mobilise communities in three different provinces under very different social and economic conditions. This achievement was particularly noteworthy in Sindh where the communities were highly ethnically and class differentiated. This represents a strong endorsement of the concept of social mobilisation. What is it that makes NRSP more effective? An important part of the answer is skills in social mobilisation that come from training and the motivation to apply those skills.

There is an important lesson to be learnt from the LGRDD experience in AJK. It appears that the field officers were able to impart what they had internalised. The concept of community self-help that they internalised was that the community should make a cash contribution, carry pipes, lay the pipes and build the tanks. While the community clearly had an incentive to do all
this considering their need for water and considering that they solicited the schemes in the first place, it is still not a small achievement to get this kind of contribution from communities generally believed to be entirely dependent on the state. However, the important point is that if LGRDD field staff took the communities this far, they could take them further. This also applies to PHED, which was very effective in establishing water committees and having them implement a tariff system.

The results of technical, community and household data analyses for the most part confirmed the evaluations of the field reports. Exploring the data to understand why NRSP schemes were viewed as better managed, we discovered that the quality of construction, masonry, catchment and placing and condition of the pipes stood out. With regard to social mobilisation, NRSP communities were better informed, were more aware of project rules and demonstrated more participation and self-reliance. Also, one could view NRSP as being a more demand-responsive project in that communities actually built the schemes, made a greater cash contribution and indicated a greater willingness to pay for improvements. The results of more formal statistical analysis indicated that social mobilisation and need were the two variables associated with scheme sustainability.

While NRSP’s performance was far superior to that of the government line departments, we do not consider that development NGOs should assume the state’s responsibility for social sector development. One can conceive of NGOs like NRSP as development partners. The more important role of development NGOs is that of being path breakers. We have shown that development NGOs, while limited in scope, may have important lessons to teach in delivering social services. Since their method of doing business is much more effective than that of the government line departments, one needs to find a way of making the government line departments function like the development NGOs. Thus government personnel need to be trained and given the right incentive structure to use this training. Training in social mobilisation is no longer a scarce service in Pakistan. The right incentive structure can emerge from bonuses tied to results-based assessment carried out internally by the department, and periodically evaluated externally. Interviews with government field staff revealed the lack of satisfaction with low salaries. Compared to LGRDD and PHED, NRSP field staff were paid a competitive salary, were better trained and were expected to work hard. Making government work may have more to do with service rules and incentive structures than with down-sizing, which may result in the loss of much-needed talent in the public sector.

Sharukh Rafi Khan is Director of the Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI) in Pakistan, and member of CEESP’s South Asia Committee.

Edited by Diana Carney, DFID; ISBN 1 86192 082 2
Papers presented at the Department for International Development’s Natural Resources Advisers’ Conference, July 1998

The 1997 UK Government White Paper on International Development commits the Department for International Development (DFID) to promoting “sustainable livelihoods” and to protecting and improving the management of the “natural and physical environment”. This book, which contains the main papers presented at the 1998 DFID Natural Resource Advisers’ Conference (NRAC ‘98) on Sustainable Rural Livelihoods, represents one step in the process of opening up the dialogue. The introductory chapter summarises current thinking on sustainable rural livelihoods within an advisory group, drawn from within DFID and from outside organisations (research institutes and NGOs). This group met six times in the first half of 1998. Key Issues papers given at NRAC ’98, address issues of policy consistency by expanding upon the relationships between sector-wide approaches and decentralisation and sustainable rural livelihoods. They also seek to expand the traditional concept of “rural” by examining both livelihood diversification and rural/urban linkages. “Entry Point” papers go into some detail about the contributions to the sustainability of rural livelihoods that can be made by involvement in any particular area. Possible “entry points” range from the more traditional natural resource sub-sectors (forests, livestock) to emerging priorities such as ethical trade, but in all cases the emphasis is on people, not resources per se.

IDS Sustainable Livelihoods Research Programme
Research being carried out since 1997 at the Institute of Development Studies, Sussex, UK, is exploring alternative routes to sustainable livelihoods for poor people in contrasting agro-ecological settings. The research asks two questions: an analytical one – what institutional arrangements enable some poor people to achieve secure, sustainable livelihoods when others fail?; and a practical one – what policies can support both groups?

The work focuses on the institutional arrangements which allow people to achieve sustainable livelihoods or otherwise. Institutions is understood in a very broad sense to mean the regularised practices or patterns of behaviour structured by rules which have widespread use in society; such institutions may be formal or informal. Such institutions mediate a range of livelihood processes in rural areas. The focus of the IDS research is on four related processes: agricultural intensification, crop-livestock integration, livelihood diversification and migration; and these have been investigated in the context of four case study countries: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Mali and Zimbabwe. Research sites are located along agro-ecological gradients from high to low natural resource endowment and differing livelihood systems.

Provisional results of the research are reported in a series of Working Papers, designed to stimulate discussion and critical comment:

Rules, Norms and the Pursuit of Sustainable Livelihoods

Impact of Structural Adjustment on Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: A Review of the Literature

Crop Livestock Integration. The Dynamics of Intensification in Contrasting Agroecological Zones: A Review

Agricultural Intensification and Rural Sustainable Livelihoods: A Think Piece
Grace Carswell, 1997, IDS Working Paper 64

Migration and Sustainable Livelihoods
Christopher McDowell and Arjan de Haan, 1997, IDS Working Paper 65

Sustainable Livelihoods: A Framework for Analysis

For further information contact Jeremy Swift, Ian Scoones or Annette Sinclair at IDS, University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9RE, UK; Tel: +44 (0) 1273 606 261; fax: +44 (0) 1273 621 202; email: A.Sinclair@sussex.ac.uk; http://www.ids.ac.uk

Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: What contribution can we make?
Edited by Diana Carney, DFID; ISBN 1 86192 082 2
Beyond Governance – major CEESP conference to take place in August

Murree, Pakistan, 24-28 August 1999

A four-day conference organised by CEESP in collaboration with the Social Science Research Council, New York, will bring together leading thinkers on the subject of governance in August this year. The objective of “Beyond Governance” which will take place in Murree (near Islamabad), is to apply an emerging understanding of governance to a concrete issue – within a regional context – in this case South Asia.

While much of the discussion will be on analytical and historical debates, natural resource conservation will provide a key focus. With this in mind, IUCN staff from the region and selected members with experience and expertise in the field will be among the participants, and a number of papers will focus directly on issues of natural resource conservation and governance, including land reforms, irrigation, agrarian structure, flood control, and public interest litigation. Water – a critical natural resource and the subject of several contributing papers – will provide a key focus, helping to clarify the linkages between the ownership and management of a natural resource and the system of governance at local, national, and global levels.

The list of invited conference participants includes Dr Ashok Khosla (DA), Prof Matthias Finger (CEESP), Dr Atiq Rahman (BCAS), Dr Haris Gazdar (SDPI), Dr Saba Khattak (SDPI), Prof Jayadeva Uyangoda (U Colombo), Prof David Ludden (U Penn), Prof Amir Mufti (U Michigan/ U Columbia), Prof Mustapha Kamal Pasha (American University), Dr Radhika Coomaraswamy (ICES, Colombo), Dr Yamin Tambiah (ICES, Colombo), Dipak Ghyawali, Dr Paula Newberg, and Kamal Siddiqi. In addition, the Asia Regional Directorate of IUCN has been invited to send at least five experts to the meeting.

Conference as a Dialogue between Perspectives

The conference is designed to take the form of a dialogue rather than a series of lectures. The aim is to integrate the experiences and perspectives of people working in the field with the theoretical discussions. Papers are expected to provoke discussion and debate, and thus identify areas of consensus as well as disagreement, and ultimately, create a research and policy agenda on governance for sustainable development.

The quality of governance has emerged as a major factor in the efficacy of policies for sustainable development. This has been borne out by numerous theoretical analyses as well as lessons from the ground, especially based on the experience of IUCN and its member organisations. Two arguments have been made in particular. Firstly, while conservation has become a global exercise requiring co-operation between industrialised as well as agrarian societies, there is no global system of governance to implement this task fairly and efficiently. Indeed, even the nation state, the primary focus of policy advice, has lost its considerable autonomy and authority with the advent of globalisation. Secondly, the environmental crisis places at risk vulnerable groups and communities, and local systems of governance that could have protected these communities are weak or have eroded. This has led to calls for a tripartite agenda on governance for sustainable development, namely local, national, and global.

CEESP has approached this issue from three directions. Firstly, a background paper on “Global Governance for Biodiversity Conservation” by Matthias Finger, Chair of the Governance Working Group, has been circulated for comment to IUCN regional and country offices as well as selected IUCN and CEESP members. This paper has also received comments from a group of sustainable development research institutes - The Ring - all of which are IUCN members, from the perspective of local and national governance, and in particular the strategies adopted by non-governmental players to overcome the obstacles. The goal of this consultation is to prepare a report for the IUCN Council and the second World Conservation Congress on the position to be taken on governance-related issues.

A third approach to the issue was organised under the auspices of the South Asia Regional Advisory Panel of the Social Science Research Council, New York. This focuses on analytical and theoretical issues in the academic literature on governance. In particular it addresses the success of “political entrepreneurs” in commandeering most progressive initiatives – democracy, development, the nation state, land reform, and conservation – for unintended (and generally personal) benefit. This group aims to move beyond the current dialogue – a dialogue that has become fashionable, and thus increasingly sterile – and ask how a social basis for reform can be initiated in societies where bad governance has historically led to the hijacking of many good programmes and institutions. This is of particular interest for natural resource management, given that struggles for the control over natural resources are often implicit in the struggles for governance.

The Roots of Governance

The term “governance” entered development discourse in around 1990. Since then it has become a key element of the mainstream debate on the subject, and, moreover, a key element of the list of conditionality attached to development assistance. According to the mainstream definition, adopted by multilateral financial institutions and technical assistance programmes, governance is identified as administrative and judicial reform, decentralisation, elimination of corruption, and a generalised improvement in the transparency of governmental functions. Most of these changes would be useful in many countries, but several fundamental questions remain. The mainstream approach to the problems of governance is to suggest a remedy – to focus on what is to be done. This in itself bypasses the central problem; it ignores the abundance of knowledge that exists surrounding “what” is to be done, as well as the limited understanding of “how” it can be done. The way in which reform is to be undertaken is the critical question – more than the type of reform. A more effective approach, then, lies in examining the successes and failures of past reform efforts. The Murree meeting will facilitate this learning by promoting dialogue between two groups, each of which is vocationally distinct but agrees on a basic premise: that governance, however defined, is a problem and an obstacle.

An understanding of failure in governance comes from the academic community – a group with a critical perspective and one which draws many of its lessons from past demonstrations of inefficacy. Identification of failed approaches can generate an understanding of, for example, the conditions of failure, and of the variables and patterns closely connected with failed efforts. Groups in the activist community, by contrast, have been involved in a trial and error process, garnering improvements in natural resource management through a range of actions – local mobilisation, public interest litigation, community organisation, public interest research and knowledge dissemination – and basing future action on past success. Their experiences are the lessons of success. The dialogue created between academic scholars and IUCN members, experts and activists will help to draw out the commonalities which may signify successful governance strategies, and will clearly identify a governance research and policy agenda.
Conference Themes
The aims described above run through the following five thematic areas, examined in the background papers:

1. Hijacking of institutions
This section should help bring out how and through what mechanisms popular institutions and programmes in South Asia were “hijacked” by narrow groups of vested interests for their own benefit. The overall goals of the analysis are first, a diagnosis of the failure (and possibly a prescription for overcoming it, i.e., identifying whether and how these programmes can be rescued in the public interest); and second, an extrapolation to the current proposals for state-led governance reform programmes. Can current programmes successfully escape hijacking? Under this theme, two broad sets of experiences will be examined, namely: institutions (or programmes) and cultural constructs. In the case of institutions, focus will be limited to three instances: democracy, reform programmes, and natural resources.

2. Hijacking the nation
The second component of the “lessons from failure”, should look at the hijacking of the idea of the nation. The nation can be seen as both a liberating idea as well as an oppressive one. On the one hand, it can provide a means of identifying the basis of trust between various groups and segments of a society, notwithstanding their divergent interests. On the other hand, it can lead to oppression, exclusion, violence, injustice, and resistance. Under this theme three aspects of the nation will be explored: democracy, citizenship, and nationalism.

3. Structure and practice: blurred boundaries
The goal of this section is to illustrate the relationship, as well as the gaps, between the theoretical structures and the practice of governance, and thus to provide a bridge between the lessons from failure and the lessons from success. This is motivated by the need to examine the role of non-formal actors in governance, and acts as a companion to a later section which looks at activism and coping more directly. This debate will be drawn out through examination of agrarian localization, irrigation and local governance, urban governance, and violence.

4. Alternative visions
The final segment of the proposed discussion will look towards the future, and at the possibility of reform. Again, the approach taken is an examination of the coping mechanisms and strategies of the people. This approach is divided, somewhat arbitrarily, into two sections. The first looks at perspectives and visions that sustain such strategies; governmentality, women’s perspectives, globalisation and governance, and community and political society, will be the focus. The latter – below – looks at practices that incorporate them.

5. Alternative practices
The four papers informing this discussion explore alternative practices that enhance rather than undermine the coping strategies of the poor and vulnerable in four different domains: resource management, legal systems, political activism, and economic uplift.

Papers from the conference and a full report will appear in the next issue of Policy Matters.

Trade and Sustainable Development
The cycle of capacity-building events on trade and sustainable development has begun, with national conferences held in Vietnam (9-10 April) and in Pakistan (12-14 April). Both were based on national research and national institutional partners and were aimed, in addition to raising awareness of the important linkages between trade, environment and development, to identifying key capacity needs – in research, information, networking, institutional support, etc. – required for the country to articulate its legitimate interests in trade and sustainable development and to defend these interests successfully at the WTO and in other trade negotiations.

The remaining phase of events in this first phase of the project will be in El Salvador for Central America in late June, in Argentina also in late June, and in South Africa in early July. Reports will follow in the next issue of Policy Matters.

The project received greater impetus during the WTO high-level Symposium on Trade and Environment (15-16 March) (See report under ‘Meetings’ in this issue) at which it became clear that environment is becoming a central issue in trade policy, and will clearly play a role in forthcoming multilateral trade negotiations to be designed at the WTO Ministerial Conference in Seattle, 30 November to 4 December.

For further information, contact Mark Halle, email: mark.halle@iprolink.ch

Ethics
The Ethics Working Group under co-chairs Stephen Margin and Franck Amalric have circulated a discussion paper to IUCN regional and country offices to stimulate dialogue on the role of ethics in their practical day-to-day work.

In summary the initial position of the group is that:

• Policies for conservation and sustainable use must be put on a sound ethical foundation, and that today this ethical basis is being sidelined by the overuse of the economics discourse;
• The economic discourse, while pretending to scientific neutrality, actually rests on an implicit but elaborate ethical system;
• Recognition that economics is not a neutral, objective science is a first step to articulating intuitions of ordinary people that something is amiss in the ethical basis of economics, and to begin a search for alternative ethical starting points; this recognition is thus the starting point of a real debate about ethics in a relationship to conservation and sustainable use of resources;
• IUCN should play a leading role in promoting the above work, first and foremost because it is crucial for its own mission.

The discussion paper outlines four assumptions underlying economics, and the ways in which these assumptions influence ethical decisions with regard to the environment. The paper goes on to suggest a set of key ethical questions to be explored by IUCN in pursuit of its mission.

To stimulate dialogue, the co-chairs pose the following questions:

• In what circumstances are you confronted with the “logic of economics” in your own work?
• Do you find yourself in opposition, or in tension with it? Why? How?
• Do you find in the paper elements of relevance to your work, or resonance with some of the issues you have been dealing with?

On the basis of the responses received, the working group plan to organise a number of consultations in the regional offices before the end of the current year which will feed into a workshop at IUCN Headquarters in February 2000. The purpose of the exercise is to flag
the various ethical dilemmas facing conservationists today, and to elaborate a work agenda for the Ethics Working Group to respond to these dilemmas.

If you would like to receive a copy of the background paper and take part in the initial consultation, please contact Catherine McCloskey at the CEESP Secretariat; ceesp@iied.org

The Ring
New research drivers from September ‘99
Viv Davies
At the recent annual meeting in Gland, Switzerland, the Ring partner organisations identified the need for a dedicated Ring research “driver”, whose role would be to co-ordinate the pooled research on the Ring priority themes and to lead on research development and overall strategy. Developments have been rapid since then, and the Ring is now delighted to announce that as from September 1999 the role of Ring research driver will be shared by two eminent academics and internationally respected figures in the field: Dr. Saleemul Huq, Executive Director of Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies, and Professor Adil Najam from the International Relations & Environmental Policy department at Boston University. Based in London as a part-time visiting professor at Imperial College, Dr Huq will focus on developing the collaborative and pooled research on water issues and sustainable livelihoods; Professor Najam will remain in Boston and focus the Ring agenda around Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and governance issues. The Ring and CEESP community would like to take this opportunity of warmly welcoming Dr Huq and Professor Najam into their new roles.

New CEESP Associate in Boston
A warm welcome to Erika Spanger-Siegfried, a research analyst who has been taken on to work on CEESP-related matters with the Chair, Tariq Banuri. Based at the Stockholm Environment Institute-Boston/Tellus Institute, Ms Spanger-Siegfried holds a BA from Umass/Amherst in biology and a Masters from Boston University in energy and environment.

Email: CEESP.tellus.org.

CEESP on the web!
The CEESP website is almost ready to be launched. Visit the temporary site on www.sdpi.org/ceesp

and let us know what you think. Comments and suggestions are most welcome.

CEESP plans regional events on road to Amman

Dear Chair
I read your “letter from the chair” in the latest issue of Policy Matters. I am just dropping you a note to say that I would be interested in helping with organising and participation at the conference on Social Sciences in Conservation. I think it is a good idea and IUCN needs a broader-level debate on this topic. I have been in the networks of IUCN (and done consultancy for IUCN) for quite a while now, and a strong advocate of social issues within the IUCN agenda in many of its Assemblies, World Congress and international meetings. I am a member of CEESP and WCPC (and working groups on Collaborative Management and Tourism Task Force) and have been practising in social sciences in conservation for too many years now to try to count. Whilst I am based in Australia now, I am in fact a Brazilian national and have worked in Africa and Latin America as well as in Oceania. Coincidentally I am also organising an integrated panel session at the forthcoming ISSNRM (International Symposium on Society and Natural Resource Management) to be held in Brisbane, Australia (July 7-10) on “Social Issues Shaping Resource Management Paradigms”. Thus I was quite interested in the idea of the conference when I read it in Policy Matters. If there is anything I can be involved with, please let me know.

Lea Scherl, Australia.

On the advice of the brainstorming session at IUCN Headquarters with Maritta Koch-Weser in March this year, we are trying to get the CEESP input into a series of regional events. We have already contacted the regional or country offices in Mesoamerica (ORMA), Asia (ARD), Southern Africa (ROSA) and Russia to determine how we could be involved in their regional meetings. We wish to provide input in the appropriate subset (relevant to the region) from the following menu: ethics, governance, market-based instruments, trade and sustainable development, collaborative management, environmental security and climate change.

We hope that these will lead to the CEESP conference that we have envisaged, possibly at the 2nd World Conservation Congress in Amman, Jordan in 1999.

At this point, I would appreciate your help. Firstly, ideas on how CEESP could work together with the IUCN community in your region would be most welcome. This could be through involvement in regional or national members’ meetings, or in other such fora as might be available in the next six months. Secondly, we are keen to receive your response to any of the CEESP papers and proposals that you think would be of interest to your region’s IUCN community. These include short papers or proposals on Environmental Ethics (Franck Amalric & Stephen Marglin), Governance (Matthias Finger; Tariq Banuri); Market-Based Instruments (Josh Bishop & Frank Vorhies); Trade (Mark Halle); Security (Mark Halle), and Climate Change and Sustainable Development (Tariq Banuri). Some versions of these have been published in earlier newsletters and are also available on the website: www.sdpi.org/ceesp. They are also available from the CEESP Secretariat.

I would also be grateful if you could send me some of your own papers that might be relevant to this agenda.

Updates on the regional events and Conference on Social Sciences in Conservation will be posted in forthcoming issues of Policy Matters.
Social Policy Global Team meets in Harare

10-12 March 1999

Following initial steps taken at the IUCN Social policy meeting in Nairobi in 1998, the Social Policy Programme, led by Dr Cristina Espinosa, organised the first meeting of the Social Policy Global Team (SPGT) in Harare in March. Comprising social policy staff and appointed focal points from almost all regional offices, the team met with the aim of defining a detailed programmatic and institutional strategy for the IUCN Social Policy Programme.

While the Nairobi workshop agreed on intermediate steps to strengthen the Social Policy Programme, the Harare workshop focused on discussing key institutional mechanisms to increase IUCN's capacity to integrate the social, cultural and economic dimensions of conservation. The Harare workshop defined a strategy to translate lessons learned in the field into more consistent and inclusive programmatic approach within the Union.

The workshop resulted in two major outcomes. The first was a common vision and agreement on the main issues to be addressed as social policy within the diversity of IUCN contexts. Secondly, broad long-term objectives and a strategic plan were agreed for the SPGT to work as a global team. The role of this team is to overcome the previous fragmentation of the Social Policy Programme and to facilitate the integration of social, economic and cultural dimensions of conservation in a more deliberate and decentralised way within the Union. A strong concern was to strengthen the interactions within and between the Secretariat, commissions and members in relation to social and economic policy issues.

The SPGT agreed on a set of recommendations concerning the way in which social equity issues should be considered in the projects, programme and policies of IUCN, based on the Union’s Mission and on the ongoing work of the regional and country offices, commissions and global programmes. Building upon the recommendations of the workshop, the Social Policy Programme will focus on strengthening the understanding and technical skills of IUCN's staff with the aim of integrating social, economic and cultural dimensions in their conservation activities and thus dealing with these cross-cutting issues in a more coherent and effective manner.

Time was also devoted to discussing the Policy document on Social Equity in Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources, of which the first version was presented to the IUCN Council in November of 1998. The group reconfirmed the need for a policy statement to guide IUCN's work in this field and agreed on a second draft, which was subsequently presented for consideration to the Policy Committee of Council at its April meeting in 1999. Focusing on equity, rights, poverty and local empowerment issues, the draft was welcomed by the Policy Committee. They suggested it be circulated as part of a consultation process among the IUCN constituency. The Social Policy Programme has already started the translation of the policy document into French and Spanish in order to open the consultation process with the members, commissions and the Secretariat in the forthcoming months.

For further information, contact: Cristina Espinosa, IUCN HQ; email: cme@hq.iucn.org

Workshop on Freshwater Ecosystem Management and Social Security

Harare, Zimbabwe, 12-15 April 1999

As part of a collaborative initiative between the IUCN Social Policy Programme and the Water Global Initiative, IUCN organised a workshop on Freshwater Ecosystem Management and Social Security in Harare in April. Led by Dr Cristina Espinosa (IUCN Social Policy Program), Dr Tabeth Matiza-Chiuta (IUCN-ROSAsA) and Dr Ger Bergkamp (IUCN Water specialist), the workshop was one component of an ongoing IUCN-led consultation process “Vision for Water and Nature”.

Chaired by Dr Aliq Rahman (Director of the Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies and a member of the Ring Network and CEESP), the meeting focused on a discussion paper prepared by Dr John Soussan (Environment Centre of the University of Leeds, UK). This document set out an analysis of the institutional dynamics, and emphasised the livelihood approach as central to the discussion.

After a preliminary analysis, the participants who represented a diverse and balanced group in terms of discipline, expertise, geographic area and gender, broke into discussion groups to address the following issues:

- Social security and freshwater ecosystem management at the level of livelihoods;
- Social security and freshwater ecosystem management related to the interactions between government and civil society;
- Towards a vision 1: redefining the institutional context;
- Towards a vision 2: mitigation and adaptation strategies at local and global levels.

Discussions culminated in reports to the plenary sessions, which were used as a basis for a Draft Statement of the Vision and a Frame for Action, discussed and agreed on the last day. The final version of the Statement and Frame of Action as well as the workshop report, is posted on the website: http://www.waterandnature.org to stimulate an open debate.

The next workshop in series, on Freshwater Ecosystem Management and Economic Security, was organised by Andrea Bagri (IUCN-Economic Unit) and will be held in Bangkok on 12-14 June 1999.

A report will follow in the next issue of Policy Matters.

Wetlands and the Private Sector

13th Global Biodiversity Forum, San José, Costa Rica, 7th May 1999

Organised by IUCN at the 13th GBF, the workshop was attended by forty people from throughout the world. The audience used the term “private sector” to mean either the corporate, business and industrial sectors of the economy, or any non-governmental player including NGOs, community groups or academia.

A number of presentations highlighted the role of community groups in forming coalitions and initiating community-based management of
threatened wetlands, including the implementation of zoning regulations; small enterprise development schemes; sustainable harvesting practices; and co-operative agreements with developers. Other case studies illustrated the part played by private land owners in taking the initiative to conserve wetlands on their own land, and by companies in reclamation and restoration schemes in development projects.

The role of government was also discussed. Presentations highlighted the ability of the private sector to manage and finance private goods aspects of wetlands, while emphasising the need for public sector management and financing of public goods aspects of freshwater ecosystems. The group stressed the need for regulatory frameworks in support of market-based incentive measures. For example, using voluntary agreements to induce an aquaculture farm to undertake extensive farming practices would not be successful without an underlying framework which enforced pollution standards.

The group articulated the vital role the private sector should have in assisting the Ramsar Convention to devise appropriate incentives for its implementation, but questioned whether it was currently well enough informed to do so. It was therefore recommended that the Convention undertake a communications and education campaign aimed at the private sector. Information regarding the country-level representatives or focal points for the Ramsar Convention should be made available to the public, by publishing them on the Ramsar Internet site.

Incentive measures which would enhance the role of the private sector “including financial/economic incentives and legal/political incentives” and other mechanisms such as certification and eco-labelling were discussed in detail. The group recommended that the 7th Conference of the Parties to the Ramsar Convention advise the Scientific and Technical Review panel to examine in more detail the array of measures available for the conservation and wise use of wetlands through the collection, dissemination and analysis of case studies on incentive measures and their institutional structures.

For further information: http://economics.iucn.org

---

Policy that works for forests and people

We are used to being told that forests are good for us. The range of benefits that can be derived from forests and trees are legion. But there are costs too, and no-one thrives on forest goods and services alone. Forests must also be transformed, in some cases, to make way for farming and settlement to meet other needs. In theory, policy should be able to ensure some kind of balance so that forests are conserved, developed – and cleared – in the most suitable places.

But policies that affect forests are a reflection of the dramas being played out on dozens of stages at the same time. It is difficult to attempt to understand what is happening to forestry and the people who depend on forests without seeing the wider picture of political and economic realities – from pressures for increasing local control, to globalisation of markets and technology, to rising inequality.

If policy is going to work for forests and people – to produce forests that people want and are prepared to pay for – it needs to engage with these political and market realities. Finding out how this can be done is the challenge addressed in a forthcoming report from IIED. Policy that Works for Forests and People – The Series Overview – draws together the key findings of a three-year project involving a global review of key issues and consultative, multi-disciplinary country studies led by local professional teams in six developing countries: Costa Rica, Ghana, Zimbabwe, Pakistan, India and Papua New Guinea. The report sets out to identify what it takes for policy to provide a working, trusted, guiding framework – to put in place a process that tackles forest problems and delivers equitable and sustainable benefits.

In particular, the report dissects the complexity of factors which determine forestry practice, examines the characteristics of good policy and identifies desirable processes to put in place. Finally it outlines four critical steps towards achieving the kind of policy processes identified. These steps describe a learning, adaptive process brought about by a regular forcing open of the policy debate by stakeholders and their ideas, and a continuous sharpening of priority problems and proven solutions. A premium is placed not on one-shot “planners’ dreams” but on step-wide approaches that notch up shared experience – making visible progress and building momentum for broader change.

Good policy becomes defined, and refined through the experience of those who have the potential to deliver good forest management and work for equitable livelihoods – often the very people who are marginalised by current policy processes. The type of work now needed is collaboration on analysis and institutional change with those who are currently marginalised from the policy process, so that they can present their views and experience, and make their claims more effectively.

Policy that Works is not a dream about saving forests or halting deforestation, or afforesting the earth, all of which match the desires of only a few. Neither is it about introducing comprehensive and logical master plans for all forests and people, and then expecting everyone to become compliant so as to quietly implement such plans. Such an approach does not recognise historical and political contexts and the ways in which real change is made in practice. Rather we should aim for a unity of theory and practice – constructive engagement with each other in processes of debate, analysis, negotiation and the application of carefully designed instruments of policy – from taxation to certification by extension. Forestry can and should be an activity which changes the political environment for the better.

Policy That Works for Forests and People: The Series Overview will be available from September from IIED, 3 Endsleigh Street, London WC1H ODD, UK; Price £12.50.
Managing for Ecosystem Health
An international Congress on Ecosystem Health
Sacramento, California, USA, 15-20 August 1999

Contact: Congress Secretariat, International Congress on Ecosystem Health, Genetic Resources Conservation Program, University of California, One Shields Avenue, Davis CA 95616, USA; email: ehc@ucdavis.edu

Philosophy and Biodiversity
International Seminar at the University of Turku, Finland
20-21 August 1999

The philosophical interest in the phenomenon of multiplicity of biological kinds is almost as old as philosophical activity in itself. Plato is alleged to be the first to defend the so-called Principle of Plenitude according to which "the world is the better, the more things it contains". The present worldwide attention to biodiversity seems to subscribe to the same idea: we should do our best not to diminish the multiplicity of life forms which have generated from the evolutionary processes on Earth. In general the notion of biodiversity is logically linked to the idea that we can recognise and identify different kinds of species, subspecies and habitats and their mutual relationships. How exactly should we construct the idea of biodiversity? What are the basic units of biodiversity? Is there some kind of correlation between diversity and stability? What is the significance of the ancient philosophical ideas to modern philosophy of nature?

The purpose of the seminar is to shed light on the phenomenon of biodiversity by creating a forum for a debate among philosophers and other researchers interested in conceptual and ethical issues of biodiversity.

If you would like to submit an abstract (not more than 400 words) or would like further information, contact: Markku Oksanen, Department of Philosophy, University of Turku, 20014 Turku, Finland; Tel: +358 2 333 6336, Fax: +358 2 333 6270; email: majuok@utu.fi

Beyond Governance
Murree, Pakistan, 24-28 August 1999
Organised by CEESP in collaboration with the Social Science Research Council


Biotechnology in the Global Economy
Centre for International Development, Harvard University, Boston, USA; 2-3 September 1999

The conference will address the implications of biotechnology for international trade; intellectual property rights; biodiversity prospecting; developing countries; human and environmental safety; and social values.

Emphasis will be placed on the relationships between biotechnology and institutional change around the world. It will build on the premise that maximising the benefits of biotechnology and minimising its risks will require adjustments in existing institutions (defined to include organisations, laws, regulations, administrative practices and social routines that are a large part of our cultural heritage). In addition, the design of technological systems needs to take into account social expectations.

The conference will bring together researchers, entrepreneurs, political leaders, policy makers, practitioners and civil society. It will foster dialogue between these groups through roundtable sessions on specific themes. Discussions will use case studies to promote the sharing of experiences and information. The outcome of these discussions will be used to formulate research agendas, guide further policy discussions and contribute to the shaping of training and educational material on biotechnology and public policy.

Contact: Calestous Juma; Tel: +1 617 496-0433; Fax: +1 617 496 8753; email: Calestous._Juma@Harvard.Edu

Global Biodiversity Forum: Regional Session for South and South-East Asia
Colombo, Sri Lanka, 24-26 October 1999

The Regional GBF will take place prior to the 5th Meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) to the CBD, Montreal, January 2000. It will focus on the following themes: an ecosystem approach to conservation with special reference to arid and semi-arid ecosystems (including arid mountains) and coastal and marine ecosystems; sustainable use of biodiversity; alien invasive species; biodiversity-friendly practices and technologies; developing and implementing national biodiversity strategies and action plans: lessons from South-East Asia.

Contact: P. Balakrishna; IUCN - South and South-East Asia regional biodiversity programme; 48 Vajira Road; Colombo 5; Sri Lanka; email: pbala@slnet.1k

International Conference on Sustainable Management of Coastal Ecosystems
Oporto, Portugal, 3-5 November 1999

Contact: Tel: +351 2 550 8270; Fax: +351 2 550 8269; email: pduarte@ufp.pt

Globalisation, Ecology and Economy – Bridging Worlds
Tilburg, The Netherlands, 24-26 November 1999

Organised by the European Centre for Nature Conservation (ECNC) and GLOBUS-Tilburg University Expertise Centre for Globalisation and Sustainable Development in co-operation with IUCN and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development.

For further details, contact the Conference Secretariat, ECNC, PO Box 1352, 5004 BJ Tilburg, The Netherlands; Tel: +31 13 466 3240; Fax: +31 13 466 3250; email: gee@encn.nl; http://www.ecnc.nl
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Next Issue
The next issue of Policy Matters will feature Governance. If you would like to contribute an article on this theme, or have news or comments you would like to flag up, please contact the Editor, Catherine McCloskey, IIEP, 3 Endsleigh Street, London WC1H ODD; email: catherine.mccloskey@iied.org
The deadline for contributions is September 1 1999.