Land and forest use by local communities and the involvement of external stakeholders - Case study of protected area in Laos

> HYAKUMURA Kimihiko Institute of Tropical Agriculture Kyushu University Japan

Background

- The establishment of protected areas is being promoted all over the world as an effective measure to preserve biodiversity and rich ecosystems.
- > In 1990s, Laos has promoted the establishment protected areas.
- There are many villages that overlap and affecting the protected areas or surrounding areas. This may cause conflict between local people and the government over land and forest use.
- The protected area management policy with less negative impacts on the livelihoods of local people is particularly necessary.
- For securing local right as well as effective forest management, collaborative protected area management system with government sector should be introduced.

Objective of the study and method

- To identify the livelihoods of local people caused by external stakeholders' activities, particularly government bodies.
- To examines the potential for collaborative forest governance with protected area management

Method

- Interview with relevant stakeholder including villagers and local forestry office
- Field observation

Protected area in Laos



- > 20 protected areas
- 330,000ha, consisting of 14% of total land.
- Village affecting protected area: 1,100 villages.(15-20% of total number of villager)

Phou Xang He protected area and study site

Village K

- 270people (49HH)
- Main livelihood: Paddy filed and shifting cultivation
- *Bru* ethnic minority
- Located inside protected area



Mix deciduous and dry evergreen forest





Dry dipterocarp forest



Agricultural land



Rainfed paddy field



Shifting cultivation

Residential area



Livelihood of village K

			No. of HH (Total:49)	%
Agriculture		Rainfed paddy field	44	90%
		Shifting cultivation	20	41%
Animal husbandry		Buffalo	31	63%
NTFP	consumption selling	Bamboo shoot	49	100%
		Yam potato for rice shortage	48	98%
		Resin Oil	35	71%
		Cardamom	1	2%
		Hard resin	18	37%

Stakeholders involved in forest management of village K

Level	Stakeholders	Role			
National	 Central government (Department of Forestry) 	Development of protected area management policies			
	 Provincial Agricultural and Forestry Office (PAFO) District Agriculture and Forestry Office (DAFO) 	Implementation of protected area management policies at the local level			
Province / District	> Aid agency (SIDA)	Support of implementation of protected area management policies			
	Companies and investors	Purchasing of timber and NTFP etc			
	Villagers of Village K	Use of forest resources and land in Village K			
Local	Local people of surrounding areas	Use of forest resources and land near Village K 11			

Stakeholders involved in forest management of village K



The history of village K and protected area

Year	Incidences	Actor involved	
1930s	 Establishment of Village K (Main livelihood: Shifting cultivation) 	Villagers	
1950s	Some HH start to cultivate paddy filed	Villagers	
1975	Expanding paddy field by Vietnamese soldiers	Vietnam villagers	
1990s	Ban on shifting cultivation	Central gov. <i>I</i> local officials, villagers	
1993	 Developed provincial road (North part of village K) Start to timber harvesting Protected area system established (PM Decree) 	Company, Villagers Central gov./local officials, villagers	
1998	Start protected area management and ban on timber harvest	Aid organization/ local officials, villagers	
2003	 Aid Organization completed their project Three zoning system established (MAF decree) 	Aid organization, Local officials, villagers Central gov./local officials, villagers	

Land use in 1958



Land use in 1998



Land use in 2005



Right to use land and forest products

	Land owner		NTFP		Timber	
•	Local traditional	PA policy	Local traditional	PA policy	Local traditional	PA policy
Paddy field	Land user Person who clear land	Use right	collector	Collector	Traditional land owner	Use right
New open paddy field						
Shifting cultivation land	Land user					
Young fallow swidden		government				
Fallow swidden (secondary forest)						
Mixed Deciduous forest (dense)				Allow to use in buffer zone	village	Allow to use in buffer zone
Dry dypterocarp forest	village			Prohibit in core zone		Prohibit in core zone
Spirit forest (protected)			Prohibit to collect		Prohibit	
Burial forest						17



Sign Board in Village K settlement indicating rules of protected area

Summary 1/2

Shifting cultivation

- Officially, shifting cultivation was ban since 1993, but local people still has continued to cultivate them. Local forestry official did not control strictly them.
- The area of shifting cultivation gradually decreased.
 1) needs for paddy field increasing, instead of shifting cultivation
 2) following government order.

NTFP

- Importance of NTFP as livelihood (Yam potato as emergency food)
- > Quantity of collected NTFP are limited, not caucused by deforestation.

Summary 2/2

Protected area management policy

- The Gap period between promulgation and implementation of the decree
- Non-implementation of zoning both core and buffer
 Not enough instruction from central government
- The gap right to use right for local people between traditional regulation and official policy

Conclusion

- Slipped protected area management
- > Delay and non implementation of the PA policy

Central government could not provide yet proper guidance and necessity budget.

Non-functioning system

Ban of shifting cultivation • NTFP utilization

The limited impact to PA. Local officials show some understanding local people behavior

Toleration by local officials

(Cf. Lack of capacity of local officials)

- The realistic solution to PA management would be to allow local officials to be flexible in the implementation of national policies.
- In the future, alternative policy implementation are necessary.

