

Introduction: Equity in Community-based Resource Management

Sango Mahanty
RECOFTC

Jefferson Fox
East-West Center, Hawaii

Leslie McLees
University of Hawaii at Manoa

Michael Nurse
RECOFTC

Peter Stephen
RECOFTC

1. Introduction

Community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) encompasses a diverse set of approaches and practices that broadly share a concern for integrating social and environmental goals by devolving power and authority in resource management from central government to the local level. Advocates promote CBNRM as a means for improving the socio-economic conditions of the rural poor, improving sustainable resource management and increasing the power and participation of hitherto marginalized groups (Kellert *et al.* 2000). Recent studies have questioned this potential, observing that in practice the equity outcomes of CBNRM fall short of expectations (Agarwal 2001, Agrawal and Ostrom 2001, Agrawal and Gupta 2005). Others suggest that CBNRM may promote a degree of equity if the right approach is used (Kellert *et al.* 2000, Edmunds and Wollenberg 2002, Nurse *et al.* 2004, Colfer 2005). To investigate the equity implications of CBNRM further, the East-West Center and RECOFTC invited a group of researchers and practitioners from Nepal, India, Cambodia, China, Laos, Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam to participate in the 'Eleventh Workshop on Community Management of Forest Lands: Equity in CBNRM' held in Bangkok in August 2005.

The East-West Center and RECOFTC have facilitated over the past four years a series of 'writeshops' that have brought together participants from various Asian countries to document case studies on topical themes in CBNRM. These writeshops

provide an opportunity for the participants and their organizations to develop capacity for critically analyzing aspects of their field work and to document what they have learned. Lessons are fed back into field project work and into key policy fora.

This chapter introduces the theme of equity in CBNRM and provides an overview of the chapters that follow. We start by examining some of the key concepts related to equity in CBNRM, and some of the critical relationships between equity and CBNRM that have been flagged in the literature.

2. What is Equity?

Equity is not a new concept, but there has been surprisingly little detailed discussion on the meaning of equity in natural resource management (NRM). This lack of clarity in definition has influenced analyses of equity in CBNRM, where the expectation that CBNRM should promote equity generally carries implicit but unexamined notions of what equity is, the extent of ‘equity’ that should be promoted or achieved and the best means of doing this. As a starting point to this exercise, we examine the concept of equity and some of its embedded meanings in greater detail. In this way, the various dimensions of equity and inequity may be better understood and the real potential and weaknesses of CBNRM initiatives in promoting equity can be examined in greater depth.

2.1. Equality versus Fairness

“Equity involves getting a *‘fair share’*, not necessarily an equal share. What is regarded as a *‘fair share’* varies according to different situations (and different cultures)” (Fisher 1989).

This definition by Fisher (1989), which is our starting point, draws attention to two related issues. First, the implication is that although there may be differences in the levels of resources or benefits received by different stakeholders, for instance according to their effort or role in a resource management system, if this rate of distribution is perceived as ‘fair’ then it may be regarded as an equitable arrangement. Second, it suggests that the ‘benchmark’ for measuring equity needs to be situationally determined to account for social contexts, norms and values. While useful as a starting point, we found this definition needed further elaboration to provide a workable framework for assessing equity in CBNRM.

2.2. Economic and Political Equity

Jacobs (1989) defines two dimensions of equity relating to the substance or outcome of a policy or resource management system, and the process by which actions are formulated and implemented. The outcome refers to the allocation of costs and benefits amongst stakeholders as a result of policy or resource management decisions. This has been called economic equity (Poteete 2004), and also allocative or

distributional equity (Jacobs 1989, Anand and Sen 2000). The distribution of benefits from community-based NRM amongst stakeholders is the most common measure of equity in the CBNRM literature. For example, Kellert and his colleagues assess the equity of CBNRM programs in terms of the distribution and allocation of socioeconomic benefits and resources. Researchers have paid less attention to equity in cost-sharing, though this is also emerging as an important area for attention. For example, the opportunity costs of attending a forest user group meeting or the labor costs of managing a community forest may be unacceptably high for the poorest in a community, which diminishes their capacity to engage in and benefit from community-based management (Nurse *et al.* 2004).

The processes by which various stakeholders make their voices heard by decision makers have equity implications in terms of access to decision-making and the ability of stakeholders to have their ideas and concerns expressed and heard. This has been referred to as procedural equity (Jacobs 1989) or political equity (Poteete 2004), a dimension which has also received significant attention in the CBNRM literature. For instance, the representation of marginal groups in resource management bodies, as well as opportunities for these groups to actually influence decision making, are the fundamental concern of authors such as Agarwal (2001) and Sarin (1998).

Agrawal and Gupta (2005) found in their study of resource user groups and their functioning in Nepal that there is often a connection between economic and political equity. They suggest that those with economic and social advantage tended to be more likely to participate in forest user groups. In our task of facilitating analysis of equity in CBNRM, we found it important to be clear and explicit about which dimensions of equity were being considered and assessed, the economic and/or political, and where appropriate to consider relationships between the two.

2.3. Equity Between Whom?

Multi-stakeholder processes span diverse social groups with differing capacities and power, functioning at different spatial scales and with ties to different localities (Jacobs 1989). Many of the authors who discuss equity in CBNRM have focused on equity between social groups at the community level. Studies from highly stratified societies such as India and Nepal have emphasized the considerable challenge faced in engaging socially marginal groups; for example women and lower castes in CBNRM (Sarin 1998, Agarwal 2001, Nurse *et al.* 2004, Agrawal and Gupta 2005). This inequity is both economic, in terms of the capacity of these groups to capture benefits, and political, in terms of their role and influence in decision making.

Jacobs (1989) suggests that the issue of equity between localities has been a central concern in the planning field where the siting of infrastructure and services has important implications for their equitable access and use. CBNRM programs have generally not explored spatial inequity, but where CBNRM seeks a more equitable balance of power between state and non-state actors, equity between stakeholders at different levels and in different localities is a critical issue. Many of the earliest CBNRM programs were successfully established in degraded forests where there were fewer

stakeholders with an economic or political interest in the resource. Several of the authors in this volume discuss the more difficult situation of gaining community access and management rights over highly valued resources such as protected areas or commercially valuable forests. This raises questions about equity between meeting the needs of local people who use resources for their daily livelihoods, and the need to protect high value areas such as national parks for the benefit of all. It also raises questions about equity between communities with access to degraded resources and communities with access to valuable resources.

In this volume, Ratna Isnaini examines a case of CBNRM in Mount Ciremai National Park, West Java, Indonesia and the issues faced by different stakeholders in the process, including rights of access for subsistence. Socheat Leakhena San discusses a new plan by the government of Cambodia to allow communities to manage existing protected areas, and the challenges they are encountering. Bhola Bhattarai looks at how establishing community access to commercially valuable forests in the terai has proved especially difficult due to significant obstacles established by the Nepali government. Another important question concerns the role of government in facilitating a fair outcome for those communities that do not live near forests but depend on them indirectly for biodiversity or commercial forest products. Domingo Bacalla reviews government regulations in the Philippines that restrict resource access to people residing adjacent to forests, leaving out large portions of a community.

CBNRM programs with sustainable resource management objectives capture to some extent the question of equity between generations, which is prominent in the sustainable development literature (see Anand and Sen 2000 for an overview). However, the concept of intergenerational equity also raises an important question about the timeframe for analyzing equity. Is it possible, for example, that short term loss may translate into longer term gains for certain social groups? The paper on Laos (by Thongmanivong Sithong and Vongvisouk Thoumthone in this volume) highlights that the poor are less likely to benefit in such situations, as they lack the capacity to make the necessary investments and to await long term returns.

Some of the papers in this volume focus on equity at the community level (such as Domingo Bacalla, Diah Djajanti, Ratna Isnaini, Harisharan Luintel, Kyrham Nongkynrih, Somying Soontornwong, Thongmanivong Sithong and Vongvisouk Thoumthone (coauthors) and Tan Nguyen), while others argue for a greater leveling of the relationship between community and state (Bhola Bhattarai, Can Liu and Socheat Leakhena San).

2.4. Who Sets the Benchmark for Equity?

If, as suggested by Fisher, we regard equity in relative rather than absolute terms; who decides what is or is not equitable? The case study of the Khasi in Northeast India presented by Kyrham Nongkynrih provides some interesting insights into this question. The exclusion of women from decision making processes at one level may be regarded as fair from the standpoint of tradition in Khasi society, but social change

and interaction with a range of external actors has stimulated some questioning amongst the Khasi about the fairness of this situation. Kyrham's paper suggests that while equity is culturally specific, cultures are dynamic, and stakeholders may need to renegotiate their thinking on equity as ideas and demands change over time.

Most of the CBNRM literature in fact does not sanction a culturally determined concept of equity. Instead, a large portion of the literature sees reducing inequity as the key agenda for CBNRM, with practitioners encouraged to take an active stance towards increasing the role, influence and benefit capture by marginal groups through the use of various mechanisms (Agarwal 2001, Edmunds and Wollenberg 2002, Colfer 2005, Agrawal and Gupta 2005). These writings posit an implicit benchmark for equity between social groups, towards which CBNRM initiatives should strive. In this context, we suggest that CBNRM is evolving into a form of social action, with governance concerns beyond resource management. Both Bhola Bhattarai and Harisharan Luintel claim that the practices of community forestry have helped communities overcome ingrained discrimination against people of lower castes. They hope that by building equality at the community level they can help facilitate it on the national level. Ratna Isnaini argues for the recognition of community rights in protected areas in Indonesia on the grounds of securing their livelihood and gaining social justice.

Workshop participants struggled with the question of 'who decides what is equitable,' a crucial issue with important political and economic implications. We contemplated that if the improvement of equity is a central goal of CBNRM, then what is the end point to which we are aiming? We questioned if an end to inequity was the ultimate goal, or was a spectrum of equity possibilities possible and desirable? At a pragmatic level, as one workshop participant pointed out, inequity has existed since time immemorial – are we then being unrealistic in expecting CBNRM to change this without supportive changes in wider society?

Our discussions highlighted that the process of setting the benchmark and goals is important, and requires reference to the social context as well as explicit discussion and negotiation between stakeholders. This rarely occurs in practice. As the Khasi case highlighted, it is also important to recognize that concepts of equity may also change over time and with processes of social change.

2.5. Assessing Equity in CBNRM

Table 1 below summarizes key elements to consider in relation to equity and CBNRM, drawing on the authors and issues discussed above. Assessing equity outcomes does not require us to necessarily address all of these elements; however, it is important for the concept of equity to be clearly considered and the focus of assessment clarified. The case studies presented in this volume refer to several of these.

Table 1: A Working Framework to Analyze Equity in CBNRM

Dimension	Description
Equity in...	Distribution or allocation of resources (economic) Representation/participation and influence in decision making (political)
Equity between...	Social groups within a community Stakeholders at different levels Localities Generations
The equity benchmark...	Processes for determining 'what is equitable' Culturally determined and socially based rights

3. Equity and CBNRM: Exploring the Linkages

While some scholars question the potential of CBNRM to fully address social inequity (Agrawal and Ostrom 2001, Wunder 2001, Agrawal and Gupta 2005), others agree that a number of CBNRM initiatives have been able to promote a degree of both economic and political equity (Kellert *et al.* 2000, Agarwal 2001, Edmunds and Wollenberg 2002, Colfer 2005). This depends largely on the degree to which facilitators actively intervene to engage with groups that have up to now been largely marginalized within CBNRM initiatives, including women (Agrawal 2001) and the poorest of poor (Nurse *et al.* 2004). Several scholars (Edmunds and Wollenberg 2002, Nurse *et al.* 2004, Colfer 2005) suggest strategies that show promise for improving the prospects of engaging marginalized groups in CBNRM processes.

Some papers in this volume describe the effectiveness of CBNRM techniques in establishing equity within communities. In Indonesia, Diah Djajanti examines how Perhum Perhutani, a state owned enterprise, has learned from past practices that the inclusion and participation of marginalized women is necessary for better resource management practices. This company now encourages more participation from women in an effort to create better management practices that will benefit the entire community. Harisharan Luintel presents a case on the effectiveness of civil society organizations (CSOs) in strengthening voices that have been historically marginalized by the caste system in Nepal. In Cambodia, Socheat Leakhena San explores the effectiveness of current facilitation techniques for soliciting the participation of poor households. Leakhena compares her results against benchmarks set by other authors and NGOs in order to determine the best practices for successful projects. Finally, in Thailand, Somying Soontornwong describes how a community has successfully solicited the participation of the marginalized poor in monitoring mangrove forests, increasing their catch of crabs and resulting in dramatic growths in household income.

Other scholars (Agrawal and Ostrom 2001, Johnson and Forsyth 2002) argue for clearly established property rights for local resource users if CBNRM initiatives are to have a chance at improving the economic and political situation of poor households. Johnson and Forsyth suggest that a 'rights based' approach that establishes communal rights over forest use and management is a fundamental requirement if equity between state and community resource users is to be achieved and economic benefits from these areas captured at the community level. Ostrom and Agrawal (2001) also find that for political and economic equity to be improved at the local level, decentralization policies need to address a wide range of rights and responsibilities, for example management and exclusion rights, and to go well beyond the limited rights to use specific resources.

Rights to access and manage resources form a central concern in current efforts to secure CBNRM for indigenous and other rural communities. Li (2002), however, cautions that the recognition of rights within a limited CBNRM framework with a focus on resource conservation may ultimately limit the options of communities to commercially utilize or develop these resources. Bholra Bhattarai describes how the rights of terai communities to manage forests have been stripped by the government, especially when compared to hill farmers, and how providing access to new community forest user groups in the terai has become almost impossible. A stakeholder analysis by Ratna Isnaini shows how the designation of a national park that severely limits access to and use of resources has formed an obstacle to CBNRM. Both of these cases highlight that CBNRM cannot be effective without supportive implementing policies. Domingo Bacalla, for example, describes how community forests in the Philippines are limited to people using the resource for traditional subsistence purposes. The law does not allow communities to utilize community forests for commercial gain. The government of Laos views swidden agriculture as environmentally destructive and is consequently promoting the development of a cash crop economy in the northern hills. Sithong and Thouthoune examine how this development makes these communities more vulnerable to commodity price fluctuations of global markets.

Varughese and Ostrom (2001) pose the question: is equity ultimately necessary for and compatible with sustainable NRM? They suggest that a degree of social inequity actually facilitates positive resource management outcomes because it provides incentives for individuals to bear a greater share of the cost and take the lead. However some uniformity in interests is also required between these groups for collaboration to occur and appropriate institutional arrangements are needed to overcome the tensions raised by social heterogeneities. Tan Nguyen explores this issue further in his examination of the equity implications of forest devolution in Vietnam, where unequal relationships between state officials and rural communities led to unequal distribution of community land plots. Tan finds that this inequality may have led to better forest management, but it came at the cost of sacrificing improvements in the livelihoods of the poorest. Tan's findings suggest we cannot simultaneously achieve both resource management and equity objectives. Ultimately we may face a tradeoff

between achieving more equitable distribution of resources (and better rural livelihoods) and better resource management. Resource managers and communities continually struggle in finding the appropriate balance between improved natural resource outcomes and greater livelihood outcomes through more equitable distribution of rights to resources. Resource managers and communities continually struggle with getting the most appropriate balance for their resource and/or community between achieving the objectives of better resource management and more equitable distribution of access rights to resources.

Wunder (2001) suggests that forest based livelihoods will not ultimately help people escape the poverty trap, although he qualifies this in more recent writings with the recognition that “forest resources are often important in poverty mitigation and avoidance, and there is often no substitute for these vital services, especially in remote areas” (Sunderlin *et al.* 2005). Can Liu notes that 400 of the 500 poorest counties in China are in forest rich areas. This raises the question for advocates of CBNRM about how far forest based initiatives will ultimately go towards alleviating poverty. The answer may depend upon whether poverty reduction is seen as a relative goal, where improvement of the current situation is the aim, or as Wunder suggests, an ‘absolute concept’, not related to the perceptions and relative situation of social groups (2001: 1818). In the former case, a number of the papers in this volume present evidence that community-based forest approaches are improving rural livelihoods (Bhola Bhattarai, Diah Djajanti, Harisharan Luintel, Socheat Leakhena San and Somying Soontornwong). Whether, in Wunder’s terms, this is sufficient to raise the beneficiaries above an objectively defined ‘poverty line’ remains an open question.

4. Overview of Papers in this Volume

Bhola Bhattarai argues against new policies in Nepal that restrict community access to productive and high value forests in the terai (the flat southern portion of Nepal) on the basis that these policies create inequity between terai and hill communities. The national government counter argument is that it is better equipped to manage these resources and that the benefits of these forests should be distributed equitably through the country. Bhola however, argues that civil society organizations (CSOs) are in fact better positioned to help communities manage forests successfully through facilitation of more efficient participation and the development of connections with distant user groups. In addition, he suggests that CSOs have the potential to promote decentralization and participatory democracy, to improve livelihoods of the poor and to promote sustainable forest management.

In the Philippines, the government has declared CBNRM to be a national strategy. **Domingo Bacalla** analyzes the policy framework that promotes this approach in terms of how well it achieves equity in access to forest lands. The logging ban, in

place since December 2004, limits economic activities to subsistence activities only in forest lands allocated as Community-based Forest Management Areas, and therefore restrict the economic rights over the forest areas of numerous rural and indigenous communities and limits their opportunities to gain commercial benefits. He finds that there have been a number of successful initiatives, but that the policy framework needs to be complemented with more formal involvement by local communities in rule making. In addition, greater support from Local Government Units is needed to ensure higher levels of community participation in community-based forest management, without which disparities in equity may actually be broadened under CBNRM policies.

Can Liu performs a statistical analysis on the relationship between poverty and total factor production. By using a two-stage model of stochastic frontier approach, he looks at the productivity of households from three counties in China that have high rates of poverty yet are rich in natural resources. He concludes that the total productivity of rural households has not increased from 1991 to 2001, despite being located adjacent to abundant areas of natural resources. He argues that it is impossible for farmers to escape the poverty trap unless off-farm income is earned to increase total productivity. He further suggests that issues such as market controls, which discourage foreign investment, and land allocation, which causes land fragmentation and neighborly disputes, are leading factors in the inability of peasants to increase productivity. This is leading to increasing inequity between poor farmers in forest rich areas and farmers in other areas of China.

In Indonesia, Perhum Perhutani, a state-owned company, has realized that its traditional practices have encouraged the destruction of forests, have been ineffective in terms of soliciting community collaboration and have excluded marginalized groups such as women. **Diah Djajanti** describes a new program (Managing the Forest with Community), in which Perhum Perhutani employees encourage more equitable community participation, especially among marginalized groups such as women, and introduce benefit sharing processes to create more equitable distribution of resources. Through these practices, the community in this study has seen marked increases in NTFP extraction and incomes. Indeed, the community has also been successful at preserving forests as the incentives to convert plots to agriculture have decreased.

Numerous scholars and practitioners have recognized that civil society organizations (CSOs) can play important roles in achieving CBNRM objectives, particularly in societies stratified along ethnic, caste or gendered lines. **Harisharan Luitnel** examines the crucial role that CSOs play in the Nepali context in promoting equity in CBNRM by implementing positive discrimination for the poor as well as groups marginalized by caste and gender and benefit sharing programs through the Participatory Action and Learning (PAL) process. Through these processes and programs, communities have successfully been organized, overcoming deeply rooted cultural differences. However, Harisharan also cautions that CSOs need to critically reflect on their roles and limitations in promoting equity in CBRNM. CSOs and

communities will be better served if they can improve their relationships with government and enhance their internal organization to better promote the inclusion of marginalized voices.

While equity may be an important concept within CBNRM, we must acknowledge that it is also a social construct. **Kyrham Nongkynrih** uses a case study from the Khasi Hills District in Meghalaya, India to explore different understandings of equity within a community. Using a conceptual framework that he creates, Kyrham examines the traditional systems of forest management that have been codified into law. Forest access and collection practices are determined strictly on whether a person bears a clan name, resides in the area and is a male. Through discussions with various groups in the clans, Kyrham determines that many non-Khasi see the management regime as inequitable, but to the Khasi, the system is fair and just. The sustainability of these institutions in the face of more democratic forms of governance and ideals that are penetrating the society is perhaps the most surprising result of the study, as more recently some Khasi are questioning the limited engagement by women in decision making in tradition institutions.

As one of the least developed countries in the world, the government of Laos has been trying to diminish swidden farming, which it views as environmentally degrading, and to reduce poverty by promoting the adoption of permanent commodity-oriented agricultural crops. Growing market demands for sugar and rubber in China, and the success of a model rubber plantation have resulted in a boom of sugar cane and Para rubber plantations. **Thongmanivong Sithong** and **Vongvisouk Thouthone** explore the impact of cash crops on the livelihoods and land tenure of local people. They conclude that rubber does not bring equitable financial benefits to farmers. Those that can mobilize capital and labor at the right time can gain more while those who cannot eventually lose out. Poor farmers that cannot invest will likely end up becoming laborers on their own land.

The Ministry of Environment in Cambodia implemented Protected Areas in the early 1990's to promote environmental conservation. After reviewing their plans, the Ministry began to establish Community Protected Areas (CPAs) for more effective management. **Socheat Leakhena San** identifies some of the issues arising out of these projects. One of the obstacles to success is the skill of the facilitators and whether they can properly draw out minority voices in the communities to ensure full participation and adequate representation of interests. Facilitators are also responsible for properly communicating plans, such as benefit sharing, that can encourage participation. Another issue Leakhena identifies is the difficulty poor households have in participating in these activities because of struggles to meet everyday subsistence needs and the lack of time and energy to participate in community meetings. Leakhena argues that the goals of biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation need to be properly negotiated to meet the needs of people trying to escape poverty and to respond to land-use dynamics such as the conversion of forest to agriculture that results in a loss of biodiversity.

By conducting a stakeholder analysis, we can see where power resides and where the power and potential of different stakeholders can be used to bring fairer access and use of government controlled lands. **Ratna Isnaini** presents a strong argument for decentralization of government management in Mt. Ciremai National Park in Indonesia, giving communities the access they require for meeting subsistence needs. Because national park land is heavily regulated and access duely restricted, communities dependent on them have become even more marginalized in comparison with other forest dependant communties. Ratna argues that equity issues compel us to take a closer look at the interests and power within conflicts over land use, specifically in national parks. Doing so will encourage more collaborative styles of management that should be based on priciples of transparency and democratization. Through these processes, more equitable practices can be implemented.

Participation of the poor in CBNRM is an issue that is addressed frequently in these papers. **Somying Soontornwong** presents us with a case study in Thailand that has had a great deal of success in raising the livelihoods of the poor through increased participation and action research. Action research, a 'learning by doing' approach, provides room for learning lessons and reapplying them through new approaches as the community and researchers work together to improve livelihood conditions. This flexible method is credited with drawing in some of the more hesitant poor, who were busy trying to subsist, into management programs that have been successful in increasing equity between all members of a community. The approach helped to raise the level of participation of the poor from passive to more interactive participation, where they begin to make decisions based on their own experiences. Active participation has enabled poor households to take control of resource management institutions and to continue to improve them.

One strategy that many countries have taken to try and involve local communities in decision making is forest devolution, or transferring the rights, responsibilities and benefits of forest management to local people. However, the poverty alleviation objectives of devolution are not always achieved. **Tan Ngyuyen** argues that devolution in Vietnam has been inequitable as land titles have gone to people with ties to government officials and local elites. This practice marginalizes the poor in communities as they are further denied access to forests, while more powerful people gain increased access. These differences create further inequity in many communities. Tan argues that while devolution may be a strategy to encourage biodiversity protection, this goal may be incompatible with improving livelihoods of poorer people, as they are denied access to the devolved forests, and thus perpetuate inequities in rural communities.

5. Concluding Comments

The papers in this volume suggest several emerging lessons from CBNRM on equity. These include:

- The process of setting the equity benchmark and goals to be achieved through an equity framework is important, and requires reference to the social context as well as explicit discussion and negotiation between stakeholders. This rarely occurs in practice.

- Ultimately we may face a tradeoff between achieving more equitable distribution of resources (and better rural livelihoods) and better resource management. Communities, and those institutions supporting communities such as NGOs and donors, must struggle to find the most appropriate balance between achieving the objectives of better resource management and more equitable distribution of access rights to resources.

- Forests (and other common property resources) may not ultimately help people escape the poverty trap. This raises the question for advocates of CBNRM about how far common property based initiatives can go towards alleviating poverty. The answer may depend upon whether poverty reduction is seen as a relative goal, where improvement of the current situation is the aim, or an ‘absolute concept’, not related to the perceptions and relative situation of social groups.

- CBNRM may help local people to gain use rights to their traditional lands. But many people may want to privatize these resources for commercial and other purposes. Is it equitable for commercial resource use to be restricted in CBNRM arrangements?

- CBNRM is unlikely to remove inequity from society unless the broader society is challenged and changed to accept the same expectations and responsibilities that are currently placed on CBNRM processes.

- CBNRM is evolving into a form of social action that is concerned with broader issues beyond resource management such as governance and democracy.

References

- Agarwal, B. 2001. “Participatory Exclusion, Community Forestry and Gender: An analysis for South Asia and a conceptual framework.” *World Development*. 30(9):1591-1605.
- Agrawal, A. and K. Gupta. 2005. “Decentralization and Participation: the governance of common pool resources in Nepal’s Terai.” *World Development*. 33(7): 1101-1114.
- Agrawal, A. and E. Ostrom. 2001. “Collective Action, Property Rights, and Decentralization in Resource Use in India and Nepal.” *Politics and Society*. 29(4): 485-514.
- Anand, S. and A. Sen. 2000. “Human Development and Economic Sustainability.” *World Development*. 28(12): 2029-2049.

- Colfer, C. J. P. 2005. *The Equitable Forest: Diversity, Community and Resource Management*. RFF Press: Washington DC.
- Edmunds, D. and E. Wollenberg. 2002. "Disadvantaged Groups in Multistakeholder Negotiations." CIFOR Program Report. Bogor, Indonesia.
- Fisher, R. J. 1989. "Indigenous Systems of Common Property Forest Management in Nepal." Working Paper No. 18. East West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Jacobs, H. M. 1989. "Social Equity in Agricultural Land Protection." *Landscape and Urban Planning*. 17(1989): 21-33.
- Johnson, C. and T. Forsyth. 2002. "In the Eyes of the State: Negotiating a 'rights based approach' to forest conservation in Thailand." *World Development*. 30(9): 1591-1605.
- Kellert, S. R., J. N. Mehta, A. E. Syma and L. L. Lichtenfeld. 2000. "Community Natural Resource Management: Promise, rhetoric and reality." *Society and Natural Resources*. 13: 705-715.
- Li, T. M. 2002. "Engaging Simplifications: community-based resource management, market processes and state agendas in upland Southeast Asia." *World Development*. 30(2): 265-283.
- Nurse, M., P. Robinson, D. Paudel and B. Pokharel. 2004. "Towards Pro-Poor Community Forestry – Recent experiences from Dolakha and Okhaldhunga district of Nepal." Paper presented to National Workshop on Management of Common Property Resources and Equity: Exploring Lessons from Nepal, 28 May 2004. Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Poteete, A. "Is Decentralization a Reliable Means of Increasing Equity?" Paper prepared for the Tenth Biennial Conference of the International Association for the Study of Common Property (IASCP), 9-13 August 2004, Oaxaca, Mexico.
- Sarin, M. 1998. "Community Forest Management: whose participation...?" in I. Guijt and M. Kaul Shah (eds), *The Myth of Community: Gender issues in participatory development*. Intermediate Technology: London.
- Sunderlin, W.D., A. Angelsen, B. Belcher, P. Burgers, R. Nasi, L. Santoso and S. Wunder. 2005. "Livelihoods, Forests and Conservation in Developing Countries: an overview." *World Development*, 33(9):1383-1402.
- Varughese, G., E. Ostrom. 2001. "The Contested Role of Heterogeneity in Collective Action: Some evidence from community forestry in Nepal." *World Development*. 29(5):747-765.
- Wunder, S. 2001. "Poverty Alleviation and Tropical Forests – What scope for synergies." *World Development*, 29(11):1817-1833.