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Variety of understandings of “tenure” across the world

More than just ownership – a “bundle of rights”

- Access
- Withdrawal
- Exclusion
- Management
- Alienation

Central to questions of management and benefits
What do we mean by forest tenure reform?

A legal process changing the rights in the bundle of rights to natural resources (land, trees, other)

Often the process begins as result of a major shift: intense social pressures, natural disaster or political commitment.

Often long and contentious processes
Trends in Forest Tenure - Global

- Owned by communities & Indigenous Peoples: 9% (2002), 12% (2012)
- Owned by individuals & firms: 11% (2002), 12% (2012)

Note: The countries included here cover 85 percent of the world’s forests. For full details see: www.rightsandresources/tenuredata.
Trends in Forest Tenure – Developing Countries

Note: The countries included here contain 80 percent of the total forest estate of developing countries. For full details see: www.rightsandresources/tenuredata.
Forest tenure distribution

Africa

Asia

Latin America

Administered by Government
Owned by communities and Indigenous Peoples
Designed for use by communities & Indigenous Peoples
Owned by individuals & firms

**SOURCES:** Sunderlin et al. 2008; ITTO/RRI 2009. Includes best available data as of December 2011 from 36 of the world’s most forested countries, representing 85% of world forests.
What explains the diversity?

Rights-based, economic or forest management-based rationales

Latin America: Social mobilization, especially Indigenous Peoples

Africa: Colonial relics (concept of *terra nullius*), state-custom conflicts, decentralization

Asia: Diverse, but much reform in China, Vietnam
Community forest tenure rights

Big changes in “community” and “Indigenous Peoples” forest tenure over past several decades

Through titles, management conventions and licenses

What rights in the bundle do these communities enjoy?
Objective: Analyze the “depth” of rights allocated to communities and Indigenous Peoples’ and create a database for wider use

Research Questions
1. What are the statutory tenure regimes governing the rights of communities and Indigenous Peoples to forest resources?
2. What rights do they accord to communities and Indigenous Peoples?
75% of the forests in developing countries
86% of the regimes established after 1992

Source: Forest tenure database. See www.rightsandresources.org/tenuredata.
Rights in each regime

Source: Forest tenure database. See www.rightsandresources.org/tenuredata.
Key findings

- 95% of regimes restrict community use of forest resources.

- Just over half of the tenure regimes (32 of 59) recognize the rights of Indigenous Peoples and communities to access, commercial exploitation, and forest resource management. But in all cases these rights are contingent on compliance with state mandated management plans and/or the stipulations of licenses.

- 36% of the surveyed tenure regimes do not recognize the right of Indigenous Peoples and communities to exclude others from their forest lands.

- 66% forbid them from alienating their lands or their rights to forest resources (through lease, use as collateral, or sale).

- In over half of the regimes (34 of 59), rights are recognized for an unlimited period.

- In 40 of the regimes, the government must comply with due process and provide adequate compensation should it decide to revoke a community’s rights.
Regional findings

- Latin America has the highest percentage of regimes guaranteeing the rights of access, commercial exploitation, and forest resource management.

- In Asia 31% (5 of 16) of those regimes communities only have the right to use timber resources for subsistence needs. Tenure reforms in China and Viet Nam not only recognize communities’ rights to forest resources but also increasingly facilitate, if not encourage, the allocation of forest land to households.

- Since early 2000, countries in Africa have established laws recognizing the rights of Indigenous Peoples and communities to forest resources. In 35% (6 of 17) of the surveyed regimes established by national legislation, rights cannot be implemented due to a lack of supplementing regulations that clearly define the recognized rights and the processes by which such rights maybe allocated in practice.
FIGURE 3: Do national laws that recognize tenure rights permit Indigenous Peoples and communities to exclude outsiders?

- **Global**
  - 58% (34/59)
  - 36% (21/59)
  - 4% (3/59)
  - 2% (1/59)

- **Latin America**
  - 72% (18/25)
  - 24% (6/25)
  - 4% (1/25)

- **Asia**
  - 71% (12/17)
  - 29% (5/17)

- **Africa**
  - 59% (10/17)
  - 24% (4/17)
  - 18% (3/17)

Legend:
- **Yes**
- **No**
- **To be determined**
- **Case by case**

* Regimes established by constitution or law but lack subsequent law or regulations defining the extent of rights.
** Extent of rights defined on a case by case basis by individual agreement.
Note: Rounding errors acknowledged.
Area under the regimes by region, 2012

228mHa or 32% of the countries’ forest area

151mHa or 34% of the countries’ forest area

15.9 mHa or 5% or the countries’ forest area

Africa

Latin America

Asia
Lessons learned from tenure reform processes

Who has an interest?
- Government
- Customary authorities
- Citizens
- Special interest groups: women’s associations, etc
- Private sector
- Right-holders

What is the objective of reform?
- Recognize rights gained through historic occupation?
- Realign production systems?
- Reflect reality?
- Change reality?
- Tenure security for the poor?
Lessons learned from tenure reform processes

Reform requires political will
Implementation requires sustained political will
Multiple sectors and institutions (conflicts in law: mining, ag, forest)
Plan for a long road – iterative, learning process
Awareness raising of new or changed rights
Training of service providers and judiciary
Mobilization of non-governmental actors
Costs vary depending on precision, location, surface area (individual plots versus territories)
Contestation, clarification, negotiation are part of the process
Examples to learn from

Mozambique: *Community territories under pressure*

Brazil: *Cleaning up a complex situation*

South Africa: *Customary authorities and power*

China: *Increased choice leads to better outcomes*

South Sudan: *recognizing community rights “land belongs to the community” what about forests?*

Indonesia: *Tenure Reform Road Map; Constitutional Court Decision*
THANK YOU
The status quo:

• The dominant economic model for forestry in Africa has been state-controlled, export-oriented, industrial scale concessions.
  o This model dates from the colonial period and relies on central state ownership of forests
  o Post-independence governments tend to maintain this, though evidence increasingly shows that this model does not promote balanced national economic growth.

Room for reform:

• 8 of the 20 most-forested countries that adopted important and new forestland reforms since 2000 are in Africa.
• In these 8 countries, the area of public forest designated for use by communities and indigenous people more than quadrupled between 2002 and 2008.
• Some important examples of reforms in the region include:
  o Liberia’s watershed Community Rights Law and anticipated land reforms;
  o Cameroon’s reforms to its land and forest codes;
  o The Democratic Republic of Congo’s 2002 forest code (replacing the 1949 colonial text) and upcoming community forestry regulations;
  o The Sahel’s ambitious decentralization of land and resource management in Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger, Senegal (since the 1990s).

• Despite this progress, forest tenure in Africa remains contested and governments still own and control 98% of total forest area.

• While the period between 2002 and 2008 saw a five percent increase in recognition of communities’ tenure regarding natural resource management, from 2008 to 2010 virtually no change in tenure occurred.
Methods, assumptions, caveats

• Legal analysis by international legal expert
• Over 170 relevant legal documents identified and consulted
• Over 90 experts reviewed preliminary data

• The analysis is based on binding laws and regulations only.
• The analysis is based on national level legislation only.
• When interpreting the data we use best-case scenario.

• Just because it exists on paper does not mean it exists in reality.
27 Countries; 75% of the forests in developing countries
86% of regimes established after 1992

Source: Forest tenure database. See www.rightsandresources.org/tenuredata.
The Bundle of Rights in 59 regimes

Source: Forest tenure database. See www.rightsandresources.org/tenuredata.
Key findings

- 95% of regimes restrict community rights to forest resources

- Just over half of the tenure regimes (32 of 59) recognize the rights of Indigenous Peoples and communities to access, commercial exploitation, and forest resource management. But in all cases these rights are contingent on compliance with state mandated management plans and/or the stipulations of licenses.

- 36% of the surveyed tenure regimes do not recognize the right of Indigenous Peoples and communities to exclude others from their forest lands.

- 66% forbid them from alienating their lands or their rights to forest resources (through lease, use as collateral, or sale).

- In over half of the regimes (34 of 59), rights are recognized for an unlimited period.

- In 40 of the regimes, the government must comply with due process and provide adequate compensation should it decide to revoke a community’s rights.
Putting community tenure regime into place is often mired in bureaucratic requirements.

- Costly land delimitation processes, requirement for the community to acquire legal status, complex legal language, proof of traditional use of forestland and short time frame to comply with complicated procedures established by Law.

The exercise of community forest tenure rights is often dependent on strict compliance requirements

- These strict compliance requirements to management plans are frequently onerous to prepare and conform to, and seldom recognize traditional ways of managing natural resources practiced by indigenous peoples.

Globally 15% (9/59) of the regimes cannot be implemented because of a lack of implementing regulations.

- Two-thirds of such regimes are found in Africa. 35% of surveyed regimes in Africa cannot be put into practice.