



GMS Forest Policy Brief 02

Field-level forestry

Institutional frameworks that fail to provide incentives to invest in forest management and a procession of high-level national and international priorities in forestry mean that field-level activities are often overlooked. The health and vitality of forests in the Greater Mekong Subregion and their productivity are threatened as a result. With demands on forests increasing and climate change threatening, efforts to maintain benefits from forests should focus attention on effective management at the field level.



Many of the day-to-day field-level activities that physically determine the future of forests and forestry are often overlooked: monitoring of forest health and vitality; fire management; forest patrolling; silvicultural activities; reduced impact logging; and collection of forest statistics among others (**Box 1, Box 2**).

The enthusiasm at national and international levels for prioritisation of development or sectoral objectives – poverty alleviation, devolution and decentralisation, climate change mitigation, forest law enforcement and governance, – although of great importance, can divert attention from field level activities and on-the-ground realities.

Often, the reality in the field is that forest management cannot keep pace with developments in national and international dialogues. In fact, high-level decisions may even go completely unnoticed by the grassroots. While theory, science and policy may advance, at the local level – where the trees are growing and where demands for wood, non-wood forest products and ecosystem services are increasing – lack of capacity and knowledge are often highly constraining. For example, local level fire management is rarely supported despite education and rapid response being the most efficient ways to control forest fires. Similarly, lack of forest rangers and guards means that biodiversity losses continue to occur and carbon stocks are at greater risk. Reduced impact logging is rarely practiced in the subregion despite its environmental and economic benefits.

The long life cycle of trees and forests means that in spite of current priorities, long-term management activities must continue in order to ensure the sustained flow of benefits. Without focus on practical aspects of forestry, it is possible that by the time changes agreed in international dialogues are translated to field levels, a protracted period of institutional strengthening and training will be required for results to be realized.

Among the challenges to implementing sustainable forest management, the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) has drawn attention to the almost universal lack of resources needed to manage tropical forests properly – staff, equipment, vehicles, facilities, etc. (ITTO 2006). Similarly, in relation to protected area management, WWF has highlighted the need for increased attention to field level issues including management planning, monitoring and evaluation, budgeting and awareness. Biodiversity condition is most strongly correlated with monitoring and evaluation, staff numbers, law enforcement and control of access (WWF 2004, 2007).

Box 1. Reduced impact logging

Logging has perhaps the most significant impact on forest health and vitality in the subregion in view of the generally low quality of harvesting operations. Associated degradation reduces not only the present value of forests but reduces regenerative capacity and leaves a legacy of low forest productivity, reduced commercial viability and impaired ecological functioning.

Reduced impact logging (RIL) significantly lessens damage to the residual stand and is economically justified by savings from reduced damage and future benefits resulting from increases in forest growth and yield.

Addressing forest health and vitality, and forest degradation in particular, has become a topic of much debate in anticipation of a global mechanism to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD). Improving the climate change mitigation potential of forests and increasing stocking densities are closely allied goals and, as such, climate change funding could go far towards improving the health and vitality of forests in the subregion (Broadhead *et al.* 2009). Adaptation of forest management is also likely to be necessary to achieve mitigation goals. For example, maintaining ecosystem integrity such that carbon is not lost through forest drying and fire, or ensuring the security of pollinators and reproductive capacity are likely to be necessary long-term measures in utilizing forest potential for climate change mitigation. Recapitalization of the region's forest resources is essential for a greener future. Continued high rates of economic growth in the region provide the means to ensure that necessary steps are taken. Failure to invest in forest resources may cost more in the long run than investing when conducive conditions prevail.

Box 2. Fire management

Since 1997/1998, when fires swept across large areas of the Asia-Pacific region, responses have been limited and the sources of problems have, in many cases, remained unaddressed. For example, forest managers and/or local inhabitants are not usually responsible for fire control and land tenure arrangements may promote short-term strategies and excessive use of fire as a management tool. Weak governance and ineffectual legal and regulatory systems may also hinder law enforcement with respect to fire (Rowell and Moore 2000).

Due to increased opening and drying of the Subregion's forests, changing weather patterns and increasing risks of anthropogenic ignitions, there is a strong need to improve fire management to avoid large losses of forest and potential ecosystem collapse. Fire has to be tackled at the source, either through prevention or through rapid response. Fire management can be improved through information and awareness campaigns, improved legislation and faster fire responses. Regional and national communication networks and monitoring schemes may also be necessary, as well as specific management practices at the local level.



The way forward

The forestry agenda is often set at levels above those at which foresters themselves have significant control. There are, however, a number of initiatives that are within foresters' grasp. Amongst these are voluntary codes of practice, which seek to provide benchmark standards to guide forest managers. Codes of practice for forest harvesting address the technical quality of harvesting in natural forests – an area in which positive economic and environmental benefits can be generated. Codes have also been developed for fire management and for planted forests, and the economic and ecological logic of implementing these codes should similarly act as the main incentive in encouraging their uptake and improving forest management.

In the coming years, there will be a growing need to develop responsive management systems and to improve ecosystem resilience. Forest monitoring to quickly detect and tackle outbreaks of pests and diseases, effective fire management, restoration of forest functions after disturbances and reduced impact logging, are all necessary. Consequently, international agreements and policy development need to be accompanied by practical steps towards improvements in forest management. Guidelines and codes of practice are often insufficiently disseminated or adhered to and science and technologies, although developed, often do not make it to the field level.

As such, major attention to training, capacity development and enforcement of regulations is sorely needed if hopes are to become realities. Efforts to better bridge high-level decision-making with grassroots field practices are also important. With these investments in forest management, a greener future with increased rural employment, higher production and improved environmental protection can be expected.

References

FAO 2011. Forests and forestry in the Greater Mekong Subregion to 2020. Subregional report of the second Asia-Pacific forestry sector outlook study. Bangkok, FAO.

International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO). 2006. Status of tropical forest management 2005. Yokohama, Japan, ITTO.

Rowell, A. & Moore, P.F. 2000. Global review of forest fires. Gland, Switzerland, WWF/IUCN.

World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). 2004. Are protected areas working? An analysis of forest protected areas by WWF.

World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). 2007. Tracking progress in managing protected areas around the world. An analysis of two applications of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool developed by WWF and the World Bank. Gland, WWF.

For more information, please contact:

Patrick Durst
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
39 Phra Atit Road, Bangkok 10200, Thailand
Tel: (66-2) 697-4000
E-mail: patrick.durst@fao.org

Or go to the Outlook Study website:
<http://www.fao.org/asiapacific/forestry-outlook>

GMS Environment Operations Center
The Offices at Central World, 23rd Floor
999/9 Rama 1 Road, Pathumwan
Bangkok 10330, Thailand
Tel: (662) 207 4444
E-mail: info@gms-eoc.org
web: <http://www.gms-eoc.org>