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Preface

Since the 1970s, the Philippine government has provided forest communities with legal framework in order for them to participate in forest management. After three decades of their involvement, communities have become more influential in continuously shaping the community forestry policy environment, notwithstanding the support of other stakeholders in these policy processes.

For those interested in democratizing policy formulation processes, this publication provides case stories of individuals and organization partners of the IIRR Community Forestry Interlocking Project. These are stories of their involvement in the CBFM policy advocacy processes and their reflections on the implications of current local and national forestry policy and advocacy process. Moreover, it also illustrates ways of engaging stakeholder groups in community forestry. Their stories narrate their involvement in the community forestry action research project of IIRR and how it provided them opportunities for realizing their potentials toward sustainable community forestry.

This publication also highlights the use of the writeshop as an evaluation tool, which, as far as we know, is new in the field. Six case stories written by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Local Government Unit (LGU) and People’s Organization (PO) representatives themselves are herein presented.

I encourage you to read through the entire publication because it will provide insightful information on the innovative IIRR Community Forestry Interlocking Project, detailed description of writeshop as a creative and participatory evaluation methodology, interesting case stories from the major community forestry stakeholders, and significant lessons from the various experiences.

Forester Reymondo A. Caraan
Manager
Community Forestry Interlocking Project
Regional Center for Asia
International Institute of Rural Reconstruction
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Introduction

During its four years of implementation, the Community Forestry Interlocking Project (CFIP) sought to achieve its goal, which is "to contribute to the release of forest communities’ potential in managing their forests whilst adding to the community forestry discourse within Southeast Asia and beyond."

An evaluation of the project was carried out to assess the realization of this goal, as well as the impact to project partners (see Annex 1 for evaluation framework). At the onset, the project adopted and practiced participatory processes in all its activities. For this evaluation, the team conducted focused group discussions and key informant interviews with its project partners in the community and the government. From this, a wealth of information was collected including testimonies on the impact of the CFIP. Producing an impartial and objective report that would capture the highlights and outcomes of the project was a daunting task for us as project implementors. What was more challenging was attributing positive changes in the individual and organizational capacities and policy processes to the project. To resolve this issue, we engaged the partners in a participatory evaluation process. Hence, the writeshop method.

The writeshop is a tool for collectively analyzing experiences, distilling lessons from experiences, and collectively documenting those practice-based learning in order to produce information resources for development practitioners. The writeshop has been used by the International Institute for Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) and many international development organizations for effectively and efficiently generating, sharing and documenting experiences in development work. For this evaluation, the writeshop became a venue for partners to collectively assess and write down their own experiences, their own assessment of the CFIP. Specifically, it was used to help the participants recollect and write their experiences which would hopefully help them:

a. reflect on and assess the impact of CFIP interventions at the individual level through changes in their knowledge, attitudes and skills (KAS) and participation in policy processes;

b. reflect on and assess the impact of CFIP interventions at the organizational level as manifested in the organization’s adoption of participatory processes and involvement in policy processes; and

c. reflect on and assess the impact of the CFIP to CBFM policy and policy processes.
In addition to the objectives above, the evaluation also aimed to test the effectiveness of the interlocking component framework (see Fig. 1) in achieving the goal of the project.

The product of the writeshop is this publication. The project team hopes that this can offer CBFM practitioners and development workers an idea of how this project tried to be a positive influence to partner individuals and organizations as the project team journeyed with them in this action research project.

While our project partners attest to concrete changes after the project in terms of CBFM policy, policy advocacy processes and individual and organizational performance, these gains could not be attributed to this project alone. At the same time, we are privileged to have been a decisive part of a process that strengthened the individual and organizational commitment and capacities of communities and organization for implementing CBFM.

Overall project interlocking strategy

**Figure 1.** Adding value to maximise potential impact.
The COMMUNITY FORESTRY INTERLOCKING PROJECT

In 1995, the government adopted the Community-Based Forest Management (CBFM) as the strategy for sustaining the country's forests. The strength of this strategy lies in the fact that it recognized and supported the efforts and capacities of local communities and Indigenous People's to manage forest lands and resources.

However initial assessments reveal that there are elements that hinder long term investment by community members in forest management. These include the points below, which were also validated in the findings of phase I of the project:

1. the lack of incentives for community members to invest in forest management;
2. the lack of community rights and substantial community participation in decision-making;
3. inappropriate roles of development professionals and the rigid and 'blueprint' nature of development projects; and
4. undemocratic and centralized nature of forest policy-making in the Philippines.

Because of these findings, IIRR embarked on an action research project with the International Development Research Center (IDRC), Canada, to contribute to efforts addressing these challenges. The phase I of the Community Forestry project of IIRR (2000-2003) was a field-based research, information sharing and policy advocacy to advance community forestry in the Philippines. As the challenges identified in phase I are interlocking, an interlocking operation of framework was adopted in the phase II of the project (2003-2007). Hence the project's name - Community Forestry Interlocking Project (CFIP).

The action research project had three components: (a) surfacing, analyzing, and documenting community perspectives and experiences in implementing community forestry policies; (b) an international experiential training and learning initiative aimed at retuning the skills of Natural Resource Management professionals; (c) and a communications advocacy and
publications component to help maximize impact through policy advocacy, institutional and inter-institutional learning capacity development, and cutting edge publications that will add to the national and international community forestry discourse.

As mentioned, the goal of this project was to contribute to the ‘release’ of forest communities’ potential to manage forests. Releasing the potential of communities to manage their forests would be as much about changing ‘us’, the development professionals, and our constructs, as it is about changing ‘them’, the community members. Hence, the project activities were focused on not only working with communities but also in attempting to change the barriers to community forestry found within the political economy and within the nature of development professional training. The components themselves and their interlocking nature were an attempt to grapple with these complex challenges in order to make a worthwhile contribution to community forestry in the Philippines, whilst learning from the experience.

Concretely, the project objectives involved the following:

**Objective I. Participatory field research:** This aimed at engendering a process of learning from and with community members and their efforts towards making forestry policies that would promote increased rights over use and decision-making by community members.

**Objective II. Supporting advocacy processes:** This aimed at supporting policy advocacy processes through the facilitation of multi-stakeholder communication platforms and publications to help accelerate pro-community changes in forest policy and in institutional and inter-institutional reforms.

**Objective III. Experiential training and learning:** This aimed to enhance the learning capabilities of professionals so that they become more sensitive and responsive to the contemporary challenges that community forestry presents.

**Additional overarching objective:** This aimed at testing the interlocking activity approach, particularly in terms of assessing if indeed the three approaches of this project complement each other for greater impact.

Theoretically, there should be clear links among the three project components. The participatory field research component should have enabled communities to gather and analyze their experiences and perspectives and prepared them to effectively participate and deliberate in the policy advocacy processes.

These processes and platforms should have provided an opportunity for community members to directly engage in deliberations with key community forestry decision makers. In the Experiential Training and Learning component, what should have been achieved was the development of the skills and motivation of professionals to engage in a multi-stakeholder and participatory and deliberative processes with community members, and, as a result, design policies/programs/projects/activities responsive to the needs and interests of the various stakeholders, especially the communities and POs involved in CBFM.

To achieve objective 1, the research team assisted community members from several areas throughout the Philippines in capturing and documenting their experiences. The research team facilitated the documentation of community stories through the use of Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) tools, which are easy to apply and understand, and very visual and participatory in nature. In objective 2, several innovative policy platforms in partnership with different stakeholders were introduced. Common among these multistakeholder reviews and formulation of policy were efforts to highlight the voice of local communities and POs. It was in these platforms where the case stories and
'experience papers' were fed into and where the community members presented their experiences by themselves. These policy platforms became opportunities where community members were able to interact directly with other stakeholders such as policy makers, NGOs, academicians, etc. These platforms also aimed to further promote the democratization of policy making in the country. Publications and policy papers were produced in support of these objectives. The multi-stakeholder process was the main tool used to achieve the objective of promoting inter-institutional learning and cooperation by enabling key representatives of all major stakeholders in the forestry sector of the Philippines to interact on an equal footing during a structured communication process.

Objective 3 dealt with testing new professional training approaches in relation to the challenges presented by contemporary community forestry. This course focused on equipping professionals with the tools necessary to become increasingly reflective and systematic learners and facilitators. The methodology employed in the course revolved around the Participatory Action Research (PAR) learning spiral, where participants themselves throughout the duration of the training were encouraged to go through all stages in this systematic learning spiral. The training approach also encouraged the participants to act as seeds of change within their organizations with follow up mechanisms with alumni as an integral component of the training approach.

The framework on page 2 illustrates how lessons from one component were fed into another component in an integrated way, ensuring no loose ends, so to speak. This way of working added more value to each component in terms of impact than would otherwise be the case if the project only worked with field level research for example. Facilitating a process towards better forest management in a community may benefit at most hundreds of villagers and may result in the improved management of hundreds of hectares of forest. Through the training initiative, which enables mid level professionals to change their organizational work plan to incorporate PAR, thousand of villagers could benefit and thousands of hectares of forest could improve. If the policy advocacy support activities result in even a modest pro-community change in forest policy or adds to the community forestry discourse at large, it could result in positive change for hundreds of thousands of villagers and hundreds of thousands of hectares of forest. This of course may or may not be the case, but the diversity of activities within the project maximize the chances of some real impact.
The Writeshop as an Evaluation Tool

Designing the process

In keeping with the principles of promoting participatory process and ‘learning by doing’, the CFIP project team innovated a project evaluation process that would:

a. involve the primary community forestry stakeholders, particularly the POs, LGU and local and national DENR;

b. evaluate the project from the perspectives of the different stakeholders, particularly in terms of its influences and contributions to project partners as individuals and organizations to community forestry in general; and

c. maximize the evaluation process as an opportunity for the project partners to acquire new knowledge and skills, particularly in terms of participatory documentation and evaluation.

As an initial step in creating this participatory evaluation process, the IIRR team drafted the design and tools for the participatory evaluation/.writeshop and consulted the target participants, on the whole evaluation process.

The Evaluation Process

The IIRR team selected two basic methods to engage the project partners in the participatory evaluation process. These were the PRA and the Writeshop process.

· The PRA

Since project partners have already participated in many PRA activities of the project, it would be easy for them to use PRA tools for the evaluation of the project. Specifically, the Timeline was used to help them recall how they and their organization grew and developed, at what stage IIRR engaged with their organization, and what they gained from these engagements. The Venn Diagram on the other hand, helped them see how they and their organizations related with the other CBFM stakeholders before and after the project, what factors made the relationships change and what were the results (positive and negative) of these changes.
The Writeshop

The writeshop is a participatory process of writing and editing. IIRR was, in fact, one of the development organizations that pioneered in the use of the writeshop to engage development practitioners and partners in a participatory process of documenting experiences in development work and creating popular printed learning materials. Through the years, the writeshop evolved into a form that does not only promote participatory production of materials; it also became an effective tool for organizational learning, for sharing and disseminating experiences in development work, effective and efficient development of training curricula, and as a venue for advocacy (see Annex 2).

For this project, the writeshop was used as an evaluation tool. The writeshop became a venue for the participants to write their own experiences and help them:

a. reflect on and assess the impact of CFIP interventions at the individual level or can be seen in changes in their knowledge, attitudes, and skills (KAS), and participation in policy processes;

b. reflect on and assess the impact of CFIP interventions at the organizational level as manifested in the organization’s adoption of participatory processes and involvement in policy advocacy processes; and

c. reflect on and assess the impact of the CFIP to the policy advocacy processes of CBFM and the CBFM itself.

Before the actual writeshop, the participants were asked to prepare a draft or an outline of their stories with reference to their timelines and Venn diagram, highlighting their insights and reflections regarding their involvement in the project. To help them write their stories, they were asked to make a time line and Venn Diagram.

For the POs, the case stories focused on:

a. how they applied the participatory approaches they learned from the project, such as adoption of action-reflection, use of PRA tools for issue and situational analysis and documentation of their experiences and lessons;

b. how the project facilitated their critical analysis of CBFM and their engagement in policy advocacy processes; and

c. the results of their involvement with the project and the application of learning.

For the LGU and DENR officials, the case stories focused on:

a. how their involvement in participatory process, such as in participatory development of CBFM information materials, influenced them to become a CBFM advocate within their organization and beyond;

b. how they were able to adapt PAR processes into their work, particularly in promoting broader participation in planning and in decision-making processes; and

c. the results of their involvement with the project and the application of learning.

Proposed guidelines for the conduct of the PRA and the story writing were sent to the participants for their review and comment (see Annex 3).

The outlines/drafts submitted by the case study authors were subjected to a writeshop. As mentioned earlier, the IIRR has been a pioneer in the writeshop process as a tool for participatory documentation of lessons and best practices, and as a method for participatory development of information, education and communication (IEC)
materials, training manuals and publications. However, this was the first time that the writeshop was used by IIRR for participatory evaluation.

After circulating the concept paper for the evaluation process and the tools and story writing guidelines, the design for the process and tools were finalized based on the participants' feedback and suggestions.

Selection of Project Evaluation Participants/Writeshop Participants

To make sure that the evaluators of the project represented the various project stakeholders, the team identified the following as writeshop participants:

- 3 Representatives from the Peoples' Organizations
- 1 Representative from a Local Government Unit
- 2 Representatives from the DENR (one from the national office, one from a provincial office)

Forming the Evaluation Team

The writeshop team was composed of authors/writers, moderator/s and a technical team composed of an editor, desktop publisher, administration/secretariat and over-all coordinator. The technical team came from the IIRR staff. The writeshop participants were the writers/authors who also took turns in helping moderate the sessions assisting the technical team from IIRR. The writeshop was managed by a team of Communication Arts students from the University of the Philippines-Los Baños who were undergoing on-the-job-training. They assisted the participants in writing their stories, incorporating comments during the writeshop, and finalizing their drafts.

Actual Writeshop

The five-day writeshop (see Annex 4), as a methodology, aimed to:

- Facilitate sharing of experiences on the CFIP
- Promote collective analysis of the experiences toward distilling lessons from involvement in the project
- Assist each other document experiences and lessons

The first day was a sharing of the results of the PRA and the outline/draft of the individual stories. The sharing of the PRA results served a purpose. First, it facilitated the writers to gather, systematize, and analyze the data and materials so that the participants could all help in constructing each of the case stories. Second, the sharing of the PRA results helped the writeshop participants understand the context and history from which each of the writers was coming from.

The sharing of the outline/drafts of the individual stories already allowed the participants to make comments and suggestions on how each one could already develop his/her case story. Hence, the rest of the first day was allotted for writing/re-writing the first draft, which would be presented the next day.

Day one ended with dinner and 'bonding' session, which helped the participants to get to know each other.
and build a sense of camaraderie and partnership which was really crucial in setting the tone of the following sessions.

Days 2-5 focused on the writeshop proper. The writeshop participants were able to do three cycles of writing and collective editing of 6 case stories: 3 stories from the PO members, one story from the LGU representative, and one each from the DENR local and national officials.

The first and second cycle focused on helping the writers clarify and elaborate on the details of their stories, drawing further on the PRA results, and citing concrete examples from actual experiences. What was really challenging was being able to surface how each of the author saw how the project helped enhance their skills, how they were able to utilize these skills both for their personal benefit and for the benefit of their organizations, and how they were able to share these new skills and knowledge to the other members of their organizations and community. The moderators were also able to draw out from each of the participants how they slowly evolved their own convictions, commitments and advocacies. Many of the discussions also helped in clarifying the specific CBFM issues and problems they brought to light and the policy recommendations and results which the writers/authors advocated.

At first, it was difficult to engage the participants in the discussion and collective editing because each one was focused on his/her own story and was less concerned about helping to improve the other stories. Nevertheless, because each story was quite engaging and inspiring, especially the narrations on how each of the authors confronted the various CBFM issues, everyone eventually participated in the discussions. The moderators also reminded the participants that each one was responsible not only for her/his story alone; that in a writeshop, there was collective authorship and ownership of the stories, and therefore, everyone had to help in improving all of the stories. Eventually, each one tried to help by asking questions to further clarify the points made by the authors and to suggest how to make the narrations more understandable.

By the second cycle (third day), everyone was quite comfortable and familiar with the process each article would go through – 10 minutes for individual silent reading, oral reading by the author followed by an open forum to solicit comments. Aside from presenting their articles, the participants also learned to moderate the sessions during the second and third cycles.

In the first and second cycles, editing focused on the content. By the third cycle, (fourth day of the writeshop), the group felt that the stories had responded substantially to the evaluation questions. The process of collective editing then focused on the form and style of writing, particularly in terms of how to structure the stories better so that they would be easier to understand.

On the fifth day, the third draft of all the case stories was finalized. What was left was fine editing, proofreading, and laying out of the different stories in preparation for publication.

**Evaluation of the writeshop**

The process of assessing and learning from each step of the writeshop was a built-in component of the whole process. This was done through the informal feedbacking sessions at the end of the day. Regular feedbacking helped the writeshop coordinator and the team adjust the processes according to the pace comfortable to the writers, without sacrificing time for substantial discussions, interaction, and individual reflections and writing.

A final assessment of the writeshop was conducted on the fifth day. The first round of assessment was done by requesting the participants to answer the following questions: (they were asked to write their answers in the metacards that were distributed to them):
1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation process?

2. What else can you say about the writeshop process?

The writeshop participants said that they had a difficult time at first because they were not used to recounting their experiences and reflections and writing a story. Equally challenging was putting a logical flow to their experiences which was why, at first, their stories seemed to be repetitive and going around in circles. It really helped that the students from the University of the Philippines were there to assist the authors in pulling their thoughts into writing. The editor also helped in structuring the stories into a form that was easier to follow and comprehend.

It was also difficult for them to recall their experiences during the four years of CFIP implementation and for some, even during the phase 1 of the project. In this sense, the timeline and venn diagram helped them to systematically recall their experiences.

Given the length of their experiences in CFIP, it was difficult to find a focal angle for the stories because there was a lot of information and experiences to share. Some of the participants also initially complained of 'information overload' from the sharing of the other authors. But as the participants and the editor eventually familiarized themselves with the stories as a result of the several cycles of story presentation and discussion, they were able to identify the focus of each story.

Others also commented that the allotted time for the writeshop was not enough; there was not enough time to finish all the stories. However, there was one who said that the process was quite long and there was just too much information to deal with.

Despite the initial difficulties, in the end, the participants thought that the writeshop process was effective because:

- They learned to write, edit and even moderate some sessions of the writeshop. This was the first time that most of the writers/authors wrote a story and participated in a writeshop. They were glad to have discovered their potentials as writers, and they were proud that they were able to produce stories that would be published.
- They were able to reflect on how the project affected them as individuals and as organizations.
- They also learned from the sharing of experiences of the other authors. They appreciated the free flowing discussion, openness to criticisms and comments on their stories, as well as willingness to help improve each story. These attitudes contributed to the over-all success of the writeshop.
- They were satisfied with the stories, which were comprehensive, truthful, creative, inspiring, rich in experiences, and could be used for advocacy purposes.
The Writers

There are 6 inspiring stories shared by project partners coming from People's Organizations, LGU, and the field unit and national office of the DENR. These writers are:

**Rosalie Imperial**, a forester from the CBFM Division of the DENR, shares her insights on the transformation of policy making in CBFM.

**Nelly Alzula**, a feisty woman leader of a PO from Luzon, narrates the development of her advocacy for a community voice in CBFM policy process.

**Rubenie Castellanes**, an emerging leader from Visayas, relates his growth as a PO leader implementing CBFM within the watershed reservation in Maasin, Iloilo.

**Jun Nieva**, a novice to CBFM, shares his and the Atimonan local government units' experiences in stepping forward in support of CBFM.

**Rosalio Fernando**, PO leader, from Mindanao shares the lessons of his PO's active participation in policy processes and how these helped his organization.

**Corazon Ramos**, from the DENR provincial office, shares her learning as she journeys through PAR as a CBFM coordinator.

*Figure 2.* The case story writers from all over the Philippines representing PO, LGU, and the DENR.
The Community – Based Forest Management (CBFM) Strategy was adopted in 1995 as the strategy for the sustainable development of the country’s forestlands and resources. The strength of this strategy was institutionalized through Executive Order No. 263, which strongly acknowledges and supports the capacities of local communities and Indigenous Peoples (IPs) to protect, rehabilitate, and manage forestlands and resources following the principles of social equity, sustainability and community participation.

The Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) is expected to be the lead agency for the implementation of CBFM. At the same time, it is mandated to work with Other Government Agencies (OGAs), Local Government Units (LGUs), Non – Government Organizations (NGOs), and other stakeholders to facilitate the implementation of the strategy. To strengthen and institutionalize partnership in the implementation of CBFM and other forest management functions, a Joint Memorandum Circular and a Memorandum of Cooperation were issued by the DENR, Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG), and the Leagues of Provinces, Cities and Municipalities.

In the last ten years, implementation of CBFM was guided by the National CBFM Strategic Plan crafted in 1997. The National Strategic Plan was also translated into Regional CBFM Strategic Plans to suit the regional and site specific concerns.

Revisiting the Past Ten Years of CBFM Implementation

After ten years of CBFM implementation, 5,322 CBFM project sites have been established, covering a total project area of 3.467 million hectares, benefiting at least 591,231 families. A total of 2.4 million hectares are already covered with land tenure instruments issued under the various people-oriented forestry programs and projects. Of these, 1.6 million ha are covered by 1,781 CBFM agreements that were granted by DENR to organized local communities. These accomplishments were achieved by DENR through the assistance extended by different support groups like the NGOs, OGAs, LGUs, and Development Assistance Organizations/Financial Institutions and individuals who believe in the CBFM slogan, “People First and Sustainable Forestry will Follow”.

However, various assessments on the CBFM reveal certain weaknesses in planning and adopting the strategy.
The CBFM Strategy, while it recognizes DENR as the primary government agency mandated in the management, conservation and protection of the country’s natural resources, underscores the participation and support of different players and stakeholders, especially the LGUs and POs. However, when the DENR prepared the first decade Strategic Plan and developed regional operational policies and guidelines, there was limited consultation with the stakeholders of the CBFM. Hence the first strategic plan was tagged as ‘the DENR Action Plan’.

Other issues and problems that were identified in the assessments revealed the inadequate institutional and operational capacities of the different players to implement CBFM. For instance, the POs found it hard to comply with the complicated procedures and requirements. An example is the preparation by the POs of the required community resource management framework and annual work plan.

Results of the assessment of the first decade of CBFM implementation pointed to the need to revise the Strategic Plan to make it more grounded, realistic and reflective of the concerns and aspirations of the communities and stakeholders of CBFM. Hence, in early 2006, various CBFM stakeholders were involved in the strategic plan development through the conduct of several meetings, and assessments consultations. These efforts culminated in a national consultative workshop in September 2006.

Subsequent activities also followed to develop and produce the draft of the revised Strategic Plan.

DENR partnership with IIRR in Integrating Participatory Policy Processes

One of the key partners in the whole process of revising the CBFM strategic plan was the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) – Regional Center for Asia, through its Community Forestry Interlocking Project (CFIP).

The IIRR had been a long time partner of the Forest Management Bureau (FMB) through its Community-Based Forest Management Division (CBFMD) in promoting and supporting community forestry particularly improving CBFM policies and implementing guidelines. To wit, there is the ‘Linking People to Policy Workshop’, which IIRR conducted in November 2002 in cooperation with the DENR, University of the Philippines Los Baños (UPLB), and other collaborators. This workshop brought together various community forestry stakeholders so that the several perspectives and experiences, including those from the communities could be heard and discussed. Participants in this workshop also discussed various issues regarding the implementation of CBFM and deliberated on possible ways to address the barriers to the effective implementation of community forestry. In 2005, IIRR also initiated a participatory process of developing Information, Education and Communication (IEC) materials. Some of the CBFM Division’s staff became active partners of IIRR in this project.

In April 2006, IIRR initiated the review of the ten-year CBFM implementation in partnership with the UPLB and other partner NGOs and LGUs. In that workshop forum, FMB acted as key planner, organizer, facilitator, and participants.

The forum analyzed the different aspects of CBFM and its impact on the community members and on forest resources. CBFM stakeholders who attended were given the opportunity to speak from their own perspectives through the use of different participatory tools such as the use of meta-cards, fish bowl debate, visual aids, drawings and illustrations, and others. To enable participants from the rural
communities and POs to actively participate, the Filipino language was used in the forum. The forum gave rise to a multi-stakeholder analysis of CBFM, a negotiated vision of CBFM by the different stakeholders, and key thematic areas which were later used in the development of the revised CBFM strategic plan.

One of the key innovations in that forum introduced by IIRR was the conduct of a pre-workshop activity, or what we call 'Day 0', specially designed to assist the POs document their experiences and present their stories at the forum. This methodology was also adopted in the series of workshop related to the formulation of the revised CBFM Strategic Plan. To illustrate, the IIRR team facilitated the pre-workshop activity during the national CBFM consultation workshop in September 2006, where the POs prepared the materials which they would use to present their CBFM experiences. The POs had the chance to practice their 15-minute presentation prior to the workshop. The Day zero activity helped build the confidence of the POs in presenting their experiences and articulating their concerns and recommendations effectively in the workshop discussions.

Another key intervention by IIRR to help integrate participatory processes into the planning and implementation of CBFM was to help build the capacities of natural resource management professionals in participatory development. In fact, IIRR conducted an international training on Participatory Action Research wherein two staff members of the Forest Management Bureau (one from the Natural Forest Management Division and one from the CBFM Division) and one from the local DENR in Quezon Province participated. In addition, I attended the IIRR and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) training program on "How to Make National Forest Programmes Work through Participation" in September 2006, together with another senior staff from the CBFM Division.

This training resulted to an action plan prepared by the participants. The action plan focused on how they would apply participatory tools in policy making in their respective countries. My colleague and I used the workshop as an opportunity to enhance the design for the second decade Strategic Planning workshop. Our plan aimed to integrate more participatory processes and involve multi-stakeholders in the planning process so as to promote wider sense of ownership of the CBFM strategic plan.

The design was formulated for the second decade CBFM strategic plan involved a series of workshops, consultation-meetings and consultation sessions to generate and document lessons from the past 10 years of CBFM implementation as basis for improving the next decade of implementation. The IIRR team, together with representatives from NGOs, academe, donors and POs, actively participated in further improving the design and the actual implementation/facilitation of these various workshops and consultations. These organizations and our office eventually formed the Organizing Committee for the development of the Second Decade CBFM Strategic Plan.
Adopting Participatory ‘Action-Reflection-Action’ in the CBFM Strategic Planning Process

The application of the learning spiral or “planning – experimentation – reflection” (or “action – reflection – action”) learning curve as well as other participatory methods to engage the participants in the discussions. The key to promoting active participation of the various stakeholders was the effectiveness of the facilitators in encouraging free and unhampered sharing of opinions while ensuring balanced and equal participation among the participants. The conduct of pre-workshop meetings with the representatives of the POs helped build their confidence and skills in articulating their ideas so that they could freely and systematically share their stories during the five regional workshops.

Planning and reflection sessions were built into each of these components which provided opportunities to quickly modify or improve on the process whenever necessary.

In every phase, multi-stakeholder participation, especially of the POs, was ensured through the effective use of metacards (on which the participants could write their opinions, comments and suggestions) as well as other participatory tools. The workshop series, a three-day activity, was held in order to validate the result of previous CBFM assessments and to gather more inputs from stakeholders at the local level, especially the POs and LGUs, where the ‘real action and challenges’ in implementing CBFM happen. The cluster consultations also aimed to create wider ownership and adoption of the strategic plan. The Organizing Committee ensured multi-stakeholder participation in these workshops, making sure that the POs, LGUs, Local NGOs, and Local DENR were all represented.

The diagram illustrates the learning spiral for the CBFM Planning Process.
The basic design of cluster workshops included:

- A preliminary session with POs to discuss the status of CBFM implementation, formulation and development of the strategic plan, and discussions on different urgent or burning issues in CBFM.
- Two break-out sessions by stakeholders group to assess CBFM implementation and formulate goals, objectives, strategies and activities, and resources needed.
- A multi-stakeholder workshop on working mechanisms for CBFM implementation.

The preliminary session was conducted to help the POs prepare for their active participation in the workshop proper and establish rapport with facilitators. Day zero usually involved the sharing of the POs on their experiences in implementing CBFM, the issues and problems they confronted, and how these were addressed. This session helped the POs understand their problems and issues, as well as consolidate recommendations that they would like to put forth in the plenary.

Applying the ‘Learning Curve’ in Evolving the Cluster Workshop Design

The basic workshop design was adopted in the first cluster workshop held in Baguio City which served as a “pretest” of the design. However due to some unavoidable circumstances, the initial design and plans had to be adjusted during the actual conduct of the workshop. The preparatory workshop for each PO was not conducted due to lack of time for informing the POs to come a day earlier for the pre-workshop. Because of this, there were some difficulties in drawing out information from the POs because there was not enough time to hear their stories, build rapport with them, and level off expectations, which should have been conducted in the pre-workshop. An adjustment in the break-out sessions was also made to address differences among the participants in terms of their level of involvement and awareness on CBFM and to relieve apparent tensions between and within stakeholder groups.

Lessons from the “pretest” cluster made way for the improvement in the design for the next clusters. Among the proposed recommendations from the participants and the organizing team for cluster 2 were the following:

a. Always start the cluster workshop with the preparatory workshop for the POs;

b. Always review the design with the members of the facilitating team to clearly delineate the roles;

c. DENR should facilitate their own workshop to avoid conflict when other stakeholders raise issues with regard to the capacity of DENR to implement CBFM;

d. Assign resource person/s in each break-out group;

e. Use only metacards, manila paper, and pentel pens in producing the workshop results so that all outputs are uniform (Power point presentations are not allowed);

f. Assign one member of the organizing team to handle ‘walk-in’ participant; and

g. Have a “freedom wall” where participants can write their suggestions, comments, etc. regarding the workshop.

In cluster 3, only minor adjustments and innovations were made regarding application of the revised design and lessons learned. These included: (a) the presentation of the highlights of the results of the break-out sessions, (b) posting of the
workshop outputs on the walls to allow the participants to view the outputs, (c) combined workshop for DENR, LGU, and NGO as support group and (d) consolidation of outputs of the workshop groups. The improved design was subsequently adopted in the remaining cluster workshops.

During the reflection session, the organizing team learned the importance of properly reflecting on the lessons of the previous experiences and reviewing the design and process, making sure that the earlier lessons are integrated in the succeeding cluster workshops. The importance of carefully explaining to the participants the design and process of the workshop was also highlighted as this ensures the active participation and ownership by the participants of the whole process.

Our experience in the cluster workshops also underscored the fact that reflection sessions are as crucial as the planning and experimentation stages. Lessons generated from the reflection sessions could lead to quick changes to suit the needs of certain situations.

The adoption of a dynamic, iterative and participatory planning process is included as one of the principles of the Second Decade CBFM Strategic Plan. The ‘learning spiral’ used for the cluster workshops can provide a practical guide in the implementation of the plan. Stakeholders involved with CBFM will also benefit in applying the learning curve when planning and implementing their local CBFM activities, as well as when monitoring their progress and evaluating action plans. Adopting the learning loop will help them generate the lessons from their experiences so as to avoid problems and unnecessary risks and save on valuable resources.

**Reflections and Insights on the Processes**

Being involved with IIRR in its training program and having had the opportunity to be exposed to its participatory processes was a learning process and a privilege. One of the most valuable lessons my organization and I gained from this whole experience is that there is so much value in hearing the voices and perspectives of multi-stakeholders as they offer a myriad of alternatives to address a number of concerns. The adoption of multi-stakeholder analysis for example, may be tedious and time-consuming but it can produce results that respond to the interests of all the parties involved. Through these participatory processes, stakeholders can agree on a middle ground without sacrificing their own values and principles.

I believe that the opinion and idea of every individual or every group is important, and it is necessary that in the CBFM planning and implementation process, these various ideas and perspectives are always elicited and shared. Indeed, the use of diagrams, illustrations, and many simple and practical participatory tools have helped, not only in surface these various perspectives, but also in allowing more stakeholders’ equal participation in the discussions and decision-making processes.

---

2 Nelly Alzula is a community leader from Atimonan, Quezon. She is the author of one of the case studies in this monograph, "From Trainor to Advocate: Journeying through CBFM".
However, for the effective use of participatory rural appraisal and participatory tools, the guidance of an effective facilitator, who has a good command of the various participatory tools and methodologies is necessary. The involvement and interventions of the very skilled and committed project team of IIRR in the development of the revised strategic plan contributed a lot in carrying out a more participatory approach to CBFM planning and policy making.

My own involvement in the participatory and multi-stakeholder processes towards the formulation of the strategic plan also helped hone my skills and build my confidence as facilitator and advocate of CBFM. I learned a lot from the 'learning curve' which I believe can be applicable to everyday life.

The FMB – CBFMD is fortunate to have IIRR as a partner in the development of the Second Decade CBFM strategic plan. The involvement of competent, development-oriented, friendly and facilitative IIRR staff in the development of the revised strategic plan is well appreciated by the organization. The learning spiral, introduced by IIRR and used in the formulation of the strategic plan, may also be adopted for implementation. The process may actually be mainstreamed in the CBFM projects nationwide.

Certainly, CFIP has helped in achieving major gains in terms of making CBFM more participatory and multi-stakeholder partnership. To be able to mainstream this process, capacity building for various participatory processes has to be sustained all throughout the implementation of the CBFM strategic plan.

**Recommendation**

There are many methods and processes that can be used to achieve an objective. However, we intend to involve as many stakeholders for a particular undertaking to make sure that the outcome reflects the diverse perspectives and needs of these stakeholders. The adoption of participatory tools and the learning spiral are some of the most effective strategies to achieve this.

The lessons from the CFIP and the examples/outputs and tools that had been produced should be shared and integrated all throughout the planning and implementation of the second decade national CBFM strategic plan.

CBFM stakeholders and partners would greatly benefit if IIRR continues with this project, especially since one of the components of the DENR – National Forest Programme Facility engagement deals with capability building of support groups as well as POs. Building the capacities of communities and POs on participatory processes and the learning spiral can be one topic in the training programs that will be developed. Participatory action research can also be one of the major components of the envisioned Regional CBFM Training Centers. Through these efforts, the CBFM program can continue to dream about having more capable support groups and PO leaders like Ate Nelly.

---

**Getting the involvement and active participation of the various stakeholders in the whole process of planning, implementing, monitoring, and generating lessons will also develop a wider sense of ownership of the Strategic Plan.**

Adopting a dynamic and iterative planning process in the implementation of the CBFM strategic plan would be one of the strategies to ensure broader participation in program implementation as well as to provide greater opportunities in sharing and benefiting from the experiences and lessons learnt by the various stakeholders of the CBFM program.
From Trainer to Advocate: 
Journeying through CBFM

Nelly Alzula
President, Kapit Bisig Farmers Association, Inc. (KBFAI), Sta. Catalina, Atimonan, Quezon

No one is born with all the knowledge they need to have in order to live.

Perhaps you would agree with this statement as I think everyone started in life not knowing much. I, myself, was inspired to join the various programs of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) in our community because of my desire to develop myself and gain knowledge and skills which I could also share with the other members of our community. At first, I felt that achieving this goal would be difficult because of my limited education. But I did not let this limitation be an obstacle for me to successfully achieve my goal.

In 1983, I became a member of the KBFAI, which was an umbrella organization of various farmers’ organizations that was established through the Integrated Social Forestry Program (ISFP) of the DENR. Because of my active participation and capacity for conducting trainings, I became the vice president of our organization and the head of the Education Committee. As head of the Education Committee, my responsibility was to educate and train my co-members on the protection and management of our environment and natural resources.

I was able to develop further my knowledge and skills on education and training by participating in the various training programs of the DENR. I benefited from the trainings on community organizing, leadership development and self-awareness, as well as on various technologies on agriculture and on natural resource management.

Whatever knowledge and skills I gained from the trainings I shared with other members. As we continued to grow and develop, so did our organization. And as our organization grew stronger and more progressive, the more that we were also able to be of service to our community. For instance, it was our organization that coordinated and negotiated with the Quezon Electric Cooperative so that our barangay (village) would have electricity. I am also proud to say that one of the KBFAI member organization, the Samahang Pangkaunlaran ng Kabahaihan Kabalikat ng Kapit Bisig (SPKKKB) or the Organization for Women’s Development in Support of Kapit Bisig, became a recipient of the Most Gender Responsive Organization in 1996.

My participation in these processes helped me realize that despite my vast experiences in training, I still had a lot to learn in terms of effectively articulating my ideas and presenting them to big group.
IIRR - A New Partner in our Advocacies

In 2002, the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) visited our community. For several days, the IIRR staff went around the villages in Atimonan to explain their project, the Community Forestry Interlocking Project (CFIP), which aimed to document our community’s experiences in implementing the Community-based Forest Management (CBFM) program. They conducted analyses of the situation and experiences of the villages using various Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) tools such as the Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats Analysis (SWOT), Resource Mapping, Venn Diagram, Problem Tree, and Timeline. My involvement in the IIRR activities in our community introduced me to these PRA tools which I now continue to use and apply for our various organizational needs.

As we participated in these various processes, we discovered and learned a lot of things about ourselves and our organization. My participation in these processes helped me realize that despite my vast experience in training, I still had a lot to learn in terms of effectively articulating my ideas and presenting them to a big group. I also finally came to terms with my fear - that even if I had been an educator and trainer for many years, I was actually still scared of speaking in public, especially to a large crowd. This was probably rooted to my insecurities, my fear of being belittled by other people because of my still very limited knowledge of CBFM.

Our partnership with IIRR opened a lot of opportunities for learning and showed us great possibilities for growth as an organization. Aside from the fact that participating in the IIRR initiated activities in our community, we also had the opportunity to attend some trainings and workshops in IIRR. One of the workshops which I will never forget is the Linking People to Policy held in November 2002. As the representative of our organization to this workshop, I had the responsibility of presenting the results of the PRA conducted in Atimonan. It was in this workshop that I finally confronted and overcome my fear of facing a large crowd, because of this workshop, I developed my self-confidence and courage in voicing out my opinions and views regarding CBFM.

My involvement in the various IIRR activities became a learning adventure where I discovered and learned about many innovative and creative tools for facilitating group discussions. Through the Linking People to Policy workshop, and later, through the National Forum on the Ten Year Review of the CBFM Implementation held in April 2006, I discovered another very innovative method for group discussion – the ‘fishbowl debate’. For me, the fishbowl debate is a very effective strategy in problem analysis or conflict resolution. In a ‘fishbowl debate’, participants are encouraged to express their views with regard to the issue at hand, even if our views are in conflict with those of others. Using this approach, the discussion on an issue becomes constructive and heated arguments that may lead to misunderstandings may be avoided.

---

3 The Linking People to Policy held in November 2002 was a multistakeholder workshop that involved local communities in the review of community forestry policy in the Philippines. It was a step towards a more democratic process for policy review. It involved facilitating a process of deliberation, where the community members presented their own stories to the workshop participants including policy makers, NGOs and academic organizations.

4 The National Forum to Review Ten-Year CBFM Implementation focused in assessing the implementation and outputs of the program. A proceeding of the forum is published by IIRR entitled “CBFM at 10”.

5 The fishbowl methodology requires participants to sit in a large circle facing each other. At the center of the circle-the fishbowl- are five chairs arranged into a small circle. One of the chairs at the center is reserved for the person tasked to explain or justify the position statement and the rest are for respondents.
Through this method, disagreeing parties can actually become partners in resolving the issue.

Before, whenever I had encounters or discussions with DENR officials or other partners in CBFM, I was afraid that if I said something against them, this would have negative implications on our partnership. As I observed, the participants in the fishbowl debate, and as I myself tried to participate in the process, I learned the importance of always standing up for and expressing the truth and what you believe in, so long as you express this in a respectful and diplomatic manner. Through honest and straightforward communication, we are able to understand each other's perspective. This process also helps in building trust among partners because we also learn to understand what to expect from each other and what we can offer each other in return.

Using the 'fishbowl debate' we were also able to negotiate for a five-year work plan for CBFM implementors. The old practice was to have an annual plan, which, in our experience, was no longer sufficient to effectively implement CBFM. We explained that the planning processes in our communities, including the time required to process the many papers and documents to have our plans approved, took from eight to nine months. This left very little time for the implementation of our annual plans. Being able to negotiate for the 5-year workplan was a very meaningful achievement and a very powerful experience as it showed a way by which we, the people from poor, rural communities, given the right opportunities and tools, can advocate and assert for what we believe in.

At the end of this workshop, the participants had a better understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the different CBFM stakeholders. The workshop also became the start of a process of building a more effective partnership and open and direct communication among the CBFM stakeholders like DENR, the LGUs, NGOs, POs and investors/donors.

In this workshop, as well as in succeeding discussions held at IIRR and DENR about CBFM, I had the opportunity to also study and understand the intent of CBFM policy. In studying the policies and experiences in implementing CBFM, I realized that our problems in CBFM implementation were similar to those of other villages. For instance, one of the main issues was the current practice of not consulting the POs and communities in policy making. Usually, we would just learn of a new policy which we were already expected to comply with. Another main problem was that policies were written in English and therefore could not be completely understood by the POs. In order for us to be able to participate in

The Linking People to Policy Forum, contributed to the revision of DENR Administrative Order 2004-09 the Revised Rules and Regulation for the Implementation of Executive Order 263. Below are the specific changes in the rules:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENR AO No. 96-29</th>
<th>DENR AO No. 2004-29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article 3: Stages of CBFMP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Article 3: Stages of CBFMP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation: Planning Stage</td>
<td>Implementation: Planning Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The objectives of this stage is to assist the POS in preparing their a) Community Resource Management Framework; b) Resource Use Permits; c) Annual Work Plans (AWPs) Section 11: Annual Work Plan – The operationalization of the CRMF and the RUP shall be embodied in the Annual Work Plan which shall indicate among other things the specific targets for the year of utilization...</td>
<td>The objective of this stage is to assist the POS in preparing their Community Resource Management Framework (CRMF) and the 5-year work plans. Section 22: Five-Year Workplan - The PO, jointly with the CENRO and LGU, shall prepare a five-year workplan... Shall contain the baseline information, detailed strategies, activities and targets for five years on protection, rehabilitation, development, and resource utilization...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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dialogues, we would have to constantly refer to the dictionary to understand the policy. Because of this, I became a staunch advocate of having CBFM policies written in Filipino and to ensure PO representation in policy-making processes. I strongly believe that the POs understand better the situation which these policies are supposed to address. Therefore, they should be equally involved in formulating and implementing these policies.

**Practicing and living by what I learned**

Because of my experiences and knowledge in CBFM and my capacity to articulate and speak about our CBFM experiences, I was often invited to become a facilitator or resource speaker at various workshops and trainings. Also, IIRR frequently invited me to assist other POs in analyzing and articulating their experiences in CBFM. Soon, I found myself traveling quite often to various communities around the country.

At the National Forum on the Ten Year Review of CBFM Implementation held in April 2006, I was invited not only as one of the PO representatives but also as one of the facilitators. That national forum was attended by local and national officials of DENR, LGU representatives, donors, members of the academe, NGOs and POs. This was another challenge that I effectively hurdled through IIRR’s help. Through a two-day preparatory workshop conducted by the IIRR, we were able to further hone our skills in public speaking. At first, just thinking of what I was asked to do in this national forum was already scary. But I said to myself that my role as a speaker was simply to tell the truth about our experiences, and so there was really nothing to fear. As a facilitator, my role was to be a good listener, to provide everyone an equal opportunity to express their opinions and be heard, to have a fair and unbiased view of each one’s perspective, and to speak in a simple and straightforward manner so that everyone, especially the participants from the POs, could understand me.

Another big and memorable event that I experienced was the National Strategic Planning for CBFM held last September 2006. For this event, I was invited to represent the POs and to be the facilitator for the Livelihood and Rural Enterprises workshop. For this major activity, I once again relied on my inner strength, self confidence, and courage to always stand for and say the truth. Luckily, I was able to successfully fulfill my role as the facilitator. Even former DENR Secretary Angelo Reyes, who was one of the Guests of Honor in that event, was amazed speech during the closing ceremony: “Trees are to be planted not only into the earth; they are to be planted into our hearts and minds. They are to be planted into our hearts so that they grow there with love, and planted in our minds so that we remember how important trees are in our lives and in the lives of the next generation.”

As I became confident in my advocacy work, I soon began to get invitations to participate in international gatherings. In September 2006, I was one of the panelists of the international training, ‘How to Make National Policy Processes Participatory’. As always, I used this opportunity to put forward my advocacy to always ensure the participation of POs in the policy-making processes whether at the local or at the national level. Again, in January 2007, I was able to attend an international workshop sponsored by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), which focused on various processes of evaluating the capacity development of leaders and their organizations. In this workshop, I also reflected on my own processes of development and growth as a leader of our organization and community. In the same month, DENR again invited me for a training on

---

6 The National Strategic Planning for CBFM: A consultative Workshop was one of a series of consultations for the formulation of the CBFM Second Decade Strategic Plan. It was conducted on September 2006 at Traders Hotel, Manila.
negotiation skills for the Forestry Sector. I was excited about this training because I knew that the negotiation skills I would learn from this training would benefit not only me but my organization as we continue to face various concerns and situations where we will have to negotiate and advocate for our stance as a PO. The training helped me gain the skill to remain calm even in the midst of disputes so that I could effectively put forward my agenda and to convince other parties even when the conditions are not that friendly or conducive.

Because of my being a staunch advocate for PO participation in policy-making, and my skill as a public speaker, I was asked to represent POs in the organizing committee for the formulation of the CBFM Strategic Plan. Indeed, this was a proud moment for me and my organization as I became a member of a national committee where I regularly interacted with representatives of international organizations such as USAID, IIRR, national NGOs, DENR, and University of the Philippines Los Baños (UPLB). In all the meetings and discussion, I continued to champion the aspirations of the POs and made sure that the strategic plan had provisions that promoted the welfare and rights of the POs. I also made sure that the document clearly articulated the need for POs to actively participate in policy making and implementation. During the writeshop to finalize the Second Decade CBFM Strategic Plan, I was honored to be selected to represent the POs in the final drafting of this historic paper.

Even as I continue to engage myself in discussions and push for my advocacies at the national level, I remain rooted and active in the struggles of my organization at the local level. One of the current problems of POs is the widespread and arbitrary cancellation of Community-Based Forest Management Agreements (CBFMA). Our organization was one of those which was issued a cancellation notice. I immediately went directly to the DENR National Office to investigate and question this decision, and soon enough, the cancellation of our CBFMA was recalled. Despite this small victory for our organization, we continue to educate ourselves about our rights as CBFMA holders, about the various national and local policies, so that in case we are faced with the same situation, we will be prepared to handle it effectively.

Because of this experience, I realized even further the need for us to develop our 'second line' of leaders. Aside from passing on to them the knowledge and skills I gained through regular trainings and workshops, I always try to help build their self-confidence and tell them that if I was able to make it, they would be able to make it, too.

Combining the Personal and Political

Aside from the continued guidance of IIRR and other NGOs in support of
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7 A two-week international training conducted by IIRR in partnership with LTS International and Food Agriculture Organization (FAO) entitled 'How to make National Policy Processes Participatory'. The training aims to increase knowledge and capacity of enhancing stakeholder participation in NFPs/forest policy processes.

8 IIRR's CFIP is one of the 9 cases for "Learning to use Evaluation in CBNRM Capacity Development in Asia". Four (4) participants, which include 2 CFIP PO/community leaders, from IIRR attended the 2nd workshop in Subic. The project is supported by IDRC together with International Potato Center - User's Perspective With Agricultural Research and Development (CIP-UPWARD).
community leaders like us, I would like to say that I have been able to face challenges through the continued support of my family. My children have served as my inspiration and it is so heartwarming to know that they have been proudly telling their friends and classmates about what I have been able to accomplish. My husband has also been very supportive of me; not once did I hear him complain about my shortcomings as a wife and mother. Whatever victories and triumphs I have, are likewise the victories and successes of my family, KBFAI, DENR, IIRR, and of the other organizations that have continued to guide and support me all these years.

Being a leader of my community and organization, being able to be of assistance to other farmers, being able to speak before local and international development professionals, and being able to push for my advocacies is quite an achievement. While my dream of being a school teacher did not come true, I have become a ‘teacher’ of sorts as I continue to educate people from all walks of life about CBFM. More than that, I have become an advocate of the dreams and aspirations of our fellow farmers. I am extremely grateful for the trust and confidence that my fellow farmers and supporters have given me. I may not have attained much in terms of formal education, but my wealth of knowledge is derived from the many lessons and experiences that life continues to share with me. For this, I will be forever thankful.

"Trees are to be planted not only to the earth; they are to be planted into our hearts and minds. They are to be planted into our hearts so that they grow there with love, and planted in our minds so that we remember how important trees are in our lives and in the lives of the next generation"
Learning about Leadership through KAPAWA

I already knew about KAPAWA and its role in restoring the watershed way back when I was still taking a Bachelor's degree in Forestry. As soon as I graduated from college, I was hired by the National Economic Development Authority (NEDA) to develop and implement a Literacy Program for KAPAWA. This program helped in improving literacy of the local population in the barangays around the Maasin watershed. In 2002, I became a member of KAPAWA.

Three years after I joined the organization, I was selected by the Board of Directors to be the president of KAPAWA despite the disapproval of some members because of my youth and my previous work as a forest guard and NEDA volunteer. At first, I was hesitant to assume the leadership position because back then, I admit that I still lacked experience. But I believe that my educational background, the various skills I gained from the trainings I attended, as well as my experience in dealing with people were the reasons why I was chosen as the leader. Through the trainings conducted by various Non Government Organizations (NGO) and organizations supporting...
people's organizations (PO), I was also able to hone and sharpen my leadership skills.

I really worked hard to become a good and effective leader, despite the criticisms of some of the members. In fact, it was these criticisms and my initial lack of confidence in my leadership skills that spurred me to work even harder. In 2003, KAPAWA was recognized as one of the Ten Most Outstanding People's Organization. This award pushed me to further develop my leadership and sustain whatever achievements our organization gained.

Eventually, the KAPAWA members, as well as the people in the communities we worked with, trusted my kind of management. Before long, aside from being the president of KAPAWA, I also got elected as the Representative of Region 6 to the national federation. This became an opportunity for me to prove my worth and capabilities as a leader even more.

Learning about Building Partnerships with CBFM Stakeholders

The active participation of KAPAWA in national and local forums and in projects and dialogues about CBFM paved the way for our organization to become prominent at the regional and national levels. Our good reputation and record helped us in establishing good partnerships with other CBFM stakeholders. Soon, even the communities that KAPAWA worked with became the priority areas for DENR projects. Private investors also got interested in working with us on livelihood projects which assured a market for our harvest.

A lot of NGOs also started having projects with us. One of them is the Green Forum Western Visayas who helped us with our Eco-tourism project and in accessing funds from investors, businessmen and the academe. The Fundamental Alliance Universal Novel Agro-Forestry (FAUNA), in cooperation with the Fiber Industry Development Authority (FIDA), also helped us access funds to promote the planting of abaca. FAUNA also conducted many school-field trainings and helped in identifying markets for our abaca. Academe-based organizations and outreach programs also provided us assistance in financial administration through their monthly trainings in bookkeeping, auditing and accounting.

As KAPAWA continued to become a stronger organization and as it tried to expand its partnerships, we also gained the wisdom that showed us the need for us to balance our autonomy and co-dependence on other organizations. One recent experience which we learned from was when KAPAWA decided to declare its independence from DENR-SUSIMO.

The DENR-SUSIMO is a special unit of DENR whose function is to provide support to local organizations.
that have been appointed as stewards of watersheds. In 2001, the staff of DENR – SUSIMO moved into the office of KAPAWA to facilitate their close coordination and so that they could help KAPAWA in facilitating organizational meetings, planning, budgeting, and patrolling the forests to prevent the intrusion of illegal loggers. After some time, however, the KAPAWA leaders and members slowly noticed that the DENR – SUSIMO began interfering in our organization’s decision making process and impeded our growth as an independent organization.

Hence, last March 2007, we decided to declare our independence from them and requested that they relocate their office. Since then, KAPAWA has been to act freely and decide independently.

Learning about Advocacy work in CBFM through IIRR

The year that I was elected as the president of KAPAWA, I also had the opportunity to meet the IIRR staff and learn about their Community Forestry Interlocking Project (CFIP).

One of the first IIRR activities in our community in which I was able to observe and learn from was one of their Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) activities. The IIRR CFIP team taught us to make social and resource maps, to study the history of the watershed using timeline to identify, analyze and find solutions to our community problems using the problem and solution tree, Strengths Weaknesses Opportunity and Threat (SWOT) Analysis, etc.

The IIRR introduced us to another process that prepared us for the greater challenges and responsibilities we had to take on as leaders. Before we engaged in various workshops and forums, preparatory workshops for PO leaders were conducted by IIRR wherein the PO leaders’ capacities to participate in multi-stakeholder process was enhanced. These preparatory workshops have helped build my confidence and have sharpened analytical skills which PO leaders like me need in order for us to effectively articulate our stance during discussions on CBFM. These preparatory processes, which included rehearsals on public speaking, workshops to help us better present our stories, and simulation exercises and role-plays, have helped me and other KAPAWA members systematically and effectively present our problems, sentiments and aspirations with regard to CBFM. The skills we learned from these preparatory processes have enabled us and other POs to actively engage in discussions on CBFM, at the local and national level.

With the enhancement of our capacities in articulating our position and demands, we have been able to push for our advocacies; such as the need for LGUs to pass ordinances to protect the rights and welfare of the POs (like the passing of the ordinance regarding the user’s fee), the need to help POs with livelihood projects, and other PO concerns.

While we in KAPAWA also conducted analyses of the various problems of the farmers in our communities, these PRA processes helped us to be more systematic and participatory in analysing the problems arising from the contradicting policies of the CBFM program, the watershed policies, the ordinances of the local government and the regulations of KAPAWA. Using the various PRA tools, I also gained a clearer understanding of CBFM and various policies on watershed, as well as the rights and responsibilities of KAPAWA as the designated steward of the watershed. In fact, it was through the various PRA tools that we realized the correctness of our demand for the passing of an ordinance regarding the user’s fee.

---

9 A recent achievement of KAPAWA is being able to advocate and push for the passing of an ordinance that will allow them to collect user’s fee from the Metro Iloilo Water District. The user’s fee is the payment received/collected for utilization of forestlands resources.
The knowledge we gained from these workshops changed our views and attitudes towards the LGUs, DENR and other partners in CBFM. It helped us build better relationships with the other actors in CBFM. Furthermore, we now are able to engage in negotiation processes through which we are able to access funds from the LGU for our projects and request for their assistance in terms of disseminating information about our CBFM policies and projects.

IIRR has also become a steady partner and staunch ally of KAPAWA and other People’s Organizations in promoting the active participation of POs in various local and national fora, workshops and discussions on CBFM. Currently, KAPAWA is one of the POs actively involved in the regional and national workshops for the preparation and drafting of the next decade national strategy for CBFM together with other stakeholders. And we have maximized our participation in these to further advocate for the protection of the rights and welfare of POs involved in CBFM. In fact, our advocacy regarding the user’s fee has become one of the main points for further discussion and deliberation in the process of crafting the Second Decade National CBFM Strategic Plan. As a result, the Second Decade Strategic Plan has adopted a specific provision indicating the institutionalization of user’s fee.

**Building on and sharing lessons I learned as an Advocate of CBFM**

My development from being a shy and timid member of KAPAWA to becoming a courageous, analytical, and responsible leader is a result of my hard work, my persistence in facing the challenges, and willingness to learn and practice the knowledge I got from the workshops I attended through IIRR and other institutions.

The enhancement of my communication skills and public speaking helped me interact and dialogue with government officials, investors, donors with conviction and self-confidence. Before, you would not be able to see my face whenever I speak because my head would be turned towards the floor as I was too shy to have eye-to-eye contact. Through simulation exercises and public speaking rehearsals conducted by IIRR, I have eventually improved my interpersonal communication skills, which I now use in negotiating with the officials of the government, business investors, and other POs. Being the representative of our

---

**8.6 Institutionalize payment for environmental services, i.e. user’s fees. (But ensure that the user’s fees for water and carbon sequestration will go directly to the POs.)**

Policy in Second Decade Strategic Plan institutionalizing user’s fee.

Figure 4. The specific advocacy is cited in the Support Mechanism section of the Strategic Plan, specifically in the Resource Generation and Mobilization section.
organization in different fora was a big responsibility. Nevertheless, I am now able to speak and make presentations to large audiences with courage and confidence. The exposure and knowledge I got from listening to good speakers in workshops and conferences I attended also helped me systematize my way of presenting my experiences and perspectives.

The lessons I learned from the many IIRR activities that I attended benefited not only me but my organization as well. A concrete example of this is how we were able to use the PRA tools we learned from IIRR to analyze and address our community problems. In one occasion, we used the PRA to analyze the recurring practice of ‘kaingin’ (slash and burn) and open farming in the communities surrounding the watershed. Through the PRA we conducted with the members of the communities, we collectively came up with the solution of practicing intercropping. By encouraging intercropping, we prevented the arbitrary cutting of trees as this would also destroy the other crops planted near the trees. Intercropping also allowed us to produce more crops for added income.

I can now see the effects and benefits of my hard work, perseverance and the application of lessons I gained from attending workshops and policy forums. With the skills I gained, I am now able to effectively speak in behalf of my organization and other POs to make sure that our aspirations and recommendations are always heard in various discussions on CBFM. For me, these are achievements, not only for myself and my organization but for the CBFM communities, as a whole.

---

10 Intercropping is the agricultural practice of cultivating two or more crops in the same space at the same time. It is also a practice associated with sustainable agriculture and organic farming.
Rampant illegal logging is a chronic and deep-seated problem in Philippines forest lands. In Compostela Valley, it was the private logging firm that caused the destruction of our forest. While it is true that for some time, the company gave almost half of our villagers additional sources of income, the severe damage that they caused our environment is far greater than what we gained from the temporary employment that the company generated in Compostela Valley. Their extensive logging not only destroyed our forests; the denudation of our forests caused our rivers to dry and led to the depletion of our wildlife.

In our desire to restore our forest, we put up a local organization that would allow us to join the Community Contract Reforestation Program (CCRP). We called our organization the San Roque Multipurpose Cooperative (SAROMCO). Through a loan we got from the Asian Development Bank (ADB), SAROMCO was able to buy seedlings from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR).

SAROMCO also became in charge of overseeing the planting of seedlings in the 50-hectare land owned by the different members of the cooperative.

Soon enough, the government granted our organization a Forest Land Management Agreement (FLMA) which, after a few years, was converted into Community Based Forest Management Agreement (CBFMA). The CBFMA gave us the right to manage our forest, to decide what trees to plant, to cut down, to regulate the activities within the CBFMA area and to patrol our areas to prevent illegal activities. While we are aware that it is still up to the DENR to decide how long we can implement CBFM in our areas, for now, our communities are greatly benefiting from this program.

Through the continued support of other government agencies, we were able to effectively implement our CBFM. We have received a grant from the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) and a loan from another cooperative to fund our livelihood projects. The Department of Agriculture, also in cooperation with DOLE, also provided assistance in our animal husbandry and agro-forestry projects. Likewise, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) helped in quickly facilitating the approval of our Wood Processing Permit (WPP), while the Local Government Units (LGUs) helped by constructing the necessary infrastructures to make the transport of our forest products easier.

Still, our organization was not free from problems. We had to contend with some employees of the local government offices who would ask for some 'grease money' in exchange for the quick processing of our papers. There were also times when we were victimized by illegal or unfair practices of some middlemen and financiers who robbed us of the profit we were supposed to gain from the sale of our products. The limited finances of our organization also prevented us from engaging in the trainings we needed to develop the knowledge and skills of our members.

Because of these problems and difficulties we wondered if CBFM
was the appropriate program for our organization. Often, we would ask ourselves, does CBFM really benefit POs, or is it simply a strategy for middlemen and financiers to 'milk' us like cows?

Reclaiming our Hope in CBFM

In 2005, upon the recommendation of the DENR office in Region 11, SAROMCO was chosen as one of the organizations that would be included in a research project on community forestry of IIRR. The project aimed to conduct a participatory research to assist POs involved in CBFM to assess their situations, problems and experiences with regard to CBFM implementation. As part of the project, we learned how to use many PRA tools such as Resource Mapping, Transect Mapping, Social Mapping, SWOT analysis, Problem Tree, Venn diagram and timeline to collectively analyze our CBFM experience.

For a few months, through IIRR's guidance, we were engaged in many workshops and discussions that helped us gain a deeper analyses and understanding of our situation and problems regarding CBFM. Part of our role as project partner was being able to document the results of our participatory research and share them with other organizations involved in CBFM. Thus, in April 2006, we were able to present the results of that research in the National Forum to Review Ten Year CBFM Implementation held at IIRR.

I was one of the two representatives of SAROMCO who went to that forum to share about our cooperative's experiences on livelihood and rural enterprise projects. In preparation for that presentation, IIRR conducted a two-day workshop for PO leaders like me to help us make a clean and systematic presentation of our CBFM experience. This was very helpful to us, especially in terms of building our confidence and honing our public speaking skills. That forum was the first time for me to speak in front of a large audience which included an international delegation. That, for me, was a great accomplishment. It was also an opportunity for us to meet other organizations and key actors of CBFM and to learn from the experiences of other POs involved in CBFM. There were many organizations in that forum who also wanted to learn from our CBFM story, including the Forestry Development Center (FDC) University of the Philippines-Los Banos which, after listening to our presentation, wanted to conduct a study about SAROMCO's livelihood projects.

As for me, the highlight of that experience was when I was able to talk to former DENR Secretary Elizea Gozun. Secretary Gozun was the person whom my late brother, Gregorio Fernando, former chairperson of SAROMCO, approached for the approval of SAROMCO's Wood Processing Plant. It was only in that forum that I had the opportunity to see her in person so I approached her and shook her hand to thank her for the help she extended to SAROMCO.

That national forum would be the first of many other events on CBFM which we participated in and which helped us reclaim our dreams and regain our hopes in CBFM. Months after that national forum, we were invited, through IIRR, to a workshop on 'Evaluating Capacity Development in Community Based Natural Resource Management' held in Subic, Olongapo. In that workshop, we shared actual experiences on how the CFIP helped develop and strengthen our capacities as individuals and as an

---

11 The National Forum to Review Ten-Year CBFM Implementation focused in assessing the implementation and output of the program. The proceedings of the forum, entitled 'CBFM @ 10', was published by IIRR.
organization. The workshop also gave me the opportunity to interact with Natural Resource Management practitioners from Vietnam, Mongolia and other Asian countries. I was also able to join a field visit to a coastal community that was trying out various strategies to preserve their marine resources. I certainly learned some strategies from that field trip which I believe our organization can also adopt.

As part of the current process to draft the Second Decade CBFM Strategic Plan, our organization was also invited to join the National Consultation Workshop to update the CBFM Strategic Plan and the Mindanao Regional Consultation\textsuperscript{12}. These provided us opportunities for us to further discuss on the issue of ‘forest charges’\textsuperscript{13} which was something we have been fighting for. Thanks to the participatory action research conducted by IIRR with SAROMCO, we were able to effectively articulate our particular experiences and stand on the issue of forest charges.

\textbf{Integrating the lessons we learned into our organizational life}

The many workshops and conferences we attended certainly gave us many lessons which we were able to bring back home with us and apply to our own organizations and communities. One of the more important lessons I learned is that a key element to promoting participatory processes is having open and honest communication. And we are continually striving to apply this principle within our own organization. By practicing honest and open communication, we learned to understand each other and improve our interpersonal relationships. And because of improved interpersonal

\textsuperscript{12} The Minadanao workshop was the 4th of a series of regional workshops which was conducted after the first national consultation held in September 2006 at Traders Hotel.

\textsuperscript{13} Forest charges are fees collected by the DENR for forest products harvested by the POs.
The specific advocacy is cited in the Major Strategies section of the Strategic Plan. Specifically, it is in the sub-strategies of Securing Tenure section.

ii. Advocate amending laws (i.e. RA 7161) on collection of forest charges and government share on products harvested in production forest and harvesting of planted species in mangrove areas. The share of government from plantations/Non-Timber Forest Product (NTFP) should be based on net sales, instead of gross sales, and forest charges on products from the natural forest within production forests should be lowered.

communication skills, our decision making processes also improved.

We have also learned the importance of regularly communicating and coordinating with other partners and stakeholders of CBFM. The negotiation skills we learned from one of the workshops we participated in also came in handy when we recently negotiated and formalized our Memorandum of Agreement with an investor in one of our projects. Also, we are now able to directly coordinate with the DENR and LGUs on matters regarding CBFM. Before, when we had problems, we would not know how to approach the DENR for endorsements or any form of assistance. Now, we are able to communicate directly with DENR to help us in processing our papers. In fact, we observed that our papers are now being assessed more quickly and efficiently. Maybe, this is because the local DENR officials know that we are actively participating in CBFM review process and are now able to coordinate directly with the CBFM Division at the DENR Central Office.

The Local Government Units seemed to have also recognized our potential and commitment to help in the development of rural communities in our province, because SAROMCO has also been invited to be part of the Barangay Watershed Protection Council and the Provincial CBFM Federation. As a member of that federation, we now attend regular meetings and consultations wherein we discuss how we can continue to work together to protect and promote

Through our regular discussions and encounters with the various actors and stakeholders of CBFM, we have also changed our view and attitudes towards the local officials of DENR and LGUs. We now see them as partners in achieving our goals.
CBFM in our province. We have also been tapped by other private and civic organizations to speak on how we can conserve and protect our environment and natural resources, especially in CBFM areas.

Facing the challenges ahead with renewed hope

For now, we are still working hard to continue our training and education program so that we can sustain the process of developing the knowledge and skills of SAROMCO members as well as other cooperatives in our province. We are currently preparing for a series of trainings on bookkeeping and finance management. Soon we will be having a series of 'Balik Aral' education programs through the Cooperative Development Authority.

We are very thankful for the trainings that we and other POs have received through the IIRR as these have empowered us to speak out, to assert our rights and aspirations, and to take an active role in promoting CBFM. Through our regular discussions and encounters with the various actors and stakeholders of CBFM, we have also changed our view and attitudes towards the local officials of DENR and LGUs. We now see them as partners in achieving our goals. We hope that the change in attitude of the local officials towards us POs will also happen within the central/national offices of DENR and other government agencies. Unless the central/national offices also recognize POs as partners in CBFM, our efforts at the local level will be in vain.

The weaknesses and mistakes we experienced in the past should not lead us to helplessness and hopelessness. While we know that change is a long process, we know that if we persevere towards bringing about the desired change, this will lead to a better life. And just as we have invested our sweat and blood in the protection and management of our trees and forests, we shall invest the same to help us face and overcome the challenges we will be facing as we continue to strive for the effective implementation of CBFM in our community and in other communities as well.
I am an agricultural technologist working in the Local Government Unit (LGU) of Atimonan, Quezon, and the designated Municipal Environment Officer (MENRO) of Atimonan. My main responsibility is to organize farmers associations and help them learn new technologies in agricultural production. As the designated MENRO, my work also involves assisting the LGU in:

- environmental planning, especially in line with Republic Act (RA) 9003 or the Solid Waste Management Act;
- addressing the issue of quarrying;
- reforestation program, tree planting activities and rehabilitation of mangroves;
- preparing the annual plan for the municipality's environment sector; and
- attending meetings and seminars on environmental issues conducted by the DENR and other agencies.

My Involvement with IIRR

In 2002, the LGU of Atimonan got involved with IIRR, particularly through one of our local POs, the Kapit-Bisig Farmer's Association of Sta. Catalina (KBFAI) and the Integrated Social Forestry Program (ISFP) implementor in Villa Ilaya and Catalina. The ISFP implementors were selected as the IIRR partners for its participatory research on CBFM. At first, there was no commitment and support from the LGU for this project other than providing access to our documents. It was probably due to the municipality's lack of awareness on CBFM program.

In May 2005, the IIRR team approached me to secure permission for them to conduct a participatory research on community forestry in barangays Sta. Catalina, Rizal and Villa Ilaya. At first I did not get excited about this project because I thought that it would be just one of those NGO projects that needed to be implemented for the sake of producing a report for the donors but did not have a substantial impact on the community. But because part of my responsibility as an LGU official was to get information about the NGOs who wanted to work with our municipality, and because IIRR was endorsed by the president of KBFAI who is a friend of mine, I decided to meet with the IIRR team.

As the IIRR team went around our municipality to visit some of our communities and their organizations, I noticed how patient they were in explaining to the farmers their...
community forestry research project. At one point, they even had to conduct an orientation session with the farmers of Barangay Villa Ilaya during a storm. I was amazed at their persistence in trying to engage the people of Atimonan in their research despite the difficulties they encountered, especially when they had to go to the more remote villages. Eventually, I found myself joining their many visits to our communities and it was through my participation in their research that I became more aware of the situation and problems of our upland communities and of the existence of other POs in our municipality.

By the end of May 2005, IIRR partnered with the Provincial Environment and Natural Resource Office (PENRO) in Quezon in conducting a two day seminar-workshop to review the revised CBFM guidelines. The workshop participants were members of POs, LGUs, CENRO and DENR field offices. That workshop proved to be quite useful as the participants learned about their roles and responsibilities as stakeholders of CBFM. Another very fruitful result of that workshop was a mutually agreed resolution to develop information and education campaign (IEC) materials on CBFM, all written in Filipino, so that these could be easily understood by the POs.

Using the materials developed during the workshop, a series of information campaigns on the revised CBFM guidelines was conducted for implementors of ISFP and CBFMP in barangays Rizal, Villa Ilaya, and Sta. Catalina. The information campaign became a team effort of my office, DENR, POs and IIRR. The active participation of the team members and my office in the orientation sessions made these activities successful programs as the POs were able to obtain knowledge and clarifications about many issues and concerns, especially with regard to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities Undertaken</th>
<th>Agencies Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td>Two day orientation/workshop on preparation of IEC materials for the revised CBFM guidelines</td>
<td>DENR, IIRR, LGU, POs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>Field testing of CBFM IEC materials with the CSC holders of barangays Rizal and Villa Ilaya</td>
<td>DENR, IIRR, LGU, POs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2005</td>
<td>Field testing of CBFM IEC materials with the CSC holders of Sta. Catalina</td>
<td>DENR, IIRR, LGU, POs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2005</td>
<td>Distribution of fruit trees to KBFAI for agro-forestry project</td>
<td>LGU, POs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2006</td>
<td>Submitted Workplan which included CBFM for Environment Sector</td>
<td>MENRO, Committee on Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2007</td>
<td>Approval of workplan and budget including CBFM for environmental sector</td>
<td>Executive head, Committee on Environment, Budget Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2007</td>
<td>Regional Consultation on National CBFM Strategic Plan</td>
<td>IIRR, DENR, POs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2007</td>
<td>Cluster validation of the National CBFM Strategic plan</td>
<td>IIRR, DENR, LGU, POs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2007</td>
<td>Community Forest Interlocking Project Writeshop</td>
<td>IIRR, DENR, LGU, POs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
issues on stewardship. This information campaign also became an opportunity for the LGU and the PENRO to really work together.

Also, the information campaigns was another chance for me to observe and learn from the way IIRR project staff facilitated the various orientation sessions and discussions with the farmers. I noticed the participatory and systematic approaches they used in engaging the POs in the discussions. Because of their effective approach, the POs listened to them attentively and actively participated in the discussions.

The barangay officials and the POs, especially those from the more remote areas who were already feeling neglected, welcomed this opportunity to discuss their problems and be more enlightened about their rights and responsibilities as CBFM implementors. Key to the success of the orientation session was the participatory approach and heart-felt commitment of the IIRR team.

Lessons and positive gains from the IIRR Project

The information campaign on CBFM which we conducted in cooperation with IIRR also had a positive impact on the LGU.

Inspired by the IIRR project, I and some members of the committee on environment held a dialogue with the other LGU officials regarding the various environmental issues which I have become more aware of as a result of my participation in the CBFM information campaign. Consequently I was appointed by the local executive head to be the permanent provincial representative that shall regularly attend meetings conducted by the DENR and other environment agencies.

I also immediately met with the Municipal Council committee on environment to formulate a work plan and budget which we submitted to the local executive head. Fortunately, our work plan and budget was approved and for the first time, the LGU work plan included CBFM.

The work plan, which will benefit not only upland communities but also fisherfolk associations and coastal communities involves:

- Providing livelihood assistance to CBFM program and ISF program recipients
- Providing funds for the agro-forestry projects
- Conduct of skills enhancement training and support for the CBFM beneficiaries
- Providing funds for the rehabilitation of mangroves and artificial coral reef.

The budget allocated to implement the approved work plan was Php240,000.00. It is a relatively small amount, compared to the other local projects, but I am still glad that the LGU responded to the needs of the environment sector, especially to the needs of the upland and coastal forest communities that have been feeling neglected and marginalized. So far, about Php80,000 had already been utilized for the installation of artificial reefs in the Lamon Bay area. Other portions of the budgets have not yet been fully utilized because of the election ban.

To generate other resources for this project, I am also actively networking with government agencies like the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) who could be potential partners of ISF and CBFM project implementors.

My participation in the CBFM information campaign became an eye opener for me to look deeper into the status of our environment, especially our forests. It also reminded me of my responsibilities as the MENRO, and as an LGU official, in regard to the protection and conservation of our environment and natural resources in Atimonan, Quezon.
Strengthening my Commitment to CBFM in Atimonan and Beyond

Because of my increasing involvement and commitment to CBFM, I was invited to participate in the regional consultation to develop the Second Decade CBFM Strategic Plan. During this activity, I was again selected as the LGU representative for Region 4 CBFM steering committee. As part of the process of developing the Strategic Plan, I also attended a two day cluster validation/consolidation workshop that was conducted at DENR office in Manila in April 2007.

Despite my heavy workload in our municipality, I have taken on these tasks and responsibilities as an advocate of CBFM within my municipality and at the regional and national level. This is because of my belief in CBFM as a strategy for nurturing and managing the environment in Atimonan as well as in the whole country. My openness and capacity to learn from the CBFM program have helped me become a CBFM advocate, especially among the LGUs where many resources and opportunities can be tapped to sustain this program.

I believe that the LGUs is one of the key stakeholders in the effective and successful implementation of CBFM. But to be able to help sustain and improve the program and services needed to address the current situation of upland and coastal communities and the environment sector as a whole, LGUs must seriously consider the following:

- A pro-environment local officer should be selected as the chairman of the committee on environment.
- A comprehensive work plan on environment should be submitted annually to the executive head by the MENRO and committee on environment for funding purposes.
- The POs should participate and join whatever LGU activities and programs there are for the protection and management of the environment. They must have their organizations accredited to be recognized as partners of the LGUs in CBFM.
- To look into other social problems affecting ISFP, CBFMP partners, especially with regard to health, agriculture and livelihood.
- Convince other LGUs to treat CBFM as one of the priority programs

Indeed, it has been a long and challenging journey – from our LGUs non-involvement and lack of knowledge of CBFM to its current commitment to the CBFM which now has its own focal person, program and budget. The challenge now is to be able to sustain CBFM and to invite others to be partners in this program.
Participatory Action Research in CBFM

Corazon D. Ramos
Community Development Officer II/CBFM Provincial Coordinator, DENR-Provincial Environment and Natural Resource Office, Quezon Province

Introduction

For the last twenty years, I have been working for the DENR office in Quezon province. My involvement in people-oriented forestry projects started with the Integrated Social Forestry Unit of the DENR which is now known as the Community Based Forest Management (CBFM) Unit.

As a Community Development Officer and the designated CBFM Provincial Coordinator, it has been a big challenge for me to oversee and support the implementation of CBFM projects of thirty two (32) people's organizations (POs) in the province. Aside from project monitoring and evaluation, I also provide assistance in building and strengthening the capacities of POs in forest/area development, livelihood and enterprise development and other CBFM related undertakings to enable the POs and their communities achieve socio-economic development and sustainable forest management. I also network with different stakeholders like the Local Government Units (LGU), other government agencies, NGOs, private/business sectors that can provide services to our CBFM implementors.

Partnership building in CBFM through IIRR

I have been engaged in the CBFM program of DENR-Quezon for six years when I first learned about the IIRR Community Forestry Interlocking Project (CFIP). The IIRR team came to our office in 2001 to seek our endorsement and some assistance in the research that they wanted to conduct in the community forestry sites in Quezon province. At that time, the research areas which IIRR considered were actually within the administrative jurisdiction of our Community Environment and Natural Resource Office (CENRO).

Thus, I expected that it would be the CENROs who would be providing assistance to the IIRR researchers. For some reason, the CENRO was not able to provide them the assistance they needed. Because of the IIRR research team's persistence, they were able to convince our office to assist them in their research.

At first, my involvement in the project was to merely allow them access to the records and documents they needed to get to know the research sites - the community and project profiles of barangays Rizal, Villa Ilaya and Sta. Catalina, in the municipality of Atimonan, Quezon, and later, General Nakar, Quezon.

Eventually, I and the other DENR staff started joining the research team in their visits to our various barangays. Then we began helping them in gathering and analyzing data, and started engaging them in discussions on community forestry policies.

Aside from the DENR provincial office, the IIRR research team also started coordinating with the LGU of Atimonan, Quezon and engaged them in collectively exploring the implications of the current community forestry policy. It was through this process of regular coordination with the various POs and LGUs in Quezon that IIRR became instrumental in linking together the different CBFM stakeholders in Quezon.

It was also through the IIRR that I got more acquainted with more community organizations/people's...
As I got more involved in the participatory research, I became more aware about the situation and various issues faced by the POs in their implementation of the CBFM.

As I observed and learned from the activities and processes conducted by IIRR in our province, I noticed two vital elements and principles that guided their work - promoting researches that encouraged people's participation and researches that prompted community action.

As I got more involved in the participatory research, I became more aware about the situation and various issues faced by the POs in their implementation of the CBFM.

For instance, through the participatory researches we conducted, I got to know more about the Kapitbisig Farmers Association, Inc. (KBFAI) and the Real, Infanta, Nakar, Polillo Aqua Forest Agricultural Development Cooperative (RINPAFADECO), both of which are POs implementing CBFM. Similar activities were done with the holders of Certificate of Stewardship Contract (CSC), in barangays Rizal and Villa Ilaya, Atimonan, Quezon.

As I got more involved in the participatory research, I became more aware about the situation and various issues faced by the POs in their implementation of the CBFM program. For instance, in one of the consultation-meetings which IIRR conducted with the POs, I learned that one of the key advocacies of the project was to promote 'utilization rights' - the right to harvest selected planted trees, a right granted to POs participating in CBFM. This was actually in conflict with the DENR's agenda at that time, which was to prioritize forest development over utilization. Later on in the research, I found out that 'utilization rights' was actually one of the demands of the POs who participated in the IIRR initiated 'Linking People to Policy' workshop held a year earlier. This made me realize how much I needed to update myself on CBFM issues and policies.

I noticed that the IIRR team really took pains in promoting participatory processes, making sure that people from the community were involved in the articulation and analysis of issues. In the many activities they undertook - the series of Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) activities, policy consultations and dialogues, informal and formal discussions, workshops and trainings - they always promoted the active participation of the different CBFM stakeholders in Quezon. I myself participated in most of these activities and it was because of my involvement in these activities that I began to better understand and appreciate the roles of the various CBFM stakeholders - the POs, the LGU, DENR and NGOs like IIRR and the importance of their active participation in CBFM implementation.

I also realized that while conducting the research, IIRR was actually helping the stakeholders address their problems and encouraging them to undertake collective action. For instance, IIRR provided assistance in the Quezon Protected Landscape (QPL) where they facilitated a meeting among its stakeholders to resolve an issue on 'illegal squatting'. It was only then that I actually saw the many squatters within the protected area. To address the issues on illegal settlement within the protected area, the residents eventually came to a consensus that they should apply for Protected Area Community Based Resource Management Agreement (PACBRMA)15.

---

14 A multistakeholder workshop including local communities that reviews community forestry policy in the Philippines. One very strong recommendation coming from the participants is the lifting of the suspension of utilization rights of CBFM implementers.

15 A CBFM tenurial agreement between the government and the community to manage protected areas.
The timeline below details our involvement in the research project of IIRR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities Undertaken</th>
<th>Purpose of Action</th>
<th>Agencies Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Year 2002</td>
<td>Discussed with IIRR its research project</td>
<td>Introduce IIRR research project</td>
<td>IIRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY-2003</td>
<td>Participated in the series of meeting, consultation and dialogue</td>
<td>Research and technical assistance</td>
<td>IIRR, POs, DENR, LGUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY-2004</td>
<td>Participated in the series of meetings/consultations with QPL squatters</td>
<td>Research and conflict mediation</td>
<td>IIRR, DENR, POs, LGUs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinated with CENRO-Real, Quezon and held series of meetings/dialogue</td>
<td>Gather more experiences and insights for the 10-Year CBFM Review</td>
<td>IIRR, POs, DENR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>Conducted 2-Day Orientation/ Workshop on Department Administrative Order (DAO) 2004-29 (Revised CBFM Guidelines)</td>
<td>Information campaign and develop information materials</td>
<td>DENR, IIRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2005</td>
<td>Held meeting with the Barangay Officials of Sta. Catalina, Atimonan, Quezon</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>DENR, IIRR, KBFAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td>Conducted 2-Day Orientation/ Workshop on the preparation of IEC Materials and orientation on DAO-2004-29</td>
<td>Develop IEC materials</td>
<td>DENR, IIRR, LGUs, POs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>Held meeting in Barangay Rizal, Atimonan, Quezon and Orientation on DAO-2004-29</td>
<td>Information campaign and field testing of IEC materials</td>
<td>DENR, IIRR, Municipal LGU, POs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2005</td>
<td>Conducted orientation of DAO-2004-29 to Barangay Officials of Sta. Catalina, Atimonan, Quezon and key leaders of KBFAI</td>
<td>Information campaign and field testing of IEC materials</td>
<td>DENR, IIRR, Municipal LGU, POs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended international training on Participatory Action Research (PAR) for CBNRM</td>
<td>Gein skills in PAR</td>
<td>IIRR, PENRO and other international organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2005</td>
<td>Conducted orientation on DAO-2004-29 to Barangay Officials of Ilaya, Atimonan, Quezon</td>
<td>Information campaign and field testing of IEC materials</td>
<td>DENR, IIRR, Municipal LGU, POs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2005</td>
<td>Conducted orientation on DAO-2004-29 to ISF devolved Projects within the administrative jurisdiction of CENRO-Real, Quezon</td>
<td>Information campaign/develop IEC material as part of my action plan in PAR training</td>
<td>DENR, Provincial LGU, POs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2006</td>
<td>Participated in Luzon Cluster Regional Workshop on Second Draft National CBFM Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Provide inputs to the CBFM Strategic Plan</td>
<td>DENR, LGU, PO, NGO, Private groups, donors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From research to advocacy work on CBFM

One problem that frequently surfaced in the various consultations and meetings we had with the various CBFM stakeholders was the lack of adequate understanding of CBFM policy. In fact, in one of the barangay level meetings we had, the barangay officials expressed the need to have information materials in Tagalog (national language) regarding CBFM in order for them to have a understanding of the program. This prompted IIRR and our office to jointly engage in a participatory development of local IEC materials on CBFM.

To develop IEC materials, we conducted a series of consultations with the various stakeholders as well as discussions on the revised CBFM guidelines. After several studies and consultations, we held a province­wide workshop that was participated in by the DENR, LGUs and POs, with the national chief of CBFM as the main resource speaker. The workshop aimed to promote understanding of CBFM policy as well as to engage the various CBFM partners in developing the IEC materials on CBFM. The IEC materials that we developed highlighted, among others, the section on the revised CBFM guidelines which clearly defined the roles and responsibilities of the POs, DENR and LGUs in the implementation of CBFM.

The IIRR team finalized the IEC materials in close consultation with various stakeholders. A few months after the initial printing of our IEC materials, we were informed that the IEC materials we developed were endorsed by the Chief of CBFM office to be reproduced in wider scale. At that moment, I felt proud because our efforts to produce local IEC materials were recognized by the CBFM chief.

To further test the effectiveness of the IEC materials, we formed a team composed of representatives from DENR, LGU and PO who held information campaigns that would pre-test the IEC materials. A series of validation activities and information campaigns were also held in the community research sites of IIRR.

III. Critical lessons

My involvement in the IIRR research was the start of a long and beneficial partnership with them. In many occasions, I was invited by IIRR to be a resource speaker for the various activities of their project. In 2006, I was invited by them as a participant in their International Training On Participatory Action Research (PAR) for Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM). This training was very interesting because of the methodology used by the facilitators – interactive lectures, group discussions, field practicum – to convey topics and lessons on PAR
which further deepened my understanding and appreciation for PAR.

I learned that in PAR, one does not only conduct research; the participatory action research becomes a process of building partnerships among different stakeholders and engaging them in actions to help resolve issues.

It was through this international course that I came to fully understand the PAR framework and methodology which the IIHR team had been applying in their work in Quezon and in their other field research sites. I learned that in PAR, one does not only conduct research; the participatory action research becomes a process of building relationships among different stakeholders and engaging them in actions to help resolve issues. Looking back, IIHR conducted the research in a participatory and collaborative way. As they partnered with the various CBFM stakeholders for their research, they were able to promote the stakeholder’s commitment and active participation in addressing issues and concerns in CBFM. As the research deepened, the partnership expanded - from the POs and LGUs, to other agencies involved in CBFM.

One practical yet vital lesson that I learned from the PAR process was that REFLECTION is very important. I learned that short meetings or ‘reflection sessions’ could be conducted before and after an activity to review/discuss what had transpired while doing the activity to generate lessons from the activities and plan what to do next. If in the conduct of activities, certain problems occur, we need to acknowledge that, learn from it, and hope that our lessons from that experience will help us prevent the problem from happening again.

**Figure 5. PAR Application on IEC Development**

- **Plan** - DENR and IIHR will conduct a campaign together with PO and LGUs in another IIHR community research site to field-test IEC materials.
- **Action** - Oriented CSC holders on CBFM. Sought approval from DENR central, and was granted.
- **Reflection** - Orientation activities must involve LGUs and POs as resource speakers other than DENR to effectively communicate to audience the different stakeholder roles and responsibilities.
- **Plan** - Conduct orientation on CBFM program and its revised guidelines and developed easy-to-understand IEC materials in local dialect highlighting roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders.
- **Action** - Conduct orientation on CBFM and its revised guidelines and developed easy-to-understand IEC materials.
- **Reflection** - LGU lacks support to CBFM because of limited awareness on the program. POs cannot understand the policy the way it is written now.
As a result of the PAR with IIRR, we have been able to build strong partnerships among POs and LGUs in Quezon for the implementation and promotion of CBFM. This brought about positive changes in the implementation of CBFM projects in the province, particularly in raising the consciousness of POs, LGUs and NGOs on their roles and responsibilities as stakeholders of CBFM. Considering that DENR currently has very limited funds available for the implementation of the project, it is good to know that now I can really rely on the LGUs and other CBFM partners for some logistical and financial assistance.

The diagram on this page illustrates how DENR’s partnership with different CBFM stakeholders has improved.

I also realized that key to the effective implementation of CBFM is being able to promote better understanding of the program. And for this, the development of IEC materials and the conduct of information campaigns have really helped in making our job of introducing and advocating for CBFM in other communities and barangays in our province easier and more effective.

My training and actual involvement in the PAR process has also helped improve my self confidence in sharing my knowledge to my co-workers, to the POs I work with and to the development practitioners here and abroad, whom I met through the trainings and conferences attended sponsored by IIRR. My involvement in the many field visits as part of the IIRR team also gave me the opportunity to sharpen my skills in facilitation.

I have also learned to be more ‘participatory’ in the conduct of the various aspects of my work. I learned to involve my staff, co-workers and partners in decision-making processes and in every phase of project implementation. This new work style and attitude has definitely helped me perform my work as a DENR personnel and as a CBFM provincial coordinator more effectively.

Drawing from what I learned from the IIRR project, now I know that a good work plan coupled with PAR processes and principles will make the implementation of projects successful.

Long after the initial researches of IIRR in Quezon had been finished, IIRR continued to return to Quezon to gather more PO experiences, insights and lessons for the 10-year CBFM Review Forum and for the 2nd Decade CBFM Strategic Plan. Again, a series of PRAs and consultations and dialogue were conducted by IIRR, in partnership with our office, the LGUs and POs. And I see this as a continuing partnership in advocating for the effective implementation and active participation of various stakeholders in CBFM. Indeed, my involvement in these endeavors also made me more committed and responsible to the various CBFM partners and stakeholders.
V. Conclusion

The stories illustrated in various ways how the CFIP activities and processes were able to contribute to the democratization of community forestry policy processes and to the release of the potential of the communities and their partners in managing forest resources. The project has employed a distinctive methodology in attaining its goal. The three interlocking components complemented with the outputs of each component being fed into the other components contributed to the achievement of the objectives of the project.
It can be gleaned from the case stories of the PO participants, that the PRA facilitated their analyses and documentation of community experiences and perspective in community forestry. The participatory and experiential learning process facilitated their deeper understanding of the CBFMP and further galvanized their respective advocacies. It also engendered the understanding of a local government unit of the CBFM and thus created partnerships and a supportive environment for the CBFMP program as shown in June Nieva’s story. The various participatory methods used by the project further initiated organizational reflections within PO organizations and thus resulted to changes in the practice and relationships within the organization as seen in Nelly Alzula and Jun Fernando’s stories.

The outputs of the analysis and documentation processes in the learning communities were fed into the second component, the component that aimed to support CBFM advocacy work. This component provided opportunities for the community and other CBFM stakeholders to engage in policy discourses by providing a platform for this engagement. This provided the communities and people’s organizations an opportunity to participate in policy process where they presented their experiences to a large audience, engage in a debate and negotiation with other stakeholders especially with the DENR. A lesson that we all learned from this project is that the community does not lack capacities; what it lacks are opportunities. Therefore in providing this platform, the project has not only enabled the community to participate in policy process but released the capacities of the community representatives to engage in policy discourse. One concrete result of this engagement can be gleaned from the PO stories where they were able to push for a change in the policy on CRMF.

The PO preparations undertaken by CFIP in every policy platform further contributed to the release of this inherent facility. As the case studies show, preparatory activities undertaken for the POs were found valuable by the community representatives. In addition, the ‘mentoring’ of PO leaders, wherein they participated in workshops, trainings, meetings, fora among others to expose them and gain hands-on experience in advocacy work, has increased their self confidence, their ability to articulate their ideas, and their social skills. Rubenie Castillanes along with Nelly Alzula’s stories illustrate such transformations.

The third component, experiential training has contributed to the transformation of the policy advocacy and formulation process. Rosalie Imperial’s story illustrates how their division’s (CBFMP Division in DENR) engagement with IIRR through the CFIP made her facilitate the acceptance of participatory process in policy making by the DENR, particularly in adopting the PAR in the formulation of the second decade CBFMP strategic plan (see Annex 5). This is indeed a very significant gain, not only for and by the CFIP, but also for the stakeholders of community forestry in the Philippines as it opened opportunities for critical engagement, partnership, and constituency building towards greater ownership of the plan for the CBFM.

In addition, Corazon Ramos’ story has shown how the “magic spiral” has made her have a better understanding of community situation in community forestry and transformed her work approach towards collective deliberation, reflection and action.

The formulation of the strategic plan served as the setting for the project to test this project’s inter-locking approach. The learning community component facilitated the understanding, recognition and documentation of the community’s experience in CBFM. The documented experience of the community served as concrete measure of the gains of the CBFM. Meanwhile the advocacy component provided a platform and opportunity...
for the community to voice their position and opinion of the CBFM and shared these documented experiences. The history of community forestry in the Philippines has shown various initiatives (forum, workshop) by advocates pushing for change in policy and improved implementation. The multi-stakeholder platforms introduced by IIRR contributed to these initial efforts. IIRR’s platforms' distinctive contribution is initiating an environment of equal footing among stakeholders. It is partial to wider and active community participation. More often than not, previous platforms were dominated by “experts”, educated and articulate. Participation of the community was limited. The Linking People to Policy and CBFM Ten Year Review platforms tried to solve this inequitable participation. The use of meta-cards and the fishbowl methodology lessened the dominance of one stakeholder and enhanced the opportunity for the community to participate extensively. The platform also provided diagnostic discourse among stakeholders on the issues affecting CBFM implementation. Hence, platforms that proceeded adopted a multi-stakeholder and community as the central actors and led to engagement and eventually collaboration among stakeholders. Many participants have pointed out the difference in interaction among

the participants during these platforms. A more active participation particularly of participants form the community was noted. Rules of engagement were more discerning and deliberate in arriving at resolution than argumentative.

In summary, the stories and testimonies attest to the following significant contributions of the project:

1. **Enhanced capacity of Community Based Organizations in advocacy as they were able to advocate their agenda:** The stories of the three PO leaders have shown their journey towards better understanding of their situation in CBFM and towards galvanizing their respective advocacies and advancing these advocacies in national platforms. Their improved confidence in engaging other stakeholders in discourse resulted in the incorporation of their advocacies in the draft of the 2nd Decade CBFM Strategic Plan. These 'individual and organizational journeys' have certainly contributed to the development of the capacities of these PO leaders and their community members.

2. **Other stakeholders participate actively in CBFM and improved relationships among stakeholders:** LGU non-participation in the CBFM has been an issue identified in various CBFM implementation assessments. This is the result of weak information and unclear definition of roles of the different stakeholders in CBFM. In the case presented by the LGU from Atimonan, the CFIP paved the way for the active support of LGU Atimonan to CBFM.

   CFIP’s platforms (Linking People to Policy and the National Review of the CBFM Ten Year Implementation) have not only provided opportunities to the communities to participate but also initiated other multistakeholder policy platforms that eventually opened critical engagement of various stakeholders who, in the past, has been cautious in engaging the other stakeholders particularly the government. These engagements have resulted in facilitating constituency building for the CBFM.

3. **DENR beginning to espouse multistakeholder participation and action-
learning method in policy making: Releasing the potential of communities in managing their forests would be as much about changing 'us' the development professionals, and our constructs, as it is about changing 'them' the community members. Hence the project activities are focused not only on working with communities but also in attempting to change the barriers to community forestry found within the political economy and within the nature of development professional training.

Engaging government officials in experiential training and in a multistakeholder platforms opened opportunities to demonstrate participatory processes to them. This could hopefully lead to possible adoption of these participatory policy processes. The Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), a seemingly impermeable institution is gradually shifting from a resistant agency to a learning agency (the CBFM Division for that matter) embracing participatory processes.

4. A more democratized and participatory process for

policy formulation: A result of the gradual shifting of the DENR to a learning agency, is the formulation of the Second Decade CBFM strategic plan. The plan was formulated through an action-learning approach and has espoused multistakeholder participation and ensured the communities voice in CBFM planning and implementation.

5. Policy change facilitated:
The most tangible impact of the project is its contribution to change in the CBFM policy. Two new national policies were adopted by the government: Administrative Order 2004-29 on its Revised Rules and Regulations and the Second Decade Strategic Plan. The multi-stakeholder platforms provided by IIRR and its partners played a part in achieving this milestone.

The initial gains of the CFIP as detailed above is a small dent in the field of community forestry and to its goal of sustainable development of the county's forestlands. Nonetheless the project's gain has contributed to the initiation of a democratized community forestry policy advocacy and policy formulation process as a channel to release the community's potential.
Annexes
OBJECTIVES

- Participatory Field Research
  To learn from and with community members as local level policies are directed towards increased rights over use and decision-making by community members regarding the local forest resources.

- Communication, advocacy and publication
  To help accelerate pro-community changes on forest policy.

- Experiential learning and training
  To enhance the learning capabilities of professionals to match the contemporary challenges that community forestry presents.

STRATEGIC INTERVENTIONS

- Participatory Action Research (PAR) - engaging the stakeholders in a process of action-reflection using participatory methods and tools like PRA and documenting lessons learned for wider sharing.

- Multi-stakeholder processes (MSP) - provision of platform for stakeholders to participate in this.

- Policy review - engaging stakeholders in critical policy discussions and build their capabilities to disseminate relevant information through IEC.

- Critical engagement w/ other NGO and DENR - supporting MSP platforms provided by other organizations; networking to push for activation of "normal" avenues for MSP.

WHAT TO ASSESS/EVALUATE

1. KAS of individual and organization in PAR and MSP
2. Participation in policy processes
3. Changes in policies and policy processes

International Course on PAR; Capacity Building Program on How to Make a Nat'l Forestry Policy Process Work through participation.
COMPONENT/OBJECTIVE

Participatory Field Research

INTERVENTION/ACTIVITIES

PAR

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Has the capacity development effort of increasing the knowledge, attitude and skills of the PO leaders and their organization contributed to their adoption and practice of PAR and MSP within their organization?

In effect has this contributed to their increased participation in CBFM policy processes?

Has the provision of an MSP platform (10 year forum, workshop) promoted inter-institutional learning and cooperation by interacting on an equal footing during a structured communication processes?

Has the CBFM policy process embraced such method?

Has the PAR training contributed to the participants enhanced understanding of new challenges in community forestry presents? How did his/her learning contributed to the organizations'.......

GOAL

To contribute to the release of the potential of communities in the Philippines to manage their forests
Annex 2 Writeshop Process

Participatory Workshops to Produce Information Materials

Producing information materials can take a great amount of time - one has to write drafts: edit the text; prepare the illustrations; layout the publication and do final revisions. The resulting prototype is then reviewed by specialists in the subject matter. This can be a long and tedious process.

Of course, it is possible to skip one or two steps to prevent delays in production. However, the final product may be technically flawed or lacking in style; the whole objective of producing such materials may be defeated.

At IIRR, workshops (usually two weeks long) are used to speed up and improve the production of printed materials. This aim is to develop the materials, revise and put them into final form as quickly as possible, taking full advantage of the expertise of the various workshop participants. IIRR has so far conducted about 12 such workshops, both at its headquarters in the Philippines and in Ghana, India and Nepal. Further workshops are planned in Cambodia, China, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Honduras, India, Indonesia and Kenya.

Workshop Process

Before the workshop, a list of potential topics is developed and resource person are identified to develop first drafts on each topic, using guidelines provided. These participants being the drafts and various reference materials with them to the workshop.

During the workshop itself, each participant presents his or her draft paper, using overhead transparencies of each page. Copies of each draft are also given to all other participants, who critique the draft and suggest revisions.

After the presentation, an editor helps the author revise and edit each draft. A team of artists draws illustrations to accompany the texts. The edited draft and artwork are then desktop-published to produce a second draft. Meanwhile, other participants also present papers they have prepared. Each, in turn, works with the team of editors and artists to revise and illustrate the materials.

Each participant then presents his or her revised draft to the group a second time, also using transparencies. Again, the audience critiques it and suggests revisions. After the presentation, the editor and artist again help revise it and develop a third draft.

STEP-BY-STEP ACTIVITIES

Before the workshop:
1. Identify topics
2. Select resource persons
3. Assign topics
4. Prepare logistics

During the workshop:
5. Prepare first drafts
6. Revise first drafts
7. Present second drafts
8. Revise second drafts
9. Prepare third drafts

After the workshop:
10. Prepare final drafts
11. Print
12. Distribute
13. Evaluate

Toward the end of the workshop, the third draft is made available to participants for final comments and revisions. The final drafts can be completed, printed and distributed within a short period after the end of the workshop.

Workshop Advantages

The workshop process is very different from the scientific conferences that many participants are familiar with. It is an extremely flexible process: the repeated presentations, critiquing and revision of drafts allow the papers to be reviewed and revised substantially, new topics to be combined, dropped or split into parts.
Early in the workshop, the participants brainstorm ideas for new topics (other than those already prepared) that should be part of the kit. These new topics are assigned to knowledgeable participants for development and presentation during the workshop.

The workshop allows inputs from all participants to be incorporated, taking advantage of the diverse experience and expertise of all present. It allows ideas to be validated by a range of experts in the field. The concentration of resource persons, editors, artists and desktop-publishing resources at one time and place enables materials to be produced far more quickly than is typical for similar publications. And the sharing of experiences among participants allows the development of networks that continue to be fruitful long after the end of the workshop itself.

Workshop participants may include scientists, researchers, government personnel, teachers, NGO staff, extension agents, farmers and other local people. The diversity of skills, organizations and backgrounds of participants is key to ensuring that numerous ideas are represented in the material produced. Members of the intended audience (e.g. teachers, farmers and extension personnel) can help pretest the text and illustrations during the workshop.

Information Materials

IIRR has used the workshop process to develop kits in several different formats. These include color-coded, loose-leaf sheets and pocket-sized, bound booklets. The institute has produced kits on a range of topics, from biodiversity and environment to sustainable agriculture, ethnoveterinary medicine and agroforestry. These kits have been translated into numerous languages including Bangla, French, Khmer, Lao, Nepali, Spanish, Telugu, Thai, Vietnamese and several Philippine languages. The kits have also been adapted to other formats for different groups of readers.

IIRR has not hold copyright to its publications. It encourages the translation, adaptation and copying of materials for non-commercial use, provided an acknowledgement to IIRR is included and the original credits are maintained.

Kit Contents

- A kit contains only relevant and practical information. It is not a vehicle for lengthy literature reviews or for presentation of unnecessarily detailed data.
- It emphasizes generic concepts or principles or direct, practical use rather than location-specific technologies.
- Whenever possible, it provides technological options which show more than one way of doing the same thing.

Presentation Format

- Each topic is limited to a single concept, contains only the key messages and is suitably illustrated.
- Concepts presented are compatible so that readers can easily select and combine those that are suitable for their own situations. For instance, a method of swine raising can be linked with a fishpond technology, or green manuring can be done at a rice-fish culture site.

Design

- Most kits have used a loose-leaf folder (or binder) format. This allows for constant updating and upgrading of information so the kit does not become obsolete. Out-of-date materials can be replaced and new topics can easily be added.
- The contents of these loose-leaf kits are classified and color-coded according to the subject matter for easy reference.
- A high quality, thick folder or binder that can withstand frequent handling is used. For the same reason, durable paper is issued for the individual information sheets.
Annex 3 Guidelines for the conduct of PRA and Story Writing

Guide for participants/writers

Maximum 3 pages

Objective:

1. For participants/writers to share their personal/individual growth in their work for community forestry (CBFM in particular).
2. They will illustrate through Venn Diagram the transformation of the relationships within their organization and relationships with other stakeholders in the CBFM (DENR, NGO, LGU). And through a timeline exercise, they will illustrate the personal changes or development they went through.

Guide Questions:

1. Introduction
   a. Introduce yourselves and the organization you belong to.

II. History of engagement with CBFM
   a. Share personal and their organizations experience with community forestry o CBFM
   b. Share experience with IIRR’s CFIP. Assess their participation in the various project activities (forum, writehop, trainings, etc.)

III. Results/outcome/impact of CFIP
   a. At the individual level.
   b. At the organizational level

IV. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the CFIP?

SUGGESTED PRA tools to use:

1. Timeline Exercise

Objective:

This tool assists with the documenting of the history of the community or beneficiary group. It can do this either in pictures, writing or symbols. A timetable (either every five or ten years) is established, going back as far as people can remember. The timetable is focused on a specific subject such as natural or communal resource management, or village growth and its effect on the surrounding environment

Purpose:

Time lines help identify important past events. For example, drought, forest felling, forest fires, etc. This information assists the PRA team in being better informed about the area and the potential risks posed to the natural resources. Understanding how the community dealt with past events may help the team to facilitate discussion and select suitable PRA methods. Timeline understand and analyse an actual problem by searching for its roots in the past as well.

Process:

1. Timelines are simple listings of events according to date (often approximate).
2. Invite as many old folks as possible.
3. Make inquiries such as:
   - When was the first settlement in the area established?
   - Who were the founding families?
   - What were the succeeding local, national or international events that affected the people?
4. Probe further if wide gaps of events occur by recalling events like war, occurrence of natural calamities, etc.
5. Use of large sheet of paper or blackboard or whichever is available.
6. Show the results/entries conspicuously for others to examine and/or modify.
Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taon</th>
<th>Mahalagang pangyayari</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Nag attend ng dialogue sa LGU para ayusin ang problema sa watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Pumasik ang CF team sa aming lugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Naging kasapi ng KAPAWA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Venn Diagram

Definition

Venn Diagrams consist of circles drawn to indicate different user groups (overlap to reflect common membership). It Identify leaders or contact representatives within the larger circles and learn about local groups and institutions, and their linkages with outside organisations and agencies. Venn diagrams are useful in illustrating forest user groups and the relationship and reliance each group has with the forest and each other. They can help identify conflicts over resources as well as establish which village institutions might play a lead role in supporting a participatory management.

Purpose:

The Venn Diagram is a tool that helps us to learn about the importance of local groups and institutions. This can be useful for clarifying decision-making roles and identifying potential conflicts between different socio-economic groups. It is also helpful for identifying linkages between local institutions and those at the intermediate- and macro-levels.

Process:

1. Organise separate focus groups of women and men, including a mix of socioeconomic groups. Be sure that the poorest and most disadvantaged (by ethnicity or caste etc.) are included, or have their own groups, as appropriate.

2. Decide on which relationship you want to investigate, e.g. the relationship of outside organization with the community, problems and others.

3. Venn Diagram can be traced on the ground, but it is especially clear (and fun!) if coloured sticky paper circles are used on a large sheet of flip chart paper. It is helpful to cut out circles in different sizes and colours ahead of time.

4. Start by asking the participants to list the local groups and organisations, as well as outside institutions, that are most important to them.

5. Then, ask the participants to decide whether each organisation deserves a small, medium or large circle (to represent its relative importance).

6. The name (or symbol) of each organisation should be indicated on each circle. (Make sure each organisation has a different colour, if possible.)

7. Ask which institutions work together or have overlapping memberships. The circles should be placed as follows:

   - separate circles = no contact
   - touching circles = information passes between institutions
   - small overlap = some cooperation in decision making
   - large overlap = a lot of cooperation in decision making

8. Discuss as many institutions as possible and ask the participants to position them in relation to each other. There may be a lot of debate and repositioning of the circles until consensus is reached.

Example:

Bago pumasok ang CF project

Pagpasok ng CF

Other

KAPAWA

DENR

TIRR

(2000)

Other

PO

LGU

DENR

NGO

PO

LGU

Ruberie

Ruberie

Other

PO

LGU

DENR

Other

KAPAWA
## Annex 4: The Writeshop Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td>Arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 16</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30AM</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspirational talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levelling off of expectations, Overview of strategic plan development process, and Writeshop objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write shop design and schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>Cycle 1-1st draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>1.0 Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 The CBFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 The DENR CBFM Strategic Action Plan for 1997-2020 (1997Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.1 Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.2 Modalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.3 Components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.4 Funding Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.5 Assessment (1997-2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>2.0 The CBFM Strategic Plan for 2008-2017 (The Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7 Major programs and implementation timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45 - 5.30</td>
<td>Major strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8.1 Developing livelihood and enterprises to reduce poverty in the uplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sub-strategies and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 17</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30 am</td>
<td>2.8.2 Securing Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sub-strategies and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>2.8.3 Empowering forestlands managers towards self-governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sub-strategies and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>2.8.4 Realizing forest development, conservation and protection, and sustainable use of forestlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Forest development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sub-strategies and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45-5.30</td>
<td>Conservation and protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sub-strategies and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| May 18   | 2.9. Support mechanisms :  
2.9.1 Management and policy  
2.9.2 Organizational and institutional development  
2.9.3 IEC  
2.9.4 Research and development  
2.9.5 Information system  
2.9.6 Resource generation  
2.10 Monitoring, assessment and reporting |
|          | 10.15 Break  
Writing session                                                                 |
|          | 12.30 Lunch                                                                 |
|          | 2.00-5.30 Cycle 2- 2\textsuperscript{nd} draft                          |
|          | 7.00 Dinner                                                                |
| May 19   | Continuation of 2\textsuperscript{nd} cycle                                |
|          | 7.00 pm Dinner-socials                                                    |
| May 20   | Cycle 3- 3\textsuperscript{rd} draft                                      |
|          | 8.30 am                                                                 |
|          | 12.30 Lunch                                                                |
|          | 1.30 Continuation of cycle 3                                               |
|          | 3.00 Action planning  
Writeshop Assessment                                                             |
|          | Departure                                                                 |


Annex 5 CBFM Strategic Plan Action Learning Framework

- Formation of organizing committee (DENR, PO, IIRR)
- Designing the National Multi-stakeholder Strategic Plan Workshops
- April Forum at IIRR on 10 year review of CBFM
- September Forum (The National Strategic Planning for CBFM: A consultative workshop
- Organizing Committee decided to hold regional consultation and design framework
- Organizing Committee meeting to assess the September Forum
- Organizing Committee agreed to a workshop methodology in writing the strategic plan
- National Confirmation and planning for the regional planning
- Revisions and review by DENR and other key stakeholders
- Workshop at IIRR on May 15-20
- 5 regional consultative workshops
  - Baguio
  - Bacolod
  - Cagayan de Oro
  - Davao
  - Los Baños

Regional Planning
Canada's International Development Research Centre (IDRC) is one of the world's leading institutions in the generation and application of new knowledge to meet the challenges facing developing countries. For more than 30 years, IDRC has worked in close collaboration with researchers from the developing world in their search for the means to build healthier, more equitable and more prosperous societies.

IDRC is one of the few institutions in the world that builds local capacity in developing countries to undertake research and create innovations based on the conviction that researchers and innovators in developing countries must take the lead in producing and applying knowledge for the benefit of their own communities.

www.idrc.ca

The International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) is a rural development organization with 80 years experience, working in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Through participatory approaches, IIRR builds capacities of communities and their organizations, encourages people-centered practices among development organizations, and strengthens linkages between communities and their partners.

IIRR mobilizes community action to achieve lasting solutions for addressing root causes of poverty through: partnering with rural communities and their stakeholders to enable the poor and disadvantaged to effect meaningful change in their lives through their own efforts and organizations; training development practitioners around the world based on practical field experience and engaging in action research; publishing and sharing lessons of what works to facilitate learning among practitioners and policy-makers.

IIRR's programs span the multiple areas that impact the rural poor, including agricultural production, rural enterprise and cooperatives, health and nutrition, food security, gender, children's education, local governance, disaster risk reduction, and natural resource conservation and management.

www.iirr.org
The right opportunity and tools, can advocate and assist for what we believe in.

Powerful expression at its sharpest edge is, by which we mean, the people from poor, rural communities, given

Bragg asked to meditate for the 5-year workshop was a very meaningful achievement and a very