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Executive Summary

The Leaders' Seminar of September 2002 was probably the most important single event in the Forestry Component of the Cao Bang Bac Kan Rural Development Project. It brought together key individuals from the disparate agencies with responsibilities in the forest sector, from within the Province and from the central MARD, to focus on identifying constraints and searching for solutions. These tasks were tackled by the concerned agencies themselves, so it could be described as a participatory approach.

Papers presented at the Seminar are included here in full. Together, they highlighted areas of concern for policy reform as well adjustments that could be made operationally without policy changes. The Working Groups set up by the Plenary developed recommendations that were acted upon by the responsible agencies as an on-going feedback.

The Seminar also began a process of increased dialogue among concerned agencies, which helped to create a working atmosphere of cooperation and coordination.

Also included in this report are an important background study by Mr Vu Liong of village forestry in Cao Bang, that provided field data in support of recommended reforms. Annex 2 is a Decision of MARD issued in January 2004, that all Provinces should embark on a systematic review of forestry development strategies to the year 2010.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5MHRP</td>
<td>Five Million Hectare Reforestation Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBBCRDP</td>
<td>Cao Bang Bac Kan Rural Development Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBFM</td>
<td>Community Based Forest Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>Commune People’s Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARD</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDS-D</td>
<td>Forestry Development Sub-Department (of DARD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLA</td>
<td>Forest Land Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLUPLA</td>
<td>Forest Land Use Planning and Land Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPD</td>
<td>Forest Protection Department (Kiem Lam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSP(P)</td>
<td>Forest Sector Support Programme (and Partnership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KfW</td>
<td>Kreditanstalt fuer Wiederaufbau (German development bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Land Allocation (used for FLA, could include agricultural land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUP</td>
<td>Land Use Plan(ning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARD</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMU</td>
<td>Program Management Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>Provincial People’s Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFE</td>
<td>State Forest Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBARD</td>
<td>Vietnam Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prefatory Note

For a general statement of introduction to this Report, we can not improve on the Press Release issued by the E.C. Delegation as follows. Note that as the Ambassador was unexpectedly not able to participate, his Speech was delivered by Mr Hendrik Franklin instead.

Hanoi, 16 September 2002

A FRESH APPROACH TO FORESTRY IN CAO BANG PROVINCE

On 16 September 2002, H.E. Frédéric Baron, Ambassador and Head of the EC Delegation, participated in a two-day Leader’s Seminar on the forestry sector in Cao Bang Province. The seminar will define opportunities for a fresh approach to forest rehabilitation and management in Cao Bang Province. Participating in the meeting are senior representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), Cao Bang Provincial authorities and representatives from the European Commission (EC).

Cao Bang has a large area of rich forest land, and has in the past enjoyed enormous forest resources. These once-great forest resources have dwindled to a few residual pockets as a consequence of unfortunate historical events and past over-exploitation.

The EC has therefore supported forestry sector activities in the Province since the year 2000, through the Cao Bang – Bac Kan Rural Development Project. The purpose is to increase forest-based incomes for poor upland families while reducing pressure on the natural environment.

Whilst progress has been made, it is evident that at present levels of investment and under current policies there are serious constraints to effective forest restoration in Cao Bang. The EC is therefore supporting the Cao Bang Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD) to overhaul its strategic thinking and planning in the forestry sector through this “Leaders’ Seminar”. The results expected are a coherent overall strategy that is fully in line with the long term goals of the Province, is consistent with the National Forestry policies and long-range planning, and is also consistent with the Forest Sector Support Programme (FSSP) & Partnership.

On the occasion, H. E. Frédéric Baron, emphasised that support for rural development in the northern mountainous areas of Vietnam is a priority for EC-Vietnam cooperation during the period 2002-2006. In this context, Mr. Baron further indicated that the EC is currently considering to expand its support to Cao Bang’s forest sector development.

For further information, please contact:  
Ms. Nguyen Thi Ngoc Ly, Press and Information Officer  
Tel: 9341300, ext. 253
1 Introduction and Background

Cao Bang is a Northern Mountainous Province of Vietnam bordering China. Its development activity between January 1999 and December 2004 was helped by cooperation with the EU-supported Cao Bang-Bac Kan Rural Development Project (CBBCRD), of which one of the three main components was Forestry.

The Project also worked in Bac Kan Province, but Bac Kan is not included in the present report because it has enjoyed support from many other internationally financed projects at the same time so the situation and the response are different.

Forest restoration in Cao Bang Province is necessary because of successive waves of deforestation over the last fifty years or so. Main causes of deforestation include heavy exploitation to develop infrastructure for wars (French, American, and Chinese), commercial logging mainly by State Forest Enterprises, inexorable use for firewood by local people and by armies, and land conversion to agriculture and grazing use, partly through progressive pressure on ethnic minorities to reduce traditional use as long-rotation fallows (“shifting cultivation”) for production of subsistence food crops. More details are given in other Project Reports (available on the Internet).

1.1 Objectives for the CBBCRDP

The main Project objective was:

“To achieve improved living standards and environmental sustainability for poor households in Vietnam’s Northern Highlands. Specifically, the project aims to enable the residents of poor communes in Cao Bang and Bac Kan provinces to increase food production, sources of supplementary income and access to markets and to assure water supply and conservation of soil by re-establishing of forest cover where required.” (Financing Agreement). Note that the target population consists of residents of poor Communes (as defined by the Government of Vietnam), and not only the poorest households (although they also are not excluded).

The Forestry Component aimed to enable the residents of poor communes in Cao Bang and Bac Kan provinces to sustainably manage their forest resources so as to assure water supply and conservation of soil as well as to improve their incomes and general livelihood. To do this, we developed practical approaches aimed at the Community or village level, mainly in poor Communes and with a focus on poverty-alleviation. This is called
Community-Based Forest Management (CBFM), and includes management of communal land as well as small plots of private forestland that have been allocated to individual households.

1.2 CBBCRDP Strategy for Forestry

The most important element of Project strategy to encourage forest restoration was to develop an enabling environment that would favour progress on real social forestry in Cao Bang. The first step towards improving the enabling environment was to increase levels and frequency of dialogue with Provincial forestry-sector agencies on policy issues and felt constraints. This dialogue led to the realisation that fresh thinking was needed to bring forward new policies and approaches from the central MARD to identify points of application in the Cao Bang context.

1.3 The Leaders' Seminar and Process in brief

Further discussion as above led to a proposal from the DARD for a “Leaders’ Seminar on a New Forest Restoration Strategy for Cao Bang” with CBBCRDP support. The People’s Committee (PPC) quickly authorised the Seminar and invitations went out in July 2002.

The Leaders’ Seminar brought together key stakeholder agencies in the Provincial and District administrations. There were invited contributory papers on relevant topics from informed officials. The DARD also brought in a small number of National experts and representatives from the central MARD to introduce and/or explain the policy advances being made in the Centre and in other provinces.

The main outcome of the “Leaders’ Seminar” was to stimulate fresh thinking and enhanced open-ness to new ideas on forest issues. The concluding Plenary Session established two “Working Groups” charged with (1) formulating new policies for PPC attention, and (2) adjustments to operations not requiring a policy decision.

The Working Groups met frequently during the first ensuing year, prompting much discussion, reflection, examination of existing practices and policy frameworks, and suggestions for reform or modification. PPC action followed on key issues such as clarification of lead and cooperating roles for LUPLA, and establishment of the Vietnam Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (VBARD) as a partner in delivering funds to farmers for forestry initiatives.

In early 2004, the MARD issued a directive to all Provinces requiring them to plan a comprehensive Forestry Strategy and Action to 2010, with broad Guidelines attached. The DARD organised a Wrap-Up Information Exchange so the Working Groups could issue their conclusions which then formed an initial input for the new process.

The following Report brings together the main contributed papers, summaries of the discussions, and the principle outputs of the Working Groups.
2 The Leaders’ Seminar

2.1 Invitation letter from DARD

Province of Cao Bang
Department of Agriculture and Rural Development

Socialistic Republic of Vietnam
Independence – Freedom – Happiness

Vietnam – E.C. Cooperation
Cao Bang – Bac Kan Rural Development Project

Date: 22 June 2002

Subject: Preliminary notice of a Leaders’ Seminar for a new Forest Sector Strategy

“A fresh approach to forest rehabilitation in Cao Bang”

10th – 11th September, 2002 in Cao Bang

Cao Bang has a large area of rich forest land, and has enjoyed a past of enormous forest resources. These once-great forest resources have dwindled to a few residual pockets as a consequence of unfortunate historical events and past over-exploitation. Much of the forest land of the province is now supporting only light cover of uneconomic shrubs and grasses. Large areas of sloping forest land are seen to be under agricultural use with consequent erosion risk and loss of productivity.

Experience with re-forestation has been gained from recent programmes such as the PAM (Food for Work), programme 327 (Greening the Hills) and the 5 Million Hectare programme. But with no provincial revenue from forestry, Central programmes have limited scope for restoring the vast areas now degraded. At present levels of investment and under current policies it could take as long as 1000 years to restore productive and economic forest and plantation cover to all such areas.

Meanwhile the Cao Bang Bac Kan Rural Development Project (with E.U. support) has supported forestry sector activities in eight focal Communes of three Districts of Bac Kan since the year 2000. These projects have given cause to hope that adoption of some fresh approaches may help to speed the forest rehabilitation.

The Cao Bang Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD) invites your participation in this important initiative which will be the start of active dialogue among interested stakeholders. The results expected are a coherent overall strategy that is fully in line with the long term goals of the Province, is consistent with the National Forestry policies and long-range planning, and is also consistent with the Harmonized Implementation Framework of the Forest Sector Support Programme & Partnership. It will include elements of the following:

1. Strengthened capacity for forest inventory and planning
2. A fresh approach to land classification and land allocation

3. Potential for and implications of re-classification of forest land to agriculture.

4. New ideas to increase incentives and farmer motivation to establish participatory production and protection forests, and to manage them sustainably.

5. Re-establishment of Forest Enterprises as stakeholders in joint venture production forests owned by farmers and the State, generating revenues for the Province and earning farmers a considerable income from agro-forestry and sloping agriculture land technologies (SALT).

The organisers – DARD in collaboration the CBBC-RDP – invite representatives from the Delegation of the E.C. in Vietnam, the Director of Helvetas in Vietnam, representation from Provincial and District Leaders of Cao Bang Province, and representatives from the Central Ministries in Hanoi. The DARD will proceed with the preparations for the Seminar having received your comments to the tentative programme and to the list of invited participants.

Vice Director,

2.2 DARD, Cao Bang

Encl: Tentative Programme for the Seminar

=================================================================================================

Leaders’ Seminar for a new Forest Sector Strategy

2.2.1 “A fresh approach to forest rehabilitation in Cao Bang”

10th – 11th September 2002 in Cao Bang

Venue: Provincial People's Committee Meeting Hall
And selected field locations near Cao Bang Town.

Tentative Programme

10th September 2002
9:00 – 11:30

- Welcoming address to participants. Vice-Chairman, PPC.
- Historical review of forests of Cao Bang. Mr Phuong.
- Introduction to DARD objectives and plans in forestry. Director of DARD
- Introduction to the relevant MARD policies and programmes, presenter to be arranged.
o What is the present situation in Cao Bang? Forest land and forest cover statistics. Mr Van, FiPU.

o The importance of planning in forestry, and a brief analysis of strategic options. Mr Ngoan, DARD Planning Unit and Drake Hocking, Head of Forestry Component, CBBC-RDP.

o Forest product markets and marketing: a factor of sustainability in forest management planning. Presenter to be arranged.

o Monitoring and control of forests at provincial level: proposed improvements and justifications, Mr Minh, FPD

o Re-vitalisation of State Forest Enterprises for benefit of farmers and the State. Mr Nguyen Ngoc Lai, Director SFE Con Cuong District, Nghe An Province

o Discussion: from theory and policies to implementation. Mr Chuong, Director DARD.

o Lunch

14:00 – 17:00

o Brief discussions between the Provincial Leaders and the representatives of the E.C. and Cao Bang – Bac Kan Project: What can be done within the present Project?

o Modalities and potential for further support from the E.U. Discussions between the Provincial Leaders and the Representatives of the Delegation of the E.C. in Vietnam.

11\textsuperscript{th} September, 2002

8:00 – 14:00 The Party divides into two groups according to preference for the selected field programmes below:

o Field visit to Na Sac Commune, field activities of CBBK-RDP.

o Visits to other field sites to be selected and arranged.
### 2.3 Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of participants</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr. Hendrik Franklin</td>
<td>Program officer of EC delegation in Hanoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mr. Hoµng Thµnh</td>
<td>Forestry program officer designate of EC delegation Hanoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mr. Bïi Huy Nho</td>
<td>Policy division, MARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mr. NguyÔn §×nh H-ëng</td>
<td>Member of steering committee – vice director of international cooperation division, MARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mrs. Chu ThĐ H§o</td>
<td>Vice-director of policy division, MARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mr. NguyÔn Quang D--ng</td>
<td>Vice director of forestry development dept, MARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr. Şç §×nh SCm</td>
<td>Former Director of ViOt nam forestry science institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mr. NguyÔn Phò Híng</td>
<td>Representative from FIFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mr. N%xng ThÔ Cô</td>
<td>Deputy Party Secretary of Cao Bang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mr. N%xng V’n P.o</td>
<td>Vice chairman of PFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mr. TrÇn Híng</td>
<td>Office manager of the Party Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mr. Hµ §øc Nhp</td>
<td>Deputy Chief Administrator of People Council and PFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mr. NguyÔn Th,i Hµ</td>
<td>Senior official of PPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mr. L--ng Thô Toµn</td>
<td>Official of PPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mr. NguyÔn §×nh Ch--ng</td>
<td>Director of DARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mr. Lý Danh Ph--ng</td>
<td>Former director of former forestry department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mr. ThÈm V’n Eng</td>
<td>Vice director of DARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mr. BÔ Ych Hång</td>
<td>Acting head of forestry development sub dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mr. L’nh Danh Gia</td>
<td>Head of policy section, DARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mr. L’s V’n Ngo’n</td>
<td>Head of planning section, DARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mr. Bïi Nguyªn V’n</td>
<td>Head of forest inventory and planning unit, DARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mr. Lôc §øc Xu©n</td>
<td>Head of science and economic section, DARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mr. NguyÔn Ngäc ThÐnh</td>
<td>Deputy Head of residence resettlement sub dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mr. NguyÔn Sinh Cung</td>
<td>Head of Extension center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mr. NguyÔn Quang Minh</td>
<td>Director of forest protection dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mr. Şµm Trung Hip</td>
<td>Head of legislation section of FPSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mr.Th,i Hång ThÐnh</td>
<td>Vice director of Cadastral dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mr. Şoun Hµl TriØu</td>
<td>Vice director dept of science, technology and environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mr. Şµm Nguyªn Cëng</td>
<td>Vice-director of financial dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mr. Sinh ThĐ Hµ</td>
<td>Vice director of investment and planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Programme

The DARD engaged an external facilitator, Mr Pham Van Vi, to generally manage the programme and to take running notes of remarks made during the programme. His summary follows below. The presented papers are given in full in the next section.

2.4.1 The protocol session

Mr. Pao, vice chairman of PPC

Mr. Henrik Franklin, Representative of the EC Delegation

Mr. Nguyen Quang Duong, MARD

Mr. Ly Danh Phuong, former director of DARD

2.4.2 Plenary presentation and discussion on objectives

Mr. Chuong (director of DARD) gave a presentation on following objectives:

- Forest coverage
- Agroforestry development
- Poverty alleviation

• Additional objectives as outcome of discussion
  - Bio-diversify
  - Human resource development
  - Finance

2.4.3 “Current policies constraints and ways to overcome”

Mr. Nho (MARD) gave a presentation on “Programs and Policies from MARD” including following subjects:

- Land policies

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mr. Nguyễn Trăng Bác</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mr. Markus Ischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mr. Lông Toàn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mr. Trịnh Văn Khênn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mr. Jerry Rolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mr. Drake Hocking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mr. Phâm Nguyễn Khôi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mr. Lý Văn Trăng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Mr. Sĩnh Cường Thanh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mrs. Nguyễn Thu Hằng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Ms. Nguyễn Thanh Yến Linh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Mr. Sĩnh Lô Vinh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Mr. Nguyễn Xuân Trung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Mrs. Hoàng Thanh Ng-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Forest management policies
- Investment policies
- Credit policies
- Distribution policies
- Taxation policies
- Policies on profit sharing

Mr. Thinh (Land Administration) gave a presentation on “Related Policies from Dept of Land Admin”, including following subjects:
- Plantation
- Importance level of forestry
- Management
- Survey
- Exploitation

Mrs. Hao (MARD) gave a presentation on “Market and Marketing of Forestry Products”, including following subjects:
- Orientation
- Distribution and consumption policies
- Certification
- Market research and development
- Market information system
- Collaboration
- Forestry production enterprises
- Product collection system

After the presentations the group discussed in dept all subjects above and agreed to set up a working group to further look into those matters.

2.4.4 “Current operational constraints and ways to overcome”

Mr. Van (DARD) gave a presentation on “Current Situation of Cao Bang Forest”, including following subjects:
- Rough land surface
- Weak collaboration between related institutions
- Local bodies do not take the initiatives
- Weak motivation toward forest development
- Poor people depending on forest

Dr. Drake Hocking (CBBCRDP) and Mr. Ngoan (DARD) gave a presentation on “Importance of Planning in Forestry Development”, including following subjects.
- Lack of land for agriculture
- Lack of land for grazing
- Lack of human and financial resource for planned forestry development
- Weak collaboration between related bodies
Mr. Minh (Forestry Protection Dept) gave a presentation on “Current Situation of Forest Management and Protection”, including following subjects:

- Not enough attention
- Lack of human resource
- Lack of new information
- Lack of data

After each presentation, group members discussed and explored all possible solution to current issues. Finally, they decided to form a working group to tackle these issues.

2.5 Final Plenary Session

The Closing Plenary Session agreed, first, to establish and continue the two Working Groups with responsibility respectively for Forest Policy issues and Forest Operational issues. The Working Groups had to prepare their work according to the following schedule:

**Follow up activities**

Step 1: Seminar on strategy for forestry development

1. Agree on objectives
2. Establish working groups – by the end of September 2002
   - Policy level
   - Operational level

Step 2: Symposium – by the end of November 2002

1. Agree on policy adjustment
2. Agree on operational adjustment

Step 3: Working group meeting by mid February 2003

Submit the Action Plan

2.6 Evaluation of the Leaders Seminar

Facilitator’s Report prepared by Mr Pham Van Vi included the following self-evaluation of the seminar overall.

“The outputs are satisfactory” was the common remarks by many participants. Most participants agreed with the seminar name, location, date, agenda, content and the overall atmosphere.

Those good signs were proved by number of participants showing in the afternoon sessions. Instead of losing some as other seminars had experienced, we in fact had one more participant join the afternoon session. No body was late for the afternoon discussion.

Supporting staff worked well. Organization of secretarial as well as other administrative works were smooth.

Many people were very excited and wanted to talk more during the discussion time. However, time was so tight. I suggest we extend the discussion time in the next similar seminar.
2.7 Presented papers

Besides the presented papers, background information had been prepared through a study done for the National Working Group on Community Forestry by Mr Vu Long. This is included in the present Report as Annex 1.

Mr Nho of MARD presented a speech to the Seminar on "Programmes and Policies from MARD". He did not provide a written copy and there is no record of the details of his presentation.

All other written presentations are compiled below in English translations. A Vietnamese version of this whole Report is in preparation.

2.7.1 Opening remarks by PPC Chairman

His Excellency, the Ambassador of Finland, Mr Kari Alanko; The Councillor, Ms Merja Sundberg; The Advisor, Mr Mikko Leppänen;

The honourable representative of the Delegation of the European Commission to Vietnam; the representatives from the MARD, MPI, MoF; the representatives from PPC, Departments and Districts in Bac Ban; ladies and gentlemen;

The Peoples’ Committee of Bac Kan has a pleasure to host this seminar to discuss the sustainable forest management on the allocated forest land. The seminar is sponsored by two important projects: Vietnam – Finland Forestry Sector Cooperation Programme and Cao Bang/BacKan Rural Development Programme which is financed by the European Commission. Both projects include objectives for sustainable management of forest resources thus contributing to long term poverty reduction.

The Province decided to arrange this seminar at this point of time when there is roughly one year left of each project. It is necessary sum up the results and findings of the two project in forestry, and if necessary to propose improvements and changes to the models and guidelines developed. In brief, the purpose of the Seminar is to fully inform the Provincial and District decision makers of Bac Kan and other stakeholders on the issues related to sustainable forest management and the work done by the Departments and projects.

The Province realises that there is still lots of scope for improvement as for forest management. There is still serious deficiencies in certain areas such as human and technology resources for modern forest information systems, application of new methods of land use and forest management planning at larger scale in the province. After the presentations by the experts, we will discuss the issues raised here, and explore ways to improve and continue the work on sustainable forest management.

With these words I wish you all welcome to the seminar on sustainable forest management on the allocated forest land.

2.7.2 Speech by the Representative of the Ambassador of the E.C.

For the Leaders’ Seminar in Cao Bang Province, 17thSeptember 2002

- Cao Bang has a great history of providing key forest products for the Nation and its people in times of crisis and need
- This has depleted the natural forests and it's time to restore them for the benefit of present and future generations of forest-dependent people as well as for the Nation
- the Cao Bang – Bac Kan Rural Development Project (with E.C. support) has supported forestry sector activities in the Province since the year 2000
- this valuable experience has helped the partnership to learn what approaches can work and what are likely to fail
- The next year will see a big expansion of successful approaches through mobilisation of new partnerships with forest-sector agencies in the province, including much wider farmer partnerships for tree planting efforts
- These activities will include pilot-scale investment in farmer-oriented plantations with important poverty-alleviation components, consistent with the objectives of the CBBK-RDP
- It is important to open the policy dialogue through this Seminar, so as to help create an enabling environment through appropriate policy adjustments to improve the effectiveness of such increased activity
- New strategic approaches will help to guide the planning of new activities, which is so important for forestry because of the long-term impact. What you do now will affect the people for many years and must be planned carefully to ensure it is a beneficial impact.
- The E.C. has now agreed to extend the duration of the Project for 7 months to August 2004
- Subject to continuing positive results, I am pleased to announce that the E.C. is minded to extend cooperation for a further five years towards restoring the great forest resources of Cao Bang.

2.7.3 Historical Background: Ly Danh Phuong

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE FORESTRY DEVELOPMENT OF CAO BANG

By Mr. Ly Danh Phuong

Former Director of Cao Bang Forestry Department

I - General Information of the Current Land Condition of the Province

Cao Bang is a Northern Mountainous Province of Vietnam bordering China. According to the province's statistic data of 2001 the current condition of the land of Cao Bang is allocated, as follows:

- Total natural land area of the province is 669,072 ha. Of this:
  1. Agriculture land is 64,600 ha accounting for 9.6%
  2. Forestry land is 584,400 ha equivalent to more than 80%. Of this:
     2.1 Land with forest is 287,170 ha making 42.9% (natural forest is 269,700 ha, artificial forest is 17,450 ha)
     2.2 Land without forest is 297,000 ha (of this 133,400 ha is bare rocky mountain)
3. Other land: The rest area is homestead, unused, residential land, etc.

II- Brief history of the Cao Bang Forestry Development Process.

Due to the time limit, I can only outline a basic development process of the Cao Bang Forestry sector for a period from 1950 up to now.

1. Forest Product Exploitation process:

In October 1950 Cao Bang was liberated, however the war of resistance was still carried out intensively through out the country. Therefore, the Central and the Province assigned the provincial Forestry Sector a task to establish Forest Enterprises to exploit timber for the construction of the railway running from Eastern Europe through China to Vietnam in support of the nation's construction and defense. This was the main task of the sector during this period. Besides that some supplementary forest products were started to be exploited for export to China. The outputs of this period reached 136,300 m³ of logs, 77,000 Ste of firewood. Thach An and Ha Lang were the districts where wood was exploited the most. The 1st Forest Enterprise exploiting wood of the province was established in Thach An district.

From 1956 - 1964: The province produced 136,280 m³ of logs, 77,000 Ste of firewood. The highest volume of timber of 17,500 m³ exported to China was achieved in 1958

From 1965 to 1980: Although the timber exploitation and export to China had been lasting for 10 years, Cao Bang forest remained high product volume. During this period, export was in process but the volume was reduced gradually.

From 1970 to 1980: Timber exploitation task was sped up for the main course of construction of the province and the country. Besides the Forest Enterprise in Thach An District, another enterprise in charge of forest exploitation and reforestation was established in Le A of Nguyen Binh District.

The exploitation outputs made by the State Forest Enterprises of the province of this period are as follows:

+ Logs: 186,800 m³
+ Firewood: 208,000 Ste
+ Vau (a species of bamboo) for Pulp: 18,500 tons
+ Vau for construction: 258,700 trees
+ Bingham bamboo (Truc) for fishing rods: 8,185,000 trees
+ Bingham bamboo for poles: 858,000 trees

The above results indicate that this was the period when forest products of Cao Bang were produced the most. 1968 produced the highest volume of timber reaching 23,100 m³.

From 1981 to now: The forest products were continued to be exploited and processed. Population increase during a period of 1980-1990 due to 1979 border war gave rise to a sharp increase in firewood for army demand. This resulted in a decrease in the timber cut down by the State Forest Enterprises and an increase in self-exploitation by the army. In addition to the increase in
the population, the disintegration of the cooperatives was contributing elements to cause the most serious deforestation so far.

Due to the above situation, the exploitation output made by State and Non-state entities was only 88,500 m³ of logs and 11,768 Ste of firewood during this period. However, these were the statistic figures, the real number would have been much larger.

Aware of the real situation of the exhausted forest of Cao Bang, in 1992 the Ministry of Forestry put a ban on exploitation of Cao Bang Forest in the State areas.

In order to exploit the forest product, it was necessary to open the forestry routes for transportation. To help with that, the Cao Bang PPC authorized to establish a Forestry Bridges and Roads Company and a fleet of vehicles for transportation of timber and forest products. The company overcame a lot of difficulties to construct more than 300 km of forestry road in Nguyen Binh and Thach An Districts.

2. Forest Product Processing

Processing of Forest Products was interested and invested in early 1970s. The first enterprise processing flooring planks was established in Dong Khe sub-town, Thach An District and the second one was based in Le A of Nguyen Binh District. In mid 1970s, they were merged and became Wood Processing Enterprise based in Cao Bang town that specialized in producing sawn timber for construction of the province and home furniture supplied to local offices and residents. Since establishment, the Enterprise had been totally in charge of making timber for construction of the whole province and partially for Central. As the consequence of the abolishment of the subsidy system, other economic elements got involved in forest product processing; the Enterprise was dissolved in early 1990s. At the present, it is remained in the form of a workshop under a company.

Besides timber, Cao Bang has one special kind of bamboo, which is renowned for its quality of pliability, straightness, and nice colour. Hence, in early 1960s, this Bingham bamboo was interested by Soviet Union and they were exported to the Soviet Union by an enterprise specializing in processing high-quality-fishing rods and skiing sticks. However, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the enterprise ceased its operation because there have been no customers for that kind of small bamboo since then.

In 1994, some Taiwanese customers invested in making bamboo mats and blinds used Cao Bang Bingham Bamboo to export to Taiwan. So in 1994, Bamboo Export Enterprise was established and has been staying in production until now. The products of the enterprise have been of good quality and fond of by domestic and foreign customers. The problem is a shortage of raw material to meet demand. To solve this problem and expand the market, a project of Truc Plantation has been approved by the Provincial authorities. The Bamboo Export Enterprise was assigned to be in charge of the project and upgraded to a Bamboo Export Company.

Cao Bang has a natural bamboo region, therefore a mill was established to produce paper for provincial use. However, due to backward technology the mill was dissolved. Presently, a Pulp Producing Enterprise supplying pulp to
Central mills to take advantage of the locally available resources has been established. The project is in process of implementation.

3. Afforestation

Since early 1960s, afforestation has been paid attention to by the province and central. Generally, it produced some positive achievements, however there are quite a few problems arising during the implementation. This process can be presented as follows:

**From 1960 to 1979:** Soon after a “Tree Planting Tet” campaign launched by the Uncle Ho, De Tham State Afforestation Enterprise was the 1st one established in Hoa An District, Cao Bang. After that, other Afforestation enterprises appeared in the focal districts. By 1970, the Afforestation Enterprises were basically established; meanwhile plantation teams were also founded within Exploitation Enterprises.

After 20 year of reforestation, Forestry sector advised to the Province on selection of several species particularly suitable to local climate and soil characteristics and easy to regenerate naturally. During that period, 12,100 ha of forest of different species were planted in the province, of these 3,900 ha belong to state sector, 8,200 ha belong to farmer and cooperatives sector. Salient points were Pine and Chestnut areas of Trung Khanh District, Pine and Cunninghamia areas in Hoa An, Nguyen Binh, Bao Lac, etc.

**From 1981-1992:** After 1979, due to the sharp increase in population, especially the great number of army troops based in the province for a purpose of national defense, the needs for timber rose rapidly resulting in heavy forest devastation. However, afforestation by the Forest Enterprises went on. Mainly Pine, Cunninghamia especially Tung oil tree (Trau) with its high value were planted during this period. Chinese Trau was developed by involving the army in its plantation, as it is suitable to Cao Bang climate and soil. A company specialized in Trau was established. Consequently, more than 3,000 ha of Trau were planted during early 1980s.

**For a period from 1981-1992,** 11,200 ha of forest mainly of Trau, Pine, Cunningham-hamia, Bingham Bamboo were planted in the whole province in both state and cooperative sectors. Even though there were great efforts in afforestation, both natural and artificial forests were ravaged seriously due to on-going fighting and poor living conditions of the ethnic people. At the end of 1992, forest cover of Cao Bang was only 14%.

**From 1993 to now:** This has been a transitional period of abolishment of subsidy system, changes in some policies, land and forest allocation to households for protection, regeneration and plantation in Forestry which used to be responsibilities of State and Cooperative Sectors. This is a special period when State Forest Enterprises have no funds for investment; forest resources are running out, cooperatives are being dissolved to convert into family and household economy both in agriculture and forestry. For these reasons, forests planted by the state and cooperative sectors were cut down. Consequently, the forest area planted by the State Forest Enterprises remained only about 50%.

Facing the above difficulties, the Party and Government issued Decision 327 CT on Greening Bare Hills and Land programme. This was a national
program. In implementation of this programme, the State Forest Enterprises moved to set up 327 project to submit to the Forestry Ministry for approval and transformed State Forest Enterprises' structures into 327 Project management boards getting project management allowances. In spite of many constraints such as: low allowance failing to cover operational expenses, the management boards made great efforts and received full supports of the people. The programme became more and more effective. Flood prevention forest and forestland were allocated on contract basis and non-flood prevention forests were assigned to households, therefore forests were well protected and developed. The programme now have been converted into "5 million ha reforestation programme" (5MHRP) with Central funding under Decision 661.

In 1997, with the support from the Central ministry, Cao Bang received an afforestation project sponsored by the World Food Organization. The project gave rice to subsidize for the poor household who participated in plantation of 1 ha/household. The project was fully responded by the farmers and got a good achievement. Nearly 10,000 ha of artificial forest were planted by 11,000 households. The trees planted during this period were of high economic value, e.g. Pine, Cuninghamia, Bingham Bamboo, Chestnut, especially Star Anis and Cinnamon in Thach An and Tra Linh. At the present, these 2 districts have nearly 2,000 ha of Star Anis and started implementing Chestnut and Bingham bamboo in 2002.

**Since 1993,** 17,700 ha of forest has been planted in the provincial area, of these Pine, Star Anis, Hybrid Accacia, Chestnut, Bingham Bamboo have made up the most part.

Currently, projects of the 5 million ha forest programme have been executed effectively. Besides, the province has invested in development of specialty species, e.g. Pole Bingham Bamboo in Nguyen Binh, Bao Lac and Thong Nong Districts, Chestnut in Trung Khanh, Ha Lang and Quang Uyen Districts. So far the 5 million ha programme has been carried out in almost every district of the province, except Bao Lam and Phuc Hoa as these are 2 newly established districts which have no projects approved.

The 327, 5 million ha programme received full supports from the people. That means the policies of the Government is going in line with people's will. Hence, investment is effective; forests are protected and well grown and regenerated; where forest is planted, it is protected and developed. Forest cover increased from 14% in 1994 to 42.9% in 2001. This is an encouraging results achieved by the Cao Bang Forestry Sector.
2.7.4 Objectives of forestry development in CB: Nguyen Dinh Chuong

OBJECTIVE AND ORIENTATION OF FORESTRY DEVELOPMENT
OF CAO BANG PROVINCE FROM 2002 - 2010

Mr. Nguyen Dinh Chuong
Director of Cao Bang DARD

Introduction
Cao Bang is a mountainous province located in the Northeastern region. It has 13 districts consisting of 189 communes. Of these, there are 9 districts and 42 communes located on the border with China. Total length of the border line is 311km.

Total natural area of Cao Bang is 669,072 ha of which hill and mountain account for 80%. There are 9 ethnic groups residing in Cao Bang. The province has favourable conditions for forestry development.

To successfully implement the 5 million hectares forest programme of the Government and the resolution of the 15th Cao Bang Communist Party Meeting, the structure and management of State Forest Enterprises should be renewed, the policy should be made to mobilize farmers and other business entities to participate actively in forestation, natural regeneration, protection of existing forests in order to ensure eco-environment and increase forest cover up to 60% in 2010 contributing to stabilization of farmers' lives in the remote areas, creating more jobs to improve their living standards and helping with the course of poverty reduction and forestry sustainable development.

Targets and orientation of forest development from now to 2010

Targets:
To protect efficiently the existing forest areas and to develop 3 types of forest: protection forest, special use forest and production forest in order to increase forest cover from 43% now up to 60% in 2010.

To implement and organize the 5MHFP (according to Government Decree 661/TTg) to develop production forest to meet the demand of supplying forest products for household use and raw materials for processing industry for export. To strive for plantation of about 14,000 ha of new forest in 2005 and 28,000 ha in 2010.

To develop industrial, fruit, timber and medical trees for a period from 2002 to 2010, of these:

- Chestnut: 3,660 ha including 2,500 ha of new planting
- Bingham bamboo: 3,490 ha including 2,500 of new planting
- Pine: 15,000 ha including 3,000 of new planting
- Fruit tree: 6,000 ha including 2,500 of new planting
- Anise and Cinnamon: 5,000 ha including 2,500 of new planting

To establish paper pulp zone to meet the demand of the mill which is being in construction and of the market in the future.
To plant multi-purpose species (such as Bitter Tea, Wild Wampi or Mac Mat) 
To develop agro-forestry and sustainable production in forestland to protect 
eco-environment.

To create job opportunity for 9,000 to 10,000 farmers and increase income 
and encourage farmers to engage in forestry which will assist in improving 
their living standards and the mountainous rural development.

**Orientation for Cao Bang Province from now to 2010:**

As the result of forest inventory according to Instructions 286/TTg of the Prime 
Minister, and the division of Cao Bang forest into 3 kinds, we should 
encourage farmers to develop farms by applying new varieties of high 
economic value to forestation, forming centralized production zones 
integrated with processing and export, planting high economic value trees to 
use the small amount of time to meet long-range requirements and applying 
the agro-forestry production for sustainable forest preservation and 
development. By 2010, to increase forest cover up to 60%; to protect eco-
environment and run sustainable forest business activities to meet the 
demand of timber and firewood for domestic consumption, for processing and 
export creating an opportunity to change the situation of the mountainous 
forestry economy, gradually increasing forest business rates in rural area. To 
develop protection forest, special use forest and production forest following 
forest economic orientation. Based on the functions and characteristics of 
forest to define a development direction for each type of forest that is suitable 
to the development strategy in forestry and socio-economic development of 
the Province, specifically as follows:

+ To focus on protection of existing forests; special use forest and 
  protection forest to be assigned to the PMUs of 5MHFP in districts, 
  towns with responsibilities of management and protection
+ To monitor efficiently Provincial 5MHFP to achieve 14,000 ha of 
  forest in 2005 and 28,000 ha in 2010.
+ To demarcate for natural regeneration of 235,000 ha to increase 
  forest cover
+ To fulfill the target of 60% of forest cover by 2010 to ensure 
  sustainable eco-environment, and create a raw material zone that 
  shall meet the demand of the provincial construction and export.
+ To upgrade the existing equipment of the Bamboo Processing 
  Company and expand and increase its production and export 
  capacity
+ From now to 2010, to consider establishing some more small scale 
  paper mills or pulp mills to consume the forest products of the forest 
  dependent farmers.
+ To establish a Star Anise oil extraction factory of 100 tons per year.
+ To establish a fruit processing factory
+ To establish a bitter tea processing factory
Flood Prevention Forest and forestland

This is an area of forest and forestland in the watershed of large rivers and streams. Total area of forested earth mountain and forested rocky mountain is 384,526.3 ha. Total area of bare rocky mountain is 117,840 ha. When forest is planted on this area, the water current will be controlled, and the downstream area will not be flooded in the rainy reason. Currently, this area is in target area of 5MHFP. The main task is to develop forest by natural regeneration, additional planting, protection and plantation through the contracts with local farmers.

Special use forest and forestland

This is an area for preservation of genetic sources of the forest animal and vegetation having high value in terms of history, culture and tourism. At the present, only 2,784 ha were planned and developed as special use forest in Pac Po Historical area of Truong Ha commune. Other areas have not been planned, such as: 5,000 ha of Ban Gioc waterfall forest, 2,000 ha of Thang Hen lake forest, 6,000 ha of Lam Son Historical area, 20,000 ha of Tran Hung Dao forest, 22,742 ha in the area for preservation of genetic sources of tropical rain forest's animal and vegetation in the northern part of Phia Oac - Phiaaden mountain range in Nguyen Binh District. These areas need to be incorporated in project formulation for the period from 2003 to 2005.

Production forest (Forestry economic zone)

This is a zone for firewood, timber and raw material forests. As a result of 327/CP programme and new programme of 5 million ha, this type of forest has been focused by the forest enterprises in all 13 districts of the province. The main species are: Pine, Cunninghamia, Chukraisia tabularish, Manglia glauca, Chestnut, Accacia, etc. From now to 2010 the area of 13,000 ha of bare land at the hill foot will be planted with timber, fuel wood and pulpwood species, such as: Bamboo, Accacia etc.

Develop an area for Bingham bamboo: there is a Bamboo and Bingham bamboo processing Company in Province, the product is consumed domestically and for export to Taiwan. Bingham bamboo will be newly planted in the area of 2,500 ha. (In Nguyen Binh, Bao Lac, Thong Nong and some communes of Hoa An District). This project should be implemented to meet the demand of raw materials of the mills.

Develop an area for Cinnamon - Anise: These species are mainly for export. They are suitable with soil, weather conditions of some communes in Thach An, Tra Linh Districts in Cao Bang. A project would be from 3,000 to 5,000 ha.

Develop an area for pulpwod for a Paper pulp mill with capacity of 5,000 tons/year. It would meet the full demand of a mill, which will be opened in 2003 and will be expanded in the next years. The area for planting should be 350 ha in 2003 and 3,500 ha in 2010.

Develop an area for multi purpose trees to speed up with plantation of species with high economic value to assist in Poverty reduction, increase forest cover, such as: a project for Bitter tea, Wampi or Mac mat plantations.

Continue with Chestnut project in Trung Khanh District for 2,500 ha, and a project of 6,000 ha for fruit tree.
Focus on protection of existing forest, special use forest, protection forest; assign the management and protection tasks to households and the Management Boards of 5MHFP.

Demarcate for natural regeneration of 235.000ha to increase forest cover.

Monitor and implementation of 5MHFP in the Province to achieve 14,000 ha of forest planted in 2005 and 28,000 ha in 2010.

Achieve the target of 60% of forest cover by 2010 to ensure sustainable eco-environment, and create a raw material and processing zone.

**Works to be done**

To develop the achievements and overcome the outstanding constraints, the following works should be done:

The State forest enterprises should be consolidated and renewed according to the Circular 187/QD/TTg dated 16/09/1999 and Circular 109/2000/TTL/BNN-BTC dated 20/10/2000. Protection forest Management Boards in 12 Districts and Towns funded by the State budget should be set up and the State forest enterprises in Districts should be restructured (in order to assist 5MHFP in Cao Bang province). For special use forest: a project to protect special use forest of Ban Gioc forest, Tran Hung Dao forest, Thang Hen lake forest, Lam Son historical area should be formulated, the genetic sources of tropical rain forest animal and plant in the northern part of Phia Oac - Phiaden mountain range in Nguyen Binh District should be preserved.

To apply advanced achievements, especially those of Biological technology in species varieties of fast growth, high economic value, suitability with each soil conditions meeting the requirements in flood prevention and economy, to increase quality of forest plantations, reduce business cycles and increase value per invested area.

To strengthen Agricultural and forestry extension activities should through organizing technical training courses and cross visits to successful models for forestry extension staff at grass root level.

To extend existing farms in terms of business and production scale and orientation, develop more new farms especially forestry farms.

To propose additional investment in forest plantation, protection, natural regeneration of protection forest in strategically important area, extremely poor communes, far flung area to assist in forest development and poverty reduction for the ethnic peoples.

To encourage investment in the development of forest economy, such as: credit schemes without interest or more preferential interest rate than for other sectors, offering loans based on cropping cycles.

To develop planned forest development in parallel with setting up a plan for the development of processing technology.

**Recommendations:**

Cao Bang is an extremely difficult mountainous province with a large area of forestland, and difficult natural and socio-economic conditions compared with other provinces in the area. It is requested that the Government revise and...
increase investment rate for forest farmers participating in successful implementation of the 5MHFP.

The Government should issue supplementary policies which make Forestry attach to farmer’s benefits

The Government and International Organizations are proposed to invest more in forest restoration and sustainable development of Cao Bang forestry.

**Conclusion**

The above is the key targets, orientation and solution for sustainable forestry development for Cao Bang Province for a period from now to 2010. This is very important to plan strategies for the Forestry sector.

2.7.5 Land policy to revitalize forest development in CB: Thai Hong Thinh

Land policy to revitalize forest development in CB

**Presented by Thai Hong Thinh**

**Deputy Director of Cao Bang Land Management Department.**

Features of forestry land in Cao Bang

Cao Bang has a wide natural area with the majority thereof being dominated by rocky terrain leaving little land area for production during dry season. Forest still constitutes a large area but mainly miscellaneous and low species of low economic value grow. Consequently, Cao Bang encounters a lot of difficulty during the course of developing socio-economic arena and solving land-related issues. Data incurring from a recent land census in 12/2001 shows: Forestry area (forest covered area) currently exists in Cao Bang is 287,170.45 hectares, accounting for 43% of total land area. In which the area has been assigned to all target groups is 169,871.29 hectares accounting for 59% of forestry area. The remaining area that has not been leased out is 117,299.16 hectares accounting for 41%. On average, the forest-covered area calculated on the basis of per rural person is 0.65 hectare/head. Henceforth, the percentage forestry area and the average per rural capita thereof in Cao Bang is higher than that in Northern mountainous area as a whole (the percentage of forestry area in Northern mountainous area is 39% the average of forestry land per capita is 0.41 hectare). Although the forest stretches over a significantly large area, it mainly habitats timber of low economic value. A robust expansion of forestry area in Cao Bang is clearly seen in a comparative relationship with 1992 when the forestry area represented only 6.7% of total natural area. Though the ecological requirement (having forest coverage of over 50%) has not been met for the current moment but in review of current expansion rate, that requirement could be feasibly met in Cao Bang (the forest coverage rate in 2001 represents 43%).

* Main reasons: The rapid expansion of forestry land (mainly resulting from protection and regeneration) is attributed to the efficiency of State policies, to the provincial attention and enforcement. Henceforth, the management and exploitation, use of bare area over past few years have been given appropriate and worthwhile attention. The establishment of cadastral dossier, assigning forestry land and issuing forestry land tittle deeds (under Decree 02/CP) to household recipients have been accelerated. Households having
received deeds numbers at 27486 households representing 53.3% of the total or corresponds to 119,704.43 hectares representing 45% of total forestry land area. Forestry land assignment to farmers has brought positive effects into protecting and expanding the forest covered area as well as alleviating deforestation for cropping. Forestry area increases, upper land cropping area decreases significantly.

1. Main discrepancies to be sorted out in the policy of developing forestry land:
   - With regard to forestry land, it was the earlier policy that forestry land dossier was granted resulting in an extremely slow and lengthy course of doing so. The granting process is enhanced due to our new policy to grant land title deeds to households. However, the process is still slow (approximately at 50%). The remaining area constituting the majority of forestry land has not had 3 types of forests identified to facilitate the deed granting process. The situation is uneasy for management, resulting in ineffective exploitation and on the other hand incurring legal complaints and social instability.
   - With the aim to have an effective management of forest resources, it is suggested that: the State should introduce policies and mechanism of ensuring benefits of foresters and obligations of land users being observed; the State should also establish land management resources and data archive since most of forestry land has not been measured as meant.
   - In order to have the targets set forth for forestry development in Cao Bang met for the period up to 2010 in Cao Bang (the forest coverage rate at 60%) the following focuses are recommended:

   - First: Intensifying afforestation, enrichment and regeneration, gradually developing forestry into a sector generating high income for farmers. Henceforth, 100 000 hectares of unused land should be brought in for forestry development. In which, 23000 hectares of concentrated forest should be planted, 70000 hectares should be regenerated. The forest covered area shall be 388000 hectares by 2010.

   Second: Forestry should gradually become an important occupation of economic value in the sense that it creates stable jobs, hence sedentarizes population settlement, improves quality of livelihood of minor ethnic inhabitants. Therefore, sedentarization of population would be attached with forestry land and development of forestry as a revenue generating occupation.

   Third: With regard to forestry farms where good management is seen, a component as part of the management apparatus should be set up to provide scientific guidance, production services, procure and process products.

   Fourth: Places (historic sites, tourist spots, etc) where forestry land assignment to households is impossible, the alternative resort would be long term and stable custody, management and exploitation being entrusted to families, organizations.
Fifth: The current situation of forestry land, unused land with capability of developing forest should be reviewed. A detailed plan and inventory of forestry land should be established on the basis of retaining 55000 hectares of immature and poor forest and 95000 hectares of forest currently existing in rocky terrain, developing forest in rocky terrain and improving the quality an resources contained therein. Current tending activities of newly regenerated forest – 20000 hectares every year – should be continued so as vast forest covered areas with rich reserve of resources could be established by 2010.

Forest development should be attached to protection, custody of historic and tourist sites; conservation of genetic vegetation and endangered species.

Sixth: Land and forest assignment to families should be accelerated. The Government should soon assist in establishing a cadastral map using aerial imagery with the purpose of exploiting all land patterns, developing production and sedentarizing population with specific goals as follows:

Cadastral mapping (having scale of 1/10000) of forestry land, unused land, completing forestry land and unused land assignment to families, establishing cadastral dossiers for the purpose of granting deeds of forestry land and unused land to families, completing the process thereof within the period of 2003-2005 (completion would be mean both completing cadastral dossiers of land assigned in previous years and incorporating it in a management system).

Seventh: Encouraging families to exploit bare hills and areas for developing forestry farms (establishing agro-forestry and employing cropping techniques in sloping land).

Eighth: An amendment should be recommended with regard to the limit on forestry land. Law provisions should contain confinement of land for developing production forest and should not stipulate threshold on land for developing protection and special use forest.

With regard to land occupied by forestry farms, rights and obligations of land occupants should be spelled out in the Law to provide legitimate facilitation to the process of managing land pursuant to envisaged plans.

**With regard to forestry land assignment policy:**

+ The Prime Minister Decision 178/QD dated 12/11/2001 governing rights and obligations of forestry land assignees should be enacted. That will be the basis for wider assignment of natural forest to families in accordance with current legislation.

+ Proceeding with assessing forest reserve, forest patterns in a quantitative manner to have the foundation for evaluating initial values of forest resources, rights, obligations and benefits would accordingly constituted.

+ With regard to bare areas in vulnerable protection forest that no organizations would receive, they should be assigned to families. The threshold for assigning bare hilly areas would be 50 hectares and shall be defined according to actual situation of each locality.
+ Vulnerable protection forest scattering in communes shall be assigned to families.
+ Additional funding should be provided for establishing land assignment map, reviewing 3 types of forests, classifying protection and categorizing funding for evaluating the reserve according to criteria of the Forest Protection Service.

2.7.6 Forestry production market and marketing: Chu Thi Hao

Forestry production market and marketing:
A sustainable factor in planning and managing forest

Chu Thi Hao, Deputy Director
Department of ARD Policy, MARD

1. The actual situation of managing and developing forest

Over 60% of natural area that Vietnam possesses are dominated with hilly and mountainous terrain that is objects for forestry. This hilly and mountainous terrain is distributed to the North, Central area and Central Highlands. A large community of minor ethnic groups resides in these areas where topography is intersected posing a difficult accessibility and less developed socioeconomic arena. A large proportion of this community residing in remoter areas still lead a difficult life. Cultivating land is quite limited to a number of those. Several residents are less knowledgeable. Application of backward cultivating techniques, shifting cultivation still persist. These are main reasons for diminished forest resources. Consequently, political, socioeconomic situation and ecological system nation wide are severely affected.

Since stakeholders are aware of this problem, over the past years, forest management and protection have received worthwhile attention from all government levels. Active participation into the process has been seen in many places, hence significant progress has been made. Destruction of forest for cultivating has decreased remarkably. Exploitation of forest products has been placed under good management and control. Enrichment and regeneration have been performed better and better. Forestry projects and programs have all more or less introduced active effects especially the national program 327 and project 661 with the objective of planting 5 million hectares of forest by 2010. As a result of aforementioned efforts, the forest coverage rate nation wide has been romantically increased from 28.2% from 1995 to 33.2% by 2000 and 34% by now.

However, shrunken forest area especially primeval forest is still the occurrence in many places. Due to an earlier fact that forest resources have not been properly understood, they have been exhausted, forest reserve has sharply reduced, forest covered area keeps shrinking, many rare fauna and flora genetic sources face extinct.

In Northern mountainous area, North of Central area, coastal area in the south, uncontrolled forest exploitation plus burning - slashing practices have deprived water shed forest of its role, triggering soil erosions, flash floods which place lives of people living in down stream area under a constant and potential threat.

Plating of production forest is still under the expected level. Forestry is still not adequately attractive to farmers since incomes incurring from forest products are low and nor stable.
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One of the primary reasons hindering sustainable development of forest in Vietnam is that over the past years forest management and development still placed much focus on expanding forest area and furnish inadequate attention to the role of market and marketing practices. Forest inventories, planning, scientific research, forest extension, policies all focused on expanding forest area, planting forest. This approach obviously had its effects in increasing forest covered area but lacked stability and failed to increase quality of forest resources.

It is clearly seen that forest covered area ever increases over past years but quality of forest has significantly diminished. The average reserve of natural forest is 76.3 m³/hectare and that of planted forest is 20.8 m³/ha. Our country would face much difficulty in balancing between the demand for commercial timber for growing domestic need, exports and ecological requirements for sustainable development.

2. Role of market and marketing practices
After 10 years of following the reform policy, our economy has steadily transformed into a state regulated market mechanism. Understanding market role and its effects shall constitute a decisive element in sustainable management of forest. Therefore, worthwhile attention should be paid to marketing. “Market” is seen as the first and last link in the chain of forest production.

Though forest production over past time has moved with steady paces but quality and competitiveness of our forest products are still at low level. Forecasting market needs reveals lots of weaknesses and fails to generate orientations for production and sale of commercial forest products.

A currently compelling matter is to organize and build up material area where commercial forest is intensively grown to provide inputs to processing industry and export. The attributes of those weaknesses and discrepancies are:

On one hand, abrupt transition from exploiting available forest resources to a mere focus on exploitation of planted forest, necessary factors and components of a commercial production have not been established.

On the other hand, in our country, marketing in general and marketing forest products in particular is experiencing lots of confusions and fails to satisfy requirements of forest resources management. That is particular highlighted with the context that our country is transiting into a management following market rules; accelerating its integration into ASEAN and global free trade.

Commercial forest products of our country must coincide and satisfy market demands and needs as well as subject to competition against imported products right in domestic market and our products must be competitive enough for international markets.

Development rules and actual requirements of producing commercial forest products necessitates high priority be afforded to marketing practices from data collection, research, analytical forecast of domestic and international needs, marketing, competitiveness, market management. Some how, those practices should become active solutions to management and development of forest resources.

Since the role of marketing has not been properly understood, planting of production forest faces much difficulty. The distinction from other productions is that forest production cycle normally lasts 6 to 12 years. Lacking a forecast of market need resulting in unpredictability and instability for product outlets. Redundancy and
under-pricing are the associated consequence. Presently, in several northern mountainous provinces, timber as material for milling industry has become redundant. Farmers sustain much damage and loss from under-pricing and rush sale of their products.

Management of resource forest sustains significant drawback since the role of market has not been given proper recognition in planning forest management. We have not established a general planning of material supplying area that attaches processing industries to outlets of forest products. A close relationship between planning of material supplying area and relevant industries has not been set up resulting in low feasibility of planning options.

Shortage of market information subjects us to the failure of determining major forest products, systematically dealing with the whole process from developing planted forest to exploiting production line to achieve products of high quality and low cost. Besides, a lot of discrepancies are seen in marketing our forest products. We still fail to find stable markets both in and outside the country, we are not prepared and fail to actively infiltrate international markets for forest products when we enter commitments with regional and global economic institutions.

Even our forest product market is not yet a full fledging one, it is a vast potential market actually. The demand for timber in construction and processed timber products (paper, hardboard) will keep growing in next decade. Fine art artifacts, joinery products and other non-wood products such as raisin, anise, vegetarian oils, etc, will find market both domestically and internationally (East Asia, South East Asia, EU countries, US).

In the next ten years, timber-supplying sources would mainly from exploiting planted stand, planted forest and selective exploitation of natural forest. For the time being, forest in our country is unable to satisfy domestic need, import of timber should be permitted to supply materials for timber processing and milling industries.

However, in the long run, we will have an affluent source of material from exploiting production forest planted over past years. Marketing practices should be properly recognized so as markets and customers’ preference could be identified to facilitate production and manufacture of suitable and preferred products. Therefore, market would be the first factor for consideration during planning for production forest. Forest varieties to be grown in production forest should be determined on the basis of market demand; technology and intensification methods would then be accordingly decided.

We should approach to substituting industrial trees for forestry trees wit the purpose of transforming forest trees into perennial industrial trees. Should we do that, production forest when coming to harvesting time would find stable markets, forestry would bring about worthy incomes for foresters and make them feel assured in forest production and investments therein.

Planted timber is mainly consumed by pulp mills, plants manufacturing boards, shoring timber and screens for export, joinery industry. Consumption by residents confines to fire wood and timber used in construction. As demand for forest products keeps growing, the timber and forest product processing industry shall assume more and more important role. One of the basic principles in managing forest is to shift from exploiting materials from natural forest to exploiting materials from planted forest, market should be the target and driving force for that course.
The development path for sustainable forestry in coming time is to speed up the process of shifting from the extraction based forestry to the participatory forestry with its focus on protecting, recovering and developing forest with the purpose of:

Ensuring the protection capacity, preserving bio-diversity, conserving endangered genetic sources; developing processing industries of medium and small scale using advanced equipment and technology; utilizing local labor sources, creating jobs and generating incomes for local people to complement ongoing poverty fight, improving local livelihood; socializing forestry, drawing investment sources, contributing to the national economy.

3. Marketing requirements in coming time.

For coming years, we should swiftly get on with setting up marketing policies and strategies for forest products with more attention being paid to non-wood products. Marketing practices, market and consumer’s preference research should be intensified and accelerated. So as trendy and high-income products would be manufactured. Necessary researches should be carried out to establish suitable policies of procuring products from people with focus on planted forest products.

Policies governing commercial forestry should be clearly established to 2006, 2010 and years to come after 2010 especially for products: pulp, artificial board, screens. Orientations for those products would be to dominate domestic market then infiltrate international markets.

The government shall play more and more crucial role in forestry in following aspects:

- Providing orientation for forestry related industries in accordance with advantages of each geographic area and for the whole country with domestic and international markets included therein for products such as: pulp, screens, artificial boards, rattan and bamboo, oils and raisin.
- Reviewing current legislation and policies governing circulation and sale of forest products with a view of encouraging enterprises to participate in processing planted timber; removing procedural and bureaucratic obstacles in circulation and sale of planted forest products. Timber extracted from planted forest should be considered “a crop product” the same as other industrial crops.
- Completing procedures to issue forest criteria based on principles and criteria of FSC (Forest Stewardship Council) to facilitate entry of Vietnamese forest products into markets of developed nations.
- More investments from current budget should be placed in researching and developing domestic and international market.
- Establishing a national market information system.
- Cooperating with other associations to facilitate forestry enterprises’ participation into exhibitions and fairs in and outside the country to infiltrate market and expand market shares.
- Encouraging enterprises to manufacture artificial boards, screens (using pine, eucalyptus, canarium. luang bamboo); to manufacture joinery products and timber products for construction, fine art products from bamboo and rattan, milling pulp.
- Creating a favorable environment for enterprises to organize trading and production networks to procure products from foresters.

In conclusion, management and development of forest products should be connected to ecology and a commercial economy. The state shall assume the role of creating
favorable environment with appropriate “close” and “open” mechanisms. Since planting forest requires considerable inputs in the context that market and price are not stable, accurate calculation of efficiency and interest is beyond forester’s ability, they have quite a reservation in placing investments in forestry. Foresters, therefore do need interventions from the state in having a legal corridor created, funding assisted, and in finding outlets for their products.

Planting forest is performed by people, management and protection of forest should be close to people. Meanwhile, favorable conditions should be created for the sale of their products. Should forestry should make people well off, forest management and protection could then be truly sustainable.
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Current situation of forest and forest land in Cao Bang
Bui Nguyen Van

Head of Forest Inventory and Planning Unit, Province of Cao Bang

Part I: The present situation of forest and forest land in Cao Bang

I - Statistics are collected based on:

1. Guidelines on forest inventory and planning issued by PIPI (Forest Inventory and Planning Institute)
2. Natural forest inventoried according to Directive No. 286/TTG dated 2 May, 1997 of the Prime Minister
3. Afforestation area and natural forest protection supported by 327 program, PAM and 5 Million Ha Program from 1994 to 2001

II - Current status of forest and forest land in Cao Bang

1. General data:
   - Total natural area: 669.072 ha of which
     a - Forestry land: 554.459,2 ha
       * Natural forest: 199.673,5 ha
         - Young forest (IIa + IIb): 80.373,5 ha
         - Poor forest (IIIa1): 5.836,2 ha
         - Medium forest: 4.658,5 ha
         - Bamboo Vau forest: 499,8 ha
         - Rocky forest: 108.305,0 ha
       * Plantation forest: 17.103,0 ha
         - Pine trees + Cunninghamia Lanceolata: 13.304,9 ha
         - Chestnut: 1.151,7 ha
         - Manglietia Glauca: 68,0 ha
         - Bingham Bamboo (Truc): 482,3 ha
         - Kamelia (Aleurites Montana + Kamelia): 382,3 ha
         - Canarium: 59,1 ha
b - Non forest land: 224,807,0 ha
    - Bare land (Ia): 39,346,8 ha
    - Shrub land (Ib): 68,329,1 ha

2 - Some remarks about forest and forest land in Cao Bang

   a. Forest status:

Through the classification of forest status levels, the high volume forest (IIa2) stands for 23 % only while the low volume forest (IIa-IIb-IIc) is 46% of the total natural forest area. This is the consequence of the enormous exploitation in the past and much of the forest land now is covered by uneconomic shrubs and grasses.

Especially in the natural forest there are 108,305 ha of rocky forest which is also affected leading to reduction in volume/ha. However owing to the complicated terrain, forest left on the rocky tops is considerable.

Young forest (IIa + IIb) is the forest generated after slash and burn with volume of 25 m3/ha including 10-15 cm diameter trees. This type of forest is 80,373,5 ha.

   * Plantation forest:

Total Pine trees and Cunninghamia Lanceolata planted so far up to 13,304,9 ha occupying 78% of total plantation forest

Province has 1,662,7 ha of Star Anise, 1,151,7 ha of Chestnut and 482,7 ha of Truc Sao bamboo. Although Chestnut area is huge, its yield after harvest shows rather low due to old growing perennial trees which need to be replanted.

   b. Non forest land

Apart from 112,840,1 ha of rocky forest, it is notable to mention 117,131 ha of bushy forest which is naturally regenerating and protected. Economic valued species are growing into forest

Bare land: Vegetation covered by grass, cane and shrub. Bare land area is 39,346,8 ha which is mostly used for grazing. A small part of this type of forest with low steep and quite good soil near roads can be used for forest plantation.

III - Forest cover in Cao Bang

Forest cover is identified based on:

   a - Existing natural forest: 199,673,0 ha
    - Young forest (IIa + IIb): 80,373,5 ha
    - Poor forest (IIa1): 5,836,2 ha
    - Medium forest: 4,658,5 ha
    - Bamboo forest: 499,8 ha
    - Rocky forest: 108,305,0 ha

Land with shrubs generated with 600-1000 trees/ha, diameter: 4-8 cm, height: 3-5 meters: 69,980, 3 ha

   b - Planted area up to 1998:

    - Planted area up to Year 2000: 8,887,3 ha
    - Planted area from 1994 to 1998: 9,399,6 ha

2 - Cover rate:

\[ C\% = \frac{(269,653,3 \text{ ha} + 18,276,9 \text{ ha}) \times 100}{669,072} = 43\% \]
Part II: forestry planning and its importance

I - The importance of forest planning

1. Report on forest resources is formulated owing to inventory of forest change and forest use that takes place every three years.

2. It helps to distribute the forest status as well as the process of forest land use through progress of new plantation - natural regeneration - forest protection every year implemented by projects.

3. Build up medium and short term planning projects for forestry development in districts invested by national programs: 327, PAM, 5 ha Million Program...

4. Identify forest area contracted to households to implement new plantation, natural regeneration and forest protection through forestry projects.

5. Synthesize land area of each district based on land map made by FIPI

II - Forestry planning in Cao Bang in coming years

Based on the characteristics and importance of forest and forest land:

- Historical and cultural significance: Interest places, conservation of animal and vegetation gene.
- Forestry planning builds agro-forestry farms to grow valuable species, fruit trees and to establish paper material providing area.

Forestry planning is expected to be classified as below:

- Watershed forest: 384.924 ha
- Special use forest: 56.526 ha
- Production forest: 113.009 ha

Forest inventory shall be conducted periodically (every three years): inventory of land use process, changes of forest.

Establishment of medium and short term projects on forestry development of districts supported and invested by the Government.

Formation of specialization areas based on factors such as ecology, site condition, source of seedlings, local experience, markets.

- Areas to plant speciality species:
  - Canarium, Cinnamomum: 5.000 ha (Thach An - Tra Linh - Bao Lac - Bao Lam districts)
  - Bingham Bamboo (Truc Sao bamboo): 2.500 ha (planting along the national road no. 3, no. 34 North of Thach An district)

Provide consultation for forestry sector to establish projects as an investment for special use forest where there are no projects yet such as: Thang Hen lake (Tra Linh district), Ban Gioc Water Fall (Trung Khanh), Tran Hung Dao forest (Nguyen Binh), Hang Lam Son (Hoa An). Conservation of animal and vegetation genes (Phia Den forest, Phia Oac, Nguyen Binh district)

Design afforestation for district projects especially designing natural regeneration - protection of the existing natural forest which has not yet invested by projects with 125.139.7 ha.
Beside the forest planning as indicated above, the forestry sector needs to re-plan timber processing network and it is more advisable to retain or to build new modern processing enterprises with new advanced technology rather than keep backward equipments.
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The importance of planning in forestry, and development strategies
By Mr Ngoan, DARD; and Drake Hocking, CBBC-RDP

The importance of planning in forestry
The forestry sector is of enormous importance of socio-economic development and eco-environment protection owing to close links to other sectors:

- output of timber and non-timber products contributes to increase in State and private household income.
- watershed protection mitigating soil erosion and flooding; reducing run-off and providing a steady flow of water for household use and irrigation for agriculture
- poverty alleviation and income improvement; natural forest in good condition can sustain the poor by harvests of non-timber products.

But, trees and forests are slow to grow. Wrong decisions made now will have bad effects far into the future; much longer than decisions made in agriculture where corrections can often be done within one year. Moreover, tree-planting choices that farmers are persuaded to adopt, but then after several years of investment turn out to be wrong, have a powerful de-motivating influence. They are reluctant to risk again. Two examples: the apricot programme that failed because of poor quality of seedlings and lack of market (no processing factory); and the early chestnut programme distributed random quality of seedlings, of which many failed to produce fruits. In both cases farmers cut down the trees and replaced with other things.

This analysis is intended to start a process to assist the Provincial managers to (i) define the sector development policy and implementation strategy, and (ii) assess capacity building needs to implement it. Much of the information in this paper is based on the Sector Review done to support National strategies for the 5MHRP (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, International Cooperation Department).

What’s the problem?
Everyone agrees that the forests of Cao Bang are over-exploited, degraded, and currently being restored but too gradually. The Province gets no revenue from forests. There is a huge area of forest land that needs restoration, and not enough money to do the job. On the information available at present about the area, and with the current level of investment, it would take very many years to restore Cao Bang’s forests to those in 1960s.

Forestry land use planning has not been modified or supplemented
An important constraint to forest restoration is conflict over agricultural and forestland; classification of 3 types of forest (flood preventing, specialized and economic forests) is used for forest development and agro-forestry economic development. Other restraints are those measurement activities “Forestry” land without tree cover is not empty or unused. It is used for other things. But the other
uses of such land are difficult to count and measure because they occur in small and diverse areas, in a complex mosaic that is invisible at the scale on which forest inventory is mostly done. We don’t really know with enough precision, the areas and distribution of non-forest land use, nor the areas and distribution of forest of different levels of degradation or regeneration.

**Lack of “agricultural” land**

Agriculture is running out of land, and “new” arable land can only come from “forestland”. Many farming households have been cultivating essential food crops on sloping “forestry” land for many years. This is technically “illegal” but is tolerated because the people have no choice; they have no other land. Households need greater land tenure security (the red books) over the “forestry” land they occupy, in order to justify investment for better land management and reduction of erosion vulnerability. They will be willing to restore such land to forest cover, only if they have food security. They will have to open new cultivated areas suitable nearby. Why? Because they give priority to food. They either don’t have access to markets for timber, or they don’t trust markets to buy non-food (forest) products and to supply essential food at fair prices.

Land that is suitable for agriculture but is classified as protection forest, is an economic resource left to waste because it makes suitable arable land unavailable for agriculture.

**Lack of forage sources for livestock**

Many previous efforts at afforestation have had low effectiveness because tree seedlings have been eaten or damaged by grazing cattle. Protection regulations successfully implemented during the wet season often fail in spring when sprouting forest plants provide the only valuable nutrients and grazing livestock still suffers from fodder scarcity during the winter/dry season.

Livestock production systems are a major economic system for many hill-dwelling people who cannot give them up without alternative means of income. The comparative advantage of livestock raising in mountainous areas lies in the cost-free feeding on “forestland” resources. In many areas “forestland” is by tradition used as grazing land and a change to cut & carry is not as quickly achieved as planting new trees. In addition cattle programmes are being promoted in most mountainous provinces, which creates even higher pressure on existing resources. Traditional local practices of animal feeding have to be analysed carefully and taken into account when developing alternative feeding systems such as planting forage crops or introducing grazing management.

**Lack of investment**

Shortage of money limits the progress and quality of forest restoration. One source of reluctance to commit money for reforestation is the obvious connections among the previous problems: weak, or not enough, data, and land use conflicts. A viable strategy needs to overcome these linked problems before it can hope to attract more investment capital.

**Lack of integrated and supportive strategic elements**

Past efforts at afforestation tended to plant and protect forest without solving completely difficult situation of the upland farmers’ lives. For future success, a fresh strategy will need integrated approaches including, first, valid inventory data, then careful and effective land use planning, extension support (technology development and transfer) and comprehensive socio-economic development.

**the solutions?**

To solve these complex and inter-related issues requires complex and inter-related strategies and planning. We in Cao Bang can learn from previous experience in friend Provinces, to recognize that there are two sets of strategies. One set consists of essential strategies. The second set consists of choices of various options.
Essential strategies

Land Use Planning

Two levels of land use planning are needed: Provincial, and Commune. Provincial level needs macro-level land use planning, priorities need to be set for strategic objectives among watershed protection and broad production targets, balancing among the objectives. Within these macro-level land units, there exists a complex mosaic of micro-units of which many will diverge from the macro-level classification. Provincial capability for analysis and planning of land use needs strengthening, and supporting capacity for forest inventory and monitoring.

At the Commune level, a participatory approach to micro-land use planning is essential for matching classification to reality, establishing clearly on the ground what are the land and forests needing restoration – and available and requiring additional inputs for economic development. Communes need to select priority areas for reclassifying as agriculture production land and to identify the critical watershed areas. For this to be effective, and to avoid or minimize causing conflict, it must be participatory, done by the local people with guidelines capital, technology, technical support and management measures.

Land classification

Problem arisen for classification of forestry land is that at present forestry land has not been classified; evaluation of forestry land is still based on old situation, therefore it does not show the soil mechanical, physical, chemical elements precisely and it is hard to arrange trees planting, and does not show clearly the production, protection forests, cultivation, and residential areas.

Detailed systems with well-developed technical criteria has been existing for land classification. There is an urgent need for establishing criteria for re-classifying land according to reality, and which recognises present land use such as food cropping on sloping land. Parallel to this, a policy is required for distinguishing between a need to bring present use into the planned optimal use, provides incentives and support to modify present use in order to make it sustainable.

Land allocation and tenure

In Cao Bang Province, more than half of forestland has been allocated but only about 8% has been issued with Red Books. Green Books lack the legality needed to give farmers confidence for investment of time and money, so it is essential to proceed towards issuing Red Books to the households and forest enterprises who are allocated with forest land. It is equally essential that this be done at the same time as participatory micro-land use planning, in order to reduce sources of conflict. Guidelines for this have been developed in Son La, for example, after many years of good experience. But provincial capacity for supporting this process needs to be considerably strengthened, together with clear designation of the responsibilities of management agencies.

In the process of land use planning and allocation, it is necessary to try to identify production forestland areas that are big enough to justify re-establishing Forest Enterprises for commercial operation and provision of assistance to farmers with forest development. There is also the option for development of sustainable forestry economy in line with objective.

A difficulty for allocation of forestland is that the usual unit for traditional forest management among forest-dwelling people is the community or village. But they have not deep understanding of the Land Law and have not been issued with Red Books. Cao Bang needs to develop a clear policy and guidelines to support stable systems of community-based forest management.
Improve the Socio-economic Status of Forest-Dependent Farmers

Cao Bang has many ethnic minorities of farmers living in or near forests who depend on forest products for subsistence, and as a social safety net from emergencies. Most of them cultivate plots of forestland for subsistence food crops. These people tend to have low income and have little chance to integrate in social or economic activities and have no access to markets. To win their full participation in strategies of forest restoration will require that they can stabilize their lives from the related activities.

For example, forest protection contracts for special use or protection forest should be reserved for the poorest segment of the forest community. Conservation activities (resource inventory, bio-diversity monitoring, and firebreak maintenance) can also be contracted. Successful forest regeneration nearer to farmers' holdings reduces the time needed to collect firewood while avoiding deforestation and provides more non-timber forest products nearer home. So parcels of near forests should be allocated to nearby households, to protect more easily and to free the farmers' time for other subsistence activities or for more lucrative home and agro-forestry garden activities.

One point is clear: any forestland allocated to forest-dependent households should not be too restrictive in the use that they can make of the land, and there must be a linked strong programme of supportive extension for better land management. Mixed forestry-agriculture measures to conserve soil can meet the need enabling economic advancement for the households.

For improving livestock production systems, a careful analysis must first be done to ensure that it will be possible to develop adequate forage resources, which must include developing alternative feeding systems such as planting forage crops or introducing grazing management. Traditional systems of open-access grazing are not sustainable for multiple-use land areas, or intensive forest management systems.

The most important strategy in assisting the forest-dependent farmer is to *diversify production on the farm and forest, ensuring that the farm family can meet their food and basic subsistence needs first*. Prices of agricultural products fluctuate drastically, especially fruits, and farmers naturally don't want to rely on being able to exchange other commodities for food.

Options and choices

**Economic and financial viability of commercial forestry**

The 5MHRP carried out plantation, demarcation for regeneration, protection and development of economic forest. PAM project implemented planting by households. The importance is to improve forest in order to increase economic value while to sustain protection and specialized forests.

Through actual facts and studies it is shown that:

1. To develop flood prevention forest it is necessary to develop indigenous species combined with fruit trees, medical plants with canopy meeting both flood prevention objective and increase in income for farmers. These forests should be assigned to responsible agencies, including farming households, for management and supported with investment.
2. Development of economic forest:
   a) Develop pulpwod forest to the extent relevant to the market. At present price levels, the plantation must be within 100 km road distance from the mill. A fresh economic market analysis may be necessary to clarify objectives and targets.
   b) Plantation of other raw materials (besides pulp) on forestry land to select appropriate investment in those products with strengths or with
more advantages than those in other provinces. The Government supports with breeds, techniques, forestry extension services; planting by households to create regions for raw materials is encouraged.

3. Households and communities are encouraged to plant small parcels to satisfy their needs for timber and firewood.

4. For large, remote areas with less population, it is considered to demarcate for natural regeneration until forest has capacity permitted for exploitation and convert a part of suitable land into agricultural production or continue planting according to the planned targets.

5. The best use for forestland little required for plantations (provided it is not needed for agriculture) is managed natural regeneration, increased emphasis on stabilizing and improving living standards for highland people and the environmental objective

What are the infrastructure resources for forest rehabilitation?

Existing forest sector agencies

There are two existing government agencies in Cao Bang with responsibilities in the forest sector: Forest Protection Department (FPD), and DARD through the District ARDO’s and the Forest Development Sub-Department (FDSD). At present, the FPD has by far the largest technically qualified manpower and has been little involved in forest restoration. The FPD should be re-deployed towards active involvement in a fresh strategy. This will increase responsibilities, be more specific in technical management and organization of instruction to the districts in respect of forest development and scientific transfer and enable the province to better use the qualified staff on forest restoration rather than policing.

State Forest Enterprises

If suitable blocks of production forestland can be identified in Cao Bang for revitalised SFE’s, the work that they do will need to be reconsidered. In some provinces, SFEs have undertaken reforestation work on a management fee basis with fees partly substituting for their declining logging income. In Cao Bang, this role has been filled by Forest Management Boards. If plantations are to be undertaken, the objective needs to be re-considered with a view to what the economic market will be. Possibly a better option would be a mix of species including a substantial percentage of high-value, high-quality timbers, mainly composed of indigenous species.

Technical quality and species choices

The quality of plantations established under PAM and 327 programmes has been very variable. The species planted were mainly pines, cunninghamia, eucalyptus and acacias. They are said to be suitable species but growth is uneven. There are no precise monitoring data for Cao Bang, but average plantation yield in Vietnam is about 4 - 12 m³/ha/yr when it could potentially be as high as 25 m³/ha/yr. Very few plantations are economically viable. The real cost-effective impact of Program 327 regreening did not come from tree planting, but, rather, from natural regeneration after farmers’ own increased protection effort as they gained user rights to the forestland. In fact, quick-growing trees planted in the 327 Program were heavily subsidized and over-restrictive conditions further reduced already low commitment from beneficiaries who really wanted the subsidies for the planting and had no real interest in growing trees for invisible markets.

The technical causes of this poor performance have been: poor species/site matching due to the lack of planning; poor quality of seedlings; lack of quality extension services; poor plantation and lack of maintenance practices.

Without clear planning, plantation without intensification leads to low economic effects.
Plantation quality doesn’t need new strategies. Rather, improvements can be achieved with careful attention to some simple measures:

- Management organisation and economic analysis;
- Improved overall administration and quicker release of funds,
- Practical training of local staff in appropriate techniques,
- More research and increased dissemination of research information;
- Systematic extension activities to transfer the technology to the village level,
- Extension organized on a contract basis to avoid unsustainable inflation of Government staff levels;
- Self-sustaining decentralised farmer-operated tree nurseries,
- Improvement of seed quality and nursery technology for both seedlings and cuttings of a wider range of species;
- Increase motivation of farmers through better terms of contracts, improved terms of benefit-sharing, diversification of associated food and commodity crops, and enhanced NTFPs;
- Effective M&E to focus investments on successful initiatives.

Protection forest management technologies include:

- Simple protection and tending of natural regeneration;
- Enrichment planting of young secondary and residual forests;
- Plantations of degraded hills or bare land to nurse regenerating natural forest. Plantations with this objective can be designed at much wider spacing, so greatly reducing establishment costs.

Protection management contracts providing 50,000 VND/ha/y over 5 years have generally been popular. Farmers may even be prepared to protect areas for less money, even (for less degraded forests) without payment, if they are given adequate rights to forest products. Thus, protection is a forest management option that is much cheaper than plantation, and can achieve environmental as well as social objectives.

Mechanisms for Community-Based Forest Management (CBFM)

Commune or Community-based Action Plans (CAPs) are the basis for low-cost and effective restoration and sustainable management of forest resources. The CAP is prepared from Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) methods that combine micro land use planning with demand-based extension support and the communities’ enunciation of priority socio-economic and infrastructure needs. The CAP can achieve a viable balance among environmental, social development and poverty alleviation, and economic objectives of forestry development. When it is done properly, CAP preparation can also reduce land conflicts, and provide for the important common use resources like grazing land. Care is needed to undertake PRA at the village/hamlet level in such a way that local officials' influence can be minimized and “true” community needs/ problems can be presented and resolved.

The CAP, when completed, would include an agreed commitment by the whole commune or its component communities to protect the conservation areas (special-use or protection forests). Individual protection contracts would still need to be written for selected parcels, but the incentive for the protection of conservation area parcels would be the value of managed harvesting from their protection parcels (limited to sustainable rates) -- not the protection payments. This could reduce further the overall costs for forest restoration.

Payments for forest protection are also justified on the basis of poverty alleviation, to provide cash payments for the poor. Putting the money into a fund for Direct
Commune Investment, available to the community to use for their priority needs, might do this more effectively. Such needs could include directly supporting the activities (which need not be forestry-oriented) of the very poor who live there.

**Credit and investment funding**

For forest dependant households, the loans available from the Banks are too expensive. Farmers cannot sustain the interest payments for the long period of time before they can make any money from the trees. The Provincial budget remains the main source for long term (more than three years) funding of forest plantings for the farm households. Banks can support the administration of funds to participating farmers through systems like the KfW Project operating in Lang Son Province.

For poor households, and those in less accessible areas, the best source of funding might be grants from the Government or Donors through the establishment of a grant for Direct Commune Investment, the use of which need not distort the functions of the financial or banking institutions.

Where and when commercially viable forestry activities exist, there are already sufficient sources of financing through, for example, bank loans or joint ventures with foreign capital.

### Summary of key elements for a fresh strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Level</th>
<th>Commune Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial land use planning</td>
<td>Community Land Use Planning and land allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of priority areas</td>
<td>Participatory Land Use Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest re-classification</td>
<td>Land allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land rights issuance</td>
<td>Optional re-allocation or aggregation of fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed administrative arrangements to improve quality</td>
<td>Provision of common-use grazing land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened capacity and capability for forest inventory and land use planning</td>
<td>Community Action Planning (CAP) for CBFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the tree species mix</td>
<td>Plantation development &amp; management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved benefit sharing for farmers</td>
<td>Mixed forestry-agriculture systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong extension support</td>
<td>Social development (infrastructure and services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective monitoring &amp; evaluation</td>
<td>Protection and benefit sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decentralised seedling production, self-sustaining farmer nurseries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.7.9 Forest protection for forestry development: Nguyen Quang Minh

Forest protection, management and prospects for forestry development
Mr. Nguyen Quang Minh,
Director of Forest Protection Dept, Province of Cao Bang

Cao Bang used to have affluent forest resources in terms of forest reserve and productivity. As population grows, the demand for fire wood, timber has dramatically increased especially since the 1979 war.

On the other hand, agricultural cooperatives dissolved, forestry farms had to shrink its size, the need for agricultural land to produce grains keeps increasing. Forestry management hence faced more difficulty. Several forest areas under cooperative and farms management are now destroyed.

As a result of lacking general planning, orientation for sustainable forestry development, lacking realistic and practical policies, slow renovation of forestry management and protection, fires and deforestation for cropping land have kept forest area in Cao Bang dramatically decreased in quantitative and qualitative sense.

In recent years, several practical and realistic policies have been promulgated such as forestry land assignment, entrusting forest, programs 327, PAM (WFP), 06, poverty reduction and other assistance to farmers. As a result, people are delighted to receive land and get on with developing agro-forestry production activities. Livelihood of people is steadily improved.

Undertaken work:
The forestry protection department and its subordinate units are tasked with advising provincial and district PCs on enacting state management in forestry protection. They also assume the task of being an executive arm in protecting forestry.

The Forestry Protection Department is staffed with 132 personnel and has 13 subordinate units in 13 districts and towns within the province (each subordinate unit comprises of 8 – 9 personnel). The number of staff acquiring graduate level and college level is 23 and 92 respectively.

Over the past years, the Forest Protection Department has exercised strenuous efforts in fulfilling the task of managing and protecting forest given by the province:

Assigning forestry land
Assigning forestry land has been seen as the focal task in forest management and protection. The forestry protection service annually completes assigning land to families in a satisfactory manner in cooperation with the agriculture and rural development, land management and local governments. It is until now in the whole province that 300000 hectares of forest and forestry land have been assigned to over 53000 households and 300 collective organizations.

Raising the awareness of law abiding and observance
The Forestry protection department in cooperation with other state services such as Cao Bang newspaper, the provincial radio and television and other mass institutions to propagandize and disseminate forestry related legislation and policies.

Cooperating with the education sector to involve pupils in law education and forest protection in relevant areas.
Constructing 2000 signs, publishing 10,000 publications and leaflets for forest protection and for propaganda at commune level. Commune level meetings are held regularly in focal areas to raise people’s awareness of preventing fires and destruction of all forms. Rehabilitating and constructing fire breaks in focal areas have proven remarkable efficiency. Cooperating with relevant authority to prevent and alleviate insect infest, verifying the application of silvicultural practices.

**Inspection and law enforcement.**

The forest protection forces with cooperation from border guards, public security, army, Procuracy have regularly discovered infringements of forest development legislation, had them strictly dealt with.

On average, 400 – 500 cases each year are dealt with, records thereof are established. Charges are brought to some example cases for the purpose of educating.

**Assessment of forest protection activities**

**Accomplishments:**

Creating robust changes in perception at all levels and by people in managing and protecting forest. Hence responsibilities and obligations vested in and exercised by each person are hiked up.

The organizational system of forest protection from provincial level to grass root level has been completed.

Mechanism and policies have fit with people’s will and they actually have become a lever for managing and protecting forest.

Several models, samples in planting, establishing farms and protecting forest have appeared. Practical and realistic aspects of forestry development have been seen encouraging people to embark on forestry.

Forest in Cao Bang has been gradually stabilized and forest coverage area is being improved year by year.

**Shortcomings:**

The replication and education of policies and lines of the Party and the State have not been done in dept and in a continuous fashion. Encouraging people in managing and protecting forest therefore is inhibited.

- Violations of Forestry Law still persist. Illegal cross border trading of forest products has not been stopped completely.
- Economically efficient models of protecting, trading forest have not been promoted and replicated.

**Shortcomings in forest protection**

Though all levels and local governments have exercised their best efforts but shortcomings in forest protection still exist. The following reasons are attributed to the situation.

1. The terrain is steep and complicated, many areas are sparsely populated, and forest therein is henceforth not managed and protected by any assignees.
2. The forest protection force is understaffed, stretching over an immense area is not possible without cooperation from local governments.
3. The cooperation among agencies is not up to satisfaction. Violations have not been timely and strictly dealt with. Violators are mainly poor residents and violation cases
are in remoter areas with heavy or bulky products posing great difficulty for the force to deal with.

4. People residing on the border are still poor. They have no income sources and little cropping land. Dependence on forest resources would bring them instant benefits. The control of cross border trading of timber hence faces a great difficulty.

5. Policies governing the assignment of land and forest to families have not substantially been satisfactory to assignees. The benefit they are entitled to for protecting one hectare of forest/year just equals the amount they get for selling one timber lump over to China.

**Orientations and solutions for protecting and developing forest**

In order to protect, develop forest and halt all forest infringements in an efficient fashion, the following initiative are recommended:

1. Continuing and intensifying the education and propaganda of Party and State policies concerning forest protection and development widely and consciously among people.

2. Continuing with assignment of forest and land to people in a satisfactory manner. Local governments are to fulfil all aspects laid down in the PM Decision 245/1998/QD-Ttg stipulated on 21/12/1998 regarding distribution of responsibilities in protecting and managing forest.

3. Closer cooperation among agencies and local governments should be built up to halt and deal with violation cases in a timely manner.

4. Reinforce the forestry protection force in a way of getting it qualified enough for the given work.

5. Identifying and exemplifying models and idols in managing and protecting forest. Assistance and focus should be given to family scale model of commercial forest or agro-forest.

**Solutions:**

1. Dispatching forest protection personnel to communes as a method of commanding the area. Establishing forest protection regulations in cooperation with local community. Understanding the forest resources, educating policies regarding forest protection. Extending silvicultural methods and skills, providing advice to local government on orientation of developing forest. Enforcing forest management and protection, assisting local government in doing the same. Checking, halting and dealing with all violations as prescribed by laws.

2. Cooperating with the agriculture and rural development, land management and local government, community to continue and accelerate assignment of land and forest to families. The goal is that forest should have its owner. Applying socialization of forest management and protection.

3. Cooperating with relevant agencies in creating commercial forest areas suiting specific feature of each and every locality. Gradually moving from shrubs to planting trees of high commercial values.

4. Developing experience and drawing lessons from bright models for wider application and replication.

5. Land and forest assignment should be made clearly and consciously understood to residents to facilitate forestry development. Assistance should be given in finding outlets for forest products.

**Recommendations**

Projects or programs should be established and provided specifically for remoter areas to generate incomes for poor residents. That would get rid of over-exploiting and destroying forest resources.
Forest products shall be exploited over a long period of time. The State should somehow have orientation and privilege policies or subsidizing products outlets for local residents.

3  Working Groups’ considerations

Working Groups met separately for discussions during 2003, the policy group met only once and the operations group met twice. There was a final joint session in 2004. The outputs from those meetings are compiled here.

3.1  Composition of Working Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Policy Issues</th>
<th>For Operational Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Forestry department</td>
<td>- DARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Land department</td>
<td>- Survey and plan group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Policy department of DARD</td>
<td>- Forestry department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PPC</td>
<td>- Center for Promotion of Agriculture and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ethnic committee</td>
<td>- Department of Land Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Department of Finance</td>
<td>- CBBCRDP-PMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dept of Planning and Investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Department of Policies, MARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CBBCRDP - PMU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2  Policy issues group (1)

3.2.1  Session 1

Forestry policies

I.  Key weaknesses, Problems and Issues

- Since 1990, the government has issued about 200 legal documents related to forestry.

1. review of the:

- Current policies relating to land, forest management, investment, credit, distribution, taxation and benefit sharing as presented by Mr. Nho (MARD)
- Policies relating to markets as presented by Mrs. Hao (MARD)

2. Main discrepancies to be sorted out in the policy of forestry land:

- With regard to forestry land, it was the earlier policy that forestry land green book was granted resulting in an extremely slow and lengthy course of doing so. The granting process is enhanced due to our new policy to grant land red books to households. However, the process is still slow (approximately at 8% for forest land). The remaining area constituting the majority of forestry land has not had 3 types of forests identified to facilitate the deed granting process. The situation is uneasy for management, resulting in ineffective exploitation and on the other hand incurring legal complaints and social instability. Moreover, the
community, and the system of communal land ownership practiced by many ethnic minority groups is not recognized in law for granting red books.

Present trends in activities and Strategy
- Identifying afforestation, enrichment and regeneration, gradually developing forestry into a sector generating high income for farmers
- Henceforth, 100,000 hectares of unused land should be brought in for forestry development. In which 23,000 hectares of concentrated forest should be planted, 70,000 ha should be generated
- Forestry should gradually become an important occupation of economic value in the sense that it creates stable jobs, hence sedentarizes population settlement, improves quality of livelihood of minor ethnic inhabitants. Therefore, sedentarization of population would be attached with forestry land and development of forestry as a revenue generating occupation
- Places where forestry land assignment to households is impossible, the alternative resort would be long term and stable custody, management and exploitation being entrusted to families, organizations
- The current situation of forestry land, unused land with capability of developing forest should be reviewed. A detailed inventory of forestry land should be established. Only afterwards can planning be done on a rational basis.
- Acceleration of land and forest land allocation to families.
- Completing cadastral dossiers of land allocated in previous years and incorporating it in a management system with participation of local communities.
- Encouraging families to exploit bare hills and areas of developing forestry farms (establishing agro-forestry and employing cropping techniques in sloping land)
- Development of non timber forest products together with promotion of marketing access and research and interest of consumers in order to produce market dominant products generating high and rapid revenue for producers (farmers)

Recommendations
- With the aim to have an effective management of forest resources, it is suggested that: the State should introduce policies and mechanism of ensuring benefits to forest dwellers and obligations of land users being observed; the State should also establish land management resources and data archive since most of forestry land has not been measured as meant.
- In order to have the targets set forth for forestry development in Cao Bang met for the period up to 2010 in Cao Bang (the forest coverage rate at 60%) the following focuses are recommended:
+ An amendment should be recommended with regard to the limit on forestry land. Law provisions should contain limits of land for developing production forest and should not stipulate threshold on land for developing protection and special use forest.

+ With regard to land occupied by forestry farms, rights and obligations of land occupants should be spelled out in the Law to provide legitimate facilitation to the process of managing land pursuant to envisaged plans.

With regard to forestry land allocation policy:

+ The Prime Minister Decision 178/QD dated 12/11/2001 governing rights and obligations of forestry land assignees should be enacted. That will be the basis for wider allocation of natural forest to families in accordance with current legislation.

- Policies governing commercial forestry should be clearly established to 2006, 2010 and years to come after 2010. Orientations for forest products with well-defined markets would be to dominate domestic market then infiltrate international markets.
- More investments from current budget should be placed in researching and developing domestic and international market.
- Establishing a national and local market information system.
- Creating a favourable environment for enterprises to organize trading and production networks to procure products from foresters.

### 3.3 Operational issues group (2)

#### 3.3.1 Session 1

**Forestry constraints and strategies**

1. Key weaknesses, problems and Issues
   - Land allocation has not yet carried out in remote area due to the difficult terrain other reasons
   - Co-ordination among the relevant agencies is weak
   - Existing levels of subsidy are too low to be effective
   - Local authorities have not actively get involved
   - Districts and communes have no forestry development plans
   - Most poor farmers are forest dependent
   - Lack of grazing land
   - Lack of agriculture land
   - Lack of fund and resources to provide staff with best means to do their job
   - Staff are limited in quantity and quality
   - Very little concern and care about forest planning
   - New technologies have not been updated
   - Plant species have not met the requirements of income increase
   - Lack of facilities and human resources to manage the forestry data system
II. Present strategy

- Speed up and complete land and forest land allocation by implementing LUPLA at district and commune levels
- Classification and re-planning for three types of forest
- Strengthening capacity for local forestry workers
- Environment enabling for forestry development
- Promotion of management structure based on communities
- Assigning forestry workers to work in the villages
- Evaluation and replication of CBFM models
- Close coordination with relevant agencies in forest management land allocation on district and commune levels
- Development of infrastructure system
- Application of appropriate techniques and diversified species
- Exploration, testing and development of new multi-purpose species
- Co-ordination of projects and donors to create economic benefits from forest
- Market network establishment and research

III. Recommendations

- Make necessary amendments to the current policies for forest management and development in order to facilitate in implementing forestry strategies of the province
- Training and human resources development
- Increase fund for forest inventory and planning.
- Carry out periodical monitoring of forest changes
- Establishment of database for province (data+maps)
- Establish projects for special use forest investment
- Creation of plantation zone based on forest development strategies
- Specification of land use ownership by legal certificates
- Responsibility decentralization for all involved stakeholders in terms of land allocation, land use planning and forest development
- Support to increase farmers’ awareness towards forest
- Consolidation and renovation of forest protection and management by social forestry promotion
### 3.3.2 Session 2: 17 June 2003

#### Solution 1: Review and classify forest into 3 categories to implement 5MHRF Programme under decree # 661/TTG of the Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main activities</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Financial sources</th>
<th>Supposing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Set up proposal and budget</td>
<td>DARD and Forest Development Department</td>
<td>6/2003</td>
<td>- Provincial Budget &gt; 1billion for third and forth year. - FIP - In 2003 =500 million</td>
<td>• Authorities of central and local government are aware of the importance of this issue and ready to support the programme’s implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sign contracts to classify forest unto commune level</td>
<td>FIPI, FIPU+ FPD + FDD, CCKL</td>
<td>2003 – 6/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Carry out forest inventory and classification for the whole province</td>
<td></td>
<td>2003 – 6/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitor and evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review</td>
<td>PPC + other relevant Departments + Projects + FPD..</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>- Idem + EU project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Outcomes for forest development strategy in Cao Bang 2005 - 2010

There are support from government, local authorities and foreign projects.
**Solution 2: LUPLA Review and Red Books issue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main activities</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Financial sources</th>
<th>Resultations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Trial on LUPLA with the participation from 6 communes of Hoa An Dist</td>
<td>Project Management Board of Hoa An and FPD</td>
<td>11/02 – 12/03</td>
<td>- Budget from project #700 million</td>
<td>• Authorities, project and people are interested in and support these activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate trial</td>
<td>PPC, DARD, Cascade, FPD, Hoa An dist and EU project</td>
<td>12/03</td>
<td>- Cascade and Forest gangers Findings from EU project</td>
<td>• Methodology and funds are approved for LUPLA’s activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LUPLA duplication in other districts</td>
<td>PPC, DARD, Cascade, FPD and DPCs</td>
<td>2004 - 2006</td>
<td>Local budget and EU project support if possible.</td>
<td>• EU project continue in the province from 2005 – 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Carry out specific projects by using experience and outcomes from this programme.</td>
<td>DARD and PMB</td>
<td>from 2005 - 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Attract more specific projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Solution 3: Set up database and mapping system on forest management and monitor and evaluate the forest progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main activities</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Financial sources</th>
<th>Supposing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate the capacities (human resources, equipments), identify the need for training staff for different agencies acting in this field (forest gangers, cascade, FIPU and DARD)</td>
<td>DARD, EU project and related organisations.</td>
<td>12/02 - 03</td>
<td>- FIPI, FSIV, VASI and project - EU project - FIPI and FPD, With local funds and EU project</td>
<td>• Database management and forest monitoring using new technology become an urgent need of the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procure new equipments and build up facilities</td>
<td>FPD, FIPU and EU project</td>
<td>4/03 – 12/03</td>
<td>Local contribution and EU project funds</td>
<td>• Foreign projects and organisations are supporting these activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement.</td>
<td>Province and EU project</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>- Province budget and (5 billion for whole programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Work out hΟ thèng « ®iÒu tra ®inh vÒp</td>
<td>FPD, FDD and FIPU</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Set up database system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Set up Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Solution 4: Set up specific forest and projects.
(- Specific use forest; - Genetic conservation; - restore rocky forest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main activities</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Financial sources</th>
<th>Supposing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gathering and studying policies of the government and local authorities on social economic development and forest development planning (classification of three categories of forest, land allocation...)</td>
<td>DARD, FDD and FIPU.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-Local contribution and EU project</td>
<td>Forest classification and land allocation have been done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising study tour to others provinces to learn from them technical and experience</td>
<td>Action groups</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>- FIPU, FPD, institutes and universities;</td>
<td>Funding from government and foreign projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up specific forest (Bingham bamboo, chestnut, anise, bitter tea, paper raw material tree...) and projects (specific use forest, genetic conservation, rocky forest restoration...)</td>
<td>FDD, FIPU and relevant departments</td>
<td>2003 - 2004</td>
<td>Local budget.</td>
<td>Local authorities applies policies to encourage the development specific zones and marketing for forest products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing projects</td>
<td>Provincial Project Management Boards and relevant agencies</td>
<td>tő 2005 =&gt;</td>
<td>Carry out by beneficiaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Solution 5: Management on forestry seedling, indigenous species**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main activities</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Financial sources</th>
<th>Supposing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Assess and evaluate the production and utilisation of indigenous species.</td>
<td>DARD, DOSTE; FDD DARD and FDD</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Local budget.</td>
<td>• Awareness and knowledge of people on high quality species having been improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Set up strategy to develop seedling production and management.</td>
<td>DARD and FDD</td>
<td>from 2003 =&gt;</td>
<td>Collaboration with seed companies, institutes and universities.</td>
<td>• Encourage the production and utilisation high quality species and indigenous species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Selection species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local budget</td>
<td>• Need of forest planting with better incomes (high productivity and quality of forest).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establish nurseries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trial on new varieties and indigenous species</td>
<td>DARD and FDD</td>
<td>from 2005 =&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creation a seedling production and management process.</td>
<td>DARD and FDD</td>
<td>from 2005 =&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Standardise indigenous species</td>
<td>DOSTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitoring and supervision the implementation of seedling within province.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Solution 6: Social Forest Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main activities</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Financial sources</th>
<th>Supposing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Assess the Social forest activities in the province.</td>
<td>DARD, FPD, Extension centre, Hoa An forestry college, projects</td>
<td>from 2003 =&gt;</td>
<td>Local budget and EU project</td>
<td>• Classification, land allocation, red books delivery have been effectively carried out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training on social forestry for related agencies (forest extension centres of deferent levels, forest rangers, agriculture and forestry staff, mass organisations....)</td>
<td>FDD; FPD, extension centres</td>
<td>from 2003 =&gt;</td>
<td>Local contribution, government budget, EU and Helvetas</td>
<td>• Local and government have policies on social forest development (land allocation, credit...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Making up documents and textbooks on social forestry development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>from 2003 =&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunities in marketing and selling forest products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish social forestry development model serving study tour and training course</td>
<td>-Hoographer An forestry college</td>
<td>from 2004 =&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Infrastructure has been improved thanks to programme 135 of the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CBFM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Household and community nurseries development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Set up communal and village level plan for social forestry development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review, evaluate and duplicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Solution 7: Building HR and Training courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main activities</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Financial sources</th>
<th>Supposing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Khỏo s,t ở nh<code>nh gi, nguồn nh</code>;n lúc cña nghµnh LN.</td>
<td>Sê NN&amp;PTNT, CCPTLN, chi côc KL, ©ơn STQH, Trung t®m KN, t,c phëng NN &amp;PTNT huyÖn.</td>
<td>From 2003=&gt;</td>
<td>Ng©n s,ch ©ba ph--ng</td>
<td>• ChÝnh qquyÖn c,c cÉp, c,c tæ chÖc quan t®m vµ hç trï cho cøng t,c ph,t trÝn nguồn nh`;n lúc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• X©y dùng ph--ng ,n qui ho¹ch Òéi ngÖ c,n bé l©m nï giÖp (trong vµ nguµi biªn chÔ) tii 2010</td>
<td>Sê NN&amp;PTNT, CCPTLN</td>
<td>from 2003 =&gt;</td>
<td>nt</td>
<td>• Cã nhïu ch--ng trxnh, dù ,n cã nhu cÇu sö dông lao Òéng kü thuÆt t¹i chÇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• X©y dùng chïn l--c vµ kï ho¹ch ©øo t¹o nguồn nh`;n lúc LN (tò x· tii tønh)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nt</td>
<td>• MÆt b»ng d©n trÝ cña tønh ®--c n©ng lºn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TrÝn khai c&lt;nng t,c ©øo t¹o - Óøo t¹o t¹i chÇ - Tæ chïc tham quan hâc tÇp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nt vµ cña c,c ch--ng trxnh, dù ,n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TuyØn ñông, thu hÖt, sµp xøp sö dông hïp lý ng--éi ©· qua ©øo t¹o</td>
<td>Tæ chïc chÝnh quyÖn; sê NN&amp;PTNT; t,c dù ,n</td>
<td>From 2004</td>
<td>From 2004</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 2003=>

From 2004
## Solution 8: Reviewing forestry projects implementing in Cao Bang Province (PAM 5322, 327, EU, 661...)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main activities</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Financial sources</th>
<th>Supposing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gathering informations related to forestry activities</td>
<td>DARD, FDD</td>
<td>From 7/03 =&gt;</td>
<td>Local budget</td>
<td>EU project continues its activities in Cao Bang province with a new orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xøy dùng ph--ng, n vụ tiến hành ©, nh gi, nhanh cả sự tham gia (ng--ếi h--éng líi, c,c tæ chæc cã lien quan) c,c dù ,n LN</td>
<td>DARD, FDD</td>
<td>from 2003 =&gt;</td>
<td>Local budget</td>
<td>By 2004 the number of projects (government and foreign) will be increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- VØ ph--ng ph,p tio̓p cÆn</td>
<td>DARD, FDD</td>
<td>from 2004 =&gt;</td>
<td>Local budget and projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- VØ c,c giïi ph,p kú thuÆt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gi,m s,t ©,nh gi, hiøu qu§ KT-XH - MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Tæ chæc héi th‰o, tui liøu ho, c,c bæi häc kinh nghiøm</td>
<td>DARD, FDD</td>
<td>from 2004 =&gt;</td>
<td>Local budget and projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SØ xuæt, giïi thiøu c,c bæi häc kinh nghiøm tæt cho viøc xøy dùng c,c ch--ng tr×nh, døan mïi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Joint Session (2004)

The Policies Working Group had no new suggestions or recommendations for policy reforms, and the members contributed to the discussions on technical issues.

Discussion result of Working Groups on technical solutions for forestry development strategy are given below. Reference is made to Solutions proposed in the previous output from this working group.

**Activities added to Solution 1: Inventory and classification of 3 forest types**
- Management board of 5 mil. hectare of forest revise the projects based on the result of forest classification
- Apply at Bao Lac and Bao Lam district
- Derive lesions from experiences and disseminate

**Activities added to Solution 2: Participatory land use planning and land allocation (LUPLA) for forest land and unused land**
- Use the experiences learned on participatory from EU project in land allocation following aerial photograph program
- Coordination between classification of 3 forest types and land allocation following aerial photograph program

**Activities added to Solution 3: Establishing information system and maps managing 3 type of forest**
- Purchase equipment and invest in material and techniques for supporting provincial forest development strategy and coordinate in implementing new project at Bao Lac and Bao Lam districts

**Activities added to Solution 4: Land use planning for areas specializing on chestnut, bitter tea, and projects**
- Participatory micro land use planning for areas specializing on chestnut, bitter tea, … and special use forest areas (Pac Bo, Ngoc Khe, Phja Den, Tran Hung Dao)
- Check the land use planning of the projects used forest land in the province
Solution 5 becomes: Managing, improving and developing forest seedling and indigenous forest seedling

Activities added to Solution 6: Develop social forestry
- Technical support for establishing small enterprises (commune and village level) on processing and marketing agricultural and forestry products

Solution 7 and Solution 8 shifted to policy solutions
Add solution (Becomes solution 7): Silvicultural solution for forest restoration and development with priority on restoration and development of forest at rocky mountain
Add solution (Becomes solution 8): Technical solution for processing and marketing forest product focused on non-timber forest products

4 Outcomes

4.1 Policy Decisions made
Cao Bang PPC Decisions (mid 2003)
1. authorize participatory review of LUPLA with KL as lead agency
2. authorize farmer payments through VBARD
Hoa An DPC Decisions (early 2003)
1. create a LUPLA Managements Board to coordinate agency inputs
2. authorize administrative guidelines and cost norms

4.2 Operational actions taken
1. Operational LUPLA has been carried out in 15 Communes of two Districts, including issuing of Red Books to farmers.
2. Village-level, farmer-operated nurseries are in operation throughout the Province, in non-focal as well as focal Districts. Total: 332 nurseries.
3. District-level staff of the Forest Protection Department have all been re-trained in Social Forestry and CBFM, and are now operating as service-providers to the Communities.
4. Communities have been trained in CBFM and are now taking full responsibility for protection and development of their own local forest resources.

5 MARD Jan 2004 Decision on forest strategy planning
In January 2004, the Central MARD issued Guidelines to all Provinces, instructing them to organise for a fresh review of Forestry Strategic Planning for the period to 2010. The Guidelines included numerous draft Tables with detailed format for collecting and analysing information.
The Decision with some of the attachments are included in this Report at Annex 2.

The Cao Bang DARD formulated a costed proposal for a new combined Working Group to carry out this fresh review in accordance with the MARD Guidelines, and submitted it to the PPC for approval. At the time of writing, the PPC had not yet approved the proposal.
6 Annexes

6.1 Status & importance of Village Forests in Cao Bang: Vu Long

ANALYSIS
STATUS AND IMPORTANCE
OF VILLAGE FOREST MANAGEMENT
IN THE NORTHERN PROVINCES OF VIETNAM

AUTHOR: VU LONG
PREPARED FOR THE NATIONAL WORKING GROUP ON COMMUNITY FORESTRY

PART ONE
GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Background
The results of the two national workshops on community forest management, which were held in 2000 and 2001 by the National Working Group on Community Forest Management, show that village forest under various types of management has been in existence for a long time as a matter of course and contributed to the development of forestry in Vietnam. But in the legal framework, villages currently have not been considered by the State as a subject to be allocated with forestry land.

The working group that drafted the revised Law on Forest Protection and Development has made the following proposal: villages could be one of those subjects to be allocated with forestry land just like households, individuals and organizations.

Therefore, a study on the status and types/types of village forest management during the course of Vietnam’s forestry development is needed to justify that the proposal that villages should be allocated with forestry land is rational and appropriate with the development of forest management in Vietnam and with current circumstances. Such a study will also lend more scientific and empirical insight to the development of a legal framework conductive to the various types of forest management, including that of village forest management.

Goals, Topics and Methodologies

Goals
An analysis of the rationale (from theoretical and empirical perspectives) of the following issues is to be carried out:

1. The status of village forest management in the overall framework of forest management in Vietnam (along with other types of forest management by households, individuals, organizations); the proved effectiveness of village forest management.
2. Evaluation of different types of village forest management that are appropriate with specific circumstances of the locality (natural, socio-economic conditions, including ethnic minority traditions, etc); the impact of central and local policies.

3. The rationale of the proposal that villages should be one of the subjects to be allocated with forestry land by the State (justifying that in certain circumstances, village forest management is effective).

**Study topics**

**Status of village forest**

1. How much is the share of forest under village management out of the total area of forest in the locality? How large is the area of forest under village management relative to that under the management of households (through allocation or contracting) or of other entities in the locality (surveyed commune, district, province)? What types of forest: forest for protection, special use, production, or natural forest, plantation forest, bare land? Where is the typical geographical location of village forest?

2. Why the above forest area has not been allocated to households (difficulty in equitable sharing; needed for public use; source of water, prevention of storms, generation of regular forest product and timber for public works; public business; traditions, religions, holy belief, etc).

3. Comparison of the plus and minus of village forest management relative to that of other types of forest management in the localities (by households, forest management commission, forest protection force, etc). Under which circumstances will community forest management prevail: natural, socio-economic conditions, human issues, or traditions?

4. The point of view and policies of the district, province over village forest management.

5. Comparing results of pilot studies on village forest conducted by WG-CFM and materials of seminars on community forest of past projects with empirical results of a study conducted in one province in order to draw general assessments on the status of village forest management in our country.

6. The future development of village forest management: originating factors of village forest + forecasts on the development of such factors, such as the status of villages, ability of village officials, perception of the local
people on forest, central and local policies on the modality of village forest management, etc.

Types of village forest management
1. Compiling and classifying types of village forest management through pilot studies.
2. Introducing classification criteria for types of village forest management in our country.
3. Conditions justifying the modality of village forest management.
4. Implementation of village forest management: regulation, institutional structure, supervision, and capability.

Study methodology
- Case studies in the province of Cao Bang:

Collecting and analyzing information related to village forest of the province, using questionnaire, data collection sheets and interviewing key officials and specialists on village forest management. Approached entities include People’s Committee of the province and districts, Provincial Department for Agriculture and Rural Development, Forest Protection Department, Forest Development Department, Forest Protection Units, district Cadastral Office, and local specialists.

Three representative districts have been selected for the study (as sample):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thong Nong</td>
<td>mountainous sub-region in the eastern part, with Tay minority residing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quang Uyen</td>
<td>mountainous sub-region in the western part, with Nung minority residing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen Binh</td>
<td>land sub-region in the southwestern part, with Dao minority residing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One or two communes are selected out of the above districts for representative survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Commune</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thong Nong</td>
<td>Ngoc Dong</td>
<td>mountainous area with Tay and H’Mong minority residing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Da Thong</td>
<td>land and mountainous area at the upper source of De rao, with Tay minority residing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quang Yen</td>
<td>Quang Hung</td>
<td>northern part of district, with Nung minority residing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hoang Hai</td>
<td>eastern part of district, with Nung minority residing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen Binh</td>
<td>district’s town</td>
<td>Dao minority residing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Collecting and analyzing results of pilot studies on community forest management conducted by the WG-CFM and by other projects, materials of seminars on community forest management.
- Conducting PRA, interview with specialists, seminars.
- Limiting the scope of study:

Village forest management is one of the types of community forest management/community forestry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community forest</th>
<th>Land use right</th>
<th>Contracting for protection and plantation</th>
<th>Status of forest owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Village forest</td>
<td>- Allocated with forestry land</td>
<td>- owner or with the forest protection force (not forest owner Contracting with the forestry project)</td>
<td>Forest owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- self establish the right of forest management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Village forest contracted for protection, plantation</td>
<td>- Not eligible for or not yet allocated with forestry land</td>
<td>- Contracting with forest owner being the State, - Contracting with forestry project owner, forest protection force (not forest owner)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family forest</td>
<td>- Self established</td>
<td>- Contracting with forest owner being the State, - Contracting with forestry project owner, forest protection force (not forest owner)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Forest of socio-political organizations (farmers associations, women union)</td>
<td>- Allocated with forestry land</td>
<td>- Contracting with forestry project owner, forest protection force (not forest owner)</td>
<td>Forest owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Forest of socio-political organizations (farmers associations, women union) contracted for protection</td>
<td>- Not eligible to or not yet allocated with land</td>
<td>- Contracting with forest owner being the State, - Contracting with forestry project owner, forest protection force (not forest owner)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Forest of group of households</td>
<td>- Allocated with land</td>
<td>- Contracting with forestry project owner, forest protection force</td>
<td>Forest owner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The subject of this study is village forest (first class)

Report structure:


Part II: Status of village forest in the province of Cao Bang.

Part III: Assessment of the status of village forest in the northern provinces of Vietnam.

Part IV: Conclusions and recommendations.

PART TWO:
STATUS OF VILLAGE FOREST IN CAO BANG PROVINCE

Natural and socio-economic conditions of the province of Cao Bang

The province of Cao Bang has a natural area of 6,690.72 square kilometer, bordering China in the north and northeastern parts (331 kilometer in length) and being a mountainous province. Cao Bang has 13 districts and 187 communes and towns.

The population in 2000 was 494,724 with a population density of 74 persons per square kilometer (district with the highest density being Hoa An and district with the lowest density being Thach An). The share of rural people represents 86.7%. The natural population growth rate is 1.3%. More than ten ethnic minorities live in the area, of which the Tay accounts for 42.58% of the population, Nung 32.8%, Dao 9.6%, H'Mong 8.4%, Kinh 4.67%, with the rest represented by other minorities such as San chi, Lo Lo, Muong, etc. The Tay, Nung, and Kinh minorities reside in each of the 11 districts. The district of Hoa An is dominated with the Tay minority, whereas the district of Quang Hoa with the Nung and the district’s town with the Kinh. The H'Mong is most populous in the district of Bao Lac while the Dao minority is found mostly in the district of Nguyen Binh.

The economy of Cao Bang remains influenced by agriculture, and a breakdown of its GDP show that agriculture, forestry and fishery accounts for 46.31%, services 37.69%, and industry and capital construction 16.06%. Annual GDP per capital is low at VND 2.328 million in 1999, and rice-denominated agricultural output per capita is 332 kg per annum.

Although it is a mountainous province, attention should be paid to environment protection in Cao Bang. Neglect over the burning of forest for
cultivation area, abused exploitation of forest and consequences of war have resulted in a forest cover of only more than 30%, a level inadequate to balance the environment ecology. Some areas at the upper source of water with steep DOC were seriously eroded, and the eroded areas now represent 13.9% of the natural area.

Status of forestry and the allocation of forest and land

Forestry planning

- Current area of forest is 208,586 hectare with the forest cover is 31.2%. Of which:
  - the area of natural forest is 199,973 hectare, representing 95.67%, which include timber forest of 199,9173 hectare (mostly juvenile forest of 188,678 hectare) and bamboo forest of 500 hectare;
  - Plantation forest of 8,913 hectare, representing 4.33%.

Total resources include 5.9 million cubic meters of timber and 2.3 million bamboo trees. The forest has been exploited to the point of depletion.

- The area of unused land, streams, rocky mountains is 332,147 hectare, representing 49.62%.

The planning for 3 types of forest of the province is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Protection forest</th>
<th>Special use forest</th>
<th>Production forest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>129,500</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>197,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With forest</td>
<td>208,600</td>
<td>94,490</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>106,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without forest</td>
<td>128,400</td>
<td>34,600</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>90,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Forestry Development Strategy for the period 2001-2010, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2001)

Thus, the area of forestry land accounts for 56.35% of the natural area of the province, of which protection and special use forest representing 20.7% and production forest 35.65%. According to the Agriculture and Rural Development Department and the Forest Protection Department of the province indicated that 100% of the forest area is planned to be protection forest.

Forest land allocation

Cao Bang has started up land and forest allocation since 1990, yet only after the issuance of Decree No. 02/CP did the allocation of forestry land was accelerated. As of December 2001, 319,435.9 hectare (94.7% of the forestry land area of the province) has been allocated [but few Land Use Certificates have been issued so far], mostly to households and “collective groups” (55,362 households and collective groups). Forestry land allocated to state-

1 Source: Forestry Development Strategy, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2001)
owned forestry organizations represents a trivial percentage, as Cao Bang does not establish the protection forest management commission. The three forest enterprises in the province (Thach An, Hoa An, Nguyen Binh) were supposed to manage 73,297 hectare in accordance with Decree No. 388/CP, yet the districts allocated all this area of natural forest to households (without the province’s decision to recall the land). For example, the farm of Nguyen Binh was supposed to manage 16,638 hectare in accordance with decree No. 388, including natural forest of 15,989 hectare and plantation forest of 649 hectare. Yet only 500 hectare of plantation forest is currently under the farm’s management (pinus massoniana). An objective reason is that since the economic mechanism was transformed in 1990, the farms have ceased operation, lacked budget resources to protect and grow forest, and later acted only as project manager for project No. 327. The farm of Hoa An, not liquidated though, had it seal recalled in 1997. In the district of Nguyen Binh, only the agro-forestry project management unit is operating, and this unit is responsible for managing the area of plantation forest of the farm of Nguyen Binh (although the director of the farm has left his duty and has been looking for a new job for over 2 years, he still keeps the forest enterprise's stamp).

According to reports of the Forest Protection Department of Cao Bang, of the area of forestry land allocated to households and collective groups, the area allocated to “collective groups” is 84,782 hectare, representing 26.54%. As explained by the Forest Protection Department, “collective groups” include socio-political organizations such as Women Union, Veteran Association, schools, armed forces and villages. The decision on land allocation issued by the district usually states that: “… allocated to the collective group of the village”, with “collective group of the village” meaning the village community. The collective group of veterans of the commune is interpreted the same way as the commune’s veteran community. “Collective groups” do not mean collective economy or agricultural cooperatives. The forest area under the management of “collective groups” in 2000 is as follows:

### The area of forest and forestry land under the management and protection of communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>District and town</th>
<th>Total area of forestry land allocated to community for management</th>
<th>Of which</th>
<th>The area of land and forest allocated</th>
<th>The area under community management by tradition</th>
<th>The area contracted for protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provincial town</td>
<td>203.8</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,037.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hoa An</td>
<td>8,540.3</td>
<td>1,233.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,037.1</td>
<td>508.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ha Quang</td>
<td>3,131.5</td>
<td>2,623.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>508.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Thong Nong</td>
<td>23,433.0</td>
<td>5,071.15</td>
<td>18,361.96</td>
<td>12,758.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tra Linh</td>
<td>13,898.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,139.6</td>
<td>12,758.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As noted above, due to the absence of a commission for the management of protection and special use forest and the fact that natural forest areas are no longer under the management of forest enterprises, the allocation and contracting of forest area to collective groups is not in accordance with decree No. 01/CP. In fact, project owners contracted with collective groups that have already been allocated with forestry land or have self established their right of management. Therefore, in our opinion, the area of forestry land under the management of communities should be revised to include the area allocated and the area self managed under traditions, which is 97,829.85 hectare or 31% of the area of forestry land allocated in the entire province.

STATUS OF VILLAGE FOREST IN CAO BANG

Village forest in the district of Thong Nong

General conditions in Thong Nong
The district of Thong Nong is located in the northwestern part of Cao Bang, about 50 km far from the province’s town by provincial road No. 204 and bordering China with a length of 12 km. The natural area is 36,409 hectare, accounting for 4.7% of the area of Cao Bang. The district lies entirely on limestone mountains and is very hard to access. The climate is moderate with average temperature of 20.20 Celsius degree and an annual precipitation of 1,736.9 millimeter, which is favorable to forest regeneration.

The district’s population is 22,732 persons forming 4,330 households, with a density of 62.4 persons per square kilometer. Eight ethnic minorities reside in the district, including the Nung (8,118 persons or 35.7%), the Dao (5,638 persons or 25.8%), the Tay (5,457 persons or 24%), the H’Mong (3086 persons or 13.57%), with the rest being the Kinh, Chinese, etc. Most ethnic minorities live in separate villages, especially the Dao and the H’Mong. Each village usually has 20-30 households with a long a stable history. The population growth rate is 2% in 2000.
### Chart: Land Use Structure in Thong Nong District

**STRUCTURE OF LAND USE IN THONG NONG**

- **I. Agricultural land**: 2690.37 hectares, 7.46%
- **II. Forestry land**: 14,888.93 hectares, 41.3%
- **III. Special use land**: 167.07 hectares, 0%
- **IV. Residence land**: 59.41 hectares
- **V. Unused land**: 18,243.22 hectares, 50.6%

(Source: Land Statistics of the district of Thong Nong – district People’s Committee, December, 2001)

### Land Usage Status in the District of Thong Nong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Land</th>
<th>Area (hectare)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total area</td>
<td>30,649</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Agricultural land</td>
<td>2690.37</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>Without cultivation land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Forestry land</td>
<td>14,888.93</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Special use land</td>
<td>167.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Residence land</td>
<td>59.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Unused land</td>
<td>18,243.22</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unused low land</td>
<td>606.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unused mountainous land</td>
<td>3,734.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rocky mountains without tree</td>
<td>13,095.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Others</td>
<td>806.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Agricultural production accounts for 91% of production value of the district. Agricultural output in 2000 reached 10,138 tons, with average output per capita of 411 kg. The main agricultural product is corn while that of forestry is bamboo. Cattle raising has not been developed yet and the stock of cattle is just enough to generate pulling power for agricultural production.

- Weak infrastructure.
Living conditions of the people have improved since 1991, yet the percentage of hungry and poor households remains at 12% in 2000.

The district’s budget is always in deficit with 87% of expenditures covered by outside assistance.

Status of forestry
The district of Thong Nong has a relatively large area of forest of 11,309 hectare, most of which is natural timber forest (forest on rocky mountains) and just tens of hectare are covered with grown THONG MA VI. Total timber resource is 331,200 cubic meter, only available in juvenile forest. Prior to 1980, the forest resources were ample, yet abused exploitation and the clearance of forest for agricultural land have swept away nature forest; only a small area of depleted forest is left while most of the remaining area being rehabilitated juvenile forest. All of the forestry land is planned to be protection forest (?). In addition, there are 16,829 hectare of unused hills and rocky mountains that will for sure be planned to be forestry land. Thus, forestry land accounts for more than 90% of the total area of the district (31,717.9 hectare). The forest enterprise of Thong Nong was established but later liquidated due to inefficient operation. Although the forestry land is planned to be protection forest, no protection forest management commission has been established. When program no. 327 was introduced, the district was not a beneficiary (because no one drafted the project?). But in 2002, the district already has a forest project for five million hectare, of which 8,000 hectare are protected for rehabilitation and for plantation of protection forest, and a project management unit of the district has been established. Therefore, it could be concluded that forestry in Thong Nong so far has been people forestry – mostly implemented by the people. A typical example of forest plantation in mountainous area is that of a cooperative named Cao Thuong in the commune of Da Thong (a H’Mong minority commune). The cooperative received investment by the State for plantation of pinus massoniana since the 1970s. Sadly, the goal was plantation itself without attention being paid to economic measures and sales of products. The people here have lamented: “the forest was grown successfully yet the people now are hungry embracing the pinus massoniana”!. Furthermore, as the land used for growing the forest was actually the land for cultivation of the local people, they found no cultivation area was left when the planted area reached about 100 hectare. When the cooperative was liquidated, the forest was partly destroyed to reclaim land for agricultural cultivation.

The allocation of forest and land was officially conducted in 1992 and accelerated with the issuance of Decree no. 02/CP. As of 2000, communes and towns have been allocated with forestry land, but not to the fullest extent. Inadequate budget is blamed for the slow progress of allocation of forestry land, while weak capacity of the district’s cadastral office is responsible for the even slower pace of issuance of the “red book”.
Summary of forest land allocation in Thong Nong district as of July 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Commune</th>
<th>Area of allocated forest land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Da Thong</td>
<td>3,135.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ngoc Dong</td>
<td>2,088.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Luong Can</td>
<td>897.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yen Son</td>
<td>1,467.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Can Yen</td>
<td>2,177.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Luong Thong</td>
<td>4,145.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thanh Long</td>
<td>560.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Binh Lang</td>
<td>1,346.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vi Quang</td>
<td>847.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,666.90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Forest Protection Unit in Thong Nong, August 2002)

The area of forestry land that has been allocated only represents 52.54% that of the entire district.

Status of allocation of forestry land to villages

In addition to households, individuals, schools, and socio-political organizations such as women union, veteran association, armed forces – subjects eligible to forestry land as specified in the law, another subject that is in need of receiving forestry land, i.e., village community, has also been allocated with forestry land. In its statistics on the allocation of forestry land, the forest protection force often uses the term “collective groups” to refer to those subjects not being households, and those subjects are collectively named “households and collective groups”. The term “collective groups” so used in the State’s statistics is not correct as it is not defined in the Law and is misunderstood as collective economic sector (cooperatives). We have relied on the forestry land allocation statistics of each commune to calculate the area of forestry land that has been allocated to villages.
# Area of forestry land allocated to villages in Thong Nong district as of July 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of commune</th>
<th>Total villages</th>
<th>Villages with village forest</th>
<th>% of villages with village forest</th>
<th>Area of village forest</th>
<th>Area of forestry land allocated</th>
<th>% of area of village forest allocated to organizations</th>
<th>% of area of village forest to that of organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>3,855.44</td>
<td>16,666.90</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ngoc Dong</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>678.96</td>
<td>3,135.95</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Da Thong</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57.64</td>
<td>615.14</td>
<td>2,088.86</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>19.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Luong Can</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>132.02</td>
<td>897.34</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yen Son</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>317.26</td>
<td>1,467.04</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Can Yen</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.60</td>
<td>1,088.62</td>
<td>2,177.62</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>90.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Luong Thong</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>553.26</td>
<td>4,145.79</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>32.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thanh Long *</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>560.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Binh Lang</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>217.3</td>
<td>1,346.1</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vi Quang</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>253.35</td>
<td>847.6</td>
<td>59.79</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) The allocation is ongoing and initiated just in 2000.

## Chart: The ratio of hamlets with village forest

1. Hamlets with village forest
2. Hamlets without village forest
Comments:
1. Only in recent years has the policy of allocation of forestry land reached people at the grassroots level. This policy has been strongly appreciated by the people and most of the households are willing to receive land. Villages are a subject that not only asks for land but also plays a very important role in sharing land among households, thus ensuring the equity and consensus among households in the village. Thus, the forest protection unit has to do nothing but legal and administrative procedures in the course of allocation. There are instances where the village asked for adjustments, as the previous allocation of forestry land to households was not appropriate.

2. The percentage of hamlets with village forest is 45%; the area under their management is 3,855.44 hectare or 23% of the forestry land that has been allocated in the entire district. The average area of village forest per hamlet is 52.08 hectare, with the largest being 176.56 hectare (hamlet of Na Thin - commune of Cau Yen) and the smallest being 0.8 hectare (hamlet of Keo – commune of Binh Lang). The area of village forest is much larger relative to that allocated to socio-political organizations and armed forces (11.6 times). Thus, in terms of area, forest under village management is second only to that under household management.

3. Village forestry land is mainly forest under category Ib, IIA, b, c, IIIc and very old tree clusters. Only the hamlets of Lung Lua and Ma Pan – commune of Da Thong have grown forest, which was planted by the cooperative of Cao Thuong in 1970 (78.24 hectare). After the cooperative was liquidated, the forest fell under the management of the hamlets, with the remaining area of over 20 hectare. The area of forest allocated to
hamlets is split into lots and a hamlet may receive from 1 to 5 lots. Village forest usually comprises of the following:

+ **Holy forest**: (in the dialect of the Tay minority, it is called *dong slan*, meaning worship forest). Holy forest was originated long time ago by tradition of the Tay and Nung minorities. A hamlet usually has one or more holy forests, but sometimes two or more hamlets may have one common holy forest. Holy forest is where the community worships the holy spirits and begs for good health and bumper harvest. Households in the village often chip in to prepare for the worship ceremony – usually very simple and inexpensive. Only the men in the hamlet participate in the preparation of the worship ceremony, which is headed by the head of hamlet. After the ceremony is completed, they will eat together with the left-over food equitably shared among households. In some areas, worshipping ceremony is no longer carried out (perhaps the people there consider it superstitious). The area of holy forest is often small, ranging from hundreds of square meter to a few hectare, which are covered with very old trees. By tradition, no one is allowed to violate the holy forest or to cut trees for firewood (even dried-up or collapsed trees), to graze livestock, or even to walk around in the holy forest. Violated persons will be severely punished by paying tributes to the hamlet in order to carry out the worship apologizing the holy spirits. If the violated person fails to pay the tributes, his family’s membership in the hamlet’s funeral association will be canceled, that is, a funeral of someone in his family will not be attended by people in the hamlet. Everyone in the hamlet pays special attention to protecting the holy forest. The holy forest sometimes serves as the forest for protecting the source of water (in the dialect of the Tay minority, it is called *coc bo* or source of water). In addition to holy forests, there are forests for worshipping a particular holy spirit of the hamlet, which are usually smaller than the holy forest and may be just a big tree cluster. (The Kinh minority also has the perception that some trees are the residence of the holy spirits, so they set up a worshipping table at the root of such trees).

All people interviewed were well aware of the holy forest and viewed that the holy forest will exist for long but will not expand in terms of area.

The newcomers to Cao Bang could easily identify the holy forest, which is a forest or tree cluster situated close to hamlets or even in the middle of a paddy field, with the surrounding area being rehabilitated forest or bare hills.

+ **Ghost forest**: cemetery of the hamlet, usually situated under the cover of old forest.

+ **Water source forest**: to protect the source of water, each hamlet has identified forests at the source of streamlines or at other sources of water (called *coc bo*). There are water source forests with very old trees that have been protected for a long time, but there are also water source forests that have been protected just recently after the policy on allocation of forestry land was introduced. Despite of its main function of protecting water sources, the hamlet sometimes allows the cutting of old or collapsed trees for common use or for equitable sharing among households.
+ **Village protection forest.** Some hamlets that are located in areas vulnerable to landslide, falling stones, or dangerous wind have retained a forest for protection purposes and from which no one is allowed to cut trees or collect firewood.

+ **Commodity forest.** The main purpose is to get timber, bamboo for constructing common public works of the hamlet and for constructing houses or supporting funerals (for constructing houses, the household could only be supported partially). Households are allowed to enter the forest to collect dried firewood, but there are forests where even dried firewood is so scared that the collecting frequency and quantity of firewood are restricted or the firewood can only be used for weddings or funerals. Forests that are located far from the hamlet can be freely exploited. The goal of selling timber and other forest products is not set out for village forest.

The area of water source forest and timber and firewood forest account for a large percentage of that of village forest.

4. The district of Thong Nong does not undertake project no.327 (because they could not prepare a project), thus village forest is not contracted with the households for protection. This means that the local people have protected land and forest not for fees but for their own benefit. As of 2001, project no. 661 of the district has just been implemented, the scope of which is to rehabilitate and grow 8,000 hectare of extremely critical and critical protection forest. No protection forest management commission is established, but the protection forest is allocated to the households and hamlets. Depending on the annual budget, the district’s project management unit shall contract the protection or new plantation of forest with households and hamlets. The contract is similar to that under Decree no.01/CP, but the nature is different in that households have been allocated with land (they are forest owners). Contracting money serves as capital to support households and hamlets to protect and plant forest. Here the hamlet is considered a legal entity to sign contract with the project management unit (with confirmation of the commune’s People Committee). The head of the hamlet shall be the representative accepted by the State Treasury to receive contracting money, not taking the cover of households to get the contracting money as usually practiced in other provinces.

5. Hamlets that have been allocated with forestry land received the allocation decision signed by the Head of the district, which was issued on the basis of land allocation documentation prepared by the forest protection unit. The hamlets, however, did not receive the “red book” as did the households. According to Mr. Dinh, director of the agriculture and rural development department (responsible for cadastral issues as well), hamlets are not provided with the red book because they are not defined in the Law. His personal view, however, is that red book should be issued to hamlets allocated with forestry land.

6. Just over 50% of forestry land has been allocated, some communes even have not accomplished this task. Thus, a large area, mostly rocky mountain forest and far from hamlets, has not been allocated. Is it possible
for villages to take care of this area, because it has been a practice for so long that villages take care of land and natural resources within the boundaries of their territory. Letting villages take care of such area is consistent with the tradition of the local people, while the modality to be applied should be further discussed.

7. A comparison of the data of forest and forestry land under the management and protection of communities provided by the Forest Protection Department of Cao Bang in 2001 shows big differences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Forest Protection Department of Cao Bang – 2000</th>
<th>Forest Protection Division of Thong Nong, July 2002</th>
<th>Differences (+,-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area allocated and issued with certificate of land use right (hectare)</td>
<td>5,071.15</td>
<td>4,215.32</td>
<td>+873.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area under community management by tradition (hectare)</td>
<td>18,361.96</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>+18,361.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (hectare)</td>
<td>23,433.09</td>
<td>4,215.32</td>
<td>+19,217.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Upon handing over to villages, the area of forest self managed by villages has been officially recognized.

This difference could be explained as follows:

8. Different interpretation of the definitions and statistical indicators for community forest has resulted in different data.

9. Previous statistical data were compiled from annual consolidated reports submitted by forest protection units, not from the source documents, which are the annual land allocation dossiers of each commune. For example, the commune of Da Thong was allocated with forestry land for 9 times between 1992 and 2001. The source documents of the forest protection unit were not updated and easy to be analyzed (when collecting data on village forest, we have cooperated with the forest protection unit to compile data from the source documents on land area allocated to each commune in each year, and update them as of December 2001).

Village forest in the district of Quang Uyen²

General conditions

Quang Hoa is a mountainous district, which is located in the southeastern part of the province and bordering China. Its natural area is 63,341 hectare, split into 24 communes and towns (Quang Uyen alone has 17 communes and one town). The district’s terrain ranges from limestone mountains (most popular with flat valleys at the foot of the mountains), to steep land mountains (400 to

² The district of Quang Hoa has just been split up into two new districts, namely, Quang Uyen and Phuc Hoa in 2001 and the statistical data have not been split accordingly. Therefore, even if we conducted our survey in Quang Uyen, still we had to use the socio-economic data of the old district of Quang Hoa.
900 meters high) in northern communes of the district, and to low hills in the southern communes of the district.

Fertile land, coupled with moderate climate, has made forest trees grow and regenerate very quickly, even on limestone mountains.

Three rivers run through the district, namely, Bang Giang, Bac Vong and Vi Vong. Water of all the three rivers is taken to support agricultural production and daily life. There are also underground streamlines, underground ponds and sources of water that are scattered among communes, yet these are usually dried up during the dry season, thus not meeting the demand for production and daily life. Therefore, the protection of forests that are located at the source of water is deemed very important.

Population and ethnic minorities: the district’s population in 2000 is 63,850 with 12,418 households. Of which, 11,914 households are involved in agricultural production, representing 95.4%. Population density is 101 persons per square kilometer (higher than the average of 74 persons per square kilometer of the province). For major minorities live in the district, including the Nung (40,407 persons – 62.66%), the Tay (22,311 persons – 34.6%), the Kinh (1,390 persons – 2.1%), and the H’Mong (338 persons).

### Status of Land Usage in the district of Quang Uyen in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Land</th>
<th>Area (hectare)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total area</td>
<td>63,341.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Agricultural land</td>
<td>11,335.81</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>Without cultivation land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Forestry land</td>
<td>25,584.96</td>
<td>40.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Special use land</td>
<td>909.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Residence land</td>
<td>308.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Unused land</td>
<td>25,201.90</td>
<td>39.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unused low land</td>
<td>100.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unused mountainous land</td>
<td>1,543.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rocky mountains without tree</td>
<td>21,900.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Others</td>
<td>1,656.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The area of agricultural land is relatively low, representing only 17.8% of natural area. Agricultural production is still the main thrust of the district’s economy, and the rice-denominated agricultural output is 26,246 tons. Agricultural output per capita is 386 kg per annum, sufficient to meet demand of the local people. Livestock raising is rather developed, with a stock of 17,199 buffaloes, 10,110 cows. A household has on the average 2.29 heads of cattle and 2.8 pigs.

The district’s road network is relatively developed, with car-worthy road density of 0.54 kilometer per square kilometer, and accessible to the center of communes. In addition to self-built small hydroelectric generators, about 30% of households get access to networked power. Approximately 53% of communes have telephones. Permanent and semi-permanent secondary schools have been built in all the communes. The living conditions of the local people have improved, with the percentage of poor households dropping from 14.8% in 1999 to 8.57% in 2000.

Status of Forestry
The area of forestry land of the district is 20,119 hectare, accounting for 40.8% of the natural area, including:

- Natural forest: 19,929 hectare;
- Plantation forest: 190 hectare.

The district’s forest has been exploited to the point of depletion, with only rehabilitate juvenile forest left over. Old tree clusters can be seen in some areas, which is in fact the holy forest (in the language of the Tay minority, it is called dong slan – or forest for worshiping the holy spirits). Under the land use scheme of the district, all forest is supposed to be protection forest. The area of unused land being hills and rocky mountains is 23,533 hectare, which is probably forestry land under the scheme. If so, the area of forestry land will represent 69% of the natural area of the district.
So far, no state-owned farms have been established in the district of Quang Hoa; forestry activities have been undertaken by the local people. Project management unit for projects no. 327 and 661 were not allocated with forestry land. As of December 2002, forestry land has been allocated to 12 out of 17 communes (the allocation to the last five communes has not been carried out due to lack of financing). Households and “collective groups” are those allocated with forestry land with a total area of 17,884.7 hectare, or 79.7% of the forestry land area of communes. Village forest was allocated to hamlet’s collective groups, not to other organizations. The forest protection unit of Quang Uyen informed that in some areas, the armed forces applied to receive forestry land yet faced with objection from hamlets and communes. The reason cited was that the forestry land has all been distributed to households and hamlets.

Status of village forest

**Chart: Ratio of villages with village forest**

1. Hamlets with village forest; 2. Hamlets without village forest

**Status of forestry land allocation in villages of the district of Quang Uyen as of December 2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of commune</th>
<th>Total villages</th>
<th>Villages with village forest</th>
<th>% of village with village forest</th>
<th>Area of village forest</th>
<th>Area of forestry land allocated</th>
<th>% of area of village forest</th>
<th>Forest area allocated to organizations</th>
<th>Ratio of village forest to that of organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entire district</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>2,905.68</td>
<td>17,884.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chi Thao</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>355.78</td>
<td>1,890.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hong Dinh</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>161.20</td>
<td>1,025.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Doc Lap</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86.70</td>
<td>943.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tu Do</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>1,063.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cai Bo</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>426.90</td>
<td>1,687.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Quoc Dan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37.20</td>
<td>782.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Phi Hai</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>351.30</td>
<td>3,917.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Quoc Phong</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>258.60</td>
<td>962.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quang Hung</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>292.50</td>
<td>1,293.9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart: Forest area broken down by types of forest owners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Forest area of households</th>
<th>Area of village forest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hoang Hai</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hong Quang</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Binh Lang</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

1. Due to limited budget for land allocation, only 70% of the number of communes of the district have been allocated with forestry land. In these communes, most of the forestry land of the communes has been allocated (79.7%), especially in communes where the allocation took place later as a result of active participation of the local people and hamlets. In communes where the allocation has not taken place, the local people have themselves shared the land under an agreement among people in the hamlet. The role of the hamlet in the sharing of forestry land is very active in order to ensure the equitability and solidarity among people in the hamlet.

2. Village forest management is very popular, representing 92.4% of hamlets with village forest.

3. The average area of village forest in each hamlet is 16 hectare, comprising mostly of regenerated natural forest (juvenile forest without timber resource) and scattered old forest.

4. Village forest also consists of the following: holy forest (dong slan), water source forest, forest for timber for and firewood, village protection forest; the internal rules for managing these forests are similar to those applicable in the district of Thong Nong. Public use of resources of village forest varies, depending on the agreement in each hamlet. For example, the hamlet of Lung Nhan, commune of Hoang Hai, in 2000 decided to hire people to saw 11 old and collapsed trees into wooden sheets in the water source forest of the hamlet. These wooden sheets then were shared equally among households (each got 13 sheets, sufficient to assemble two coffins, and in turn had to pay VND 500,000). Yet in the hamlet of Bo Meo, the cutting of even collapsed trees or collecting firewood in the water source forest – the only source of water to support agricultural production and daily life of the hamlet, is strictly prohibited. The area of forestry land
in the hamlet of Bo Meo is very small, only 12 hectare, and shared among 30 households (the head of the hamlet got only 200 square meters). Falling short of firewood, people in the hamlet have to use corn branches instead, but no one violates the forest or steals from others. Although holy forest is most preserved and respected by the local people, it has been violated in times of extremely difficulty. Between 1960 and 1986, in a bid to get timber and cultivation land, the largest holy forest of the commune of Hoang Hai, which was established under the regime of the hero named Nung Chi Cao, a well respected leader of the Tay minority, and was the worshipping place of many hamlets in the area, was completely destroyed (as narrated by Mr. Su, vice chairman of the commune of Hoang Hai).

5. All hamlets have their own internal rules, which have been discussed democratically, voted by the majority, and approved by the commune’s People Committee. Included in the internal rules are provisions related to the protection of forest, yet at a very simple level. For example, the internal rules of the hamlet of Bo Meo, commune of Hoang Hai (version 2000), in a typed form, state that:

10. Article 5. Provision of protection of environment:
11. …..
12. Everyone has the responsibility to take care of rehabilitated forest, water source forest, cemetery forest, and shared forest, in order to protect the ecology.
13. Setting fire on forest is strictly prohibited; violated persons shall be punished depending on the extent of damage and fined VND 50,000-100,000.
17. Article 9. Provision related to the use, transport, and trade of narcotics.

In addition to these internal rules, the head of hamlet, Mr. Ma Van Si, also showed us the handwritten internal rules (version 1985), which were developed in more details. For example:

“Article 4. The mountains of Coc Bo and the streamlines surrounding the hamlet fall under the ownership and protection of all people in the hamlet, are the water source of the hamlet, and may positively or negatively affect the environment of the hamlet. Therefore, everyone, including the head of the hamlet, has the responsibility to protect them. No one is allowed to cut trees for firewood in the mountains of Coc Bo or clear bushes (except trees grown by individuals in bare land in order to improve the forest cover, yet this activity should not be abused to clear the bushes)”.
These internal rules also provide for the most severe punishment on a violated person: his membership in the funeral association will be canceled. If so, people in the hamlet will not attend the funeral if someone in his family dies. So far, no one has suffered from this punishment, and most of the sanctions that have been applied are of warning nature.

The forest protection unit of Quang Uyen is providing guidance to communes to develop the Rule on Protection of Village Forest in accordance with Directive no. 52 issued by the MARD on 7 May, 2001 regarding the accelerated development and implementation of forest protection rules among village communities. The rules have been prepared in advance with a number of articles, which need to be approved by village people, signed by the head of the village, and sent to the respective commune or district for approval. In our opinion, this practice is too general and serves to circulate prohibited activities specified in the laws in order to protect forest (but not comprehensive). These rules are not specific and fit with the circumstances of each village, and their effectiveness is probably lower than that of the rules prepared by the local people.

For example: “Part II. Specific Provisions
- Forest in the village’s area should not be cleared for cultivation land.
- Forest should not be destroyed illegally; water source forest, rocky forest and landscape forest should be well protected.
- The transporting, harboring, and trading of forestry products, special products, and forest animals should not be carried out ?? (not consistent with prevailing regulations)
- Wild animals should not be hunted or trapped (the prohibition is limited to valuable, scare wild animals !?)
- Animals should not be grazed in newly planted forest.
- Setting fire on forest is prohibited; regulations on fire prevention and pesticide prevention should be complied with.
- No illegal dispute over forest or shared forestry land is allowed.
- The plantation of trees to expand the forest should be actively carried out.
- All individuals or organizations in the hamlet have the right to prevent and denounce those who violate the above rules, including people in and outside the hamlet.”

We think that after regulations or forest protection are well circulated and aware of by the people, let the local people develop their own rules. By doing so, the rules would be practical and most appropriate with the specific circumstances of each hamlet. It would not be possible to expect the forest protection rules to replace regulations on forest protection.

There is no uniform rule of the exploitation and use of wood and firewood in village forests, as it is conditional on the status of the village forest, public and individual demand. For example, in the hamlet of Bo Meo, commune of Hoang Hai, it is not allowed, whether wood or firewood. In the hamlet of Lung Nhan,
the exploitation is allowed once in many years to supply wood for making coffins. The hamlet of Phuc Sen stipulates that households are allowed to enter the forest twice a year to collect firewood (four bunches per household). If a family organizes a wedding or funeral, each household in the hamlet are allowed to enter the forest to collect two bunches of firewood for that family. Physical distance between the district’s administration and those in the communes and the fact that the extent of violation did not endanger the forest allow the latter to ignore such violations. A number of communes, however, informed us that inspection shall be carried out if any hamlet is detected as abusing the exploitation.

**Village forest in the district of Nguyen Binh**

**General conditions**

The district of Nguyen Binh lies on the land mountains in the southwestern part of Cao Bang and borders the province of Bac Can. Its natural area is 83,720 hectare, with 18 communes and two towns. The population is 39,081, of which the Dao minority has 20,018 persons (52.6%), the Nung minority 3,604 persons (4.5%), the Tay minority 10,453 persons (13%), with the rest being H'Mong, Kinh minorities, etc.

**Status of Land Use in the District of Nguyen Binh**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Land</th>
<th>Area (hectare)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total area</td>
<td>83,720.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Agricultural land</td>
<td>4,496.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Without cultivation land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Forestry land</td>
<td>31,631.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Special use land</td>
<td>512.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Residence land</td>
<td>126.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Unused land</td>
<td>46,953.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unused low land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unused mountainous land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rocky mountains without tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Structure of Land Use in the District of Nguyen Binh

The area of agricultural land is trivial, representing only 5.3% of the district’s natural area, and comprises mostly of high-altitude fields. Forest-covered land area accounts for 37.7%. The area of unused hills and mountains that are planned to be forest is 37,641 hectare. Thus, the total area of forestry land will be 69,272 hectare, accounting for 82.78% of the district’s natural area.

Rice-converted agricultural output per capita is 272 kg in 2000, lowest among districts in the province (the province’s average level is 332 kg). Livestock raising is relatively developed thanks to large area of hills and mountains. The district has a stock of 10,159 buffaloes, cows and pigs, ranking fifth in the province.

Forest status

According to data of the forest survey conducted in 1999, the area of forest of the district is less than the figure shown above, 28,783 hectare, and comprises of the following:

- Natural forest: 27,287 hectare, including timber forest of 27,079 hectare (21,838 hectare being juvenile forest or 80% of the area of timber forest), bamboo forest (101 hectare);

- Plantation forest: 1,063 hectare.

With a timber stock of 967,875 cubic meters, (847,593 cubic meters from the natural forest and 120,048 hectare from the plantation forest), the forest in Nguyen Binh has been exploited and abused to the point of depletion.

The district has allocated land and forest to organizations and households. Between 1993 and 2001, 43,975 hectare have been allocated, representing 63.5% of the area planned to be forestry land. Of which, 41,299.8 hectare were allocated to households and “collective groups”, representing 94%; the
number of households receiving land is 4,582. The area of forest allocated to villages is 204.3 hectare (34 hamlets).

**Summary of forestry land allocation to households and villages, August 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Commune</th>
<th>Total villages</th>
<th>Villages with village forest</th>
<th>% of villages with village forest</th>
<th>Area of village forest (hectare)</th>
<th>Area of forestry land allocated (hectare)</th>
<th>% area of village forest</th>
<th>Ethnic minorities account for &gt;= 50% population</th>
<th>Ethnic minorities account for &lt;50-30% population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nguyen Binh town</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>Tay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tam Kim</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>163.8</td>
<td>2,316.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Tay Dao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thinh Vuong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,839.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ca Thanh</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>225.5</td>
<td>2,824.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Dao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bac hop</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,279.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Tay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Phan Thanh</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3,675.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Dao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Quang Thanh</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,390.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Trieu Nguyen</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,163.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Minh Thanh</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,356.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Tay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hung Dao</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>2,022.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Dao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tinh Tuc town</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>142.5</td>
<td>996.86</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>Tay Kinh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Vu Nong</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>143.6</td>
<td>970.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>Dao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Minh Tam</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>416.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Tay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Thai Hoc</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,008.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mai Long</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,391.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yen Lac</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,039.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hoa Tham</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>173.7</td>
<td>3,402.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Dao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The Duc</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,561.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Tay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lang Mon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Tay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Thanh Cong</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>4,465.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Dao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Entire district</strong></td>
<td><strong>226</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,204.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>41,299.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.91</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

1. Village forest in Nguyen Binh is not popular, not so many hamlets have village forest and the area of village forest is also small (15.4% of the number of hamlets and 2.91% of natural area). Most of the village forest is juvenile forest (Ila, b, c), and the average area of village forest per hamlet is 35 hectare, equivalent to that in the districts of Quang Uyen and Thong Nong.

2. Most of the village forest is water source forest and forest for conventional forest products. Holy forest does not exist because the Dao and H’Mong minorities do not have this tradition. In the hamlet of Bo Um, commune of Tam Kim, even the Tay minority here ceased worshipping in the holy forest (according to the head of Communist Party’s division in the hamlet, this practice is superstitious and therefore must be abolished). One reason attributable to the abolition of this practice is that this area used to be the base of the Party prior to the 1945 revolution, thus the people here well absorbed the Party’s policies.

3. It seems that the existence of village forest in Nguyen Binh has nothing to do with the characteristics of the largest minorities living here, i.e., the Dao or the Tay. Of the 11 communes without village forest, six (54.5%) is dominated by the Dao minority and five by the Tay minority. Of the
communes with village forest, eight (66.6%) is dominated by the Dao minority and two (33.4%) by the Tay minority.

4. For village forest being water source forest or commodity forest, the essential way of management is to protect the rehabilitation of forest, allow the exploitation of timber and firewood taking into account the forest’s capacity, and meeting only critical demand of the hamlet community or households. For example, the hamlet of Thom San (dominated by Dao minority), town of Nguyen Binh, stipulates that only households damaged by calamity or fire may cut trees to set up temporary house (the household itself must find timber for setting up the permanent house later on) or to use as the coffin-carrying poles (because the forest here is rehabilitated and big trees are not available). The management and usage of village forest is decided by the hamlet itself, relying on local knowledge and subject to the capability of the hamlet’s head.

5. Unlike in the districts of Thong Nong or Quang Uyen, village forest in the district of Nguyen Binh has been issued with certificate of land use right, in which the “hamlet community” was specified as the subject to receive the land. What are the rights of the hamlet community that was issued with certificate of land use right? The district’s officials said that they only care about the goal of issuing the certificate, i.e., forest protection but the rights of the hamlet. The hamlet itself also does not care about the rights that may be given by the authorities, as it has been managing the forest by traditions so far. Two rights that hamlets are exercising are: (i) protect the forest, not allowing others (in or outside the hamlet) to impact the forest in ways contrary to the hamlet’s internal rules, and (ii) exploit and use timber and firewood in accordance with the hamlet’s internal rules.

6. A big gap emerges when the data of the survey on the area of forest and forestry land under community management, which was conducted by the forest protection unit in 2001, are compared with data of our survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of data</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Forest protection unit, 2001</td>
<td>23,653 hectare, or 57.2% of the area of forestry land that has been allocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Survey, 2002</td>
<td>1,204 hectare, or 2.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our point of view is that there was misunderstanding of the community forest and most importantly, the data were not consolidated from the source documents on land allocation of each commune and the source of data was not clearly indicated.
ASSESSMENT OF THE STATUS OF VILLAGE FOREST IN THE PROVINCE OF CAO BANG

Consolidated data of village forest of 3 districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total villages</th>
<th>Villages with village forest</th>
<th>% villages with village forest</th>
<th>Area of village forest (hectare)</th>
<th>Area of forestry land allocated (hectare)</th>
<th>% area of village forest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thong Nong</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>3,855.44</td>
<td>16,666.90</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quang Uyen</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>2,905.68</td>
<td>17,884.70</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nguyen Binh</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1,204.0</td>
<td>41,299.80</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>587</strong></td>
<td><strong>290</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,965.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>75,851.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart: Ratio of villages with village forest

1. Hamlets with village forest; 2. Hamlets without village forest

Chart: Area of forest broken down by forest owners

1. Village forest; 2. Forest under household management
Consolidated results of interviews with provincial, district, communal, and village officials

Provincial and district officials: 15 persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The existence of village forest</td>
<td>Yes: 93.3%, No: 6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The popularity of village forest</td>
<td>Yes: 86.7%, No: 13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ethnic minorities have village forest</td>
<td>Tay: 93.3%, Nung: 66.7%, Dao: 53.3%, H'Mong: 46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Way of establishing management right</td>
<td>By tradition: 73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocated: 53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others: 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Types of popular village forest</td>
<td>Holy forest: 73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water source forest, PH: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional wood forest: 53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Types of forestry land of village forest</td>
<td>Natural forest: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plantation forest: 13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DTDT: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Reason for existence of village forest</td>
<td>By tradition: 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard to be equally shared: 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Located in remote areas: 6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ways of exploitation and use of village forest</td>
<td>The use of village’s internal rules is appropriate: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Should the existence of village forest be acknowledged</td>
<td>Yes: 100%; No: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Should the village be issued with certificate of land use right</td>
<td>Yes: 80%; No: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The certificate should indicate the subject allocated with land is the village community, not the head of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Which rights should be given to the village?</td>
<td>Long term permanent management and use right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The following rights should not be given: conversion, transfer, inheritance, mortgage, lease, capital contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The development trend of village forest</td>
<td>Established long before but will not be expanded (holy forest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expandable in remote areas where households do not take care of.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commune officials: 12 persons
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Which ethnic minorities have village forest</td>
<td>Tay: 58.3%, Nung: 83.3%, Dao and H'Mong: 58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Types of forestry land of village forest</td>
<td>Natural forest: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plantation forest: 8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DTDT: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Popular types of village forest</td>
<td>Holy forest: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water source forest, PH: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional wood forest: 83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reason for existence of village forest</td>
<td>By tradition: 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard to be equally shared: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Located in remote areas: 8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Any dispute over village forest</td>
<td>Yes: 16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No: 83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The village has forest protection rules of its own</td>
<td>yes: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Have the rules been approved by the commune authorities</td>
<td>yes: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Should the existence of village forest be acknowledged</td>
<td>yes: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Should village forest be expanded</td>
<td>yes: 91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no: 8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Village officials: 8 persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The existence of village forest</td>
<td>yes: 87.5%, no: 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Any rules on protection of village forest</td>
<td>yes: 87%, no 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Any rules on exploitation of wood and forestry products</td>
<td>yes: 50%, no: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Are the rules on protection of village forest complied with by the local people</td>
<td>yes: 75%, no: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Any dispute over village</td>
<td>yes: 62.5%, no: 37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments and evaluation of the status of village forest in the province of Cao Bang

Through survey data, interviews of officials at various levels and observations during our field visits, we find that the survey data and results of interviews are relatively consistent and have the following comments on the status of village forest in the province of Cao Bang:

Village forest is a popular type of forest existing in different localities with different ethnic minorities in Cao Bang

The popularity is manifested with the following indicators:

- The percentage of hamlets with village forest is 49.5%, with Quang Uyen being the district with the highest percentage of 92.4%, Thong Nong being the district with the average percentage of 45%, and Nguyen Binh with the lowest percentage of 15.4%. 93.3% of provincial and district officials acknowledged the existence of village forest.

- The scope of village forest, measured by its area relative to that of forestry land allocated, is 10.5%, with Thong Nong being the district with the highest percentage of 23%, another district with the average of 16.2%, and Nguyen Binh the lowest of 2.91%. The data of the survey on the area of forest and forestry land under the management of communities, which was carried out in 2001, are overstated at 39.1%. In our point of views, the following reasons may be attributable to the inaccuracy:
  - Although Cao Bang has forest area allocated under projects no. 327 and 661 or with budget funding granted to the forest protection force, such allocation is not in accordance with decree no. 01/CP because project owners or the forest protection force are not forest owners. Incorporating the contracted area of forest that has been allocated to or put under the management of villages results in double accounting of the area of village forest.
  - We have checked the area of village forest in the district of Thong Nong and found that it is 11 times larger than that under the management of other collective groups. In the district of Quang Uyen, the forest protection unit informed us that the area of forest that is under the management of other entities is very small (arm forces wanted to be allocated with forest, yet the communal authorities did not accept it).
- The data were not compiled from the source documents on allocation of forestry land of each commune, despite the fact that the data in these documents accurately record each forest owner that has received land. That the area of village forest of the province of Cao Bang accounts for 15-20% of the forestry land area may be acceptable.

- Village forest is most popular among the Tay, Nung, Dao, and H'Mong minorities. Yet it is not necessary that every hamlet has a village forest as indicated in the statistical data of village forest in the district of Nguyen Binh (we have not been able to find the reason for not having village forest in a number of communes).

The existence and development of village forest may be attributable to the high consensus and solidarity among local people in the hamlet in terms of sacred belief (worshipping the holy spirits or avoiding some taboos) and of joint management and use of natural resources within the boundaries of the hamlet. We have found that each hamlet has its own boundaries, which were established long ago and defined relatively clear, and which are accepted by other hamlets in the commune. The area of each hamlet is not always correspond to its population. There are large hamlets with few residents and vice versa, yet the boundaries have never been adjusted. As the forest resources were depleted and scarce, the need for joint management and use of forest became increasingly urgent, for it is difficult to equitably share the resources to households. Some hamlets set forth the following rule: all old trees that lie scatteringly in the hamlet’s area fall under the ownership of the hamlet’s community (even though the land has been allocated to each household). One special but typical case has happened: a household was allocated with a piece of land on which lied some very old trees. When the land was acquired for paving a new road, the timber harvested from those trees was equitably shared among households in the hamlet, while the compensation proceeds and other benefits were left with the household said above. The solidarity is also reflected in the voluntary reciprocal assistance among households when one holds “major event” or faces difficulty. That the most severe punishment is to cancel membership in the hamlet’s funeral association is also a proof of high solidarity. High solidarity and a well-respected head of the hamlet are a guarantee for the enforcement of rules set forth by the hamlet, including rules on forest protection.

(According to Vuong Xuan Tinh, The traditional ownership and use of land of ethnic minorities in Vietnam, seminar materials, November 2001:

“The ethnic minorities in Vietnam have a special tradition of owning and using land, the most typical feature of which is the right of community management…

The establishment of the ownership of land and natural resources in the traditional society of ethnic minorities is linked to the differentiation of such ownership between those in the community and those outside of the community. For minorities such as Kho Mu, E De, Gia Rai, Ba Na, etc., most of the cultivation land, abandoned land, wild forest, river wharf, ghost forest,
etc., fall under the management of the village community. The collective ownership of the village within its boundaries is reflected through the head of the village – the representative of the village. For some minorities or in some regions, the village head is usually the landowner, etc. That land falls under the ownership of the village community is a holy issue because it is linked to the worshipping of the deity of land: the land of each village belongs to the deity of such village. The deity is the ultimate owner with full powers, who can confer favorable or unfavorable things on the land users.

Outsiders are not entitled to cultivate on a village’s land. Outsiders who want to cultivate on land of a village must be granted approval by such village, otherwise it will be considered an act of intrusion that seriously insults the land deity of the village and the village community.

Other resources such as forest, rivers, streams, water sources, etc., all fall under the ownership of the village community. Outsiders who go fishing, hunting, harvesting fruits in the territory of a village must inform the village’s head or the land owner of the village. The assertion of ownership is also seen in the practice that outsiders must give the village part of the booties that they harvested.

It is observed that to manage land and other resources, whether under public or private ownership, the ethnic minorities always rely on the community. Here all community members take responsibility to remind and supervise one another regarding the compliance with related rules. Playing a major role in the process are the village’s head, the elderly council, and the head of an ancestry, who are well respected and representing the community’s interest. The major management method mostly relies on education, directing people to voluntarily comply with the rules. Punishments are only of warning nature and hardly imposed”.

We note that the feature of community in the management of land and natural resources is most represented in the management of village forest.

**Village forest accounts for a large area of natural forest,** which consists mainly of rehabilitated juvenile forest and some remaining and well protected old forests and very old tree clusters (dong slan or holy forest, and water source forest). This is in line with the current status of forest in Cao Bang, with juvenile forest representing 95.5% of the natural forest area, and reflects the tradition of joint managing and using natural resources of ethnic minorities (both forest and old trees are under the management of the village’s community). This practice is also fit with the capacity of the village community, i.e., it could protect the forest but could not mobilize capital and other resources to make further investment into the forest. Bare land and hills of the village are usually used as the public grazing ground of the village.

**Popular types of village forest include:**

i) **Holy forest** (called dong slan in the language of the Tay minority, meaning worshipping forest). The holy forest was established long before by tradition of the Tay or Nung minorities. Each hamlet often has one or more holy forests, but in some cases two or more hamlets may share one holy forest. Holy forest is where the hamlet community comes to worship and pray for bumper harvest and good health for everyone in the hamlet, usually done once a year.
Some hamlets no longer retain this practice (perhaps they consider it superstitious), yet the holy forest is maintained and considered a luck-keeping place of the hamlet. Whoever intrudes the holy forest will bring bad luck not only to him but also to the hamlet community. Holy forest is usually small, ranging from hundreds of square meters to some hectare, and covered with very old trees. By tradition, no one is allowed to intrude the holy forest, neither he is allowed to cut trees, collect firewood (even dried-up or collapsed trees), graze cattle, or even walk into it. A violator will be severely punished by paying tributes to the hamlet for worshipping and apologizing the holy spirits. If he fails to do so, the most severe punishment will apply – cancellation of his membership in the funeral association of the hamlet, so the funeral of a member of his family will not be attended by the hamlet people. Everyone in the hamlet takes the responsibility of protecting the holy forest very seriously. The holy forest sometimes serves as the water source forest. In addition to holy forests, there are forests for worshiping the land deity of the hamlet, which are usually smaller than the holy forest and may be just a big tree cluster. (The Kinh minority also has the perception that some trees are the residence of the holy spirits, so they set up a worshiping table at the root of such trees).

All people interviewed were well aware of the holy forest and viewed that the holy forest will exist for long but will not expand in terms of area.

The newcomers to Cao Bang could easily identify the holy forest, which is a forest or tree cluster situated close to hamlets or even in the middle of a paddy field, with the surrounding area being rehabilitated forest or bare hills.

ii) Water source forest: to protect the source of water, each hamlet has identified forests at the source of streams or at other sources of water (called coc bo). Some water source forests have very old trees and have been protected for a long time, but some have been protected just recently after the policy on allocation of forestry land was introduced. Despite of its main function of protecting water sources, the hamlet sometimes allows the cutting of old or collapsed trees for common use or for equitable sharing among households.

iii) Village protection forest. Some villages that are located in areas vulnerable to landslide, falling stones, or dangerous wind have retained a forest for protection purposes and from which no one is allowed to cut trees or collect firewood.

iv) Commodity forest. The main purpose is to get timber, bamboo for constructing common public works of the hamlet and for constructing houses or supporting funerals (for constructing houses, the household could only be supported partially). Households are allowed to enter the forest to collect dried firewood, but there are forests where even dried firewood is so scared that the collecting frequency and quantity of firewood are restricted or the firewood can only be used for weddings or funerals. Forests that are located far from the hamlet can be freely exploited. The goal of selling timber and other forest products is generally not set out for village forest.

The area of water source forest and of commodity forest accounts for a large percentage of that of village forest.
Holy forest, ghost forest, protection forest, and water source forest are usually located close to the village and paddy fields and established by traditions long ago. The commodity forest whereas is often far from the village (forest that is close to the village has been distributed to households, which is usually adjacent to their paddy fields).

The above classification of village forest is not comprehensive, relying only on their utility and the extent of management:

- Holy forest and water source forest are usually strictly protected (heavy punishments to be imposed on violators – cancellation of membership in the hamlet’s funeral association). The exploitation of timber and other forest products is hardly allowed.

- Commodity forest (timber and firewood) is not as strictly protected, and the punishments are also less severe.

**Village forests are well managed and protected**

Every hamlet has its own internal rules for protecting village forest (or some provisions in the general rules of the hamlet). The hamlet’s head plays a vital role in enforcing the compliance with the rules. The local people protect the forest because of their awareness of the benefits of forest to their family and the community, not because of the contracting money paid under various projects. Many hamlets and communes, not being beneficiary of projects no. 327 and 661 though, have voluntarily protected the village forest. Many people interviewed said that the status of village forest was as good as that of household forest, especially in terms of protection. Further investment of capital and labor into the village forest, however, is less than that put into the household forest. The village forest relies mostly on natural regeneration. The community spirit of villages is good not only to village forest but also to the protection of household forest. Even in the course of land and forest allocation, the village actively participated in the sharing of land and forest to households in a democratic way, thus facilitating the allocation of forestry land.

(An example of village forest management in the commune of Phuc Sen, district of Quang Uyen:

**Phuc Sen is a mountainous commune, with 77% of its natural area being forestry land and 20% agricultural land. Its population is 2,027, with the Nung minority accounting for 99%. The population density is 169 persons per square meter.**

The villages of Lung Vai and Tinh Dong are two typical examples of management of forest on limestone mountains. The natural area of the two villages is 310 hectare, 90% of which being forestry land, 7% agricultural land, and 3% others. Fifty percent of forestry land is under the management of households, with the rest under that of villages. Most of the forest is regenerated or rehabilitated natural forest, with no nature forest left.

Under the management of the village of Tinh Dong are 20 hectare and of the village of Lung Vai are 120 hectare, all of which are located far from the
residence of the people. Timber and other products from the village forest are used for common objectives such as building schools, medical stations, assisting families that suffered from calamity, and providing firewood to weddings or funerals. The forest itself is the reserved land that may be distributed to the households if needed. Village forest and household forest in Phuc Sen had been “distributed” by the commune long before the policy of land and forest allocation was introduced. The distribution was carried out because otherwise it would not be possible to protect the forest.

Modality of management of village forest: the village head has the ultimate power in the village. The village has from one to three ancestries, and the head of the ancestry with the most descendents usually is head of the village. The head of the village is selected by the local people and the term of office is 2 years. The village head is responsible for preparing the plan for management of village forest and circulating it among village members for implementation. Mass organizations such as youth union, women union, security unit, and arbitration unit also participate in the management of village forest. They do it seriously and voluntarily in line with the internal rules set forth by the community. Twice a year, households contribute one or two days of labor in January and July to take care of the forest. Everyone has the responsibility to protect the forest and implement the forest protection and management plan set forth by the village.

Rules on the use of products of the village forest:
- Timber for building houses and public works of the community;
- Firewood for weddings, funerals, 300 kg per event on the average.
- Firewood for the village families (supplementary);
- Grass for cattle and pig and vegetable for families;
- Source of water for production and daily life.

The forest in Phuc Sen has been rehabilitated with the allocation of forest to the village and its households: 97% of the area of forestry land has been covered with forest and the rest 3% with bushes (Ia, Ib). With locally originated knowledge, the people here have found a local tree (DAÚ CHOONG) that is appropriate with the purpose of covering limestone mountains. They have also nourished and plant other value added trees such as NGHIEN, TAU, TRAI, etc. Thanks to the distribution of forest to the village and households for management, the slash and burn cultivation is no longer practiced. Currently, most of the bare hills has been covered with forest trees.

The community in the village of Phuc Sen plays an essential role in rehabilitating and protecting forest, which had previously been destroyed due to management weaknesses. The forest management apparatus is operating well and bringing benefits to the local people through effective enforcement of internal rules on forest protection.

The management of village forest is also faced with a number of difficulties:
- Some households illegally encroach the village forest (about 10%) that is located near their residence;
- There is dispute over the bordering area between two villages;
- Difficulty in mobilizing human resource to grow more timber-generating trees in the village forest

(Source: Nguyen Huy Dung, Pilot Study on Community Forest Management in the commune of Phu Sen, Quang Uyen, Cao Bang, materials of seminar on Experience and The Potential of Community Forest Management in Vietnam, June 2000).

Local policies on village forest
Interviewed officials at the provincial and district levels indicated that the province has not had any policy on village forest. Yet we observed that in fact the local people have implemented a number of policies (not set forth by the central level). Most important is the allocation of forestry land to villages (in the land allocation decision issued by the district’s People Committee, it was written that the land was allocated to the village community, etc.). Districts like Nguyen Binh even issued certificate of land use right. Although the rights associated with the land have not been specified, the allocation was carried out because the authorities knew for sure that the forest would be managed and protected in line with the local people’s tradition and aspiration. In some instances, even the budget for allocation has not been made available by the district (commune), the commune (village) led the distribution of forestry land to households and village communities in order to protect and rehabilitate the forest. The commune of Phuc Sen, Quang Hoa, distributed forestry land in the 70s of the previous century. When the State hand over forestry land and officially recognize the distribution of land to households and communities, the communities have already become forest owners.

In the district of Thong Nong, contracts under the Five Million Hectare of Forest Project were signed directly with the hamlet communities for protecting the forest. No problems arise when it comes to settlement with the State Treasury, meaning that the hamlet already has the right to undertake civil transactions (the head of hamlet is the representative).

Conventional timber is a legitimate demand of people living in areas with forest, yet no consistent policy has been introduced by the State to that effect. The local authorities, not issuing separate policies though, in fact acknowledge the autonomous management of forest by villages and the exploitation of timber to partially meet that demand. If the contracting of forest regeneration could be implemented with regard to village forest, it would address one drawback in forest development because then capital investment would be made available for maintenance and supplementary plantation.

With about 15-20% of allocation forestry land being village forest and with the strong community spirit of villages, we believe that no separate or special policy is needed for this modality of forest owner.

Acknowledging the existence of village forest and deciding on the allocation of forestry land to villages is an appropriate policy that could bring into play the good traditions of the ethnic minorities.

Development trends of village forest
With the area of forestry land already allocated to households, individuals, and organizations, we believe that village forest will remain stable because
the village community did participate in the distribution of forest when the allocation took place and the area of village forest is not large (less than 20%). Of the various types of village forest, holy forest will be kept intact while water source forest not vulnerable to much change as it is surrounded by household forest. Only commodity forest may be subject to changes. The area of forestry land allocated in the province as of 2001 is 319,435.9 hectare, representing 94.7% of the planned forestry land area (only 17,565 hectare are left). Therefore, village forest in Cao Bang is now in a stable status in terms of planning, only the quality of which will need to be improved to better meet the demand of village communities.

The village, a forest owner in addition to households, shall be a key player in the development of people forestry in the province of Cao Bang.
PART THREE
ASSESSMENT ON THE STATUS OF VILLAGE FOREST IN THE NORTHERN MOUNTAINOUS PROVINCES

Criteria for assessing the status of village forest
We have used the following criteria to assess the status of village forest:

- The popularity of village forest: the percentage of communes with village forest of the total number of communes in the surveyed provinces.
- The scope of village forest: the area of village forest out of the total area of forestry land and relative to household forest.
- The pluses and minuses of village forest management relative to those of forest management by households and other organizations.

The status of village forest in the northern mountainous provinces
Village forest management is relatively popular in the northern mountainous provinces

Relying on newspapers and detailed statistical data from the Preliminary Survey on the Status of Community Forest Management in Vietnam – Hoang Cong Tuan, Forest Protection Department, MARD, June 2001, we have arrived at the following:

Percentage of communes with village forest in various provinces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Total number of commune</th>
<th>Commune with community forest</th>
<th>% commune with community forest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cao Bang</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hoa Binh</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>78.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lai Chau</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>75.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ha Giang</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>70.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Son La</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>56.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lang Son</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>51.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bac Can</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Quang Tri</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lao Cai</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>38.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yen Bai</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nghe An</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>19.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Phu Tho</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>TT- Hue</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

i) The subject of the above Survey is community forest, which includes village forest. In our pilot survey in Cao Bang, village forest accounts for most of the community forest. Thus, the data in the above table accurately reflect the popularity of community forest.

ii) Village forest exists in every province with forest, but most popular in the northern mountainous provinces. The percentage of communes with village forest in the fifteen provinces is 35%. Seven northern mountainous provinces has a percentage of 50% or higher, with Cao Bang reaching the highest of 80% and Bac Giang the lowest of 4.9%. Despite being a central province, Quang Tri has a relatively high percentage of 47%.
Village forest is popular among regions with ethnic minorities

Relationship between village forest and ethnic minorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>% ethnic minorities (1)</th>
<th>% communes with community forest (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cao Bang</td>
<td>95.33</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ha Giang</td>
<td>88.10</td>
<td>70.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bac Can</td>
<td>87.74</td>
<td>50.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lang Son</td>
<td>83.50</td>
<td>51.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Son La</td>
<td>83.14</td>
<td>56.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lai Chau</td>
<td>83.14</td>
<td>75.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hoa Binh</td>
<td>72.36</td>
<td>78.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lao Cai</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>38.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yen Bai</td>
<td>50.37</td>
<td>37.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Thanh Hoa</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Phu Tho</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nghe An</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>19.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bac Giang</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Quang Tri</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>47.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>TT- Hue</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>11.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Chart: Relationship between ethnic minorities and village forest
Comments:

i) In provinces with the percentage of ethnic minorities of 50% or higher, the percentage of communes with village forest is 40% or higher. However, while the district of Nguyen Binh, Cao Bang, has a percentage of ethnic minorities of 90% (the Dao, Tay, and Nung), only 15.4% of its communes have village forest.

ii) Village forest exists not only in remote and deep communes but also in district or provincial towns with forestry land and ethnic minorities. An example is the towns of Ha Giang, Lao Cai, Cao Bang, Dien Bien Phu, Son La, etc.

iii) Not only the ethnic minorities but also the Kinh (minority) has village forest. Twenty three communes dominated by the Kinh in the province of Quang Tri have village forest, representing 36% of communes with village forest. Most of these communes are located in the midland or coastal districts such as Hai Lang, Trieu Phong, Vinh Linh, and Do Linh. In the province of Thua Thien – Hue, forest has just been allocated on a pilot basis to the village of Thuy Yen Thuong (Kinh minority), commune of Loc Thuy, district of Phu Loc.

Village forest is found not only in unpopulous areas but also in populous areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of commune</th>
<th>Communes with community forest</th>
<th>% communes with community forest</th>
<th>Population density</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thong Nong</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quang Uyen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Luong Son</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Yen Minh</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quan Ba</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bac Me</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Xin Man</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. H. Su Phi</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Da Bac</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ky Son</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95.45</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sin Ho</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Quynh Nhai</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Tan Lac</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91.66</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Vi Xuyen</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Dien Bien Dong</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Meo Vac</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Phong Tho</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Dong Van</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.21</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Ngan Son</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.80</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Kim Boi</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Phu Yen</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77.77</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Yen Lap</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.47</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Moc Chau</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Mai Son</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Mai Chau</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Son La (town)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Ba Be</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61.53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Tuan Giao</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Thuan Chau</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Lac Son</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>187 Max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Song Ma</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59.25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Na Ri</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Than Uyen</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.82</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Bac Ha</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58.82</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Tua Chua</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Yen Chau</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Bac Quang</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Muong Te</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>5 Mim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Bao Yen</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Yen Thuy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Nguyen Binh</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Muong Khuong</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Bach Thong</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Muong Lay</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

i) The number of communes with village forest accounts for 74.77% the total number of communes in 44 districts. The average population density in these districts is 70.4 persons per square kilometer, the lowest being 5 persons per square kilometer (Muong Te – Lai Chau) and the highest being 187 persons per square kilometer (Lac Son – Hoa Binh).

ii) Twenty six districts or towns (numbered from 1 to 26) with 70% or higher of their respective communes managing village forest have an average population density of 73.6 persons per square kilometer, higher than the average of the 44 districts. The district of Muong Te has the lowest population density of 5 persons per square kilometer, yet the percentage of its communes managing village forest is just 50%, lower than the average. Several districts in the province of Hoa Binh have a population density of more than 100 persons per square kilometer, yet the percentage of their communes managing village forest is more than 70%.

iii) Thus, the popularity of village forest is not closely related to the population density (at the district level). The overriding factor impacting
village forest is the extent and quality of land and forest allocation in the local areas and management capacity of villages.

**Scope of village forest**
The area of village forest is a very important indicator reflecting the status of village forest in forest management, yet its accurate figure is hard to come by. Hoang Cong Tuan, in his preliminary survey on the status of community forest management in Vietnam, which was presented at the Seminar on Community Forest Management in 2001, indicated that the total area of forestry land under community management is 2,348,296 hectare of forest and forestry land. If the area of forestry land allocated to communities in accordance with decree no. 02/CP and the area of forest under their traditional management, it should be 1,412,027 hectare (including 756,451 hectare of forest and 655,576 hectare of land without forest). The area of natural forest under community management accounts for 37.7% of the area of forest allocated to households and other collective groups (2,006,464 hectare) and 16.66% of the area of forestry land of the surveyed provinces (12,406 hectare).

Even in the workshop held in 2001, some local officials doubted the accuracy of these data (that they were overstated). Looking into the reports of provinces, we found that they contained statistical data of each commune. The area of community forest as stated above is larger than the area of village forest, because there are other subjects such as ancestries, groups of households, socio-political organizations that participate in the management of forest. Yet the area of village forest definitely accounts for a large percentage. While studying village forest in Cao Bang, we have tried to verify the above data (report on the survey of community forest collected data just down to the district level) and got the following results:

**Results of survey taken in July 2002 on village forest in Cao Bang (1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total villages</th>
<th>Village with village forest</th>
<th>% villages with village forest</th>
<th>Area of village forest (hectare)</th>
<th>Area of forestry land allocated (hectare)</th>
<th>% area of village forest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thong Nong</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>3,855.44</td>
<td>16,666.90</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quang Uyen</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>2,905.68</td>
<td>17,884.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nguyen Binh</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1,204.0</td>
<td>41,299.8</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>587</strong></td>
<td><strong>290</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,965.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>75,851.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* All forestry land is allocated to households, not to organizations)
### Extracted report of Cao Bang Forest Protection Sub-Department on community forest, June 2001

Unit: hectare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total forestry land area under community management</th>
<th>Of which</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area allocated</td>
<td>Contracted area</td>
<td>Area self managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thong nong</td>
<td>23,433.09</td>
<td>5,071.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,361.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Quang hoa</td>
<td>5,089.50</td>
<td>766.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,323.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nguyen binh</td>
<td>23,635.34</td>
<td>18,036.44</td>
<td>2,131.4</td>
<td>3,485.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,157.93</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,873.99</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,131.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,170.56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

i) There is a significant gap between the result of the Forest Protection Unit and that of our survey. The result of the Forest Protection Unit is 9.8 times higher than that of our survey and represents 68.78% of the total area of forestry land already allocated. In all the three surveyed districts, we found that the area of village forest accounts for the largest percentage of community forest (in the district of Thong Nong, the area of village forest is 11 times larger than that of other “collective groups”). The area of village forest in Cao Bang accounts for only 10.5% the area of forestry land allocated to households and “collective groups”.

ii) With knowledge accumulated from a number of studies on land and forest allocation in the province of Hoa Binh, we believe that the reported figure of community forest area of the province is reliable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total forestry land area under community management</th>
<th>Of which</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area allocated and issued with certificate of land use right</td>
<td>Contracted area</td>
<td>Area under traditional management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mai chau</td>
<td>11,347.60</td>
<td>4,417.90</td>
<td>6,624.40</td>
<td>305.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ky son</td>
<td>11,704.12</td>
<td>3,932.15</td>
<td>5,760.80</td>
<td>2,001.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Luong son</td>
<td>10,505.61</td>
<td>6,144.33</td>
<td>2,584.00</td>
<td>1,777.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hoa binh</td>
<td>630.58</td>
<td>630.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Lac son</td>
<td>7,289.20</td>
<td>5,283.67</td>
<td>2,005.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The area of community forest allocated and self managed is: 18,862.42 hectare + 20,459.67 hectare = 49,322.09 hectare, **accounting for 15.4% of the forestry land area** in the province and 21.6% of the forestry land area of households.

The Working Group’s consolidated data of the area of forest and forestry land that is under the management of communities is 1,411,967 hectare, including 756,402 hectare with forest and 655,515 hectare without forest. Of this total area, however, that of the province of Lai Chau is 690,411 hectare, accounting for 49%. We believe that the allocation of land to communities in Lai Chau is an exceptional case.

*(Lai Chau’s report on the outcome of forestry land allocation (July 2001) indicated the following reasons for allocation of land to communities: (i) the master plan has not been developed; (ii) large area, high mountains, steep hills, (iii) long border line; (iv) many ethnic minorities with different traditions; (v) local people is poorly educated and lacking knowledge of forestry economics; and (vi) local people do not have capital to invest into forestry).*

In fact, the above features are common among mountainous provinces. Thus, we think it is necessary to exclude the data of Lai Chau before calculating the area of forest under community management as a percentage of the area of forest-covering land and forestry land.

**Community forest area as a percentage of forestry land area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Community forest area (*)</th>
<th>Forest land area (**)</th>
<th>% in total forest land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>With forest</td>
<td>Without forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cao Bang</td>
<td>95376</td>
<td>68037</td>
<td>27376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ha giang</td>
<td>13918</td>
<td>94170</td>
<td>45007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bac can</td>
<td>40675</td>
<td>29902</td>
<td>10773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Lang son</td>
<td>57590</td>
<td>37158</td>
<td>20432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Son la</td>
<td>23404</td>
<td>13859</td>
<td>8544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Gia lai</td>
<td>13061</td>
<td>51616</td>
<td>87999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the above table, the area of community forest on average accounts for 11% of the area of forestry land, about 50% of which is forest-covering land.

We estimate the area of forest under community management, the major of which being village forest, represents between 10 and 15% of the area of forestry land nationwide.

The effectiveness of village forest management
The consolidation of the thirteen reports on the area of forestry land and forest under community management of provinces shows that:

The number of opinions on community forest management: 38
Number of opinions indicating its advantages: 29 (76.3%)
Number of opinions indicating its disadvantages: 9 (24.7%)
Total: 38 (100%)

Assessment on the advantages (+) and disadvantages/limitations (-) of village forest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Lai Chau| - Everyone in the community participates in the management and takes responsibility  
<p>|            | - Everyone supports the prevention of forest abuse; the prevention is more effective with a large protection force |               |
| 2. Son La  | - Forest is closer to village than to commune or other organizations      |               |
|            | - Well aware of forest status                                               |               |
|            | - Well aware of the location of protection                                 |               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest Region</th>
<th>Challenges/Best Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lao Cai</td>
<td>- No instances of careless exploitation or cutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen Bai</td>
<td>- Bringing into play the traditional solidarity of the community - Mobilizing different forces to participate in forest protection under the uniform leadership of the village head. - There are instances of screening violators when forest is abused; over-reliance on one another; passiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha Giang</td>
<td>- Villages are entitled to organize protection force - Forest is not split up into small lots and dispute hardly occurs - Everyone in the community benefits from forest products - The community has not paid attention to forest development – not putting investment capital into forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac Kan</td>
<td>- Allocation of ownerless forestry land to communities should be continued, especially for land that can not be allocated or leased out -- There are instances of illegal exploitation in community forest, especially in remote or bordering areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phu Tho</td>
<td>- People voluntarily comply with internal rules on community forest protection, promptly detect violations for prevention and resolution - Forest resources are used more appropriately and economically - Natural forest at water source should be allocated to communities for management (bare land should not be) - Passiveness in taking technical measures to boost forest development; mostly relying on the natural rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac Ninh</td>
<td>- Centralized management facilitate the implementation of State plans - The transformation of objectives of land use is easier for the State - Lack of investment capital causes irresponsibility - Arbitrary use forest, not in line with forestry objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanh Hoa</td>
<td>- Good management is attributable to economic benefits brought to the community - Community management would not be good if local people do not have the sense of responsibility - Expansion of the area of community forest is not appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nghe An</td>
<td>- Good forest protection on the spot in line with the direction of socializing forest protection - The role of land owners is not brought into play in order to make</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Improved sense of responsibility of local people
- Bringing into play the role and responsibility of the village head, ancestry head in forest protection

**positive impact on forest protection and development**

| 11. Quang Tri | - Forest is well managed
- Community forest should be expanded in some mountainous communes, especially in the upper lands and water dams | - Forest develops naturally, resulting in low efficiency |

12. Thua Thien – Hue

- Forest really has its owner; both the community and the people are closely linked to forest, as the protection and development of forest is closely linked to the benefits of themselves, thus creating a strong urge to protect and develop forest
- The State do not have to pay for the contracting of forest protection as it is doing now

(Source: extracted from the provinces’ reports of the area of forestry land under community management and protection, July 2001)

Thus, the positive features of village forest management are overwhelming. The negative features may be mitigated through the influence of organizations and policies. The biggest disadvantage of village forest management is that it is pure protection, without resources to upgrading and regenerating forest. Therefore, this modality is not appropriate with the management of bare land and hills, which requires new plantation.

**Example: an assessment of community forest in the province of Bac Kan by Pham Xuan Phuong – materials of the seminar on status of community forest management in a number of northern mountainous provinces of Vietnam, November 2001**

The province of Bac Kan has 434,861.5 hectare of forestry land, which accounts for 89.5% the natural area of the province. About 267,144 hectare of land and forest have been allocated to households, individuals and organizations, representing 61.5% the area of forestry land of the province. Of this, 29,375 hectare have been allocated to 271 village communities and mass organizations in 62 communes (6 districts and towns), representing 6.75% the forestry area of the province or 15.7% the area of forestry land that has been allocated to households and individuals. The area of forest allocated to communities is mainly depleted forest or rehabilitated forest (Ic, Ila, b). In addition to the area of forestry land allocated to communities for management, there are 13,000 hectare of forest land that have been put under the management of village communities before (called village forest, hamlet forest, old forest, etc.). The communities also have the aspiration that the authorities will legally acknowledge their right of management of this forest on a long-term basis. Thus, so far in Bac Kan, the communities have participated in the management of 42,374.6 hectare, which accounts for 10% of the total
area of forestry land, excluding forestry land contracted to state-owned organizations.

In overall, various types of community forest management exist, yet most of them are executed through the development of rules of forest protection and development. The responsibilities of community members are specifically defined in the rules, which are signed by each member. Already 940 villages in the province have rules on forest protection, representing 82.5% of the total villages. And 30,096 households have signed the rules, representing 68.5% the total number of households. This is considered an effective measure to protect community forest.

Assessment of community forest management. So far no specific assessment has been carried out on various types of community forest management. According to a number of forest protection officials and local people, the following assessments can be made:

- The forest allocated to communities has been well protected. Its growth and rehabilitation are also fast because most of the forest is water source forest with the role of maintaining source of water for the whole village.

- Community forest meets the common demand of the community such as timber for constructing culture house, kindergarten, bridge, coffin, etc.

- Reduced cultivation in community forest.

However, community forest management also faces with the following impediments:

- Illegal exploitation of forest products exists, cultivation on the area allocated to the community, especially in areas bordering with other provinces.

- No technical intervention by the community into the forest, which is due in part to lack of resources and to uncertainty of the benefits to be received from such forest.

- In some areas, only 30-40% of the area allocated to communities is well protected and not vulnerable to destruction.

Local Policy on Village Forest

Local communities at the district and communal levels do not issue any regulation specifically addressing village forest. They, however, all support the existence of village forest management. Provinces such as Lai Chau, Son La, Thua Thien-Hue, and Dac Lac have issued decisions on pilot allocation of forest and forestry land to village communities. In Son La and Lai Chau, the allocation of forest to villages has been carried out on a wider basis, covering the whole province. In other provinces, although there is no document on the allocation of land and forest to villages, they in fact received forest along with households. Some districts have issued certificate of land use right to villages (issued to village A, B, for example). Yet others only issued decision on land allocation without any certificate of land use right (they argue that villages are
not a subject to be allocated land under the prevailing Land Law). In the course of land allocation, procedures for land allocation are often carried out for villages that have self-established the right of forest management. What are the rights associated with the forest and forestry land allocated to villages? Officials at the provincial and district levels in Cao Bang, when asked this question, said they had not thought of this. All they thought was to hand over the forest so that it would be used and managed by villages. Even Son La and Lai Chau, which had the policy of handing over forestry land to village communities, have not defined the rights of villages allocated with forestry land. In the decision issued by the People Committee of Thua Thien-Hue to hand over natural forest to the community of the village of Thuy Yen Thuong (commune of Loc Thuy, district of Phu Loc) for management, protection and benefiting, only the benefit was mentioned (as a percentage of the incremental forest growth) while other rights were not. Interviewed officials at the communal and village levels (in Cao Bang and Hoa Binh), said they had only paid attention to the right to manage and use forest products from village forest. Attention had not been paid to other rights, as they have not emerged in practice. Thus, this is a loophole in the policy when provinces hand over forest and forestry land to village communities.

No other policies have been introduced, except the policy of allocation of forest and forestry land to villages. Villages, however, are eligible to support for the village forest under projects no. 327 and 661 as households are. In Cao Bang, villages signed contract for forest protection and plantation directly with the management unit of project no. 661, and were accepted for payment by the Treasury. They do not have to take cover of households or groups of households like in other provinces. In this respect, villages already have the right and can exercise the right of executing civil transactions.

**Development Trends of Village Forest Management**

- The developments of village forest management nationwide vary in two regions:
  - In northern provinces (down to Quang Binh). Provinces in this area basically have completed the allocation of forest and land. The management of forest by different owners has been established. Therefore, the area of village forest will not vary so much, but may increase somewhat incorporating areas far from villages, hard to access, and unmanaged (currently, the district “hand over” such forest to communes or the forest protection force). Such areas may be allocated to villages if they can justify their management capacity. The area of village forest in Lai Chau, however, will decline, as part of which will be distributed to households.
  - In southern provinces (Quang Tri down to south). Southern provinces have just paid attention to handing over land to state-owned forestry
organizations (state owned forest farms, management unit of protection forest and special use forest) but to local people.

(One example: the state-owned forest farm of Loc Lam, district of Bao Lam, was allocated with more than 13,000 hectare of forest and forestry land in the commune of Loc Lam. The 333 households in the commune whereas were allocated with just agricultural land (400 hectare) but forestry land. Holy forest that had been established by villages long ago has also been allocated to the farm for management).

Such kind of forest and land allocation will be adjusted to raise the area allocated to the local people, thus the area of village forest will also increase. (On a pilot basis, the province of Dac Lac is recalling part of natural forest and forestry land of state-owned farms, which shall be allocated to village communities and households).

- Market activities will be buoyant in the land market in mountainous provinces and areas. Forestry land (convertible to industrial tree land) in the southeastern part of Vietnam and the Central Highlands has been traded or transferred (even illegally) buoyantly in the past years, thus the structure of forest by owners in these areas has changed to some extent. This is also the foreseeable future in other parts of the country, when the economy and the real estate market develop. Given that the area of community forest not so large, about 10-15% the area of forestry land, and that community forest includes holy forest, ghost forest, water source forest, etc., which are closely related to the sacred belief and traditions of the local people, the market elements will find it hard to penetrate. Conventional timber forest whereas is usually located in areas less favorable than those of household forest, thus it is of less value and the market for which is less buoyant. The transfer of village forest is more difficult than that of household forest because it needs the consensus of the entire village community and economic benefits are not the primary goal of village forest.

- A foreseeable trend is that the State will improve democracy at the level of village community, thus the administration at the village level will be improved in terms of personnel capacity and working conditions. This can be interpreted that the management of village forest will also be improved.

- The local people awareness of forest, especially of its increasingly important protection function, will rise along with the improved literacy in the rural areas. With secured food sufficiency and better performance of the poverty reduction activity, the pressure on the local people to earning a living from the forest will ease.

- The status of village forest will be justified and legally recognized at the central level.
➢ Village forest is not a pure forestry management modality but is associated with the cultural values of ethnic minorities’ community, which need to be preserved and brought into play.

➢ Most of the opinions expressed during interviews, in local reports, and in seminar on the potential development of village forest in the future indicated that village forest will exist, develop, and play an active role in forest protection and management.

Drawing on the above analysis, we believe that village forest in the future will improve and play an active role along with other types of forest in the cause of protecting and developing forest.

**Types of Village Forest Management**

**Types of Village Forest**

Drawing on the study of village forest in Cao Bang and the results of studies conducted by the Working Group and presented in the two seminars, we found the following types of village forest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Main function</th>
<th>Origination</th>
<th>Management style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Holy forest (worshipping forest, deity forest)</td>
<td>Satisfy the sacred belief and religion of the community</td>
<td>Long ago, possibly with the origination of villages</td>
<td>Strictly protected, not for exploitation of forest products. Heavy sanctions on violators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Ghost forest</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Long ago</td>
<td>Protected and not for exploitation of forest products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Water source forest (called cob bo, bo nam in the language of the Tay, Nung)</td>
<td>Satisfy the need of water for daily life and cultivation</td>
<td>Long ago, possibly with the origination of villages</td>
<td>Protected, frail or collapsed trees may be exploitable to meet demand of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Village protection forest</td>
<td>Prevention of wind, storm, landslide</td>
<td>After suffering from calamities</td>
<td>Protected; big trees not exploited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Commodity forest</td>
<td>Satisfy demand for timber and other forestry products of community and part of the demand of village members</td>
<td>When the forest in the area becomes scarce. When policy on forest and land allocation and contracting to</td>
<td>Exploitation of forestry products for community use is prioritized. Households are allowed to exploit forestry products. Villages decide on the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classification criteria for village forest:

- Objectives: sacred belief, water source, protection, forest products, grazing ground.

- Management style: strictly protected, forest products not exploitable (holy forest), combined protection and exploitation (water source forest and protection forest), exploitation of forestry products or grazing ground.

The above types of village forest are not related to the scope of area or quality of forest. Subject to the specific circumstances of each village and its population that the area of village forest would be large or small.

Conditions warranting village forest management

- Mountainous areas with forest.

- Areas with ethnic minorities.

- Village community is of solidarity, has a strong village head with good leadership skills, strong local Communist Party’s division, and mass organizations.

- Local people’s awareness of the benefits of forest to their sustainable life.

Types of village forest management

- Availability of forest protection internal rules developed and approved by village members, which are appropriate with specific conditions of the village;

- Part-time forest protection force organized, aided by information supplied by local people;

- Village head closely supervise the implementation of forest protection internal rules and impose severe sanctions on violators;

- Fund for protection of village forest set up; and

- Full authority given to villages in the management and use of village forest, taking into account the local knowledge of forest, and improved awareness raising activities regarding forest legal framework and technical skills for
forest protection and development, especially among the forest protection force and the village head.

PART FOUR
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

Village forest is popular in the northern mountainous provinces and in regions with ethnic minorities. The average percentage of communes with village forest is about 35%. There are seven provinces exhibiting a percentage of more than 50%, with Cao Bang taking the highest of 80% and Bac Giang the lowest of 4.9%. Quang Tri, a province in the central region, registers a relatively high percentage of 47%. In provinces with ethnic minorities population representing more than 50%, the percentage of communes with village forest is 40% or higher. Village forest exist not only in remote and deep areas but also in district or provincial towns with forestry land and ethnic minorities residents, such as provincial towns of Ha Giang, Lao Cai, Cao Bang, Dien Bien Phu, Son La, etc.

Not only ethnic minorities but also the Kinh minority has village forest. In the province of Quang Tri, 23 communes, representing 36% of the number of communes with village forest, are resided purely with the Kinh minority. These communes are located in the midland and coastal districts like Hai Lang, Trieu Phong, Vinh Linh, and Do Linh. In Thua Thien-Hue, however, only one village resided by the Kinh minority, namely Thuy Yen Thuong (commune of Loc Thuy, district of Phu Loc), has been allocated with forest.

The popularity of village forest is not closely related to a district’s population density. An important factor influencing village forest is the quality of land and forest allocation activity in the district and the management capacity of villages.

The area of forest under village management accounts for 10-15% the area of forestry land, of which more than 50% is covered with forest, and mainly comprises of depleted natural forest and rehabilitated juvenile forest.

The goal of village forest is to meet the sacred demand of the community, to protect the water source and to party satisfy the demand for conventional forest products.
Village forest management is a modality appreciated by the local people, State management authorities and forestry authorities as possessing many advantages, which contributes to protect the forest and the environment, and to partly satisfy the demand for forest products of the community and households. It is also a modality attracting the voluntary participation of local people in forestry activities. Village forest does not cause any conflict with other types of forest management such as those under households, forest enterprises, private farms, etc. In contrast, it has a supplementary and developmental effect on household forest management, evidenced by the fact that villages participate in the sharing of forestry land to households and assist them in forest protection. A major drawback of village forest management is the limited investment resources to improve the quality of forest rehabilitation and new plantation on bare land.

Village forest management contributes to preserving cultural traditions and features of ethnic minorities living in mountainous areas.

Regardless of the development of the market economy, village forest management will exist in the future, as it is closely related to the traditions of local people and less vulnerable to market factors. The area of village forest will not vary so much but the quality of management will improve.

The major types of village forest include holy forest, water source forest, protection forest, and commodity forest. Subject to the type of forest that villages design appropriate management styles.

The existence and development of village forest hinge upon the availability of a strong village leader and internal rules of the village. The latter must have been developed by the village members, taking into account their traditions, education level, and the specific conditions in the village, and complied with by village members voluntarily.

Trust of the management capacity of villages should be kept and autonomy given to them in terms of management measures built up from local experience. Forestry extension should also be improved in tandem with raising the awareness of the local people and community.

Recommendations

To amend the Land Law and the Law on Forest Protection and Development: specifying village community as a subject to be allocated with forestry land, issued with certificate of land use right, and granted with permanent and infinite use right (not the rights of transformation, transfer,
inheritance, mortgage, and capital contribution by value of land use right as applicable to households).

- Under the Project for Five Million Hectare of Forest, provision of capital for regeneration and new plantation of village forest should be given priority.

- To amend the regulation on exploitation of forest timber, which was issued by the MARD, to make it appropriate with the autonomy of village forest management style, towards improving the autonomy of villages in forest management and use.

**REFERENCE**


### LIST OF INTERVIEWEES IN THE PROVINCE OF CAO BANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provincial agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mr. Chuong</td>
<td>Agriculture and Rural Development Department</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pham Thong</td>
<td>Agriculture and Rural Development Department</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ly Danh Phuong</td>
<td>Agriculture and Rural Development Department</td>
<td>Head of the Party Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nguyen Van Le</td>
<td>Agriculture and Rural Development Department</td>
<td>Head of Planning Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mr. Eng</td>
<td>Forestry Development Department</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Le Van Non</td>
<td>Forestry Development Department</td>
<td>Former Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nguyen Quang Minh</td>
<td>Forest Protection Department</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mr. Thien</td>
<td>Forest Protection Department</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dam Trung Hop</td>
<td>Forest Protection Department</td>
<td>Head of Forest Protection Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Duong Kim Quy</td>
<td>Minorities and Religions Committee</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mr. Boc</td>
<td>Minorities and Religions Committee</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Luc Van Ky</td>
<td>DCDC-KTM Department</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hoang Xuan Tiep</td>
<td>DCDC-KTM Department</td>
<td>Head of Planning Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mr. Do</td>
<td>DCDC-KTM Department</td>
<td>Deputy Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nong Minh Huan</td>
<td>People’s Committee of Thong Nong</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nguyen Ngoc Dinh</td>
<td>Agriculture Division</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hoang Thi Ngon</td>
<td>Agriculture Division</td>
<td>Vice Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Nong Van Ve</td>
<td>Forest Protection Division</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dam Van Can</td>
<td>Forest Protection Division</td>
<td>Vice Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Nong Vinh Trung</td>
<td>People’s Committee of Quang Uyen</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Phung Chi Soi</td>
<td>Forest Protection Division</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Chu Van Chai</td>
<td>Forest Protection Division</td>
<td>Vice Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Position Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Luc Duc Truong</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Forest Protection Division of Nguyen Binh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Dang Hung Chuong</td>
<td>Vice Head</td>
<td>Forest Protection Division of Nguyen Binh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mrs. Nam</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry Project Management Unit of the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communal and village level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hoang Van San</td>
<td>Head of Party Division</td>
<td>commune of Ngoc Dong, Thong Nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Vuong Thi Van</td>
<td>Vice Head of Party Division</td>
<td>commune of Ngoc Dong, Thong Nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Hoang Binh Kim</td>
<td>Head of commune</td>
<td>commune of Ngoc Dong, Thong Nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Luong Van Boi</td>
<td>Deputy Head of commune</td>
<td>commune of Ngoc Dong, Thong Nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Vuong Van Hong</td>
<td>Vice Chairman of People’s Council</td>
<td>commune of Ngoc Dong, Thong Nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Hoang Van Cong</td>
<td>Head of the central village</td>
<td>commune of Ngoc Dong, Thong Nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Hoang Van Gioi</td>
<td>Deputy Head of commune</td>
<td>commune of Da Thong, Thong Nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nguyen Van Than</td>
<td>Cadastral Official</td>
<td>commune of Da Thong, Thong Nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Trieu Xuan Noi</td>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry Official</td>
<td>commune of Da Thong, Thong Nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Hoang Thi Hop</td>
<td>Head of Women Union’s division</td>
<td>commune of Da Thong, Thong Nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Nguyen Van Thang</td>
<td>Head of Fatherland Front division</td>
<td>commune of Da Thong, Thong Nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Hoang Van Thong</td>
<td>Head of village of Na Khau</td>
<td>commune of Da Thong, Thong Nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Hoang Van Kiem</td>
<td>Head of village of Da Xa</td>
<td>commune of Da Thong, Thong Nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Nguyen Van Thuyen</td>
<td>Head of village of Ban Trang</td>
<td>commute of Da Thong, Thong Nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Rien minh Don</td>
<td>Head of village of Ban Ruom</td>
<td>commute of Da Thong, Thong Nong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Nguyen Dinh An</td>
<td>Vice Chairman of People’s Committee</td>
<td>commute of Quang Hung, Quang Uyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Be Ich Hon</td>
<td>commune of Quang Hung, Quang Uyen</td>
<td>Vice Chairman of People's Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Phan Chuyen</td>
<td>commune of Hoang Hai, Quang Uyen</td>
<td>Head of Party division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Phan Thanh Hai</td>
<td>commune of Hoang Hai, Quang Uyen</td>
<td>Chairman of commune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Phan Su</td>
<td>commune of Hoang Hai, Quang Uyen</td>
<td>Vice Chairman of commune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ma Van Si</td>
<td>commune of Hoang Hai, Quang Uyen</td>
<td>Head of village of Bo Meo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Ly Kieu Sinh</td>
<td>Nguyen Binh town</td>
<td>Head of village of Thom San</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Nong Viet Toai</td>
<td>commune of Tam Kim, Nguyen Binh</td>
<td>Head of Party division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DECISION

By the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development

On

“Guideline for Provincial Forestry Development Strategy”

- Pursuant to the Decree 86/ 2003/ ND-CP dated 18 July 2003 on the assignment of function, task, right and organizational structure of MARD;

- Pursuant to the Government Decision 245/1998/QD-TTg dated 21 December 1998 on implementing the task of forest land State Management at different levels;

- Pursuant to MARD’s Decision 199/QD-B NN-PTLT dated 22 January 2002 on the approval of “2001-2010 Forestry Development Strategy”;

- Pursuant to the proposal by the Director of Forest Development Department and the Director of Personnel Department

DECIDES:

Article 1: Enclosed herewith the “Guideline for Provincial Forestry Development Strategy”.

Article 2: The budget for “Guideline for Provincial Forestry Development Strategy” is from the administrative budget

Article 3: It is the responsibility of MARD’s Senior Secretary, Directors of MARD’s Departments; Directors of DARDs, Directors of Forest Protection Sub-Departments to implement this decision.

Destination:
Guidelines for Establishment of Provincial Forestry Development Strategy

(Enclosed with MARD Decision 147/QD-BNN-LN dated 19 January 2004)

Chapter I:
General regulations

I. Foundation and legal ground for “Guideline for Provincial Forestry Development Strategy”

1. The Party’s documents and Resolutions

IX Party Congress Resolution, Resolution 28 of the Politburo on the resumed restructuring of SFEs, …;

2. Central Government’s legal documents:

- Law of the forest protection and development, The Revised Land Law;
- Decree 163/1999/QD-CP dated 16 November 1999 on the land allocation and forest land lease to organizations, households and individuals for forestry-purposed long-term use;
- Government Decision 245/1998/QD-TTg dated 11 January 2001 on management implementation of all levels for 3 forest types;
- Government Decision 661/QD-TTg dated 29/7/1998 on the target, task, policy and implementation arrangements of the 5MHRP;
- Government Decision 187/1999/QD-TTg dated 16 September 1999 on the restructure of SFEs;
- Government Decision 225/1999/QD-TTg dated 10 December 1999 on the 2000-2005 program of seeds, breed animals and forest seedlings;
- Government Decision 178/2001/QD-TTg dated 12 November 2001 on the beneficiary right and task of households and individuals allocated and leased with forest land;
- Government Decision 03/2001/QD-TTg dated 19 December 2001 on the approval of national forest and land inventory results;


- Government Decision on the approval of 2001-2010 Provincial and Territorial Socio-Economics Development Program.

- Government Decision on the approval of provinces’ land use plan, planning and revised, supplementary land use plan and planning.

- Government Decision on the approval of local forest-related projects and programs such as the socio-economics development in remote, mountainous and specially disadvantaged communes (program 135);

- Government Decision 179/2003/QD-TTg on the implementation plan of the Politburo's Resolution 28;

- Other related documents
  3. MARD’s documents and project proposals

  - Strategy for 2001-2010 forestry, agriculture and rural development;

  - Strategy for 2001-2010 forestry development (released under the decision 199/2002/QD/BNN-LN dated 22 October 2002;

  - Nationwide Development Planning of 3 forest function classes;

  - Forestry modernization and industrialization program;

  - 2003-2010 forestry, agriculture and rural structure shifting and planning;

  - Planning of nationwide seedlings provision network;

  - Planning of paper raw material and MDF area;

  - Relevant agencies’ documents and programs;

  4. Provincial documents and policies

  - Provincial socio-economic development strategy by 2010;

  - Provincial and district resolutions, decisions… relevant for strategy set-up (PPC’s resolution, People Council’s resolutions, PPC decision on the approval of 3 forest function classes and utilization of bare land and hill by 2010.

II. Purposes and requirements for the establishment of “Guidelines for provincial forest development strategy”
1. Purposes

1.1 To lead and direct the implementation of forest development task and socio-economic development strategy generalization in the province;

1.2 To set up the planning and determination of priority programs/projects and establishment of provincial short-term and long-term forest development plan;

2. Requirements

The Provincial Forestry Development Strategy (PFDS) to be established must meet the following requirements:

2.1. Guarantee the harmonization and combination of economic development, social advancement and justice, environment security and national defense.

2.2. Meet present requirements and allow for future ones.

2.3. Specify the national forestry development strategy in the province that is in line with the provincial socio-economic development strategy and seen against the regional socio-economic and forestry development background.

2.4 Proceed from current local socio-economic situations;

2.5 Has the participation from individuals and organizations that directly relate to forestry activities.

2.6 The Forestry Development Strategy report must summarize basic information, update documents, and must be precise, clear and grounded. Its contents and outlay must be concise and straightforward.

2.7 Be advanced, scientific and relevant with the course of national industrialization and modernization; practical and unbiased.

III. Authority over the establishment, appraisal and ratification of Provincial Forestry Development Strategy

1. The agency to build the Provincial Forestry Development Strategy

1.1. Presiding agency: MARD

1.2. Co-coordinating agencies:

- MPI
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
- MoFi.

1.3 Ratifying agency: Provincial People’s Committee (PPC).
IV. The achievements of Provincial Forestry Development Strategy Establishment

1. Documents:
   1.1. Report of “2001-2010 provincial forestry development strategy”, appendixes, tables (maps and explanation tables, detailed reports of each of the components);
   1.2. Submission Letter for approval of the Provincial Forestry Development Strategy (enclosed with appraisal documents);
   1.3. Decision on the approval of Provincial Forestry Development Strategy by PPC chairman;

2. Maps at the scale of 1/100,000
   2.1 Forest Resources and Current Land Use Map;
   2.2 Forestry Development Planning by 2010 Map;

Chapter 2 Contents and proceeding steps
The establishment of Provincial Forestry Development Strategy consists of 5 steps:

1. Set up the Steering Board and Working Group;
2. Collect relevant necessary data and information;
3. Generalize, study and analyze information;
5. Conduct workshop, appraisal, and approval of Provincial Forestry Development Strategy.

Step 1: Set up the Steering Board and Working Group

1. Set up the Provincial Steering Board
   1.1 Composition
   - Director: PPC Vice Chairman in charge of the economics, forestry, agriculture and rural development;
   - Vice Director: Director and Vice Director of DARD;
   - Members: Director and Vice Director of DARD and relevant agencies; Chairmen and Vice Chairmen of DPCs of the districts where there are forest focuses; Directors of local forestry units (if any) directly under the central level.

   1.2 Task
- Set up the overall plan of the provincial forestry development strategy establishment;
- Select consultants and form the working group;
- Direct, check, supervise the working group’s implementation of the provincial forestry development strategy;
- Preside meetings, solve problems.

2. **Form the working group**

2.1 The composition of the working group consists of representatives from the following agencies:
- DARD;
- Forestry Development Sub-Department;
- Forestry Protection Sub-Department;
- DPI
- Department of Natural Resources and Environment;
- MoFi;
- Department of Science and Technology;
- Forestry and agriculture inventory and planning delegation (or unit having similar function).

With Leader and members of working groups.

2.2 Working Group’s task
- Provide consultancy service to Steering Board for the set-up of the overall plan (activities, budgets…) and establishment of the provincial forestry development strategy to submit to the PPC for approval;
- Assign specific tasks to (each of) the members of the working group;
- Implement the plan of the provincial forestry development strategy establishment;
- Prepare implements (stationery, documents, finance…) for the plan implementation.
- Collect necessary relevant data and information;
- Analyze and generalize the information;
- Take minutes of meeting, write sectional reports and draft report of the provincial forestry development strategy;
- Hold workshops, supplement ideas, finalizing draft of the provincial forestry development strategy to submit to the governments of different levels for appraisal and approval.
Step 2: Collection of necessary relevant data/information and additional researches

1. **Collection of maps**
   - Provincial administrative map;
   - Provincial current land use map and 3 forest function class map (special-use, protection, production);
   - Provincial current land use map and 3 forest function class map with commune boundaries according to the Decree 364;
   - District and provincial forest land allocation maps;
   - Land use planning and forest development map (of the forestry programs/projects), and local processing industry map (if any).

2. **Collection of relevant documents and additional researches**
   - Relevant government-issued documents, resolutions, legal regulations and policies;
   - Documents of provincial forest land planning, management, protection and utilization and the situation of project 661 and other local forestry projects;
   - Documents of the provincial overall socio-economic development planning and documents of other relevant agencies’ planning in the locality;
   - Socio-economics information, especially that on the advantages and disadvantages of the province in developing present and future socio-economics, which includes:
     + Population, ethnicity, educational levels, labor, forest-related employment, people's income of the province (especially mountainous farmers, forestry workers)…;
     + Forest land use situation, production experiences, cultivation practices, organization and management of forest utilization and development; forest main products, forestry sector’s contribution to GDP, demand for and information of local, domestic and foreign market of forest product that are related to the provincial forestry.
     + Organizational structure of local forestry personnel and labor

Step 3: Generalization, research and analyze information

1. **Main information needs analyzing, assessing and generalizing**
   1.1 Information on the physical features (geographical location, climate, hydrological characteristics and forest resources, etc…) and socio-economics (population, labor, GDP, structure shift, etc…), clarification of forestry sector’s contribution to the GDP of
the province and employment/ income generation, forestry personnel and labor organizational structure.

1.2 Information on the mechanism, policy and legal documents for forest (3 forest types) management and utilization; orientation and target of the provincial, regional and national socio-economic development.

1.3 Information on the assessment of forest resources developments, which is inclusive of land use, forest products (yield, transport, processing, market); forestry science and technology; human resources development, foreign investment and co-operation, etc.

1.4 Analysis and forecast of factors and conditions that are influential to forestry production, such as: forecast of environment, population growth, labor, domestic consumption demand and export; analysis of competitive factors and forecast of forest technological and scientific advancement by 2010.

1.5 Analysis, generalization and determination of opinions and development target of:

- Comprehensive, diversified, stable and sustainable forestry development in the direction of industrialization, modernization with focus on goods production.

- Determination forestry role in the social stabilization, environment protection and development of other economic sectors.

- Development rate, and determination of forestry structure in the provincial economy.

- Determination of development target (in terms of economy, society, environment protection and national defense).

- Determination of some norm of forest products and goods…

1.6 Generalization of information, set-up of forestry development orientation, which include the following:

- Review of stable forestry planning (3 forest function classes planning)

- Effective forest resources management and utilization and land planned for forestry purpose.

- Industrialization and modernization of forestry.

1.7 Determination of main solution for forestry development that include:

- Direct and organize the system of production units, socialize the forestry business
- Select technological solutions: seeds, techniques of cultivation, harvesting and processing, forestry extension work, etc…
- Labor structure shift, training and capacity building.
- Infrastructure construction and support from different sectors.
- System of policy on land use, forestland protection and utilization, rights and obligations of the forestry workers, etc…
- Investment fund solution.

1.8 Determination of priority programs and projects, and order of the strategy implementation.

2. Approach of information analysis and generalization

2.1. The participatory approach that is used throughout the process of the provincial forestry development strategy establishment.

2.2. The professional approach that is used to generalize and analyze information.

2.3. The statistic approach that is used with the help of computer for data analysis and database setup.

2.4. The approach of model analysis is also used to produce and select appropriate plans and solutions in the provincial forestry development strategy.

2.5. The manual approach and information technology, or the combination of the two approaches to set up the system of maps and data.

3. The tools for information analysis and generalization

3.1. Computers, printers (including the printers for printing colored big-sized maps, if any).

3.2. Computer software application (Map/Info, ArcView, Arc/Info etc) used for the set-up of data and map system.

3.3. Other tools, such as the system of partially formal questions, logic frames, tables, and maps.

3.4. The manual tool and semi-manual tools like simple computer, technical drawing sets, tracing paper, topographical map, printing paper etc.

Step 4: Set up the achievements of the report “Provincial Forestry Development Strategy”

1. Write draft report “Provincial Forestry Development Strategy”.
2. Set up appendixes
3. Write submission letter for the appraisal and approval of the Provincial Forestry Development Strategy.
(For details, please refer to the Chapter 3).

Step 5: Hold workshop and finalize, appraise and approve the report “Provincial Forestry Development Strategy”.

- 1st workshop: among the members of Working Group
- 2nd workshop: among the Steering Board and Working Group
- 3rd workshop: among representatives of PPCs, relevant departments, agencies and organization at provincial level, directors of SFEs, Protection and Special-Use Forest Management Board in the locality.
- Ask for written consultation from DPCs and relevant departments, agencies at provincial level.
- Ask for written appraisal from MARD and relevant Ministries and agencies as said in the 2 (III) of Chapter I.
- Submission to PPC for approval.

Report achievement development

Outline (guidelines) of provincial forestry development strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>No. of page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appreciation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Table of contents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vocabulary explanation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategy summary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preface</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Part I:</td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of provincial physical and socio-economic situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geographical position and physical features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Geographical position and climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Physical characteristics (climate, land, forest resource, water resource)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Socio-economic features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Population, distribution, literacy, labour assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>General situation of provincial and regional economic development and economic structure shifts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The situation of society and security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The situation of domestic investment, credit and overseas investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part II:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>General evaluation on forestry activities in the period of 1991 – 2000</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Current situation of provincial forestry sector (2001-2003)</td>
<td>3–4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Current situation of forest resource and forest land use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Current situation of forest management, protection and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Current situation of forestry sector management and organization, forest management and forestry business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Technology application and human resource training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Forestry policy mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>National programs and investments in forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Forestry sector efficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III **Shortcomings and challenges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Basic shortcomings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Advantages and challenges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part III:
**Provincial forestry sector development strategy (2001 – 2010)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Forecasts</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forecasts on population, poverty and forest dependence of poor people, ethnic minority and women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Forecasts on forest resource and environment development needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Forecasts on the needs of protection forest and environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2</strong></td>
<td>Forecasts on provincial needs of wood use and outside consumption (including export)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3</strong></td>
<td>Forecasts on the needs of firewood and other forest products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4</strong></td>
<td>Forecasts on markets for forest products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>Forecasts on land use needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>Forecasts on scientific technology development in forestry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>Other forecasts (infrastructure...)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II Forestry development viewpoints and objective

#### 1 Provincial forestry development viewpoints

#### 2 Forestry development objectives

#### 2.1 Specific objective

Some specific targets:

- Provincial forest coverage (%):
- Special – use forest development (ha):
- Protection forest development (ha):
- Production forest development (ha):
- Implementation of land allocation, long-term forest contract in accordance with Government issued beneficiary policy for target groups
- Yield of plantation (m$^3$), natural forest (m$^3$):
- Yield of NTFPs: bamboo, pine resin, firewood, cinnamon bark...
- Export turn-over:
- Solution of employment, poverty reduction for people living near the forest
- Human resource:

### III Forestry development orientation in the period of 2001 – 2010

#### 1 Establishment, development and stabilization of 3 types of forest (special – use, protection and production)

1.1 Planning stably 3 forest types

1.2 Protection, development and expansion of 3 forest types:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Protection, zoning for regeneration, centralized plantation, scattered plantation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Forest decentralization and forestry socialization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Effective forest land and resource use:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material area planning along with processing industry and forest product consumption...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Forestry sector industrialization and modernization</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV Key solutions of provincial forestry development (2001 – 2010) 9 – 10**

1 **Organization and institution solutions** 1

1.1 State administration renovation at all levels

1.2 Renovation of State Forest Enterprises, state processing and forest trading enterprises

1.3 Village – based forestry socialization

1.4 Reinforcement of coordination with regional projects, programs

2 **Solutions of scientific technologies** 1 – 2

2.1 Planning the network of seedlings supply, scale and production methods of high value, productivity and quality species. Selecting and crossbreeding the group of high quality seedlings.

2.2 Solutions on forestry extension, building and transferring new process, progress in permanent economic plantation with high quality.

2.3 Solutions on natural forest rehabilitation; development of sustainable forest management model.

2.4 Solutions on the application of advanced technology in processing so as to improve the quality of goods

2.5 Informatics technology application in forest management and resource happenings monitoring.

2.6 Forest fire and insect prevention

2.7 Researching other science on forestry

3 **Solutions on institutions and policies for forestry development** 2

3.1 Beneficiary policies after allocating and contracting forest and planned land for forestry purposes (178/ CP)

3.2 Investment encouragement policies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Policies on allocating, contracting forest and land for forestry purposes so as to provide incentives to different economic sectors participating in forestry development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Other policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solutions on human resource development training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Retraining on management and professional qualification for local staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Trainings for new management officers and technicians balancing each field and appropriate the needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Increasing training courses for local trainers on techniques of forestation and forest management and protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Financial solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Increasing state budget for forest protection and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Calling for domestic and overseas investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Efficiency fund management and use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Prior programs, projects: objectives, outputs and estimated cost of each program, project implementation.

1. Programs on forest, land allocation, contracting and hire
2. Continuous rearrangement, renovation of State Forest Enterprises
3. Programs, projects on forest protection and development
   - 3.1 5 MHRP in the province
   - 3.2 Centralized material and scattered plantation program
   - 3.3 Forestry seedlings development program
   - 3.4 Forest fire prevention and protection program
   - 3.5 Sustainable forest development and management program
   - 3.6 Biodiversity conservation program
   - 3.7 Other programs (if any)
4. Forest products and wood processing development application program
5. Trade promotion program
6. Forest resource investigation, monitoring and evaluation program
7. Human resource training program
8. Other programs (if any)

### Expectedly obtained assumptions

1. Open and synchronous policy system
2. The satisfaction of funds
3. Influences and threats on economy, environment, society and labour source attraction
4. Natural disaster, insect and forest fire prevention

### Part IV: Provincial forestry development strategy implementation arrangements and investment plan

1. Implementation arrangements
   - 1.1 Decentralization of responsibilities, duties to lower levels, related departments and agencies, and steering and executing system for
strategy implementation.

1.2 Developing the action plan to carry out solutions, programs periodically

2 Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) 2

2.1 Indicators, evaluation criteria based on time and expected results

2.2 Applied methods of data collection analysis

2.3 M&E plan and process

3 Financial needs

3.1 General estimate on financial needs for the action plan aimed at carrying out solutions, programs by specific stage

3.2 Expected state budget distribution

3.3 Finance creation mechanism for provincial forestry development strategy implementation

4 Efficiency prediction of provincial forestry development strategy 1

4.1 Environment: forest coverage increase, natural disaster reduction, regulation of climate, water source, erosion decrease...; facilitating sustainable agriculture production.

4.2 Economy: GDP contribution increase, income generation for local people in poverty reduction; satisfaction of forest product needs, enterprise benefit increase...

4.3 Society and security defence: employment provision aimed at restricting unemployment, shifting cultivation restriction, literacy improvement, reduction of social evils, contribution in politics stabilization, especially in boundary, mountainous and remote areas.

Part V: Conclusions and recommendations 1 – 2

1 Conclusions:

2 Recommendations: on policy mechanism, investment, evaluation and approval.

There follows also many detailed tables and forms, that are not included here.