



# SPARK newsletter

Promoting community-based approaches in natural resource management in South East Asia



Issue No 13, October 2003 English Version

Produced by Voluntary Service Overseas Philippines and Environmental Science for Social Change

CONTENTS	
Learning From the VSO-NTFP-ESSC Study Tour	2
"Watershed Rehabilitation", what is that?	4
Learning about Rattan in Agusan del Sur	5
Strengthening the Local Community Through Environmental Education	6
Watershed Community Network in the North of Thailand	7
Using Tools to Build Shared Understandings, Using a Sustainable Livelihoods Framework to Learn	8
Training and Resources	10

## Making Communication and Networking Effective

*Mariel de Jesus (ESSC) and Ronet Santos (VSO)*

Recently we've been using the term "end users" often, in an effort to focus on our goal of improving the lives of the disadvantaged. The term refers to beneficiaries of our work in promoting community-based approaches in natural resource management.

Another often used term is "service providers." In natural resource management (NRM), this refers to the institutions implementing policies and programs that assist communities in their use of natural resources.

Fishers, farmers, people dependent on non-timber forest products are "end users". Government institutions that regulate natural resource use, provide extension services, conduct research activities, and keep records of natural resource users are "service providers." Non-government organizations may also assist in service provision. End users may also be involved in this, through co-management arrangements or community-based natural resource management initiatives.

End users and service providers belong to different "conversation groups." A conversation group is composed of people that are in constant communication with each other. This communication allows them to assess their situation and make decisions. Fishers in a community or the members of a fishers' federation can make up a conversation group.

Communication between different "conversation groups" is not easy. A powerful group may impose their views, resulting in bias. If communication between end users and service providers in one geographical area using one language is not easy, it is even more challenging when different countries and languages are involved.

Effective networking can enrich strategies for NRM. Groups from different countries, but similar situations, can learn from each other. However, cross-country sharing is challenging. Access to translation facilities does not ensure effective networking in a multilingual context. Translation does not equate communication. Deeper meanings and connotations may not always be captured by direct translation.

Last quarter's issue focused on the results of the first joint SPARK-STREAM<sup>1</sup> workshop on livelihoods and languages. This issue contains applications of concepts learned from the second workshop held in June 2003. The articles describe the challenges of analysing the needs of communities in Agusan, Philippines and in Northern Thailand, and emphasise the importance of effective communication between end users and service providers.

Let us not forget that there is a wide network of individuals and organizations that we can network with and learn from. By building networks and fostering relationships, we can support each other towards achieving our goal of effective CBNRM.

The SPARK newsletter is a quarterly publication produced in Thai, Bahasa Indonesia and English aimed at practitioners of community-based natural resource management in Thailand, Indonesia, and the Philippines. It is received by about 900 organizations in these countries. The newsletter is intended to serve as a networking tool to encourage the sharing of knowledge, experiences, ideas and cooperation amongst different groups implementing CBNRM activities in the three programme countries.

SPARK e-mail address:  
[rpc.spark@qinet.net](mailto:rpc.spark@qinet.net)  
Telephone: 0632 927-3304,  
Fax: 0632 426-2761  
Address: 20 South Lawin Avenue, Philam Homes, Quezon City, Philippines  
Homepage:  
[www.vso.org.uk/overseas/spark.htm](http://www.vso.org.uk/overseas/spark.htm)

**SPARK is funded by**



<sup>1</sup> Sharing and Promotion of Awareness and Regional Knowledge and Support to Regional Aquatic resource Management.



# Learning From the VSO-NTFP-ESSC Study Tour

By: Kagawad Myron Tortola, Impasugong, Bukidnon

Four decades and three years ago, Impasugong was still behind compared to other municipalities in Bukidnon. Its vast natural resources, however, spread along Mt. Kitanglad from the south and Mt. Kimangkil from the north to make it one of the richest municipalities in the province of Bukidnon. The town is blessed in abundance with wildlife both from its virgin rainforests and clear waters from its rivers, lakes and springs. The two great watersheds of Pulangi and Tagoloan support the Cotabato provinces and Macajalar bay in Misamis Oriental respectively. In the broader area of its landscape, the municipality is also endowed with vast plains and ranges. 82.68% is considered forest land and 17.32% is alienable and disposable land.

The population of Impasugong is approximately 31,000 people, 65% of which belong to the Higaonon tribe. Agriculture is the primary source of livelihood for most of the population from traditional to commercial crops. The municipality has experienced a rapid pace of agricultural intensification. Forestlands have been sacrificed and converted into farm lands. Denudation has resulted in increasing loss of biodiversity, soil erosion, and water quality degradation. Logging companies, corporate farming, and massive migration also contribute to the rapid decline of the municipalities natural resources.

## ***The challenge for conservation***

Today the municipality is faced with a challenge...a challenge to balance the preservation and protection of the environment while ensuring the viability of local autonomy in accelerating economic development and upgrading the quality of life of its people. Despite appropriate laws that have already been enacted, timber poaching still exists and the rarest of naturally growing species are endangered. Chemical residues from plantations also poison the rivers and streams.

These trends pose a constant threat to the already fragile environment of the municipality. There is, therefore, a need to develop a sustainable long term

environmental policy framework for Impasugong. Such a framework shall provide policy and procedural guidelines in ensuring a holistic and workable system of managing the environment of the municipality.

The Local Government Unit (LGU) is critical in the formulation and implementation of the said environmental policy framework. The decentralization and devolution to the local government makes the LGU a key actor in natural resource governance. But the LGU's capacity to manage is limited if not exercised in collaboration with the private sector and the communities residing in the various *barangays* or villages of the municipality.

## ***Exchange Visit to Northern Luzon***

In March 2003, the Volunteer Service Overseas (VSO), Non-timber Forest Product – Exchange Programme for Southeast Asia (NTFP-EP) and Environmental Science for Social Change (ESSC) organized an exposure visit entitled “**Decentralizing Natural Resource Management: collaborative initiatives between local governments and local communities**.” I had the opportunity of joining other Mindanao and Indonesian government and NGO representatives



Study tour participants discussing a drawing at the Lower Magat Forest Reserve

...continue on page 3



from page 2...

to visit LGUs in Northern Luzon that were known for their governance of natural resources. These LGUs are considered models in their efforts to work with other sectors on resource management concerns. My interest was also to see how LGUs are dealing both with economic concerns and ecological protection. From this visit, we realized that the challenges faced by other LGUs are most similar to those in Impasugong.

In Imugan, a barrio of Sta Fe, Nueva Vizcaya, the government granted the *Ikalahan*, the mountain dwelling people, the right to manage their resources through a communal lease agreement. This was the first agreement of its kind. It gave the impetus to the government for recognition of the vital role and active participation of the local community in the preservation and conservation of natural resources. As observed, the place is utilized economically. Agricultural production exists as well as commerce.

Another place visited was the Barobbob watershed (429 has) also in Nueva Vizcaya. The government granted the cooperative an Agroforestry Land Management Agreement (ALMA) to develop the area, to protect the area from squatters, and of course to conserve the watershed. Credit facilities were also granted by government and micro-economic activity appears to be productive and functioning. The nearby Lower Magat Reservation (24,251 has) is learning from the Barobbob experience, and a new level of awareness has been raised among the people to develop the relatively barren area after also receiving ALMAs.

But as some problems of balancing economic and environmental concerns were addressed, there were also others that remained unanswered or other questions that were raised. In Imugan, though the community is well organized and managing their enterprises, decisions appear to be very centralized which raises questions on leadership in the future. The Barobbob watershed as in the larger Lower Magat Watershed, tenurial rights were secured but as admitted by the LGU, more work was needed in terms of rehabilitation and programs on self-reliance and savings generation. The LGU may also look into subdividing Lower Magat into smaller subdivisions to prevent the growth of large landlords.

The last place visited was the town of Besao in the Mountain Province. This was a remote municipality with both mossy and pine forest. The water resources are especially fully utilized for their rice terraces. Unfortunately, water is becoming scarce. Maybe the good integration of the traditional Kankanaey leadership structure with the existing political structure of the barangay and municipality can work to sort out these problems.

### ***Insights for Impasugong***

Overall, the land management agreement (ALMA) was one of my greatest learnings from the exchange visit. The ALMA is a concrete example of how granting tenure to local people provides an incentive for them to conserve forest resources. In Bgy, Hagpa in Impasugong, the Higaonon community is also trying to apply for a Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title (CADT). It is believed that the recognition of the ownership of these people over their lands is accompanied by a responsibility in protecting the resources within the domain. The role of the LGU would be to support both the ecological and economic projects of the Higaonon within the domain.

Our environmental policy framework appears to be moving in the direction of that of Nueva Vizcaya and Besao where participation from local stakeholders is the key to effective management. The multi-sectoral Task Force – *Cumadon* (indigenous) was established by the local government to integrate the watershed plan, *barangay* development plan and ancestral domain management plan in Hagpa. TF *Cumadon* works to harmonize the various strategy documents.

This experience in Northern Luzon has paved the way for a more in depth study on the municipality of Impasugong. It has also validated our own strategies. However with the present challenge Impasugong is facing, considering its rich diverse ecosystem, further experiences must also be explored. It is now up to the leaders, NGOs, POs and all sectors of society to have one unified mechanism to preserve and conserve the remaining resource base of the municipality without hampering the already booming economy of the place.

*For more information please contact:  
crissyg33@yahoo.com*



# “Watershed Rehabilitation”, what is that?

## The importance of clarifying terms

By Robert Kockelkoren

Terminologies can be confusing. Development jargon like “sustainability” and “livelihoods” may be interpreted in different ways by different people. It is important to define and clarify terms and get a common understanding of their meaning, or confusion will reign. This may require some serious discussion.

Clarifying terminology turns out to be an important aspect in the initial stages of my VSO placement in the Municipality of Salcedo, Eastern Samar, Philippines. I arrived here in May 2003 to assist the Municipal Government and the Eastern Samar State College (ESSC) Salcedo in a project in which “watershed rehabilitation” is the central theme.

During my first visits to the communities in the proposed project area, people asked me: “What are you doing here?” My response was something like: “I am a volunteer working for the Municipal Government on a project to rehabilitate the Salcedo Watershed.” I noticed that people interpreted my words in different ways. Most thought I had come to repair the village water systems: fix the cracks in reservoirs and pipelines. Others thought I was going to help them to build irrigation systems for rice farming. Some thought that I had come to plant trees.

It is not strange that people were confused about the terminology used. Actually I started to wonder myself: what IS “watershed rehabilitation” and where is the “Salcedo Watershed” located to begin with? Even my colleagues at the Municipal Building and at ESSC Salcedo had differing views on that. A common understanding of terms is needed.

The area known among local residents as “the Watershed Area” encompasses some 70 ha of mainly forested land that supplies the drinking water for the town of Salcedo. Indeed this area corresponds reasonably well with the official definition of a watershed used by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR): “a topographically delineated area of land from which rainwater can drain, as surface run-off via a specific stream or river system to a common outlet point which may be a dam, irrigation system or urban water supply take-off point, or where the stream discharges into a river, lake or the sea.”

So is this the Salcedo Watershed? It has been argued that the definition should be widened to include the whole of Salcedo’s central uplands because the rivers and springs that emerge from that area are vital for the water supply of the whole municipality.

As to “watershed rehabilitation”, the problem with that term is that it is a difficult one, encompassing a wide variety of possible interventions and management practices. Actually there is no standard recipe to rehabilitate a watershed for the simple reason that no two watersheds are alike. Those community members who thought that I had come to plant trees were probably nearest the mark, but planting trees alone is not watershed rehabilitation. The core of rehabilitating the Salcedo Watershed lies in helping people to make their “livelihoods” more “sustainable”. This means: help them to develop activities that will fully fulfill their and their families’ needs now and in the future without further depleting the scarce forest resources. Activities that will even enhance the municipality’s biophysical and socio-economic assets, through for instance the planting of trees, more diversity in crops planted and a sustained supply of water.

The discussion on how to rehabilitate the Salcedo Watershed is ongoing. Viewpoints change and new ideas are born continuously as new pieces of information become available. It is vital that the communities who use the Salcedo Watershed are actively involved in this discussion, as one thing is for sure: watershed rehabilitation cannot succeed without their active support and participation. The discussion therefore has to be held in a language that is understandable to all and terms that may cause confusion will have to be clarified. Because if people don’t understand the discussion, how can they participate?

*Robert Kockelkoren is an agroforester working with the Municipal Planning and Development Office of Salcedo, Eastern Samar. For more information, email robert\_salcedolgu@yahoo.com*

\*\*\*



## Learning about Rattan in Agusan del Sur

*By Mariel Q. de Jesus*

Many of us perhaps have seen finished rattan products: chairs, tables and other decorative pieces. Those of us from the Philippines know that many of these items are produced in Cebu. But not many are aware of how these are made, and are not aware that in some cases the story begins all the way in Agusan del Sur...

The Voluntary Service Philippines (VSOP) and its partner organization Environmental Science for Social Change (ESSC) conducted an assessment in Agusan del Sur on the request of the Provincial Governor Adolph Plaza. The Governor was requesting assistance in implementing the province's natural resource management (NRM) programme. ESSC works with the Agusan provincial government and is also the hub organization of SPARK in the Philippines. VSOP and ESSC designed a workshop that would help describe the NRM-related service provision system in the province and identify the end users of these services. By first identifying any "choke-points" that prevent end users from improving their lives, effective and appropriate development interventions can be designed.

SPARK and Support to Regional Aquatic Resources Management (STREAM) have undertaken two workshops on Livelihoods and Languages. One main lesson was the importance of ensuring that stakeholders are "on the same page". The opportunity of doing an assessment in Agusan was also an opportunity for stakeholders to build a common understanding of the provincial situation. It was important for the local government, VSO and ESSC to be clear on who the end users are for NRM services, and who are responsible for delivering these services.

Agusan del Sur is a major supplier of raw or semi-processed rattan in the Philippines. Upland communities depend on rattan for their livelihoods. Although they are essential to the rattan industry, the gatherers are often overlooked. At least, this was what we learned from Josefa Martinez.

Martinez is a rattan permit holder, and a member of the cooperative, Agusan Highlanders Incorporated. She buys rattan from the gatherers and stores them in her stockyards in La Paz and Loreto. She also does semi-processing of the rattan and oversees the export to Cebu. She maintains that the province should encourage investments in order to develop the rattan industry in Agusan del Sur. The province would reap greater benefits if it could process

the rattan itself, instead of exporting to Cebu. This would help relieve the poverty of the rattan dependent community. The visit to Mrs. Martinez revealed the largely invisible community of rattan gatherers and the lack of an adequate mechanism to address their needs. For although she is recognized as end user, being the permit holder, there is another layer of end-users – the rattan gatherers - that remains hidden.

The rattan gatherers, especially those living and working in their ancestral domains, have no security of tenure. This is currently being addressed through the issuance and recognition of Certificate of Ancestral Domains Claims (CADCs). Securing tenure for the gatherers is an important step to securing their livelihood. But the rattan dependent community, including the traders like Mrs. Martinez, face numerous challenges. The rattan gatherers and traders are at the mercy of the market, and are unable to negotiate for better prices. The rattan travels a long route with roadblocks and checkpoints. Passing these checkpoints often means shelling out extra cash, Mrs. Martinez says. Rattan gatherers need to support in making their harvesting more efficient and sustainable. Rattan gathering involves much hard labor. Mrs. Martinez says that the rattan gatherers have a very difficult life, and because of their remote location, access to basic social services is minimal, further adding to their situation of poverty.

By using the sustainable livelihoods (SL) framework, VSO and ESSC realized the need for capacity building for the rattan dependent community, specifically in giving them appropriate technology for sustainable rattan harvest and management. Perhaps the province can also develop and expand its rattan industry.

The use of the SL framework through participatory processes, like focus group discussions and interviews helped to uncover the community behind the rattan products that we see in the market. With the learnings gained from the assessment, VSO, ESSC and the provincial government now have a better basis for developing the right development intervention that will respond to the real needs of the end users.

*For more information please contact  
esscsprk@mozcom.com*



# Strengthening the Local Community Through Environmental Education

By : Primanto Nugroho

JPL Kendari conducted a study tour to three areas in Southeast Sulawesi last year. Through the visit to the three areas, two types of environmental education programs were seen: one type focuses on the local community as the recipient of the education program and the second focused on the power of the local community. This article will focus on one village visited during the study tour.

The second stop in the study tour was the Wapulaka Village in Buton Island. In 1967, the village was called Desa Bahari, meaning maritime village. The community in Wapulaka village sees education not only as something that happens in school. Rather education for them is a process of instituting and transforming life values. The biggest question of the fishermen from the village was: "How should we, as the local community, maintain our environment?"

Wapulaka village is a fishing village. The sea is the main source of livelihood, specifically through shark fishing. There is a very good market for shark fin. The fishermen fish in the Papua waters and the waters of the Australian coast. The hilly land in the area is also used by Wapulaka for agriculture. Corn, sweet potato, and guava are grown here. Coconut trees are also found in the beach area.

The village has a school as well as a government health facility. However, there is still a need for a road that will connect it to the main district area. Water and electricity are also necessities that need to be focused on. There is only one spring well in Wapulaka. The well was built through community initiative.

The customary leader, the Parabela, and the Pitaka ceremony are two of the institutions in the village. Many local problems, including those related to the environment, are resolved through these custom-

ary institutions. For example, using bombs to catch fish was once a problem for the area. But they are now able to control this by using traditional methods, which have been used by the older generations.

Population growth is one of the main problems in Wapulaka. This is problematic in terms of finding work, and also of maintaining the natural resources for a growing population. How can fresh water resources be made sustainable and available for the next generation? The village is also affected by external pressure, particularly from pressure from the market. The shark fin market affects the price of gasoline, the price of boat rental, as well as materials for building the boats.

Social information is a format that can be developed through production of information material and dissemination of this through the media. This can be facilitated by an environmental NGO. Information from local people about the environment can have a lot of meaning for the local community. Stories and legends that have been passed down for generations are important parts of developing the community's identity. There is also a need to build social institutions and strengthen them. Communities should be able to build relationships with each other to form networks.

Environmental education can be one way to strengthen the customary institutions in communities, as well as to facilitate training for the youth in fishing and for labor in the service sectors.

*Primanto Nugroho is member (staff) of Yayasan Humana – Yogyakarta. This article is his summary as facilitator in study tour of JPL Kendari, Province of Southeast Sulawesi.*

\*\*\*



## Watershed Community Network in the North of Thailand

*By Northern Watershed Sustainable Management Through Community Organisation Project*

There are seven main watersheds in Northern Thailand. Various ethnic groups live in these areas, and rely on the river catchments for food, agriculture and protection. These communities manage the watershed, believing that self-reliance is the key to sustainable livelihoods. The communities maintain that everything in the ecosystem is linked. If one part of the ecosystem is altered or disturbed, there is a corresponding effect in another part of the ecosystem. Based on this concept, if natural resource degradation occurs in one community, there would be impact on other communities in the watershed as well.

What is remarkable in the case of northern Thailand is how the watershed communities have collaborated to come up with a common watershed management strategy and resource utilization plan. To implement this they established a sub-watershed community network. A committee is selected from each community to oversee the management plan and to network with the other sub-watershed community organizations. The sub-watershed network thus builds a larger community network to protect the watershed. This system is described below using the example of the Ping community network.

The Ping River originates from Tuai Mountain, Ampur Chiang Down, Chiang Mai Province and flows through Ampur Chiang Down, Mae Tang, Mae Rim, Chiang Mai and many other provinces, before entering Tak Province to meet at the Wang River. Geographically, the Ping watershed is a large low-lying area that is suitable for agriculture. The Upper Mae Ping Watershed network (composed of Ping, Mae Tang and Mae Yad River) covers 3 Ampurs in Chiang Mai Province. There are a number of ethnic groups residing there, namely, the lowland Thai, Karen, Lue, Tai Yai, Lahu, Lesu, Hmong, Arka, and Palong, among others. Eighty percent of the area was declared as a conservation area. Because of this, communities have lost their land tenure and right to collect food in the forest area. In response, the communities mobilized in 1996 and began to seek advice and sup-

port from NGOs, government officials and other nearby communities.

This mobilization led to the establishment of the Community Forest of Mae Ping Watershed Committee in 1998. When this started, there were a total of 14 participating villages. The network has since expanded to cover 54 villages (24 network committees), managing 29 forests with an area of about 572 hectares. Watershed meetings are held monthly, where village representatives give reports on the NRM situation.

Villages used to be represented by the elders, but they had limited capacity to communicate and share information with the other networks. This resulted in inconsistency and inefficiency in coordination and in information sharing. Consequently, each village decided to restructure their organization. They clearly identified roles to ensure that representatives would attend the network meetings. They also increased the involvement of women and youth, who assisted in setting up the coordination committee of the network. This committee is responsible for coordination, facilitation of sharing and providing assistance during emergency situations.

The watershed committee faced numerous obstacles at first. Coordination between watershed committees was difficult because the distance between villages resulted in high travel costs for the community. The community plans to develop the network and improve coordination. The network may also expand to include lowland communities in the watershed. They will also try to coordinate more closely with the government and private sector to gain their acceptance and cooperation. Lastly, the network will also focus on conflict management at the local level by increasing public awareness and understanding that "man can live with the forest".

*For more information please contact  
preecha@mozart.inet.co.th*



## Using Tools to Build Shared Understandings, Using a Sustainable Livelihoods Framework to Learn

*Nuchjaree Langkulsane*

As a part of its monitoring and evaluation process, SPARK Thailand organized field visits to the north of the country in July 2003. The objectives were to evaluate the learning activities of SPARK-supported partners and to help volunteer placements and OSLO awardees<sup>2</sup> to document “significant changes” in the lives of community (end users), and in the behavior and practices of natural resource management (NRM) related service providers. The team tried three tools from the Second Livelihoods and Languages Workshop organized by SPARK and Support to Regional Aquatic Resources Management (STREAM) to build shared understandings, develop a communication process and analyze communication among SPARK and its partners. The tools were 1) Conversation Partners, 2) Relationships and 3) Communication Issues for Conversation Groups.

In the middle of a conversation with NGOs in Chiang Mai, pulling out the concentric-circle illustration to explain “output, outcomes and impact”, to get us “unstuck” in our discussion

The first and second tools were used during the pre-visit phase, to design and plan the communication process. The first tool helped define our conversation partners – those with whom we should talk, who they represent, and the purpose and issues of our conversation. The second tool – illustrated with concentric circles for “output, outcome and impacts” – helped to clarify relationships. We defined our conversation partners as two NGOs – Northern Development Foundation (NDF) in Chiang Mai, and Phayao Project for Development (PDP) in Phayao – and their stakeholders. NDF and PDP are SPARK partners, supported in terms of placements and OSLO activities. They provide NRM-related service to their stakeholders: community leaders, the Tambon Administration Office (TAO) and local NGOs. We set objectives for the conversation and designed a structured process, beginning with our partners, then community leaders, the TAO and NGOs. We wanted to explore the NRM services NDF and PDP provided to their stakeholders and what they learned through the implementation. The combination of tools seemed to help us map our ideas and plan the process.



*In the middle of a conversation with NGOs in Chiang Mai, pulling out the concentric-circle illustration to explain “output, outcomes and impact”, to get us “unstuck” in our discussion*

### **Achievements and Relationship of SPARK Stakeholders**

The second tool was used again during the actual visit to capture and analyze “significant changes” in people’s lives, and in the behaviors and practices of service-providers. During the conversation, we tried to understand partners’ achievements and lessons learned, who benefited from the changes and how SPARK contributed to this. The partners became confused when we asked about SPARK’s contribution, because they received support from different sources, making it difficult to assess what SPARK contributed.

We found that the second tool helped explain how stakeholders had benefited, whether it was the community, NGOs or government service-providers. In the case of NDF, the most significant changes happened with the strengthening of people’s organizations in Northern Thailand. The community became more confident and could represent their interests in policy discussions. Some are even members of the National Advisory Committee for Economic and Social Development. The team also documented SPARK’s sup-

*...continue on page 8*



from page 7...

port for capacity-building with NDF staff who are service-providers. Similarly, for PDP the most significant change concerned community involvement in NRM, while SPARK activities strengthened NGO capacity in terms of community-based work and wider perspectives on NRM.

In using the second tool, we discovered the need to for good facilitation in building a shared understanding. We clarified with partners that our conversation should not focus on the results of our inputs, but rather on changes that happened and the role of different groups in achieving these, whether or not SPARK had contributed. Then, we could explore further how SPARK should support them in the future. In this way, communication would be two-way, with SPARK and its partners learning together, rather than a one-way situation in which the “recipient” reports on “benefits” from the “giver”.

### ***Power Relationships and Trust***

In conversation with community leaders. The map was drawn by the community and used to convince the government that they have been in their place (to be declared a national park) for a long time, and have established systems that do not harm forests and biodiversity



*In conversation with community leaders. The map was drawn by the community and used to convince the government that they have been in their place (to be declared a national park) for a long time, and have established systems that do not harm forests and biodiversity*

The third tool helped analyze power relationships and the validity of information. SPARK has a distant relationship with the community, since it does not work directly with them, and face-to-face communication with them was only for a short time. This makes it difficult to build trusting relationships, which affects the information we get from the community. How do we know if they felt secure and trusted us enough to provide complete and accurate information? Since SPARK is an external funder, it has an influential role with partners, and it is possible for partners to provide “pleasant” information to the “donor”. Thus, we should validate information through various means, understand our role and clarify with partners our sincerity in evaluating the real situation so that there will be future improvements.

### ***Learning through a Sustainable Livelihoods Framework***

During our conversations, a sustainable livelihoods (SL) framework guided our learning about the lives of people in communities. It helped us see an overall picture of how communities make a living, their livelihoods outcomes, and issues related to resources, capacity and how government policies affect them. Through the SL framework – which we kept in the “backs of our heads” – we learned how to raise questions and learned more about the community’s diverse livelihoods.

### ***Communicating and Learning***

Using the three tools and the SL framework, the communication process among SPARK and stakeholders was structured and everyone involved had opportunities for sharing and understanding each other. The “significant changes” we captured were evidence of the learning of SPARK, its partners and communities, and will lead to improvements in the collaboration.

*Nuchjaree Langkulsane is a Programme Assistant with SPARK Thailand. She can be reached at <Nuchjaree.Langkulsane@vsoint.or*

<sup>1</sup> Panpilai Kitsudsang, Decha Phasuk and Duangkamol Sirisook were also on the SPARK Thailand team.

<sup>2</sup> OSLO is Other Shared Learning Opportunities and includes regional activities such as research, study tours, secondments and scholarships. “OSLO awardees” are people selected and supported by SPARK.



## TRAINING

### IIRR Training

Participatory Action Research (PAR) for Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) International course: 8-19 December 2003

Training base: IIRR, Cavite, Philippines

Costs: US\$2500. This includes food and accommodation, course materials, airport pick-up and health insurance but excludes costs of visas, transportation costs of getting to and from IIRR (apart from airport pick-up and drop off) and pocket money (US\$ 100 per week is suggested).

Community-based Integrated Watershed Management (November 10 to November 28, 2003)

Sustainable Agriculture Training of Trainers (November 24 to December 12, 2003)

For application and more information, contact: Education&Training@iirr.org

### Field Alliance Training

Governance, ecology and empowerment Indonesia, October 20-31, 2003

This course is being organised by *FIELD Indonesia* in collaboration with the National Association of IPM Farmer Trainers.

Education, ecology and empowerment Thailand, November 3-14, 2003

This course is being organized by the Thai Education Foundation in collaboration with the Eco-schools Network.

For more information, please visit the Field Alliance website: [www.thefieldalliance.org](http://www.thefieldalliance.org)

## RESOURCES

### **Sustainable Livelihoods: Building on the Wealth of the Poor**

by Kristin Helmore and Naresh Singh

Paperback – September 2001

Kumarian Press

Place order at <<http://enotalone.com/books/>> <http://enotalone.com/books/>

This is an informal handbook for development professionals. At the same time, it is written in an accessible, journalistic style for anyone concerned about effectively reducing poverty. It illustrates a holistic approach to poverty reduction that places the priorities of the poor first in development planning and action. It uses the sustainable livelihoods approach as a framework for analysis and details the use of the Participatory Assessment and Planning for Sustainable Livelihoods methodology.

### **Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries**

by Frank Ellis

Paperback - July, 2000 Oxford University Press

Place order at <<http://enotalone.com/books/>> <http://enotalone.com/books/>

Both livelihoods and diversity have become popular topics in development studies. The livelihood concept offers a more complete picture of the complexities of rural areas in low-income countries. Diversity recognizes that people manage by doing many different things rather than just one or a few things. This book sets out the rural livelihoods approach within the context of past and current themes in rural development. It adopts diversity as its principal theme

and explores the implications of diverse rural livelihoods for ideas about poverty, agriculture, environment, gender, and macroeconomic policy. It also considers appropriate methods for gaining quick and effective knowledge about the livelihoods of the rural poor for project and policy purposes.

### **“Communication & Natural Resource Management: Experience/Theory”**

This is a manual written for people involved or interested in communication and natural resource management who seek a better understanding of how different theories and strategic change principles relate to practise. It relates a variety of theories and change principles in simplified schematic form, to a series of actual programmes through interactive experiences.

The reader becomes a participant by reading and analyzing each initiative through a different theoretical lens. Each experience is organized around a theme, a learning objective, a description of an actual NRM initiative and one or two theories by which these initiatives can be analyzed. The idea is to create an interactive space for reflection on what works in your own context and on whether different contexts require different approaches, principles and theoretical frameworks.

It can be downloaded at [http://www.comminit.com/drum\\_beat\\_213.html](http://www.comminit.com/drum_beat_213.html) <[http://www.comminit.com/drum\\_beat\\_213.html](http://www.comminit.com/drum_beat_213.html)>