

The Effect of Forest Management by Local People to Forest Resource and Local Livelihood in Nam Dong district, Thua Thien Hue province, Viet Nam

Student name: NGUYEN Thi Thuy Phuong
Student ID: 201025040

(ベトナムのトゥアティエンフエ県ナムドン郡の人々による森林経営が森林資源と生計に与える影響)

Supervisor: Prof. Misa MASUDA

Background and objectives

Forest cover in Viet Nam has been rapidly expanded since the mid-1990s (Sikor, 2001). Many studies have demonstrated the positive effect of policies to involve local people, especially upland ethnic minorities in forest management. Forest allocation program, the reform of the 2003 Land Law, and the 2004 Forest Protection and Development Law are supposed as keystones to create this change (Castella et al., 2006). However, the effect of these policies to forest resource and local livelihood is still argued (William and Huynh, 2004; Nguyen and Sato 2008).

This study aimed to describe the process of implementing these policies to decentralize forest management and to evaluate the effect of forest management by local people to forest resource and local livelihood in a mountainous district of central region of Viet Nam.

Material and method

Both primary and secondary data were collected in Nam Dong district of Thua Thien Hue province, from July to September of 2011. Primary data were obtained through questionnaire survey in Doi village. From 133 households (HH) of the village, 92 HH (69.2%) were randomly selected for the questionnaire survey. Review of government laws and regulations helped to describe formal tenure and the implementation process.

Results and discussion

Under the forest land allocation program in the early 1990s, only barren land and forest land for plantation purpose could be allocated to local people. In Nam Dong district, the barren land area decreased during the 1990s, but degraded forest area continuously increased (Table 1).

Table 1: Percentage of land area by land use and forest type in Nam Dong district (ThiHa et al., 2007)

| Forest type and other land use | Year | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 1975 | 1985 | 1989 | 2001 | 2004 |
| Severely degraded | 8.8 | 10.5 | 13.2 | 14.0 | 18.1 |
| Fairly degraded | 9.7 | 3.9 | 2.8 | 4.8 | 5.5 |
| Closed canopy | 71.8 | 73.6 | 69.4 | 67.6 | 60.6 |
| Total | 90.3 | 88.0 | 85.4 | 86.4 | 84.2 |
| Non-Forest | | | | | |
| Upland crops | 8.1 | 8.6 | 8.5 | 7.2 | 5.1 |
| Lowland irrigated agri. | 0.3 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.5 |
| Barren | 0.6 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| Miscellaneous | 0.4 | 1.1 | 2.6 | 1.8 | 2.3 |
| Tree plantations | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 2.2 | 5.6 |
| Water bodies | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 |
| Total | 9.7 | 12.0 | 14.6 | 13.6 | 15.8 |

After the reform of Land Law (2003) and Law on Forest

Protection and Development (2004), natural protection forests were also allocated for the purposes of income generation of the local people, natural forest protection, and illegal logging control.

Of total 92 samples HH, 53 were allocated with both types of forestland, 21 HH with forestland for plantation purpose, and only 8 HH with natural forests (Table 2). However, local people felt not attractive in managing natural forests because of unclear benefit-sharing policies.

Table 2: Number of HH allocated with forests

| Forest type | No. of HH | % |
|-------------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Natural protection forest | 8 | 8.7 |
| Plantation forest | 21 | 22.8 |
| Natural and plantation forest | 53 | 57.6 |
| None | 10 | 10.9 |
| Total | 92 | 100.0 |

Table 3: Land tenure by land use in Nam Dong district (Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2010)

| | Area (Ha) | Percentage (%) | |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|-------|
| Un-utilized land | 11804.8 | 18.15 | |
| Farmland | 4445.5 | 6.83 | |
| Forestland | Allocated land | 13255.8 | 20.38 |
| | Other | 35545.8 | 54.64 |
| Total | 65051.9 | 100 | |

Lack of the supports to integrate local people into the forest product market moreover discouraged the forest management by local people. Although allocated forest land accounted for a higher percentage in the land tenure (Table 3), income from forest did not contribute to the total income (Fig. 2).

Figure 2: Contribution of forest sector to the annual income of sample HH (2010-2011)

