

# Is community participation necessary for the success of development programmes? Key lessons from Pakistan

Ayat Ullah, Miroslava Bavorova and Giri Prasad Kandel Department of Economics and Development, Faculty of Tropical AgriSciences, Czech University of Life Sciences Prague

Benifits aquired



Czech University of Life Sciences Prague Faculty of Tropical

## Introduction

- Sustainable forest landscape restoration (FLR) is critical to global climate efforts (Mansourian, 2017).
- FLR includes afforestation and reforestation to combat degradation (Erbaugh and Oldekop, 2018).
- Addressing complex challenges is critical to the long-term success of FLR (Löf et al., 2019).
- Involving local communities improves the sustainability of FLR (Ullah et al., 2022a).
- Participation ranges from influence to empowerment (Mensah, 2019).
- Community involvement tailors efforts and provides holistic benefits (Le et al., 2014).
- Successful participation reduces poverty and improves livelihoods (Li et al., 2018).
- The Billion Trees Afforestation Project (BTAP) engages rural communities to restore landscapes (Ullah et al., 2022b).
- This study examines factors that influence community and household level of participation in BTAP activities.



#### **Methodology**

- The study was conducted in the Dir-Kohistan Forest Division, Upper Dir, Pakistan.
- Official project data and surveys conducted from Feb to Sep 2021.
- 300 farm households surveyed.
- Descriptive statistics examined socioeconomic and community characteristics.
- Poisson regression model identified factors influencing community participation.

## **Descriptive analysis**

- Average age of BTAP participants: 47.06 years, with 4,033 years of formal education.
- Average household size: 12.46 persons.
- 52% reported political conflict, 46% ethnic conflict in their communities.
- 20% reported elite capture as a community problem.
- 24% were aware of BTAP policies and procedures.
- 57% had functioning Village Development Committees (VDCs).
- 58% reported contact with the Forest Department.
- Only 30% reported monthly meetings of village leaders to plan activities.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the variables used in the Poisson regression model: Definitions and Summary Statistics

<b>Continuous variables</b>	Description and measurement of variables	Mean (SD)
Age	Age of household head (years)	47.06 (11.82)
Education	Education of household head (years)	4.03 (5.39)
Household size	Family members (number)	12.46 (6.18)
Political conflicts	1 if a farmer's participation has been affected by politically	0.52 (0.49)
	motivated conflicts, 0 otherwise.	
Ethnic conflicts	1 if there are ethnic conflicts in the community, 0 otherwise	0.46 (0.49)
Elite capture	1 if farmer participation has been affected by elite capture in	0.20 (0.40)
	the community, 0 otherwise	
Awareness of the	1 if a farmer is aware of the participation process, 0 otherwise	0.24 (0.43)
<b>Participation Policy</b>		
Functional VDC	1 if there is a functioning VDC in a farmer's village, 0	0.57 (0.49)
	otherwise	
Extension contact	1 if a farmer is in frequent contact with the forest department,	0.58 (0.49)
	0 otherwise	
Monthly meetings	1 if monthly meetings are held during planning of key	0.30 (046)
	activities or plantation season, 0 otherwise	

## ■ Low ■ Medium ■ High

Fig 1. Level of community participation and extent of associated benefits

# **Factors determining the level of participation: Community perspective**

- Variance Inflation Factors (VIFs) were calculated for the independent variables, with the highest VIF being 3.389, indicating no significant multicollinearity problems.
- The pseudo-R2 value is 0.074, indicating that approximately 8% of the variation in farmers' BTAP participation is influenced by the independent variables.
- Higher education level of the household head is positively correlated with increased BTAP participation, likely due to better understanding of the project.
- Functioning VDCs at the village level positively correlated with increased participation.

# Table 3. Results of the Poisson regression model

Variables	Coef.	St.Err.	p-value
Age	.003	.006	.591
Education	.046	.014	.001
Household size	.002	.011	.824
Functional VDC	.583	.22	.008
Monthly meetings	.004	.152	.98
Extension contact	.048	.156	.757
Ethnic conflicts	.068	.151	.651
Political conflicts	34	.235	.147
Elite capture	.229	.21	.274
Awareness of the participation policy	.281	.179	.117
Constant	-1.055	.375	.005
Pseudo r-squared	0.074	Number of obs	300
Chi-square	46.730	Prob > chi2	0.000

## **Conclusion and recommendations**

Note: 35% of respondents participated in up to 4 activities, 53% participated in up to 8 activities, and 12% participated in more than 8, up to 11 activities.

## Major activities undertaken by communities under the BTAP

- Household level: 14,714 plants collected, 23,690 fruit plants distributed, 975 hectares rehabilitated, 2,200,000 free plants for farm forestry.
- Community level: 14,226.35 hectares rehabilitated, 265,000 plants in villages, participation of 468 communities.
- Mass reforestation: 497 hectares rehabilitated; unregistered participants; varying levels of participation.

## Table 2. Activities and community participation in BTAP and 10 BTAP from 2014 to 2021

Activity	Unit	Total achievements	Level	Number of people participated
Protection of existing enclosures	Ha.	728	Group	18 communities
Establishment of new enclosures	Ha.	10603	Group	262 communities
Fruit plants	No.	10,000	Individual	909 households
Walnut plants	No.	13690	Individual	619 households
Community plantation	No.	265,000	Group	18 communities
<b>Owner's plantation/ Woodlots</b>	Ha.	975	Individual	4909 households
Planting of roads, canals and railway	Ha.	70	Mass	Unlimited (numbers of
tracts				participants not known)
Farm forestry and agroforestry	No.	2,200,000	Individual	8277 households
Mass afforestation	Ha.	15	Mass	Unlimited (numbers of
				participants not known)
Sowing/Dibbling	Ha.	834	Group	23 communities
Stream bank stabilization	На	259.19	Group	26 communities
Plantation in moist temperate zones	Ha.	412	Mass	Unlimited (numbers of
				participants not known)
Bad land stabilization	Ha.	203.54	Group	23 communities
<b>Restoration of marginal lands</b>	Ha.	302.79	Group	51 communities
Plantation of fast-growing trees	Ha.	1295.83	Group	47 communities

- Successful forest landscape restoration depends on strong community engagement (engagement in maximum activities.
- High-level BTAP participants reaped greater benefits than those with lower levels of participation.
- Key factors influencing high-level participation included the education of the household head and the presence of functioning Village Development Committees (VDCs).
- It is advisable to establish and train VDCs or other community-based organizations (CBOs) prior to afforestation projects.
- Developing effective communication networks and attractive land tenure policies in mountain communities can increase participation.
- Organizing knowledge and skills development programs for rural households and forest department officials on afforestation, reforestation and forest management will enhance community participation in BTAP.

#### **References**

Erbaugh, J. T., & Oldekop, J. A. (2018). Forest landscape restoration for livelihoods and well-being. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 32, 76-83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2018.05.007 Löf, M., Madsen, P., Metslaid, M., Witzell, J., & Jacobs, D. F. (2019). Restoring forests: regeneration and ecosystem function for the future. New Forests, 50(2), 139-151. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11056-019-09713-0</u> Mansourian, S. (2017). Governance and forest landscape restoration: A framework to support decision-making. Journal for Nature Conservation, 37, 21-30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2017.02.010

Mensah, J. (2019). Sustainable development: Meaning, history, principles, pillars, and implications for human action: Literature review. Cogent Social Sciences, 5(1), 1653531.

#### https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2019.1653531

Le, H. D., Smith, C., & Herbohn, J. (2014). What drives the success of reforestation projects in tropical developing countries? The case of the Philippines. Global Environmental Change, 24, 334-348. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.09.010

Li, C., Li, S., Feldman, M. W., Li, J., Zheng, H., & Daily, G. C. (2018). The impact on rural livelihoods and ecosystem services of a major relocation and settlement program: A case in Shaanxi, China. Ambio, 47(2), 245-259. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-017-0941-7

Ullah, A., Zeb, A., Saqib, S. E., & Kächele, H. (2022a). Constraints to agroforestry diffusion under the Billion Trees Afforestation Project (BTAP), Pakistan: policy recommendations for 10-BTAP. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 29(45), 68757-68775. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-20661-9</u> Ullah, A., Zeb, A., Saqib, S. E. & Kächele, H. (2022b). Landscape co-management and livelihood sustainability: Lessons learned from the billion trees afforestation project in Pakistan. Land Use Policy, 106034. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2022.106034

Mass afforestation is achieved by mobilizing students, community groups and volunteers through events such as Plant for Pakistan Day and Green Pakistan Day.

#### Level of participation and benefits from BTAP

- Communities with high participation received significant benefits: Fuelwood availability (100%), Timber availability (89%), Increased forest cover (83%), Improved environmental services (97%)
- Medium participation communities also saw improvements in forest cover, local wildlife, and ecosystem services.
- Low participation communities experienced fewer benefits compared to medium and high participation communities.

This research is technically supported by the Faculty of Tropical AgriSciences and financially by Czech University of Life Sciences Prague under the grant number 20223102

#### Contact: Ayat Ullah, PhD, (ayatullah238@gmail.com or ullah@ftz.czu.cz)