LANDCARE - Claveria Landcare Association (CLCA) (Filipinas)

**DESCRIPCIÓN**

Associations that help diffuse, at low cost, soil and water conservation technologies among upland farmers to generate income while conserving natural resources.

In parts of the Philippines, farmers who are interested in learning and sharing knowledge about sustainable land management and new SWC measures organise themselves into the so-called ‘Landcare’ associations. These self-help groups are a vehicle for knowledge exchange, training and dissemination of SWC technologies. A main objective is the empowerment of farmers’ groups in their efforts to improve their livelihoods as well as the environment. Landcare has three components and aims at strengthening collaboration between those: (1) grassroots farmers’ organisations (Landcare organisations); (2) technical facilitators, for example the World Agroforestry Centre (formerly the International Centre for Research in Agroforestry: ICRAF) and government and academic agencies and (3) Local Government Units (LGUs). The Landcare associations are structured as municipal groups, village groups (barangay level or affiliate peoples’ organisations), and village sub-groups ( sitio or purok level). This ensures effective dissemination of technologies from the municipal level down to the smallest village. To give the associations a legal status, they are registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Landcare associations conduct regular monthly meetings to promote exchange of information, ideas, and experience, thus promoting spread of SWC technologies. Extension service is carried out through the Local Government Units, which allocate 20% of their development funds for Landcare related activities such as meetings, training and visits, and nursery establishment. Farmers organised in Landcare groups have better access to technical and financial support for SWC activities from LGUs and other technical facilitators.

LGUs also enact local laws to encourage adoption of SWC technologies, such as giving tax incentives, and Landcare members are given priority access to programmes and financial assistance. Landcare acts as a guarantor against loans. The facilitating agencies provide technical assistance, and also help create an environment of dynamism among Landcare groups. A link is created between Landcare associations and these service providers. Landcare enhances sharing of labour, builds camaraderie, and encourages group decisions on matters relating to SWC. The approach is spreading rapidly: from the original one association with 25 members in 1996, this increased to 45 groups with over 4,000 members by 1999.
METAS DEL ENFOQUE Y ENTORNO FACILITADOR

Propósitos/ objetivos principales del Enfoque
- organise farmers with common concerns, problems, needs and aspirations into self help groups.
- establish farmers' groups as conduits for financial and other support for SWC technologies.
- empower farmers' groups in their efforts to improve their livelihoods as well as the environment.
- strengthen working linkages between farmers and the LGU, NGOs and technical facilitators.
- promote sharing of new technologies, information, ideas and experiences about sustainable agriculture and natural resources management among Landcare groups and members.
- facilitate collective efforts in activities which cannot be carried out at household level (eg communal nurseries).
- assist in the marketing of agroforestry-derived products of the members, and to develop links to studies on agroforestry based farming

Condiciones que facilitan la implementación de la/s Tecnología/s aplicadas bajo el Enfoque
- Normas y valores sociales/ culturales/ religiosos: Members of Landcare are recommended to lending institutions for production loans.
- Marco de trabajo legal (tenencia de tierra, derechos de uso de tierra y agua): Speed up the land reclassification and land registration program of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR).
- Conocimiento de MST, acceso a apoyo técnico: farmers training and cross visits to nearby farmers.

Condiciones que impiden la implementación de la/s Tecnología/s aplicadas bajo el Enfoque

PARTICIPACIÓN Y ROLES DE LAS PARTES INTERESADAS INVOLUCRADAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partes interesadas involucradas en el Enfoque</th>
<th>Describir roles de las partes interesadas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>usuarios locales de tierras/ comunidades locales</td>
<td>land user driven (bottom-up). Spontaneous adoption with technical assistance from donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>especialmente MST/consejeros agrícolas</td>
<td>ICRAF facilitated the organisation of farmers. Specialists established the linkage between Landcare and LGUs/NGOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gobierno local</td>
<td>Local government units (LGU's)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gobierno nacional (planificadores, autoridades)</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working land users were mainly men (Men do the main job in the field. Women do home-related agricultural activities e.g. corn shelling. Men do the heavier works (plowing, harrowing). Women in light</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Involucramiento de los usuarios locales de tierras/ comunidades locales en las distintas fases del Enfoque

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fase</th>
<th>Iniciación/ motivación</th>
<th>Planificación</th>
<th>Implementación</th>
<th>Monitoreo y evaluación</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

public meetings, rapid/participatory rural appraisal, workshops/seminars
organisation of major and minor activities: coordination of casual labour
measurements/observations, public meetings, interviews/questionnaires
on-farm research supported by LGU, academics, ICRAF

Flujograma
The diagram demonstrates the collaboration, complementarity, interdependence and synergism between the actors.

Explanations: ---->Support (technical, financial, policy) -->Demands, requests, feedback IC

La toma de decisiones en la selección de Tecnología MST

Las decisiones fueron tomadas por
- solamente usuarios de tierras (autoiniciativa)
- principalmente usuarios de tierras con el apoyo de especialistas MST
- todos los actores relevantes, como parte de un enfoque participativo
- principalmente por especialistas MST en consulta con usuarios de tierras
- solo por especialistas MST
- por políticos/ líderes

La toma de decisiones se basa en:
- la evaluación de conocimiento MST bien documentado (la toma de decisiones se basa en evidencia)
- hallazgos de investigaciones
- la experiencia personal y opiniones (no documentadas)

APOYO TÉCNICO, FORTALECIMIENTO INSTITUCIONAL Y GESTIÓN DEL CONOCIMIENTO

Las siguientes actividades o servicios fueron parte del enfoque
- Construcción de capacidades / capacitación
- Servicio de asesoría
- Fortalecimiento institucional (desarrollo institucional)
- Monitoreo y evaluación
- Investigación

Construcción de capacidades/ capacitación

Se proporcionó capacitación a las siguientes partes interesadas
- usuarios de tierras
- personal de campo/ consejeros

Forma de capacitación
- en el contexto de trabajo
- de agricultor a agricultor
- áreas de demostración
- reuniones públicas
- cursos

Temas avanzados

Servicio de asesoría

Se proporcionó servicio de asesoría
- en los campos de los usuarios de tierras
- en centros permanentes
Fortalecimiento institucional

Se fortalecieron/ establecieron instituciones
- no
- sí, un poco
- sí, moderadamente
✓ sí, mucho

Tipo de apoyo
- financiero
✓ construcción de capacidades/ entrenamiento
- equipo

Monitoreo y evaluación

Investigación
La investigación trató los siguientes temas
✓ sociología
- economía/ marketing
- ecología
✓ tecnología

FINANCIAMIENTO Y APOYO MATERIAL EXTERNO

Presupuesto anual en dólares americanos para el componente MST
- < 2,000
- 2,000-10,000
- 10,000-100,000
- 100,000-1,000,000
- > 1,000,000
Precise annual budget: n.d.

FINANCIAMIENTO Y APOYO MATERIAL EXTERNO

Los siguientes servicios o incentivos fueron proporcionados a los usuarios de las tierras
- Apoyo financiero/material proporcionado a los usuarios de tierras
✓ Subsidios para insumos específicos
- Crédito
- Otros incentivos o instrumentos

ANÁLISIS DE IMPACTO Y COMENTARIOS DE CONCLUSIÓN

Impactos del Enfoque

¿El Enfoque ayudó a los usuarios de tierras a implementar y mantener Tecnologías MST?
The approach has greatly helped land users in the implementation of soil and water management technologies. Farmers now adopt ‘natural vegetative strips’ (NVS). Large farms (> 3 ha) have generally evolved into commercial production of tree crops (coffee) and trees (timber).
✓

¿El Enfoque mejoró cuestiones de tenencia de tierra/ derechos de usuarios que obstaculizaron la implementación de la Tecnologías MST?
Land tenure is still an important factor in adoption of SWC technology. Providing simple technology in establishment and maintenance enhance adoption. Landcare groups exist where tenants are members. They adopt SWC technology.
✓

Did other land users / projects adopt the Approach?
Many other NGOs, local government units (LGUs) and line agencies have adopted - and further adapted - the Landcare approach in their respective areas. The approach has been proven effective and it is now being looked upon as a model for the implementation of SWC and other related activities, particularly in Mindanao.
✓

Motivación principal del usuario de la tierra para implementar MST
- producción incrementada

Sostenibilidad de las actividades del Enfoque

¿Pueden los usuarios de tierras sostener lo que se implementó mediante el Enfoque (sin apoyo externo)?
La documentación fue facilitada por

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>recursos clave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fortalezas: perspectiva del usuario de tierras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debilidades/ desventajas/ riesgos: perspectiva del compilador o de otra persona recurso clave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debilidades/ desventajas/ riesgos: perspectiva del compilador o de otra persona recurso clave

- Individual problems not easily addressed, as few members are frank and open → Encourage everybody to share their problems and concerns
- Participation entails time to be away from farm work → Meetings and discussions should be scheduled during evenings or holidays.
- Lack of leadership and organisation skills of some Landcare leaders, who are unable to guide groups into cohesive, dynamic organisation. It takes time to get consensus and to make them work together → Landcare group leaders need to be better trained in leadership skills group facilitation and participation
- Over-reliance on ICRAF on technical innovation → Encourage farmers to conduct farmer level experimentation.
- Some farmers join Landcare expecting handouts or grants → Project objectives and strategies should be explicitly explained to farmers
- Over-emphasis of political patronage by some LGUs alienates people of different orientation/background → Encourage a more transparent government at LGU particularly at barangay level

Debilidades/ desventajas/ riesgos: perspectiva del usuario de tierras

- Makes farm workers easier
- Promotes social integration and addresses other social issues which are beyond individual household capacity to solve (burials, weddings, etc.)
- Promotes rapid adoption of SWC technologies. Provides easy and fast access/implementation of SWC technologies
- Encourages farmers to gain access to services and financial support from LGU, technical facilitators and service providers
- Provides a vehicle for participatory research and technical interventions and ensures that newly-developed technologies are appropriate
- Makes extension activities cost effective
- Ensures sustainability ofactions
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Comentarios

- Lack of leadership and organisation skills of some Landcare leaders, who are unable to guide groups into cohesive, dynamic organisation. It takes time to get consensus and to make them work together → Landcare group leaders need to be better trained in leadership skills group facilitation and participation
- Some farmers join Landcare expecting handouts or grants → Project objectives and strategies should be explicitly explained to farmers
- Over-reliance on ICRAF on technical innovation → Encourage farmers to conduct farmer level experimentation.
- Over-emphasis of political patronage by some LGUs alienates people of different orientation/background → Encourage a more transparent government at LGU particularly at barangay level
- Individual problems not easily addressed, as few members are frank and open → Encourage everybody to share their problems and concerns
- Participation entails time to be away from farm work → Meetings and discussions should be scheduled during evenings or holidays.
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