FROM CENTRALIZATION OF CONTROL TO PLURALISTIC FORMS OF POLICY-MAKING AND IMPLEMENTATION: CASE STUDIES OF TWO FOREST DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN EAST KALIMANTAN

By Aleksius Jemadu

ABSTRACT

Tujuan Utama penelitian ini adalah membahas ciri-ciri pokok pembuatan dan pelaksanaan kebijaksanaan pemerintah dalam sektor kehutanan khususnya yang berkaitan dengan dimensi lingkungan hidup. Unsur-unsur sosial dan *ekologis dianggap esensial dalam mendefinisikan konsep "sustainable forest management". Pengertian "governance" dalam sektor ini mencakup kompartementalisasi birokratis di tingkat pusat, hubungan pemerintuh pusat dan daerah, dan hubungan antara pemerintah - swasta. Melalui studi perbandingan yang dilakukan secara "time series" maupun perbandingan antara dua program pembangunan ditemukan bahwa sentralisasi kontrol yang berlebihan merupakan hambatan untuk pencapaian tujuan pemerintah. Karena itu pendekatan yang lebih pluralistik dalam pembuatan dan pelaksanaan kebijaksanaan pemerintuh perlu dipertimbangkan.*

Introduction

As an archipelagic country Indonesia consists of nearly 14,000 islands of which only 930 are inhabited. It covers an area of 1.9 million square kilometers with an ethnically diverse population estimated at almost 200 million today. Indonesia consists of 27 provinces, 241 *kabupaten* or regencies and 55 *kotamadya* or urban municipalities, 3837 *kecamatan* or subdistricts, 62000 *desa* or rural villages and 5000 *kelurahan* or urban villages. Indonesian provinces are variable in many aspects. Some provinces are as sizeable as Germany and some others are as small as Luxemburg. It is only natural to expect that with such a large population which is complicated by a diversity in ethnicity and culture, Indonesia faces a tremendous challenge in accomplishing an effective governance to bring prosperity to its people.

Indonesia is known as a developing country with an abundance of natural resources. One of the natural resources that has become increasingly important in its current economic development is tropical woods. Indonesia's forests are second only to Brazil's in size, and represent 10 percent of the world's remaining tropical rainforests. According to the data from the Ministry of Forestry, in 1993 the value of forest product exports made up 26.9 percent of the total non-oil export which amount to roughly 6 billion US dollars. The province of East Kalimantan is one of the most important regions as far as the forestry sector is concerned. It contributes 20 to 25 percent of national forest product exports annually. We can say that the management of forest resources is important not only for national economy but also for regional and local development.

Concern over the Sustainability of Forest Management

There is, however, a growing concern about the sustainability of forest exploitation in Indonesia, especially with regard to the different causes of deforestation, and how to rehabilitate degraded and critical forest lands. Even though it is quite difficult to have an accurate and reliable estimation of deforestation in tropical countries, some calculations made by independent agencies and government agencies would give a picture of the magnitude of the problem in this policy field. According to one calculation, deforestation in Indonesia during the period of 1979 - 1984 was between 1 and 1.2 million hectares annually. There are several causes of deforestation which are inseparable because they are interrelated. They are shifting cultivation and

smallholder agricultural conversion outside development projects, forest fire and logging operations. Indeed, there is still a hot debate regarding the real causes of deforestation. This study is not going to offer a new solution to this debate. We are more interested in the government policies which are aimed at dealing with each cause of deforestation. As such it gives a special attention to the incorporation of the environmental dimension into the sustainable management of forest resources. It should be noted, however, that the above-mentioned causes of deforestation can be regarded as an important setting or background for the formulation of the operational definition of the environmental dimension of forestry management in this study.

The Concept of Sustainable Forest Management

In general we can say that the concept of "sustainable forest management" has a broad meaning and consists of two main elements: social and physical or ecological. For those who are not familiar with the unique history of forest exploitation in tropical countries, it might be surprising to find that the environmental dimension of this sector contains not only concerns for physical ecosystems but also some social elements. Furthermore, the existing social and economic conditions in developing countries are such that the government can only address environmental problems in gradual manner while taking into account which policy priority should come first. In this study both physical and social elements of sustainable forest management are considered as equally important. One thing we can be sure of is that we cannot expect that tropical countries should address their environmental problems simultaneously. Historical, political, and financial imperatives may force them to make realistic choices. On top of that, the importance of social factors in the sustainable management of forest resources is closely related to the fact that since the commercialization of forest resources in late 1960s, local communities were left without alternative choice for developing their livelihoods. Some people might arguably ask an important question. If you open more access to forest resources, won't you end up with more destruction of your resource base? This question points directly to the heart of the matter. The choice for our developing society is not whether we utilize our natural resources or we let them idle. The real choice is whether we organize or govern the access to natural resources in a more rational and convergent way or not. We have to choose whether we stick to centralization of control or try to introduce more pluralistic forms of policy-making and implementation which could encourage the participation all policy stakeholders in sustaining the resource base.

The above explanation should serve as an answer why we should include social

forestry programs or rural development programs when we discuss government policies and actions in the environmental policy field. Indeed, addressing social aspects of the environmental problems in developing countries may not be sufficient but there is a strong foundation to assume that giving more attention to the well-being of people living in and near forest areas would be the most urgent policy agenda for government policy makers. Some authors even argue that social or human aspect of environmental policies in the Third World should come as first priority. Reflecting on the typical environmental problems related to the management of natural resources in the developing countries, M. Redclift argues that "*it is an illusion to believe that environmental objectives are other than political, or other than distributive.* Eva Wollenberg and Carol J. Pierce Colfer (1996) from the Center of International Forestry Research (CIFOR), say that social criteria and indicators of sustainable forest management consist of several elements including security and sufficiency of access to resources, economic opportunity, decision-making opportunity, justice, heritage and identity, safety and health. The World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) which gets its mandate from the United Nations gives a frequently-quoted definition of sustainable development which refers to "*development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs*". This definition has two key concepts, namely, *needs* and *limitations*. The first is concerned with the essential needs of the world's poor, to which overriding priority should be given; and the second is related to the fact that the environment has limitations to meet both present and future needs. It can be reasonably argued that given a well-organized program formulation and implementation, the participation of local communities in social forestry programs could contribute much to government's conservation efforts since these people, unlike timber companies, live permanently in and near the forests. What really matters is whether the government uses an exclusionary approach or an inclusionary approach in managing the remaining natural forests.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The main objective of this study is to identify the main structural characteristics of the policy-making process with regard to the accomplishment of sustainable forest management. In order to simplify the governance of the policy field we introduce three

major clusters of relations, namely, bureaucratic compartmentalization of central government ministries and agencies, central - local relations, public - private relations. Comparisons are made not only between different periods since 1967 to the present but also between development programs. It will be shown that the general characteristics of these interorganizational relations in policy-making and policy implementation would determine whether the governance of policy field under discussion is divergent or convergent. Divergent governance is defined as a quality of governance in which policy-making and policy implementation processes tend to favour the accomplishment of goals or objectives of one or two dominant policy actors at the expense of other policy actors or policy stakeholders. Conversely, convergent governance denotes some integration and coherence of the actions and interactions of policy actors so that they may promote opportunities to achieve their common goals. In most cases in many developing countries, the first possibility is more likely to take place than the second one, especially with respect to the environmental policy field where conflict of interests and priorities among government and private agencies is quite evident. Therefore we need theories in the recent literatures of public administration which we believe can be proposed as appropriate alternatives in order to manage intergovernmental relations in a more integrative and convergent way. Therefore, we would introduce theories of policy networks and some methods that are normally used to manage the networks.

It should be clear that the unit of analysis of this study is interorganizational relations which we have grouped into three different categories: compartmentalization among central government ministries or agencies regarding the environmental aspect of forestry development, central - local relations, and public private relations in a defined policy field. This unit of analysis will be studied both in the general scope and in limited scope of the development programmes. Thus, different methods of data collection including direct observation (the author visited East Kalimantan twice in 1994 and 1995), the study of important documents such as government regulations and reports, reports made by private companies and state enterprises, and interviews with government officials and private companies used as multiple sources of evidence which are reviewed and analyzed together so that the case study's findings can be based on the convergence of information from different perspectives.

Methodology and the Organization of Field Research

As should be clear from the formulation of research questions, this study is

primarily concerned with the question of how relations and interactions take place among different policy actors in the environmental policy field. Therefore, the use of case studies as research strategy is relevant for this specific inquiry. First of all we want to make some geographical limitations. Geographically, we focus our study on the province of East Kalimantan because viewed from the theoretical framework used in this study, it represents a rich-information case. It is widely known as the center of commercial timber industry supplying nearly 25% of the nation's commercial needs, or approximately 6.5 million cubic meters logs per year. Due to the richness of its timber resources, East Kalimantan has become the most exploited forest area over the last three decades. The salience of policy problems in the forestry sector in this province is also indicated in a study conducted by a team from WALHI which concluded that timber exploitation in East Kalimantan has little contribution to regional development, and there are reasons to be doubtful about the sustainability of forest management in this area. The team also provided a case study about long-enduring land conflict between local population and private timber companies who wanted to expand their forest plantations.

However, to cover the whole area of East Kalimantan whose size is almost seven times as big as Belgium, would be difficult for practical reasons. Therefore, I choose to use development programs with different policy arrangements. Forest village development programs conducted obligatorily by private companies and state enterprises are taken as case studies. I have chosen a private concessionaire who has conducted this program in several villages. We will describe how the program is actually implemented. We will describe as well how the program is implemented by a state enterprise. At the same time I conducted interviews and discussions concerning the implementation of the program with village government officials, informal leaders, head of subdistrict, and government officials from the regency level. Then a series of interviews were conducted on the provincial level in order to know the perception of local government officials including provincial development planners, government officials both from *Dinas Kehutanan* and *Kanwil Kehutanan* and the Office of the Governor. In order to have a comparative dimension, we make comparisons between the policy-making process (three clusters of relations) of forest village development program and that of another development program which tries to combine reforestation and transmigration. In doing the comparison we will give a particular attention to the dominant patterns of relations among public and private actors and also between levels of government. By making comparisons we expect to come to more generalized conclusions.

General Tendencies of Policy-making and Implementation in the Forestry Sector

There are several general tendencies in the policy making process with regard to the government efforts to integrate the environmental dimension into the management of forest resources (Aleksius Jemadu, 1996). First, at the program implementation level we have found visible evidence that compartmentalization among different ministries or agencies became a great obstacle to the solutions of social, economic, and environmental problems of local people. For instance, the unresolved problem of the titling of the irrigated rice fields that have been developed by timber companies and the villagers through the BDH program *(Program HPH Bina Desa Hutan or forest village development program)* should become a future policy agenda to be dealt with by the Ministry of Forestry, BPN (the National Land Use Agency), and the Ministry of Home Affairs. In addition, the integration of the BDH program with other government rural development programs for the sake of efficiency and avoiding overlappings and waste of limited development resources became quite unlikely because each program was administered separately from the central level with its own mission. Another general tendency with regard to the relations among central government ministries has been the fact that the addressing of environmental degradation was the preoccupation of technical departments themselves with little, if any, consultation or cooperation with the Ministry of Environment which is formally responsible for the coordination of government environmental policies. This phenomenon of compartmentalization is particularly relevant in analyzing the relations between the Ministry Forestry and the Ministry of Environment. It should be noted, however, that the minor role of the latter in the management of natural resources was also due to its lower position in the whole configuration of central government policy priorities which greatly favoured economic growth over environmental protection. Finally, a joint decision has become a common instrument of the Ministry of Forestry and the Ministry of Transmigration and Settlement of Forest Squatters in formulating a development program which cut across their areas of competence. Yet even in a centrally coordinated program such as HTIT *(Program Hutan Tanaman Industri - Transmigrasi or a combination of transmigration and timber plantations)* , coordination at the implementation level was often constrained by the centralistic nature of development planning.

The second tendency was the centralization of policy-making in

management of forest resources in the outer islands in the early 1970s, there has been little change in the role of local government as regards policy formulation and implementation in the environmental policy field. Local government has become just an instrument of the central government to ensure the accomplishment of the latter's policy priorities. At the same time, local government leaders like governors, regents, and subdistrict heads could not act as effective coordinators of regional and local development as stipulated in the Government Regulation No. 6/1988 since the whole development process was dominated by a sectoral approach of the technical ministries. It is then possible to suggest that compartmentalization of central government ministries in dealing with local problems could increase the tendency of centralization in intergovernmental relations. Even in the definition of policy problems and how to solve them through development programs, the top down approach was overwhelming. The centralization of policy making has added to the difficulty of integrating development programs into the general framework of regional and local spatial planning. For instance, the provincial *Bappeda* was not really involved in the process of selecting locations of the HTIT program because it was dominated by the deconcentration structures, namely, *Kanwil Kehutanan* (the Regional Forestry Office) and *Kanwil Transmigrasi dan PPH* (the Regional Office for the Ministry of Transmigration and Settlement of Forest Squatters). Since subnational governments can contribute something useful in the formulation and implementation of development programs for the accomplishment of environmental objectives, we would agree with R. Maes who suggests that interdependence between the central and local governments should be recognized so that interaction which is essential in modern and more democratic governance, could develop (1996).

The third tendency was the strengthening and deepening of the interdependence between central government policy makers and big timber companies in the process of policy-making of managing forest resources. In the early 1970s the government decided to rely on the capital and technology of the private sector in extracting timber resources in the outer islands. Political favouritism and the dominant role of the army officers were said to be the major factors in the distribution of forest concessions both to foreign and domestic private companies. In addition, the eligibility of timber companies in getting a license from the government was not really based on their adequate professionalism in managing forest resources. At the same time, the establishment of forest concession areas was not preceded by a thorough field survey to the effect that the protection of some ecologically important forest areas had been quite neglected. In the early 1980s the central government was confronted with the drastic decrease of oil

prices. There was then an idea of promoting state revenues from non-oil sector including timber exports. Cooperation was again established between the government and private timber companies in promoting domestic processing of timber products. Several incentives were given to private companies who built their own processing industries so that they might be able to compete in the international market. Timber industrialization was justified not only on the grounds of opening employment opportunities and activating regional development, but also on the sustainability of the resource base.

In 1984 *Apkindo (the Indonesian Woodpanel Association)* was given authority by the government to organize the Indonesian plywood industries and manage the promotion of Indonesian plywood exports in world market. Since then *Apkindo* has become a powerful private organization in the making of major Indonesian forestry policies. The interdependence between the government and private companies continued to flourish in the establishment of industrial forest plantations (HTI). The government's financial participation and the inclusion of state enterprises in the establishment of HTIs were strong indications of interdependence between the two sides. The fact that the HTIT program combined transmigration interests and forest plantations was a good example of a close cooperation between the government and big private timber companies. It can even be argued that the development programs (especially the BDH and HTIT programs) that were designed to integrate the environmental dimension into forestry development were promoted mainly on the basis of compromise and negotiation between the two policy actors since the programs would be unlikely to lead to a fundamental change in the existing configuration of power and control over forest resources in which the two policy actors hold a dominant position.

If we combine the three tendencies of Indonesian forestry policy-making with respect to its environmental aspects, they would have a common cumulative effect which is the strengthening of the centralization of control and management of forest resources. Major policy initiatives mainly came from the central government without giving sufficient space for the development of two-way communication between central government authorities and subnational governments. This cumulative effect of centralization would lead us to conclude that the policy making process has been characterized by divergent governance of the forestry sector rather than a desirable convergent governance where economic and environmental aspects could be realistically integrated in harmonious way. Policy networks may have existed in the relations between central government policy makers and timber companies. From their respective actions and interactions we have observed that they did recognize their interdependence

and create instruments to promote their common interests. However, on the vertical line of the relations among policy actors, centralization of control was dominant instead of a network-like policy management.

Indeed, according to an analysis made by a combination of American and Indonesian authors (C.V. Barber, N.C. Johnson, and E. Hafild, 1994), policy-making in the Indonesian forestry sector is highly centralized and there are three elements which influence the making of forestry policies. The first element is concerned with the coexistence of two contradictory faces of laws and regulations in the forestry sector. The authors argue: "Forests and forest policy [in Indonesia] ... are governed by both an unassailable core of exclusive and comprehensive authority held by the state, and a vast body of indeterminate and often contradictory laws and regulations that delegate *de facto* authority over many aspects of forest policy and management to the private sector, while effectively abdicating authority in other aspects". The second element is what is called "conflicting bureaucratic management styles". The authors explain that theoretically Indonesian bureaucracy follows rational bureaucratic management with its emphasis on formal hierarchy, central coordination, clearly defined repartition of competences, and rule of law. In practice, however, "personalized 'patron-client' relationships" are overwhelming. The third element is what the authors call "the corporate culture of Indonesian foresters and forestry institutions". According to the authors this culture has the characteristics of a highly centralized and hierarchical policy making mechanism, reliance on professional foresters, a close relationship between forestry service and large scale timber industries, urban-biased in policy-making, maintaining colonial forestry tradition and background, resistant to change in the structures and ways of doing things, strong belief in the scientifically-based forest management, and underestimation of traditional land use practices by local people.

The identification of the basic structures of policy-making in the Indonesian forestry sector which is believed to have led to the divergent governance of this sector provides a stimulation of opening the discussion of adopting recent theories in the practice of public administration. The basic question is: can we propose the theoretical concepts like intergovernmental management, network management, co-production and co-management, and interactive governance as the Indonesian government wants increasingly to sustain and conserve its forest resources? What are the opportunities and constraints in adopting these theories? We will discuss this topic in the next section.

Multiorganizational Service Networks: A Hybrid for Co-governance in the Forestry Sector?

Milton J. Esman (1991) introduced the concept of multiorganizational service networks which could be very useful if applied to the governance of the forest sector in Indonesia. Let us see how this concept can be applied in the implementation of forest village development programs. Application of this concept would require the transfer of management and protection of forest areas (at least people's TFAs) from the government (Ministry of Forestry) to local communities. Each step in the policy process should be carried out in consultation with, and the consent of, the local people without which the plans will fail (A. Banerjee and H. Mishra, 1995).

First of all government authorities delineate forest areas to be managed and protected by local people. They have to identify the existence of forest products that can be generated on a sustainable basis and the real possibility to sell them in the accessible local market. The second step is to form small groups of people, with each group linked to one specific block of forest. Of particular importance at this stage is to make sure that every individual of the group gets an equal share of the benefits, and is involved in making decisions on forest management. This is an effective mechanism to commit the group to conserve the forest since it is directly linked to their interests. Third, dividing the forest areas into blocks. There should be a match between the size of the blocks with its ability to make a "significant contribution" to the income of the individual families. Negotiations regarding the size of the blocks should be made possible. Fourth, agreements should be drawn up between groups and government. In the agreement the government retains the ownership of the forest areas and every group is responsible for the sustainability of forest resources. The local people are authorized to manage and protect the forest area and they are convinced that the government is sincere in sharing benefits from use of forest resources. The next step is to develop the skills of local people. In doing this it is highly recommended to combine people's good knowledge about traditional sustainable management practices and modern forestry management for commercial gain. In addition, local people also need to improve their basic knowledge of money management, accounting, sale negotiations, and marketing. Finally, an equitable benefits-sharing system should be created. This is to make sure that the project and all the benefits of forest multiple products (such as fodder, grasses, fuelwood, timber, non-timber forest products) belong to all members of the group and are not confined to local/rural elite.

The question now is: how could the multiorganizational service networks come into being? We have learnt earlier that networks consist of interactions among public and private actors which are bound together by the fact that they are interdependent. To see how the actors might depend on each other, let us describe their respective roles and positions. The Ministry of Forestry holds the authority over state forest lands. But this ministry is responsible for protection of the forest and the environment. To do its multiple tasks in managing forest areas it has limitations both in terms of personnel and financial resources. Therefore it needs to share its responsibilities with local people. The Ministry of Forestry might also need to provide soft loans to local people which can be taken from the Reforestation Fund. Local government authorities could be trusted to organize the management of the credits. Local authorities are also responsible for supervising the implementation of the project. The task can be carried out by *Dinas Kehutanan* (the Provincial Forestry Service) or *Bappeda* (the Regional Development Planning Agency). Timber industries which might need supply of raw materials from local people can contribute to the financing of training and education of the people. The Ministry of Environment can be expected to provide incentives to any group which has the best performance in protecting and conserving their forest area. From this scenario it can be seen that the more the actors cooperate the more likely it becomes to realize common objective of sustaining forest resources. It is the task of public administrators and development managers to facilitate such cooperation.

There are several advantages of these multiorganizational service networks. First, it can be proposed as an alternative to the implementation of the BDH program which has seemed be too hierarchical and dominated by the interests of powerful actors. Second, much forest area can be conserved because local people will participate in this goal and could make real benefits from doing so. Third, the project can give significant contribution to local economic development. Fourth, the project can also reduce the burden of forestry authorities to control large forest area because some of this responsibility has been transferred to local people. Instead of recruiting new personnel, they could improve the skills of the existing ones. In addition, the Ministry of Forestry can concentrate more on the supervision of forest concessionaires. Fifth, this project can reduce illegal logging since social control in rural communities is believed to be strong. Moreover, the participation of traditional leaders in the project can also be used to control the behavior of local people. Finally, we would agree with Geert Bouckaert (1993) that the participation of citizens in governance could improve efficiency, effectiveness, and legitimacy of the public services.

All these examples provide real indications that the Indonesian forestry sector is

increasingly challenged to seek new alternative approaches which could complement traditional reliance on the hierarchical approach and centralized bureaucratic control. Esman, one of quite a few authors who proposed pluralistic forms of development management in developing countries, argued that development managers in developing countries should stimulate, cultivate, and tap every source of initiative that can contribute to the achievement of common policy objectives. He recommended the sharing of responsibility and operations with local government, private companies, and voluntary associations so that many units in and outside of government may contribute to the solution of increasingly complex and intractable social and environmental problems emanated from natural resource commercial exploitation. According to Esman, networks can be used as instruments of pluralist administration.

The prominence of interdependence among actors in the application of multiorganizational service networks in managing forest resources is very much in line with the idea of Elinor Ostrom (1994) about the necessity of voluntary actions instead of a coercive state in governing the commons. Ostrom argued that the use of centralization of control and privatization as policy prescriptions in managing natural resources was actually based on unrealistic assumptions about the real function of institutions. She wrote: *An assertion that central regulation is necessary tells us nothing about the way a central agency should be constituted, what authority it should have, how the limits on its authority should be maintained, how it will obtain information, or how its agents should be selected, motivated to do their work, and have their performances monitored and rewarded or sanctioned. An assertion that the imposition of private property rights is necessary tells us nothing about how that bundle of rights is to be defined, how the various attributes of the goods involved will be measured, who will pay for the costs of excluding nonowners from access, how conflicts over rights will be adjudicated, or how the residual interests of the right holders in the resource system itself will be organized* . If we reflect on what happened to the Indonesian forestry sector during the last three decades, it would be clear that government forestry policies were very much based on a belief that by centralizing control and privatizing forest resources through licensing mechanisms the sustainability and efficiency of the resources could be guaranteed. Instead of building policy prescriptions out of metaphors which tend to oversimplify and idealize the function of institutions, we should make a thorough assessment of human capabilities and limitations in dealing with problems of managing common resources. According to Ostrom policy failures that emanated from centralization of control and privatization through licensing mechanisms had led to the replacement of "limited-access common

property resources" which had successfully been maintained by local communities by *open-access resources* which had led to rapid depletion of the resources. We believe that the application of multiorganizational service networks as we suggest here can lead to voluntary actions in conserving the resources for collective benefits. Through the function of multiorganizational service networks actors could develop shared understandings and mutual trust which are essential in sustaining collective action for the benefits of all.

Selected Bibliography:

Banerjee, A. and H. Mishra. 1995. Transfer of Productive Forests to Local People: An Alternative Paradigm for Forest Management. in E.H. D'Silva and D. Kariyawasam (eds.) *Emerging Issues in Forest Management for Sustainable Development in South Asia.* Manila: Asian Development Bank, World Bank, and IUCN.

Barber, C.V., N.C. Johnson, and E. Hafild. 1994. *Breaking the Logjam: Obstacles to Forest Policy Reform in Indonesia and the United States.* Washington D.C.: World Resources Institute.

Bouckaert, G. 1993. Governance Between Legitimacy and Efficiency: Citizen Participation in the Belgian Fire Services. in J. Kooiman (ed.) *Modern Governance.* London: Sage Publications.

Esman, M.J. 1991. *Management Dimensions of Development.* West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Jemadu, A. 1996., *Sustainable Forest Management in the Context of Multi-level and Multi-actor Policy Processes,* Leuven: Faculty of Social Sciences, KU Leuven.

Maes, R. 1996. Local Self-Government and Territorial Scale. A paper presented at Conference in Trencin, 28-30 April 1996. A project of the Institute for European Policy, KU Leuven and the Comenius University in Bratislava.

Ostrom, E. 1994. *Neither Market Nor State: Governance of Common-pool Resources in the Twenty-first Century.* Washington, DC: International Food Policy Institute.

Redclift, M. 1984. *Development and the Environmental Crisis: Red or Green Alternatives.* London: Methuen.

Yin, R. K. 1994. *Case Study Research. Design and Methods.* Applied Social Research Series Volume 5, Second Edition, California: Sage Publications.