

The Common Property Resource Digest

NO. 56 QUARTERLY PUBLICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF COMMON PROPERTY MARCH 2001

This issue's CPR Forum examines consumer "eco-labelling" in resource conservation. This idea is being used in forestry through schemes that certify sustainable management practices and then provide a label for their products that indicates this sustainability. Now the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) is working to create a similar certification program for the conservation of fish stocks.

We begin with two commentaries. In the first, *Douglas Constance* begins from the fisheries side by examining the history of dolphin-safe labelling for tuna and the implications that that history has for more recent efforts. In the second commentary, *Peter Egestad* begins from the forestry perspective with some observation on forest labelling in Denmark. The CPR Forum responses begin with *Neil Byron* who inspects the issue from the perspective of several types of stakeholders and concludes that, after several decades of experience, the jury is still very much out. Then *Brendan May*, speaking for the MSC, outlines that group's goals and procedures and responds to some common criticisms of their effort. Next, *Shashi Kant* raises some hard questions about the usefulness of forest labelling to address the most important issues in forestry - especially as they are seen from the South. *Holger Donath*, fresh from some empirical research with consumers, relates what he has found about what matters to them about the eco-labelling issue. Finally, *Maria Recchia* describes what the MSC program looks like from the perspective of a small scale, community managed fishery.

The issue also includes a Practitioner's Profile by *Norman Cohen* whose program involves Alaskan communities that are part of a community-level fisheries quota program. **Enjoy!**

CONTENTS	
CPR FORUM: ECOLABELLING IN FORESTRY AND FISHERIES	
CPR Forum	1
From "Dolphin-Safe Tuna to the Marine Stewardship Council: Ecolabelling in the Fisheries Sector <i>Douglas Constance</i>	1
Certification in Fisheries and Forestry: Distrusting People while Trusting Numbers <i>Peter Egestad</i>	3
Environmental Certification and Labelling <i>Neil Byron</i>	5
Response to Douglas Constance and Peter Egestad <i>Brendan May</i>	6
Forest Certification: A Marketing Tool <i>Shashi Kant</i>	8
Ecolabelling from the Consumers' Perspective <i>Holger Donath</i>	9
Looking at Ecolabelling from the Bay of Fundy <i>Maria Recchia</i>	10
Practitioner's Profile	9
Recent Publications	12
Letters	15
Announcements	15

CPR FORUM COMMENTARY

From "Dolphin-Safe" Tuna to the Marine Stewardship Council: Ecolabelling in the Fisheries Sector

Douglas Constance
Sam Houston State University

"Green Consumerism" represents the fastest growing sector of the food system. Green products usually sell at premium prices and bear an "ecolabel" to certify their enhanced characteristics. In recent years there has been a surge of ecolabels as countries and companies mobilize to service this lucrative market. The history of ecolabelling suggests that this process might be more problematic than many people think.

Ecolabelling in the food system in general, and in the fisheries sector in particular, began in the United States in 1972 with the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA). While most of the public attention centered around saving the whales and the baby harp seals, the Act also mandated that the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) under the Department of Commerce reduce the incidental killing of dolphins associated with commercial tuna fishing to "insignificant levels approaching zero". Millions of dolphins had died in the Eastern Tropical Pacific (ETP) during the 1960s. Tuna fishermen in the ETP had long known that large yellowfin tuna associated with dolphins. With the advent of new fishing technologies, in the late 1950s San Diego fishermen began "setting on dolphins" with large purse-seines and reaping record tuna harvests. The "setting on dolphins" fishing system begins when a lookout spots a pod of dolphins. Hi-speed

The Common Property Resource Digest

Published with support from

the Ford Foundation

Douglas C. Wilson

Editor

skiffs are deployed from the tuna seiner to round up the dolphins in a tight circle. At the same time a more powerful boat is dispatched to encircle the dolphins with the purse-seine net. The bottom of the net is drawn closed and the catch is hauled onto the seiner. The problem is that dolphins, although able to, will not jump the net. They get their flippers and beaks caught in the net and drown - often hundreds, sometimes thousands of them.

MMPA was secured by a coalition of environmental groups. Earth Island Institute (EII) became the locus of activity for tuna/dolphin issues. EII repeatedly charged the Department of Commerce with foot-dragging related to establishing the guidelines necessary to reduce dolphin deaths. The Department of Commerce argued that the intent of MMPA was to manage dolphin populations based on "optimal sustainable populations". Environmentalists argued that the intent of MMPA was to eliminate dolphin deaths, not manage them according to population dynamics.

In the 1980s the US-based tuna fleets reflagged under "foreign" flags to avoid the emerging regulations, specifically the onboard observers and the use of certain fishing procedures. As a result, the California-based tuna industry declined as processing capacity moved to Puerto Rico with the Japanese firms Mitsubishi and Mitsui joining Heinz's Starkist, Pillsbury's Bumble Bee, and Ralston Purina's Chicken of the Sea plants. Amendments to the MMPA in 1984 and 1988 required foreign fleets to adopt US dolphin protection measures and have dolphin death levels comparable to the US fleets. This action eventually led to the elimination of the sales of ETP tuna in the US and forced the tuna fleets to transfer to the Western Pacific to source tuna that did not associate with dolphins. As a result, the tuna processing industry based in Puerto Rico was decimated as processing capacity shifted towards Asia. Due to favourable regulations, many companies set up processing facilities in American Samoa. During this time, both Chicken of the Sea and Bumble Bee were sold by their US-based parents and

bought by Southeast Asian-based firms (Mantrust of Indonesia and Unicord of Thailand, respectively).

Due to the success of a consumer boycott of "dolphin-death" tuna organized by the environmental coalition, in 1990 the Big Three tuna processors announced that they would only buy "dolphin-safe" tuna. In the same year the Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act was passed. It defined "dolphin-safe" to exclude any tuna caught by "setting on dolphins" and forbade the sale of tuna in the US that was not "dolphin-safe". Thus the first ecolabel was born. The environmentalist coalition then secured an embargo against Mexico, Ecuador, Venezuela, and Vanuatu for all tuna that could not be proved to be "dolphin-safe". In 1990 Mexico and the other embargoed countries charged the US with "green imperialism" and took their complaint before the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The GATT ruled against the US and found that tuna could not be embargoed because of how it was caught. In 1992 EII charged the tuna processors with "tuna laundering" through third party countries resulting in more embargoes and yet another complaint to the GATT by Asian, Latin American, and European countries. Again, the GATT ruled against the US.

In an attempt to resolve the controversy, the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) advanced the La Jolla Agreement, a voluntary program of onboard observers and dolphin protection techniques that all nations that fished the ETP would follow. While the environmentalists welcomed this initiative, they were leery of the voluntary component. In 1995 the IATTC proposed the Panama Declaration signed by the countries that fished the ETP, including the US, that made the voluntary aspects of the La Jolla Agreement legally binding. The agreement set a 5,000 dolphin mortality per year per species cap to be adjusted down in future years depending on NMFS-guided research on individual dolphin species. The Panama Declaration became US law with the passage of the International Dolphin Conservation Program Act in 1997. The Act was supported by both Republicans and Democrats, as well as the mainstream environmental organizations such as the World Wildlife Fund and Greenpeace. The environmentalist coalition was now split on dolphin/tuna issues.

The major ecolabelling aspect of this act was that the meaning of the "dolphin-safe" label changed while the label itself remained the same. The previous label certified that the tuna was not caught by "setting on dolphins." The label now meant that an onboard observer had not seen any dolphins die in the process of "setting on dolphins." A new EII-led coalition has challenged the regulations on the grounds that observers will not see all dolphins that might die and the dolphins experience unnecessary stress from this fishing technique. In this latest round of the thirty year old tuna/dolphin controversy, the interests aligned with "setting on dolphins" prevailed. At about this same time, another fisheries ecolabelling venture was being launched.

In 1996 the World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF) and Unilever, PLC. announced a joint initiative called the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) modelled after the WWF's successful Forest Stewardship Council (FSC). The WWF is the largest environmental organization and Unilever is one of the largest buyers and sellers of frozen fish. Citing the collapse of the world's major fisheries, the enormous bycatch problems associated with industrial fishing fleets, and the lack of ability of countries or groups of countries to reverse these trends, the MSC was created as an independent non-governmental organization (NGO) designed to establish sustainable fishing practices and set standards based on fisheries science for individual fisheries. Fisheries that are declared sustainable by third party certifiers will receive the MSC ecolabel and food wholesalers and retailers will be encouraged to sell only MSC-certified fish. In this system, markets will link green consumers to sustainable fisheries and thereby support the restocking of the global fisheries.

While the MSC argues that all major stakeholders were included in the creation of the MSC, opponents claim it is a system of eco-imperialism that services Northern consumers at the expense of Southern producers and consumers. Some critics argue that many fisheries in the South, and some in the North, will be excluded from the MSC accreditation system and by default be relegated to selling "dirty" fish. Others state that important social factors will not be included in narrow, ecological-based criteria of sustainability. Still others assert that the MSC cannot be an independent NGO with Unilever as one of its parents. More specifically, they argue that the industrial fleets such as those owned by, and linked to, Unilever created the problems in the global fisheries and the MSC is really a "wolf in sheep's clothing" hiding behind the "green mantle" provided by WWF.

The history of the "dolphin-safe" label suggests that the institutionalization of ecolabels may be a long process rife with disagreements. Although the environmental perspective prevailed through the 1980s and early 1990s, market forces have come to dominate the reregulation of the tuna fishing. The disturbing part of that story is that the "dolphin-safe" ecolabel on the can of tuna remains the same while its meaning has changed. The MSC does seem to have learned some important lessons from the tuna/dolphin controversy. Like the IATTC that crafted the Panama Declaration, the MSC is a NGO with some freedom to manoeuvre in arenas not available to corporations and nation-States. The MSC has secured the support of a powerful "green" ally. Whether the MSC can legitimize itself as a sustainable fisheries ecolabelling program is yet to be seen. Mark Ritchie, Executive Director of the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, remarked that while the FSC has been very successful, the MSC is more suspect due to its affiliation with the dominant fisheries transnational corporation, Unilever.

SOC_DHC@exchn1.shsu.edu

Certification in Fisheries and Forestry: Distrusting People while Trusting Numbers

Peter Egestad

The Danish Forest and Nature Agency

Within the last decade, environmental certification has become influential in resource management globally. In its ideal form, it is an instrument that works through the market. The driving force behind it is the environmentally sensitive consumer who is concerned about how a product is produced and prefers those coming from sustainably managed resources. To recognise these products a label is necessary. This tells the customer that the product is coming from resources managed according to a specific set of standards. And the companies selling the product can market it as having a sustainable pedigree. Due to the economic interests of the chain of custody it is rarely appropriate for them to certify themselves. Therefore an independent third party often performs the certification to guarantee the scheme's environmental integrity. The beauty of the scheme, again in theory, is that it regulates management through ordinary citizen's concern for nature.

In practice, the Achilles heel of certification has turned out to be provision of certification standards. They define

International Association for the Study of Common Property

Current Officers

President: Susan Hanna

President Elect: Erling Berge

Council

Arun Agrawal	Antonio Diegues
Anil Gupta	Owen Lynch
Ruth Meinzen-Dick	James Murombedzi

CPR Digest Editor	Doug Wilson
Information Officer	Charlotte Hess
Secretary Treasurer	Michelle Curtain

© 2000 IASCP

sustainable management and ideally they need to be objective and acceptable to all parties. But they are not. In Denmark, there are two main certification initiatives in forestry. The Forest Stewardship Council and the Pan European Forest Certification schemes. The former is an environmentally based international initiative and the latter a European forest owners initiative. Both aim at certifying sustainably managed forests but so far they disagree as to who should define the certification standards.

The claim here is that the emergence of certification is an expression of distrustful social relations in forestry and at the same time expressing a trust in numbers. The perspective behind this claim is one, where forestry, like fisheries, are seen as social worlds. Worlds evolving around a concern for forests. Worlds organised by roles, objectives, and equipment and co-ordinated by a more or less shared style of interaction.

Let forestry be the example again. Forestry is defined by different roles: foresters, environmentalist, recreationists, etc. Each role have its objectives. The forester aims at good forest management. The environmentalist at protecting the environment and ecosystems, the recreationist at outdoor experiences. The equipment belonging to this totality entails uniforms, chainsaws, binoculars, tractors, inventory gadgets, etc.

A social world can be more or less unified and stable. For it to be unified, it is required that the different roles and objectives define each other and combine into some kind of whole. The better the elements fit together and the better they fit into the surrounding society, the more stable and taken for granted will the social world of forestry be. Most people will see the same thing when thinking of forestry and it is clear what it means to be a forester, an environmentalist, etc. Expectations of how others will act are fairly stable and perceptions of good and bad are by and large shared. Sub-worlds, as for example those of hunters and birdwatchers, have their place and fit into the social whole.

At the present, the social world of forestry in Western culture, is not unified. The configuration of forestry is changing. Society has come to value forests differently. A large part of the population seems to value recreation and biodiversity more than production of wood and hunting. A primary focus on production and of a steady

supply of wood that used to be good management practice is no longer socially acceptable. Forestry is characterised by new and more environmental objectives, new actors, and new emerging roles. The utilitarian understanding forest management is not able to gather forestry and meet the values of society. But no new dominant shared vision has yet crystallised into a new and more stable configuration of roles, objectives and equipment.

The mood in contemporary forestry is competitive and characterised by uncertainty. Uncertainty of what will be good forest management practice in the future and how the changes will affect the actors. The doubt fosters uncertainty and the vacuum created by lack of shared and 'right' standards for managing forests, attracts different interest to suggest their way of forest

management. Forestry actors, both the old and the new, want to make sure that their understanding and interest are not overseen in quest for new forest management practices. By now this competition has resulted in a myriad of standards for forest management. Certification standards have become a medium of expressing different understandings of nature.



Global Reach: Dolphin Safe Tuna in Lao PDR

Forest management has become political. The interests of consumers, environmentalists, forest users and foresters are all competing for a place in the new order and for the favour of the consumers.

The competitive and uncertain mood in forestry reflects changed relations between actors. As the old configuration is gradually eroding, the trustful relations that defined it also disappear. They are replaced by a more suspicious style of interaction.

But is certification the answer to the problem of providing new institutions in forestry? Can it help provide a new vision and organise forestry based on new and stable relations?

So far not much common ground has been found in Denmark. Certification as initiated by green movements expresses distrust in the ability of the traditional forestry institution to produce sound forest resource management. Not sound from an economic or production point of view but from the environmental and social points of view that have become influential in forest management. To counter such environmental initiatives, the traditional fraction of forestry has come

up with their own certification schemes. They want to document to the public, that their way of managing forests is sound. Environmentally concerned consumers and market forces are the levers used both to change forest management and to argue for a more conservative approach.

And so far most certification efforts has been an attempt to de-humanise forest management. About finding objective standards for resource management independent of individual interests and biases. Then nobody will have to worry about actors with narrow interest pursuing their own agenda. But each actor likes to emphasise that their standards are objective. In a social world characterised by uncertainty, credibility comes to the fore as the scarce resource.

The quest for objective standards is anchored in a deep tradition of trust in numbers as Theodore M. Porter so well has illustrated. When social relations become unpredictable and no longer hold trust, we seek to place trust in impersonal standards that can easily be quantified, measured and controlled. The quest has deep roots in the Cartesian worldview so strongly influencing modern thinking and the wish to establish clear and quantifiable standards for forest management is a product of this tradition. But whereas the enlightenment quest for objectivity was embedded in an strong ethic of elevating general rules and social values over subjectivity and selfish desires, the question is if this ethic still remains intact in our time. Sometimes one gets the impression of the opposite, namely that the (remaining) authority of science is used to further certain management schemes over others. Not necessarily in the interest of society but rather as a way to validate more narrow interests. Standards for forest management are proposed as being scientifically sound, thereby enjoying the authority and impartiality of science.

But are objective standards for forest management to be found independent of the society and human relations producing them? Probably not. Therefore standards for forest management should be agreeable rather than objective. And the process of supplying them should be one where different interests, preferably in co-operation, seek to articulate a new vision for forest management.

If the processes of certification acknowledges the social origin of the problem and see certification as an attempt to provide new institutions in forestry they make sense. As such they may lead to improved relations between actors in forestry and help establish a common understanding of forest management. But if certification remains a competitive quest for objective standards it is not likely to solve the problems of forestry. One set of standards might win the battle but that is not necessarily the same as ending the war.

Forest management can only become objective through social convention. Interaction in a process of supplying standards for certification may lead to objective standards. Not because of their scientific objectivity *per se* but because they become meaningful to the interests in forestry and solve the problems of society. They are not, but become objective. And at this point a new institution will have evolved and there will be a common dominant understanding of what forest are and are fore. Certificates will, at this point, be redundant. They were just the means.

If, on the other hand, interaction over certification does not result in a dominant shared understanding, it is likely to disappear without having improved relations in forestry substantially. The political game over forest management will then be played out in different arenas and in different guises. And due to the inherent social character of the problem a similar forecast sounds for fisheries.

Peter.Egestad@bhhk.bosb.wau.nl

CPR FORUM RESPONSE

Environmental Certification and Labelling

Neil Byron

**Commissioner, Australian Productivity
Commission**

Environmental labels can provide information about the potential (positive and/or negative) environmental impacts of all kinds of products and services, as well as the overall environmental performance of organizations. While “dolphin-friendly tuna” and ‘sustainably managed timber’ may be the best known at present, eco-labels are not that new. Many of us bought goods in “bio-degradable” packaging, and “low-phosphorus” detergents in the 1960s to prevent eutrophication of waterways. Systems have evolved through Germany’s “*Blue Angel*” in 1977, the “*Nordic Swan*” in 1989 and the Japanese ‘*Ecomark*’ in 1989, so we now have independent third-party certification of the producers’ claims, and producers voluntarily submit their products and claims for assessment, in order to impress consumers.

Consumers have a right to know what they are buying, and to express their preferences. Accurate, relevant and credible information about the potential environmental impacts of products is important to some consumers, especially when:

- product prices do not fully reflect the environmental impacts of a product over its lifecycle (such as disposal and waste costs); and/or
- it is difficult or prohibitively expensive for consumers to personally identify and/or evaluate the environmental qualities of a product, either through inspection or use. You cannot tell by the taste whether the canned tuna is dolphin friendly or not.

So environmental labels may influence consumers' choices by:

- affecting the costs of searching for, and evaluating, information about particular environmental attributes;
- signaling the importance of that information; and/or
- potentially affecting the price of the product (if, for example, firms pass on to consumers any additional costs related to labelling practices).

What we still do **not** know about consumers and labelling is: How many consumers want to express such eco-preferences, and who/where are they? How much more are they willing to pay (if anything) and what attributes are most important to them? As Egestad notes "Certification standards have become a medium of expressing different understandings of nature" but which understandings will predominate? Which aspects of nature count? And do they count more than social justice, occupational safety, gender equity, etc?

Producers, on the other hand, can be rewarded commercially for documenting the information relevant to consumers, or it can be mandatory. But again:

- What information do consumers want/need (a German list had over 1200 bio-physical and socio-economic attributes required for certification of tropical forests);
- How to reliably and objectively assess whether the agreed criteria have been met?
- How credible is the documentation/certification? and
- How secure is the 'chain of custody' (so no fraudulent substitution can occur)?

Firms may use environmental labelling voluntarily if they perceive a commercial advantage in providing consumers with environmental information about the product. Firms make their own judgements as to whether the extra costs of such labelling are worth incurring and such costs are generally passed on to consumers. Firms may also label to be 'good corporate citizens' or in response to existing or expected mandatory labelling requirements. Sometimes firms have incentives to withhold information or provide exaggerated or deceptive information. This has led to concerns about the adequacy and reliability of environmental labels in some markets. There are now so many

competing labels and certifiers that consumers may decide to ignore them!

Governments sometimes try to use environmental labels explicitly as an element of environmental policy, seeking to improve environmental outcomes by indirectly influencing firms' behavior. Governments may also become involved with environmental labelling in response to community concerns regarding inadequate voluntary environmental labelling practices or misleading and deceptive environmental claims. Governments try to control such claims.

It is difficult to evaluate the impact of environmental labels on consumer choice and the environment. Some environmental labels appear to facilitate consumers' choices and/or have some positive environmental effects, but this may not always be the case. Indeed perverse effects from environmental labelling practices may sometimes occur which increase, not reduce, environmental damage. Even if production processes are environmentally improved, if total sales increase the aggregate environmental damage could be worse.

I suggest it is still too early to tell whether particular environmental problems are best handled through such market-based mechanisms, but these 'experiments' are likely to evolve further yet. What I find really surprising is how much money and effort governments and NGO have spent in certification, given our immense ignorance of what information consumers care about, the size of the "green premium" for certified products and whether certification really benefits the environment and will have lasting effects.

The author was actively involved in the international forest certification debates between 1992 and 1998 as the Assistant Director General of the Centre for International Forest Research, in Indonesia. nbyron@pc.gov.au <http://www.pc.gov.au/icinfo/bio/byron.html>

CPR FORUM RESPONSE

Response to Douglas Constance and Peter Egestad

Brendan May

Chief Executive of the Marine Stewardship Council (MSC)

There is an almost universal consensus in the global scientific community that the threat to the world's fisheries through over exploitation is one of the planet's most urgent environmental problems. At the very heart of the issue has been the absence of economic incentives to make conservation profitable.

This absence of any encouragement to conserve for tomorrow and not take today have ruined many of the world's commercially valuable fish stocks. The problem is not that fishermen are anti-conservation, but their legitimate fear that what they conserve somebody else will take. It is the market place which has caused the continuation of irresponsible behaviour and therefore the market place that must be reformed if the decline is to be reversed.

In his thoughtful analysis of the growth of ecolabelling for the fisheries sector, Douglas Constance rightly identifies the emergence of the "dolphin friendly" label as an early attempt to intervene in the seafood market place. Interestingly, in many countries it is now impossible to buy a can of tuna which is not in some way produced with the interests of dolphins in mind. Thus the market was reformed.

In some ways the MSC is similar. However there are important differences. Firstly, the nature of what the MSC is seeking to measure is perhaps more complex. The definition of a sustainable fishery is a topic which has teased the intellects of countless fishery scientists for decades. We believe there are three key factors which should be considered in assessing the sustainability of a fishery in the face of over fishing. The first is the state of the stock in question. The second is the effect on the overall eco-system of fishing activity. The third, and for the MSC the most important overarching principle, is the existence of a robust management system.

It is these three principles which form the basis of the MSC's environmental standard against which fisheries can volunteer to be assessed. A fundamental element of this process is that the assessment is undertaken at arm's length from the MSC itself by independent certifiers. In this way the room for prejudice and unscientific subjective judgement is lessened significantly. The MSC's role is as guardian of the standard and distributor of the eco-label seafood products can bear if they are from a certified fishery.

Mr Constance has unfortunately repeated the rather common myth that this standard is only applicable to northern fisheries at the expense of southern ones. Whilst he does not purport to hold this view himself, it is fundamentally wrong. Half of the world's seafood is traded internationally and it is precisely the large northern

buyers of seafood who take large quantities of the developing world's products. The label will therefore benefit them.

Furthermore, anyone taking a casual tour of the world's fisheries will know that there are countless fisheries in the south which are far more sustainable and better managed than many species off the shores of northern countries.

The second great myth is that the MSC is effectively a conspiracy by Unilever to obtain some quick PR success and denude the south for the benefit of the north. The independence of the MSC is thus sometimes called into question, although seldom because of its association with WWF! Of course, the actual reality of the situation is that neither of the founders of the MSC exert any disproportionate influence over the organisation, as they form part of a group of over 200 signatories ranging from processors, retailers, environmental groups, governments, scientists and others, all of whom support the MSC and are represented on its advisory bodies. *Unilever does not even sit on the MSC's board and is one of the MSC's smallest funders.* It is also the case that none of the three fisheries which have already been



certified to the MSC's standard have benefited Unilever commercially because two of the three are not bought by them at all and the third is only of interest to them in one small country. Additionally, Unilever has absolutely no influence whatever on the certification process because of the independence of the assessment process.

Whilst conspiracy theories may excite readers, they do little to help the marine environment. The only reason the MSC will succeed is because it is made up of such a broad coalition of support from so many fishery stakeholders.

We are all learning, because nobody has ever tried to do this before. The early lessons show that those fisheries whose products are already carrying the MSC label are already enjoying improved prominence and competitiveness in the market place.

Certainly, the environmental community has its disagreements on fisheries management and on the MSC programme. WWF International is a robust ally of our organisation in these debates. They would agree with the MSC that to include a number of social criteria in our standards would be to deny many parts of the developing

world the certification which they seek. Those who complain that the MSC is closed to developing countries but would wish to impose social criteria in an environmental standard, which would be illegal in those countries, do no service to those who are proclaiming to help.

The MSC's great challenge is to sit directly in the centre between all the conflicting demands which are made on our organisation. We have to find an equitable and pragmatic balance between reactionary industry representatives and equally reactionary environmentalists. As always, the real progress is being made by a core group of pragmatic and principled allies in the middle of the spectrum.

It is still early days for the MSC. We have however, already proved that sustainable fisheries can be certified as such and that conservation can be made profitable. The priority now is to bring those benefits to as many fisherpeople and consumers as possible.

info@msc.org

CPR FORUM RESPONSE

Forest Certification: A Marketing Tool

Dr. Shashi Kant

**Faculty of Forestry, University of Toronto,
Canada**

The concepts of Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) and Forest Certification (FC) have emerged almost simultaneously in the last decade. SFM emerged as a concern about tropical deforestation (Guidelines by International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) 1992). The SFM concept has been extended to other areas through processes such as Agenda 21, the Helsinki Process, the Montreal Process, the Lepateric Process, the Lisbon process, and the Bhopal Process (2000). Forest Certification was also proposed as a tool to halt tropical deforestation by some NGOs in 1989, and in 1993 the "Forest Stewardship Council" (FSC) was established as a global agency for Forest Certification. Hence, FC seems to be a logical outcome of SFM, but in reality they are separate processes. SFM and certification are certainly related, but they are impelled by different drives.

SFM is a forest management (production) oriented process while certification is a marketing tool for

product promotion and an alternative to product boycotts. Certification is neither necessary nor sufficient for SFM. The main argument is that certification will create market-based incentives for SFM. Undoubtedly, certification has a potential to provide a marketing edge to forest companies in terms of access to environmentally sensitive markets, premiums on certified products, gains in market shares, and improvement of the corporate image. Preference for certified wood by many big retailers, such as Anderson Windows, Centex Homes, Home Base, Home Depot, Ikea, Menards, and Ryland Homes, in the last two years, has further enhanced the marketing power of certification. As a result, there has been proliferation of certification initiatives but the processes have, as Peter Egestad states, become political and embroiled in competition for markets. In this market-oriented environment, diverse actors are competing to define their own standards for certification that will give them a market-edge.

Internationally, two common approaches have evolved for FC - a process-based management systems approach adopted by the International Standards Organization (ISO) and the performance-based approach used by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC). The ISO approach specifies how a management system must be organized to address environmental aspects, and has no relationship with real on the ground outcomes of forest management practices. As a result forest industries have jumped for ISO certification. For example, in Canada more than 13.9 million hectares of forests have been certified under ISO certification. The FSC sets out performance standards for certification of forests, and includes the chain of custody certification. However, it does not provide directions on how to achieve these standards. Undoubtedly, performance -based certification will result in better outcomes in terms of SFM. Although FSC certifiers can follow a generic set of standards, the FSC encourages the development of regionally-based standards. But, there have been instances when forests were certified by FSC certifiers in the absence of regional standards. These instances are an indication of priority being put on the market and not on the standards.

In addition, forest industries and other stakeholders such as small wood lot owners are engaged in promoting their own systems of forest certification. Among these are the Canadian Standards Association Sustainable Forest Management Standards (initiated by the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association), the US Sustainable Forestry Initiative (established by the American Forest and Paper Association in 1994), the

CPR FORUM RESPONSE

Ecolabelling from the Consumers' Perspective

Holger Donath

The University of Rhode Island

Ecolabelling in the forestry and the fisheries sector is an example of a growing trend in consumerism. Today's consumers are better educated and care not only about the attributes of the final product itself but also about the production process and the associated impact on the environment. Both of the lead authors express some skepticism about the future of the MSC but examine the issue only from an institutional point of view and neglect the role of consumers in determining the success of ecolabelling.

The situation in the Danish forestry is described as a confrontation of different groups trying to determine objective management standards for the forestry sector. These different user groups, i.e. environmentalists, forest managers and hunters derive utility from different ways of using the forest. The quest for an objective standard can be regarded as equating the marginal benefit from forest use across these user groups. One way to achieve this goal is to use market mechanisms and give consumers a choice to express their preferences for a specific kind of standard by purchasing certified products. The result is a percentage of a resource managed in a specific way for specific purposes. Depending on the consumers' reaction in the market, resource managers may see economic incentives to follow the given standards. These standards may be arbitrary and lead to 10 percent or 90 percent of an existing resource to be certified. If the standards are too generous, consumers may ignore the ecolabel as meaningless; if the standards are too stringent, the resulting product may be scarce and too expensive. The important point is that the *consumer's reaction* determines the success of such certification.

Thus, ecolabelling can be seen as the attempt to match consumers' preferences for "green" products with a supply of "green" products. An ecolabel typically conveys otherwise unobservable information about the production process to the consumer who is enabled to distinguish between two otherwise identical products. The consumer then has the choice to act upon that information as was the case in the dolphin safe tuna issue.

What factors determine the "success" of an ecolabel with consumers? Foremost, the issue the ecolabel addresses has to be meaningful to the consumer if the consumers do

United Kingdom Woodland Assurance Scheme (UK Forestry Commission, 1999), and the Pan European Forest Certification System (1999). These systems are hybrids of ISO and FSC certification systems and the degree of inclinations towards the ISO or FSC system depends on acceptance by the main stakeholder who is promoting the system, and not on specific requirements of SFM. Apparently - the main focus of these schemes is on capturing market benefits as soon as possible because experience of certification for other products suggests that market benefits tend to be a short-term phenomenon.

The process of certification, irrespective of its market orientation, has contributed to the establishment of multi-stakeholder groups and increased opportunities for broader consultations. However, it has failed in



Charcoal Dealers in Zambia

addressing the main issue - tropical deforestation. Certified forests are located mainly in the boreal and temperate regions of Canada, Poland, Sweden, the UK and the USA. In the majority of tropical countries, forests are used mainly to satisfy domestic needs, and timber is not traded in international markets. Hence, a market-based certification cannot influence forest management practices in these countries. The case is similar for many forest-poor countries in temperate and boreal regions. Hence, certification is only a marketing tool for forest-rich developed countries, and it may provide some economic gains to leading countries, in the short-term, but the gains will disappear in the long-run.

Finally, the real danger to forests, including tropical forests, is from the consumption side while certification focuses on the production side. FC has an in-built danger of exporting consumption habits from developed countries to developing countries, and this will prove counter-productive to the original conceptualization of forest certification.

shashi.kant@utoronto.ca

not know about the issue of sustainability in the forestry or fishery industry, an ecolabel will not be successful. In the case of the MSC label, the awareness of overfishing differs across countries and regions within countries. Consumer education about the issues addressed in the label is essential for the consumers' acceptance of the label.

Another factor to be considered is the consumers' understanding of the link between the environmental impact and the purchasing decision. If consumers understand how their purchase helps to improve certain undesirable aspects of a product or production process, they are likely to alter their purchasing decisions accordingly. Consumers also have to recognize the logo or the label itself. Competing labels are likely to confuse consumers and the meaning of the label may get lost. Again, consumer education about the content of the label is necessary to establish this link between environmental aspect (overfishing) and product purchased (ecolabelled seafood).

The credibility of the Certification Agency is another factor. Research has shown that government guarantees are considered most trustworthy among consumers, followed by environmental organizations and industry ranking third. The MSC is legally an independent party; if consumers perceive it to be an industry sponsored label they will be less likely to choose certified seafood. The opposite could be said about the second partner in this joint venture: The WWF. Consumer perception of the label depends on reports in the media and future marketing efforts by the MSC. There is no indication yet that consumers regard the MSC as an industry label.

Availability of certified product: The greenest consumer can not act upon his/her preferences if the product is not available in the location and at the time the consumer chooses to purchase seafood. The MSC has emphasized getting the seafood industry and supermarket chains involved, but the availability issue creates pressure to certify more seafood, which in turn could weaken standards and thus the credibility of the label.

The MSC has considered these factors and initiated a transparent process of fact finding including representatives from industry, government, academia, and environmental organizations. Success depends on future marketing efforts and consumer education. The MSC will give consumers more choices that better match their preferences and provide incentives for sustainable management of resources.

hdon8422@postoffice.uri.edu

CPR FORUM RESPONSE

Looking at Ecolabelling from the Bay of Fundy

Maria Recchia

**Centre for Community-based Management,
Bay of Fundy Region**

The groundfish (cod, haddock, and pollock) handline fishery in the Bay of Fundy is one of the most sustainable fisheries known to me. Marine habitat is not damaged, bycatch is extremely minimal, it has the capacity (with healthy fish stocks) to employ a large number of independent fishermen, and it produces a very high quality product. If the purpose of eco-labelling is to provide an environmentally friendly product to enlightened consumers while rewarding and thus encouraging good fishing practices, one would imagine that the Bay of Fundy handline fishery would stand a good chance of becoming certified sustainable.

Chances are, however, that this fishery will not become MSC certified for several reasons. The MSC certification process is geared towards large-scale corporate/industrial fisheries with well-funded marketing bodies. That level of organization is absent in the independent small-boat handline fleet. The expense of the certification process is also a deterrent (one estimate I received was as much as \$40,000). The level of in-depth information required by the certifying body is not even readily available for many small-scale Canadian fisheries, let alone the artisanal fisheries of the South.

Nonetheless, I believe that it is possible to pursue MSC certification for a fishery like the Bay of Fundy handline fishery. I expect that there are funders who would support such an initiative that we can only assume would result in the granting of the MSC stamp of approval. There are NGOs who could facilitate the process. If successful, handline fishermen, who generally have very modest fishing incomes, could receive a better price for their fish. In addition, such a move could put pressure on the Canadian government to encourage the handline fishery instead of discriminating against it through ever stricter regulations designed with large-scale corporate fisheries in mind.

This scenario is conceivable, but in terms of benefit to the handline fishermen, I wonder if funding wouldn't be better spent in developing niche markets for fish that are truly sustainably caught, of exceptionally high quality,

and commanding a very high price. Public education would be a prime component of such a project.

Peter Egestad reminds us that certification programs can potentially have a more far-reaching effect than this, even leading to the development of a new concept of resource use. In the fisheries sector I think it is a long shot unless the make-up of the MSC and its processes change to accommodate inshore fisheries. We may have the ability to influence the direction of the MSC simply by pursuing certification for small-boat fisheries. If we can create this opportunity, I think it is worth pursuing as one way to make change.

Eco-labelling may improve the practices of the fishing and logging industry giants but I think it is overly optimistic to think that environmentally sound practices, akin to those of the handliners, will be achieved. Fisheries certification could also lead to the frustration of handliners who see ITQ dragger-caught fish stamped with an eco-label while theirs blends in with the other “dirty” fish. Douglas Constance’s story of dolphin-safe tuna makes it clear that consumers can be blinded by eco-labelling.

The small wood lot owner, forester, and small-boat fisherman in my part of the world is often the most likely to utilize sustainable, environmentally-friendly harvesting techniques. I would like to see these people held up as examples of sustainability and reaping the economic benefits of eco-labelling. Though any improvements, from an ecological point of view, in resource harvesting practices are very welcome.

mariar@nb.sympatico.ca

PRACTITIONER'S PROFILE

Coastal Villages Region Fund

Norman Cohen

1. What does your program do?

Coastal Villages Region Fund (“CVRF”) is a not-for-profit entity organized to represent twenty Alaska coastal communities participating in the Western Alaska Community Development Quota Program (“CDQ” Program). The purpose of the CDQ Program is to provide the means for eligible coastal communities to develop regional fisheries-based economies through a direct allocation of a portion of the total allowable catch of Bering Sea fishery resources. CVRF is one of six groups organized for this purpose. Its membership includes the largest number of

cooperating communities and the largest number of village-based residents.

Developing a fisheries-based economy has three components: First, to accumulate the capital necessary to invest in the harvesting and processing sectors in the Bering Sea. Prior to the start of the CDQ program, these cash-starved communities did not have any capital to invest in the industry that occurs immediately in front of them. All of the value from these fisheries (e.g., pollock, Pacific cod, crab, sablefish, halibut, and others) was being taken out of the Bering Sea and returned to owners and shareholders in Seattle and further south. By dedicating a portion of the harvestable surplus to these communities, they are able to invest in the harvesting and processing sectors. CVRF has invested in American Seafoods Company, the largest offshore company operating in the Bering Sea pollock fishery.

Second, to develop the infrastructure necessary to obtain the greatest value out of the locally available fishery resources. While the CDQ program provides allocations to what are considered as offshore fisheries, local fishermen participate directly in the nearshore and inriver salmon, herring, and halibut fisheries. However, due to their remote location at the end of the transportation systems, costs of operation are high and generally not competitive with more centrally located businesses. By having the funds to put into infrastructure, the local fisheries have a better chance to compete in the world market.

Third, developing the human resources of the region so that they operate the local fisheries businesses and are provided meaningful and higher skill-level employment throughout the fishing industry. This component recognizes that outsiders traditionally have operated businesses in remote Western Alaska communities. Managerial and technical skills are now being developed in these areas, in large part through the training, scholarship, internship, employment, and apprenticeship programs created by CVRF and the other CDQ entities.

2. How did you get started?

After 10 years of active advocacy by western Alaska residents, the North Pacific Fishery Management Council dedicated a portion of the total allowable catch of Bering Sea fishery resources to eligible western Alaska communities. Later, the U.S. Congress placed the program into federal law. Seventeen eligible communities to receive the fishery quota allocations on their behalf created CVRF’s predecessor in 1992. A group of fishermen who participated in the advocacy efforts over the previous decade were the original incorporators of the new organization. Since that time, the organization reformed as a

not for profit entity and grew by three additional eligible communities.

3. How is your group funded?

CVRF licenses its quota allocations to various harvesting and processing companies, which in turn pay licensing fees, called “royalties.” These royalties are paid on the basis of a fee per metric ton harvested or on as a percentage of the value of the fish products sold.

4. What have been your most important accomplishments?

The four top accomplishments to date include: 1) Significant investment in American Seafoods; 2) development of viable salmon and halibut seafood businesses; 3) development of human resources to take a wide range of jobs within the company and in the industry; 4) development of partnerships with other governmental and non-governmental organizations that together promote economic development in the CVRF region.

5. What have been your biggest hurdles or challenges?

The three biggest hurdles include: 1) Dealing with the problems created by the remoteness of the region; 2) dealing with a region where what are considered normal working conditions are the exception rather than the rule; and 3) overcoming the social problems that have grown as the region has slowly transformed from a subsistence economy to one that relies more and more on cash and regular employment.

6. What lessons have you learned that would be useful for other groups or communities involved in common pool resource management?

Some important lessons that we have learned are not to squander opportunities that arise, as there may not be a safety net later. CVRF’s predecessor ran into difficulties as a result of a losing partnership and nearly lost the opportunity to participate in the program. In regard to the common pool resources, endangered and bycatch of species important to other fishing sectors requires flexibility so as not to be caught relying on a particular fishery that cannot be sustained over time. Entire segments of the local fishing industry has been effectively put out of business due to market and resource failures.

7. How can readers get in touch with you?

CVRF can be reached through its main office at 711 H Street, Suite 200, Anchorage, AK 99501. Telephone: 907-274-5151. Fax: 907-278-5150. E-mail to: morgen_c@coastalvillages.org.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Charlotte Hess

Books

- Allman, J.** and V. B. Tashjian. 2000. *I Will Not Eat Stone: A Women’s History of Colonial Asante*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Bavinck, M.**, ed. 2000. *Marine Resource Management: Conflict and Regulation in the Fisheries of the Coromandel Coast*. London: Sage.
- Bouge, M. B.** 2000. *Fishing the Great Lakes: An Environmental History 1783-1933*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Dussart, F.** 2000. *The Politics of Ritual in an Aboriginal Settlement: Kinship, Gender, and the Currency of Knowledge*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.
- Ganoulis, J., I. L. Murphy, and M. Brilly,** eds. 2000. *Transboundary Water Resources in the Balkans: Initiating a Sustainable Regional Co-Operative Network*. Boston: Kluwer Academic.
- Groenfeldt, D.** and M. Svendsen. 2000. *Case Studies in Participatory Irrigation Management*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Grosso, P.**, ed. 2000. *Land Reform: Land Settlement and Cooperatives*. Rome: FAO (Land Reform Bulletin Vol. 2000 No. 1).
- Kloezen, W.** 2000. *Vialidad De Los Arreglos Institucionales Para El Riego Después De La Transferencia Del Manejo En El Distrito De Riego Alto Rio Lerman, México*. Mexico City, Mexico: Instituto Internacional Del Manejo Del Agua / IWMI.
- McDonald, D. A.**, ed. 2000. *On Borders: Perspectives on International Migration in Southern Africa*. New York: St. Martin’s.
- Meinzen-Dick, R., A. Knox, F. Place, and B. Swallow,** eds. 2000. *Property Rights, Collective Action, and Technologies for Natural Resource Management*. Washington, DC: CGIAR.
- Minten, B.** and M. Zeller, eds. 2000. *Beyond Market Liberalization: Welfare, Income Generation and Environmental Sustainability in Rural Madagascar*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Nambiar, E. K. S., A. Tiarks, C. Cossalter, and J. Ranger,** eds. 2000. *Site Management and Productivity in Tropical Plantation Forests: Workshop Proceedings 7-11 December 1999, Kerala, India*. Bogor, Indonesia: Center for International Forestry Research.
- Nervi, P.**, ed. 2000. *Le Terre Civiche tra l’Istituzionalizzazione del Territorio e il Declino dell’Autorità Locale di Sistema: Atti della IV Riunione Scientifica (Trento, 7-8 Novembre 1998)*. Trento, Italy: Casa Editrice Dott. Antonio Milani (CEDAM).
- Nunow, A. A.** 2000. *Pastoralists and Markets: Livestock Commercialization and Food Security in North-Eastern Kenya*. Leiden, The Netherlands: African Studies Centre.
- Roberts, J.** 1999. *Rain Forest Bibliography: An Annotated Guide to Over 1600 Nonfiction Books About Central and South American Jungles*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Rouyer, A.** 2000. *Turning Water Into Politics: The Water Issue in the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict*. New York: St. Martin’s.
- Schumaker, L.** 2001. *Africanizing Anthropology: Fieldwork, Networks, and the Making of Cultural Knowledge in Central Africa*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Silva-Ochoa, P.**, ed. 2000. *Unidadades Riego: La Otra Mitad Del Sector Agrícola Bajo Riego en México*. Mexico City, Mexico: Instituto Internacional Del Manejo Del Agua / IWMI.

Valeri, V. 2000. *The Forest of Taboos: Morality, Hunting, and Identity Among the Huauilu of the Moluccas*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Wunder, S. 2000. *The Economics of Deforestation: The Example of Ecuador*. New York: St. Martin's.

Articles

Ahn, T. K., E. Ostrom, D. Schmidt, R. Shupp, and J. Walker. 2001. "Cooperation in PD Games: Fear, Greed, and History of Play." *Public Choice* 106:137-155.

Al-Oufi, H., E. McLean, and A. Palfreman. 2000. "Observations Upon the Al-Batinah Artisanal Fishery: The Sultanate of Oman." *Marine Policy* 24:423-429.

Anand, P. 2000. "Decisions vs. Willingness-to-Pay in Social Choice." *Environmental Values* 9:419-430.

Anderson, J. A., D. J. Blahna, and D. Chavez. 2000. "Fern Gathering on the San Bernardino Natural Forest: Cultural Versus Commercial Values Among Korean and Japanese Participants." *Society and Natural Resources* 13:747-762.

Baker, K. and M. McKee. 2000. "Increasingly Contested Property Rights and Trading in Environmental Amenities." *Land Economics* 76:333-344.

Batanouny, K. H. 2000. "Land-Use Traditions and Indigenous Knowledge in the Arab Region." *World Conservation* 31:18-.

Beck, T., and C. Nesmith. 2001. "Building on Poor People's Capacities: The Case of Common Property Resources in India and West Africa." *World Development* 29:119-133.

Berkowitz, D., and W. Li. 2000. "Tax Rights in Transition Economies: A Tragedy of the Commons?" *Journal of Public Economics* 76:369-397.

Berman, T., P. Seitel, and A. McCann. 2001. "Local Empowerment and International Cooperation: A Report on the Working Conference 'A Global Assessment of the 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore'." *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 24:28-31.

Bollig, M. 2000. "Staging Social Structures: Ritual and Social Organization in an Egalitarian Society: The Pastoral Pokot of Northern Kenya." *Ethnos* 65:341-365.

Bowder, G. and L. Ortolano. 2000. "The Evolution of an International Water Resources Management Regime in the Mekong River Basin." *Natural Resources Journal* 40:499-532.

Bush, R., and A. Sabri. 2000. "Mining for Fish: Privatization of the 'Commons' Along Egypt's Northern Coastline." *Middle East Report* 30:20-.

Butler, L. L. 2000. "The Pathology of Property Norms: Living Within Nature's Boundaries." *Southern California Law Review* 73:927-1015.

Campbell, D. J., H. Giohohi, and L. Chage. 2000. "Land Use Conflict in Kajiado District, Kenya." *Land Use Policy* 17: 337-348.

Chakraborty, R. N. 2001. "Stability and Outcomes of Common Property Institutions in Forestry: Evidence from the Terai Region of Nepal." *Ecological Economics* 36:341-353.

Choi, S. H. 2000. "Land is Thicker than Blood: Revisiting 'Kinship Paternalism' in a Peasant Village in South Korea." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 56:349-363.

Coppolillo, P. 2000. "The Landscape Ecology of Pastoral Herding: Spatial Analysis of Land Use and Livestock Production in East Africa." *Human Ecology* 28:527-560.

Crean, K. 2000. "The Influence of Boundaries in the Management of Fisheries Resources in the European Union: Case Studies from the UK." *Geoforum* 31:315-328.

Dasgupta, S., S. Hennessey, and R. S. Mukhopadhyay. 2000. "Class, Caste and Agrarian Structure in West Bengal." *Man in India* 80:31-55.

Deadman, P. J., E. Schlager, and R. Gimblett. 2000. "Simulating Common Pool Resource Management Experiments with Adaptive Agents Employing Alternate Communication Routines." *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation* 3(2)

Doorne, S. 2000. "Caves, Cultures and Crowds: Carrying Capacity Meets Consumer Sovereignty." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 8:116-130.

Erickson, J. D. and J. M. Gowdy. 2000. "Resource Use, Institutions, and Sustainability." *Land Economics* 76:345-354.

Fehr, E. and S. Gächter. 2000. "Fairness and Retaliation: The Economics of Reciprocity." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14:159-181.

Fernandez-Gimenez, M. E. 2000. "The Role of Mongolian Nomadic Pastoralists' Ecological Knowledge in Rangeland Management." *Ecological Applications* 10:1328-1326.

Firmin-Sellers, K. 2000. "Custom, Capitalism, and the State: The Origins of Insecure Land Tenure in West Africa." *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics* 156:513-530.

Gaube, T. 2001. "Group Size and Free Riding When Public and Private Goods Are Gross Substitutes." *Economics Letters* 70: 127-132.

Gifford, J., and R. Gifford. 2000. "FISH 3: A Microworld for Studying Social Dilemmas and Resource Management." *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers* 32:417-422.

Gintis, H. 2000. "Strong Reciprocity and Human Sociality." *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 206:169-179.

Gomiero, T. and M. Giampietro 2001. "Multiple-Scale Integrated Analysis of Farming Systems: The Thuong Lo Commune (Vietnamese Uplands) Case Study." *Population and Environment* 22:315-352.

Grafton, Q. R. 2000. "Governance of the Commons: A Role for the State?" *Land Economics* 76:504-517.

Grafton, R. Q., D. Squires, and K. J. Fox. 2000. "Private Property and Economic Efficiency: A Study of a Common-Pool Resource." *Journal of Law and Economics* 43:679-713.

Güth, W., B. Peleg, and H. Kliemt. 2000. "Co-Evolution of Preferences and Information in Simple Games of Trust." *German Economic Review* 1:83-110.

Hanazaki, N. and A. Begossi. 2000. "Fishing and Niche Dimension for Food Consumption of Caicaras from Ponta do Almada (Brazil)." *Human Ecology Review* 7:52-62.

Hatcher, A., et al. 2000. "Normative and Social Influences Affecting Compliance with Fishery Regulations." *Land Economics* 76:448-461.

Herve, D., and S. Ayangma. 2000. "Land Use Dynamics in an Agro-Pastoral Community of the Bolivian Altiplano." *Revue de Geographie Alpine* 88:69-94.

Iyer-Raniga U., and G. Treloar. 2000. "A Context for Participation in Sustainable Development." *Environmental Management* 26:349-361.

Jager, W., M. A. Janssen, and H. J. M. De Vries. 2000. "Behaviour in Commons Dilemmas: Homo Economicus and Homo Psychologicus in an Ecological-economic Model." *Ecological Economics* 35:357-379.

Jodha, N. S. 2000. "Globalization and Fragile Mountain Environments: Policy Challenges and Choices." *Mountain Research and Development* 20:295-339.

Kalabamu, Faustina T. 2000. "Land Tenure and Management Reforms in East and Southern Africa: The Case of Botswana." *Land Use Policy* 17:305-320.

Kammerbauer, J. et al. 2001. "Identification of Development Indicators in Tropical Mountainous Regions and Some Implications for Natural Resource Policy Designs: An Integrated Community Case Study." *Ecological Economics* 36:45-60.

Kellert, S. R., J. N. Mehta, and L. L. Lichtenfeld. 2000. "Community Natural Resource Management: Promise, Rhetoric, and Reality." *Society and Natural Resources* 13:735-745.

- Korn, Evelyn.** 2000. "On the Formation of Family Structures." *Public Choice* 105:357-372.
- Kull, Christian A.** 2000. "Deforestation, Erosion, and Fire: Degradation Myths in the Environmental History of Madagascar." *Environment and History* 6:421-450.
- Lele, Sharachandra.** 2000. "Godsend, Sleight of Hand, or Just Muddling Through: Joint Water and Forest Management in India." *Wastelands News* 16:32-38.
- Locke, C., W. N. Adger, and P. M. Kelly.** 2000. "Changing Places: Migration's Social and Environmental Consequences." *Environment* 42:24-35.
- Loomis, J. B.** 2000. "Environmental Valuation Techniques in Water Resource Decision Making." *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* 126:339-357.
- Lubell, M. and J. T. Scholz.** 2001. "Cooperation Reciprocity, and the Collective-Action Heuristic." *American Journal of Political Science* 45:160-178.
- Matera, A.** 2000. "Whale Quotas: A Market-Based Solution to the Whaling Controversy." *Georgetown International Environmental Law Review* 13:23-46.
- Matthews, S. A., G. P. Shavakoti, and N. Chhetri.** 2000. "Population Forces and Environmental Change: Observations from Western Chitwan, Nepal." *Society and Natural Resources* 13:763-775.
- Mauro, F. and P. D. Hardison.** 2000. "Traditional Knowledge of Indigenous and Local Communities: International Debate and Policy Initiatives." *Ecological Applications* 10:1263-1269.
- Maurstad, A.** 2000. "To Fish or Not to Fish: Small-Scale Fishing and Changing Regulations of the Cod Fishery in Northern Norway." *Human Organization* 59:37-47.
- Merges, R. P.** 2000. "Intellectual Property Rights and the New Institutional Economics." *Vanderbilt Law Review* 53:1857-1877.
- Milon, J. W.** 2000. "Pastures, Fences, Tragedies and Marine Reserves." *Bulletin of Marine Science* 66:901-916.
- Naik, G. and A. H. Kalro.** 2000. "A Methodology for Assessing Impact of Irrigation Management Transfer from Farmers' Perspective." *Water Policy* 2:445-460.
- Okigbo, C. and M. Meister.** 2000. "Sustainable Development of Africa: A Cultural Communication Perspective." *Journal of Development Communication* 11:1-15.
- O'Neill, J. and C. K. Spash.** 2000. "Conceptions of Value in Environmental Decision-Making." *Environmental Values* 9: 521-535.
- Ostrom, E.** 2001. "Commons, Institutional Diversity of." *Encyclopedia of Biodiversity* 1:777-791.
- Ostrom, E.** 2000. "Private and Common Property Rights." In *Encyclopedia of Law and Economics, Vol. II: Civil Law and Economics*. 332-379pp. B. Bouckaert and G. De Geest eds. Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar.
- Panin, A. and B. Brummer.** 2000. "Gender Differentials in Resources Ownership and Crop Productivity of Smallholder Farmers in Africa: A Case Study." *Quarterly Journal of International Agriculture* 39:93-107.
- Parr, John.** 2000. "An Overview of Protected Area Regulations in Southeast Asia." *Tiger Paper* 27:18-23.
- Salmon, E.** 2000. "Kincentric Ecology: Indigenous Perceptions of the Human-Nature Relationship." *Ecological Applications* 10:1327-1332.
- Shelson, K. M., and H. A. McGregor.** 2000. "Extrinsic Value Orientation and 'The Tragedy of the Commons'." *Journal of Personality* 68:383-411.
- Singleton, S.** 2000. "Co-operation or Capture? The Paradox of Co-management and Community Participation in Natural Resource Management and Environmental Policy-Making." *Environmental Politics* 9:1-21.
- Skocpol, T., M. Ganz, and Z. Munson.** 2000. "A Nation of Organizers: The Institutional Origins of Civic Volunteerism in the United States." *American Political Science Review* 94:527-546.
- Smith, H. E.** 2000. "Semicommon Property Rights and Scattering in the Open Fields." *Journal of Legal Studies* 29:131-169.
- Smith, K., C. B. Barrett, and P. W. Box.** 2000. "Participatory Risk Mapping for Targeting Research and Assistance: With an Example from East African Pastoralists." *World Development* 28:1945-1960.
- Songorwa, A. N., T. Buhrs, and K. F. D. Hughey.** 2000. "Community-Based Wildlife Management in Africa: A Critical Assessment of the Literature." *Natural Resources Journal* 40:603-644.
- Southgate, D., P. Salazar-Canelos, and R. Stewart.** 2000. "Markets, Institutions, and Forestry: the Consequences of Timber Trade Liberalization in Ecuador." *World Development* 28:2005-2012.
- Span, H. A.** 2000. "Of TEA's and Takings: Compensation Guarantees for Confiscated Tradeable Environmental Allowances." *Yale Law Journal* 109:1983-2017.
- Takasaki, Y., B. L. Barham, and O. T. Coomes.** 2000. "Rapid Rural Appraisal in Humid Tropical Forests: An Asset Possession- Based Approach and Validation Methods for Wealth Assessment Among Forest Peasant Households." *World Development* 28:1961-1978.
- Tarlock, A. Dan.** 2000. "How Well Can International Water Allocation Regimes Adapt to Global Climate Change?" *Journal of Land Use and Environmental Law* 15:423-449.
- Tarlock, A. Dan.** 2000. "Reconnecting Property Rights to Watersheds." *William and Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review* 25:69-.
- Turner, N. J., M. B. Ignace, and R. Ignace.** 2000. "Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Wisdom of Aboriginal Peoples in British Columbia." *Ecological Applications* 10:1275-1287.
- Uphoff, N., and C. M. Wijayaratna.** 2000. "Demonstrated Benefits from Social Capital: The Productivity of Farmer Organizations in Gal Oya, Sri Lanka." *World Development* 28:1875-1890.
- Usher, P. J.** 2000. "Traditional Ecological Knowledge in Environmental Assessment and Management." *Arctic* 53:183-203.
- Vanberg, V. J.** 2000. "Functional Federalism: Communal or Individual Rights?" *Kyklos* 53:363-386.
- Vatn, A.** 2000. "The Environment as a Commodity." *Environmental Values* 9:493-510.
- Viramontes, D., and L. Descroix.** 2000. "Progressive Degradation of a Milieu Through Overgrazing and Deforestation, and Its Hydrological Consequences: A Case Study of the Western Sierra Madre (Mexico)." *Revue de Geographie Alpine* 88:27-.
- Ward, D., B. T. Ngairorue, and A. Apollus.** 2000. "Perceptions and Realities of Land Degradation in Arid Otjimbingwe, Namibia." *Journal of Arid Environments* 45:337-356.
- Webb, E. L., and M. Khurshid.** 2000. "Divergent Destinies Among Pine Forests in Northern Pakistan: Linking Ecosystem Characteristics with Community Self-Governance and Local Institutions." *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology* 7:189-200.
- Wollenberg, E.** 2000. "Methods for Estimating Forest Income and Their Challenges." *Society and Natural Resources* 13:777-795.
- Worrell, R. and M. C. Appleby.** 2000. "Stewardship of Natural Resources: Definition, Ethical and Practical Aspects." *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 12:263-278.
- Zhang, Y.** 2001. "Economics of Transaction Costs Saving Forestry." *Ecological Economics* 36:197-204.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor,

I received CPR Digest today. It is good that the Digest also use another major language than English. However, a rather high proportion of the content in this edition is in Spanish. For my own part I do not read Spanish, and probably that is the situation for many subscribers. My question is about costs. Would it not be cheaper to have two versions - or would the reduced mailage and print costs imply so much extra administration that there would be no benefit?

With kind regards,

Prof. Jan Åge Riseth,

Narvik University College, Norway

This suggestion is a very good one, if fact it is what we are headed for. Our eventual plan is to put together "regional editions" where there will be some global content and some local content in each issue. We are moving slowly in this direction, however, putting together editorial boards and networks on different continents. Our first attempt to have two different versions of the Digest is tentatively scheduled for Sept 2001.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Send Letters and Announcements to Doug Wilson, Editor, CPR Digest. Institute for Fisheries Management, North Sea Center, PO Box 104, DK-9850, Hirtshals, Denmark. dw@ifm.dk Tel: 45 98 94 28 55 fax: 45 98 94 42 68

For membership, dues, back issues, and missing copies contact Michelle Curtain, P.O. Box 2355 Gary, IN 46409 USA iascp@indiana.edu Tel: 01-219-980-1433 Fax: 01-219-980-2801

For questions about IASCP papers and research, contact Charlotte Hess, Information Officer, IASCP, 513 N. Park, Bloomington, IN 47408 USA iascp@indiana.edu Tel: 01-812- 855-9636 Fax:: 01-812-855-3150

Commons Listserve

The IASCP maintains a simple list serve email facility for passing on announcements. This is a way to send a message to many people at one time through a single email address that the people have signed up for. Users can subscribe (or unsubscribe) by sending a message to **mailserv@aesop.rutgers.edu**. In the body of the message they should type: *subscribe commons*. Those wishing to send announcements to the subscribers should send the message to **commons@aesop.rutgers.edu**. Be sure and avoid sending subscribe and unsubscribe messages to the whole list by sending them to commons@aesop instead of mailserv@aesop.

Inaugural IASCP Pacific Regional Meeting

Theme: Tradition and Globalization: Critical Issues for Accommodation of CPRs in the Pacific Region.

The IASCP Pacific Region includes both small nations, remnants of colonial empires, and medium sized nations, all of which are experiencing unprecedented development stresses upon both local and regional CPRs. It is a region which is characterized by vast tracts of maritime CPRs, while the significantly smaller terrestrial resources are being utilized in an unsustainable manner.

John Sheehan, National Native Title Spokesperson, with the Australian Property Institute is the inaugural appointee for the Pacific. The first IASCP Regional Meeting for the Pacific will be held on 2-4 September 2001, in Brisbane Australia at the Queensland University of Technology, with papers presented over two days 3-4 September in the OJ Wordsworth Theatre, at Gardens Point Campus, Brisbane City.

Pre-Registration and expressions of interest in response to a Call for Papers to be made in late March should be forwarded to the Secretariat, IASCP Regional Meeting for the Pacific, c/- Australian Property Institute, Queensland Division on facsimile 61 7 3839 0438 or email qld@propertyinstitute.com.au

Site Proposals for the 10th Biennial Conference

IASCP is now accepting preliminary proposals for our 10th biennial conference scheduled for 2004. Those interested should submit a two-page statement identifying your interests in hosting an IASCP conference. The most useful statement will include the following information: 1. the name of the sponsoring organization; 2. a list of potential co-sponsors; 3. proposed themes and sub-themes; 4. identification of appropriate venues; and 5. budgetary information outlining projected costs.

Proposals must be received by the Secretariat no later than May 1, 2001. You may send your proposals via postal mail or e-mail to Michelle Curtain at IASCP, PO Box 2355 Gary, IN 46409 USA iascp@indiana.edu

Common Property Resource Digest

JULY 1, 2000- JUNE 30, 2001 IASCP MEMBERSHIP CARD

Renew your membership now and you will not miss any of your membership benefits; including: subscriptions to The CPR Digest; discount registration at our nearly annual meetings; conference abstracts, and the opportunity to contribute to the growth of the IASCP. Contact the IASCP office for additional information or visit our web site.

MEMBERSHIP INFORMATION: Renewal New (Please check one)

Last Name _____ First Name _____ Middle _____

Address:

City _____ State/Province: _____ Postal Code/Zip: _____ Country: _____

Email Address:

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP* **CHECK MEMBERSHIP YEAR(s):**
\$15,000 or more.....US \$30.00 _____ July 1, 2000- June 30, 2001
OR \$14,999 or less.....US \$8.00 _____ July 1, 2001- June 30, 2002
_____ July 1, 2002- June 30, 2003

Total dues payment @US \$30.00.....\$ _____

Total dues payment @ US \$ 8.00.....\$ _____

*Institutional membership fees are a flat rate of US \$60.00.

PAYMENT INFORMATION:

You can return this card to IASCP with:

___ A check payable to IASCP

___ MasterCard ___ Visa ___ Discover | Card Number _____

If your situation prevents you from remitting payment using the above methods, please indicate that and write a brief explanation on the form.

Signature _____ | Exp. Date: _____ OR Email, phone or fax the information to:

THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF COMMON PROPERTY

P.O. Box 2355 Gary IN 46409 USA Phone: 219-980-1433 Fax: 219-980-2801 e-mail: iascp@indiana.edu <http://www.indiana.edu/~iascp>