



Collaborative Management of Land

Broad Strokes of the Concept

Responsible Land Governance Mindanao (RLGM) Program | September 2020



Implemented by



Our Aim

“Local governments have agreed on a common management structure in cooperation with national agencies and local communities – including indigenous cultural communities – in the context of the sustainable integrated area development (SIAD) approach to public lands”



The Challenges

- Under what conditions will government actors with overlapping mandates and authorities and land rights claimants with competing interests, needs and strategies enter into a collaborative management framework?
- Up to what extent will formal institutions embrace positive values of informal institutions in aid of collaborative management to ensure integrated and sustainable management of lands?



What we mean by land

- Encompassing term referring to terrestrial resources such as land, water bodies, forests.
- Land with common resources.
- Land that may straddle private and public domains with dual or multiple ownership rights and claims.
- The underlying consideration: with resource/s that is/are commonly used.



Why Collaborative Management

- Complexity of problems needing new approaches
- Need for better governance mechanisms that combine whole of society efforts
- Technology (e.g. IT)
- Nature of resources and number of actors.
- Need to establish legitimacy of actors and roles.
- Need to manage competition.
- Develop capacity.

Bingham, Lisa Blomgren, O'Leary, Rosemary and Christine Carlson. (2015), Feiock, Richard C. (2015), Cooper, Terry L., Bryer, Thomas A. and Jack W. Meek. (2015)

Collaborative Management: Common Issues

1. Appropriation, provision and resource size/quantity
2. Limits imposed on local government units
3. Capacity of resource users to impose resource regulations and schedules at different levels
4. Defining stocks and flows of resources with great precision
5. Trust and tact (sensitivity or being considerate)

Dolšak, N. & Ostrom, E. (eds.) (2003), Gibson, C. and Becker, C. (2000), Ostrom, E., Gardner, R., & Walker, J. (1994), Haslett, B. (2012)

The Concept of Collaborative Management

Characteristics (1)

- A systematic effort to move forward to a different or higher level of working relationships.
- Involves one or more organizations with purposive and official partnership or contractual arrangement.
- Multi-organizational arrangements to solve problems that are difficult to solve.
- Unique institutional form different from spontaneous coordination or synergy-based cooperation.

Characteristics (2)

- Involves a complex sequence of moves and countermoves, adjustments and readjustments, actions and nonactions
- Driven by interdependence among players: extent, density and multiplicity of linkages.
- “Collaborative” as its operative concept; not only between and among organizations but also citizens in governance
- Implemented at vertical and horizontal levels
- Role of collective (not individual) agency.

Distinctiveness from Cooperation and Coordination

1. Cooperation

- Absence of conflict; it is less formal, involves sharing information, may be short term, and presents little risk
- Working jointly with others to some end
- Those working jointly seek to be helpful as opposed to hostile

2. Coordination

- Orchestration of people toward a particular goal; it involves more formal and longer-term interaction, increased risk, and shared rewards (e.g. JAO 01-2012)
- Quality depends on identification and recognition of dependencies as logic for interdependence

Structural Design

- Clearly defined boundaries
- Proportional equivalence between benefits and costs
- Collective-choice arrangements
- Monitoring
- Graduated sanctions
- Conflict-resolution mechanisms
- Minimal recognition of rights to organize
- Nested enterprises (for resources that are parts of larger systems)

Rules

- Similar to regulation – a set of instructions for creating an action situation in a particular environment
- Aims to build the structure of an action situation
- The result of implicit or explicit efforts to achieve order and predictability
- With shared understandings by participants about enforced prescriptions concerning what actions (or outcomes) are required, prohibited, or permitted
- Dependent upon the shared meaning assigned to words used to formulate a set of rules; also dependent on enforcement
- Should be fair, effective, and legitimate as necessary complements to shared norms
- Compatible with the underlying physical domains rules

Ostrom, Elinor. (2005), Ostrom, E., Gardner, R., & Walker, J. (1994), Haslett, B. (2012)

Expected Results

- Increase in benefits that outweigh transaction costs
- Selective incentives
- Trust and shared understanding
- Building legitimacy, reputation, and social or organizational capital
- Networks building and collaboration
- Collective benefits through efficiencies and economies of scale and control of negative externalities

Our Focus: Commons



Implemented by



Characteristics of Commons

- A shared resource that is vulnerable to social dilemmas
- A resource system
- A property-rights regime

Hess, C. & Ostrom, E. (Eds). (2007)

Types of Commons

- Natural-resource commons which are depletable and “rivalrous”
- Commons that manage non-depletable, non-rivalrous resources

Hess, C. & Ostrom, E. (Eds). (2007)

Common Pool Resources

- Goods that can be kept from potential users only at great cost or with difficulty.
- Goods that are subtractable in consumption and can thus disappear.
- Goods that are excludable depending on size and granularity.
- Goods that are independent of particular property rights.
- Common property as a legal regime in itself – a jointly legal set of rights

McKean, Margaret A. (2000), Dolšak, N. & Ostrom, E. (eds.) (2003), Manning, R.E. (2007), O'Leary, Rosemary and Lisa Blomgren Bingham (eds.). (2009), Hess, C. & Ostrom, E. (Eds). (2007)

Ownership and Use

- Ownership of the resource is held in common, often by a large number of owners who have independent rights to use the resource.
- Control of access to the resource is problematic for several potential reasons (e.g. size, pervasiveness, migratory nature, political intransigence).
- The level of exploitation by one user adversely affects the ability of other users to exploit the resource.

McKean, Margaret A. (2000), Dolšak, N. & Ostrom, E. (eds.) (2003), Manning, R.E. (2007), O'Leary, Rosemary and Lisa Blomgren Bingham (eds.). (2009), Hess, C. & Ostrom, E. (Eds). (2007)

Management of commons

- Equity: referring to just or equal appropriation from, and contribution to, the maintenance of a resource.
- Efficiency: dealing with optimal production, management, and use of resource
- Sustainability: looking at outcomes over the long-term

Hess, C. & Ostrom, E. (Eds). (2007)

Learning from Indigenous and Local Practices in Collaborative Management

Agusan del Sur and Misamis Oriental



Implemented by



LUBIDAN Lake, Rosario, ADS

- 1.The Common: Lake Lubidan
- 2.The Common Pool Resource: fishery resources
- 3.Characteristics of the common pool: depletable, excludable
- 4.Characteristics of use: multiple users, consumption and surplus for market
- 5.Property rights regime: customary common property independent of the territorially-bounded rights under IPRA

KANDIBUKO-PANLABUAN Lakes, Loreto and Talacogon, ADS

1. The Common: Lakes shared by Loreto and Talacogon
2. The Common Pool Resource: fishery resources
3. Characteristics of the common pool: depletable, excludable
4. Characteristics of use: multiple users, consumption and surplus for market
5. Property rights regime: customary common property independent of the territorially-bounded rights under IPRA

Dinawihan, Gingoog

1. The Common: 2-hectare Dinawihan Lake and 7-km portion of Odiongan River
2. The Common Pool Resource: depleted fishery resources (also due to seasonality)
3. Characteristics of the common pool: depletable, excludable
4. Characteristics of use: open access; low intensity competition of multiple users (less than 2 percent of total households) and mainly for consumption; two fishers engaged in seasonal surplus production for market
5. Property rights regime: unwritten, unspoken; presumptive common property managed by the State.

Lunotan, Gingoog

1. The Common: Lingon-Lingon Creek being developed as an irrigation system
2. The Common Pool Resource: just frogs, no fishes.
3. Characteristics of the common pool: depletable but low significance to needs; irrigation water, once established, will become the new common pool
4. Characteristics of use: open access; non-conflictive
5. Property rights regime: unwritten, unspoken; presumptive common property with open access

Bal-ason, Gingoog

1. The Common: 3 km portion of Odiongan River used as irrigation system
2. The Common Pool Resource: water for irrigation
3. Characteristics of the common pool: depletable, excludable; currently in favor of 200 HH with rice farms; 20 individuals engaged in small-scale quarrying
4. Characteristics of use: favors 200 HH (out of 1,000 HH) that have rice farms.
5. Property rights regime: unwritten, unspoken; presumptive common property managed by the State (through the NIA)

References (1)

Agranoff, Robert and Michael Mcguire. (2003). Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Governments. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Bingham, Lisa Blomgren, O'Leary, Rosemary and Christine Carlson. (2015). Lateral thinking for collaborative public management. In Bingham, Lisa Blomgren and Rosemary o'Leary (eds). (2015). Big ideas in collaborative public management. USA: Routledge.

Bingham, Lisa Blomgren and Rosemary o'Leary (eds). (2015). Big ideas in collaborative public management. USA: Routledge

Cooper, Terry L., Bryer, Thomas A. and Jack W. Meek. (2015). Outcomes achieved through citizen-centered collaborative public management. In Bingham, Lisa Blomgren and Rosemary o'Leary (eds). (2015). Big ideas in collaborative public management. USA: Routledge

Dolšak, Nives and Elinor Ostrom. (eds). (2003). The commons in the new millennium: challenges and adaptation. USA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Ehls, Daniel. (2014). Joining Decisions in Open Collaborative Innovation Communities. Hamburg, Germany. Springer Gabler.

Feiock, Richard C. (2015). Institutional collective action and local government collaboration. In Bingham, Lisa Blomgren and Rosemary o'Leary (eds). (2015). Big ideas in collaborative public management. USA: Routledge.

Garber, Peter R. (2006). 51 Activities for Collaborative Management. Massachusetts: HRD Press.

Gibson, Clark and C. Dustin Becker. (2000). A lack of institutional demand: why a strong local community in Western Ecuador fails to protect its forest. In Gibson, C., McKean M., and Elinor Ostrom. (2000). People and Forests. MIT Press: London, England.

Gibson, Clark C., McKean, Margaret, and Elinor Ostrom. (2000). People and Forests. MIT Press: London, England

References (2)

- Haslett, Beth. (2012). *Communicating and Organizing in Context*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hess, Charlotte and Elinor Ostrom. (Eds). 2007. *Understanding Knowledge as a Commons*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Kolers, Avery. (2009). *Land, Conflict, and Justice: A Political Theory of Territory*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Manning, Robert E. (2007). *Parks and Carrying Capacity: Commons without Tragedy*. Washington, Covelo, London: Island Press.
- McKean, Margaret A. (2000). *Common property: what is it, what is it good for, and what makes it work?* In Gibson, C., McKean M., and Elinor Ostrom. (2000). *People and Forests*. MIT Press: London, England.
- O'Leary, Rosemary and Lisa Blomgren Bingham (eds.). (2009). *The Collaborative Public Manager - New Ideas for the Twenty-first Century*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Ostrom, Elinor. (2005). *Understanding institutional diversity*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Ostrom, Elinor (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. USA: Cambridge University Press
- Ostrom, Elinor., Gardner, Roy., Jimmy Walker. (1994). *Rules, Games, and Common-Pool Resource*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Bingham, Lisa Blomgren and Rosemary o'Leary (eds). (2015). *Big ideas in collaborative public management*. USA: Routledge
- Cooper, Terry L., Bryer, Thomas A. and Jack W. Meek. (2015). *Outcomes achieved through citizen-centered collaborative public management*. In Bingham, Lisa Blomgren and Rosemary o'Leary (eds). (2015). *Big ideas in collaborative public management*. USA: Routledge



Thank you!

