



Editorial

It is our pleasure to present Volume 9 (1) of the Journal of Forest and Livelihood. In this volume, we have brought together research and perspectives from professionals working in forestry, natural resources and the global change sector. We are indeed very pleased to receive a diversity of contributions on themes that are highly relevant to forests and local livelihoods. Over the past ten years, we have been able to mobilize commitments from outstanding researchers as well as the continued support from our readers, supporters, contributors and reviewers.

The first ten years of the publication of *Journal of Forest and Livelihoods* have revealed a great transformation in our understanding about participatory forestry policies and programs and about the way resource users manage natural resources. Our goal of contributing to knowledge about forest management and rural livelihoods has also encompassed themes that span from the dynamics of forest user institutions, stakeholder communications, networking and collaboration, to learning and adaptive approaches taken by stakeholders, as well as the threats posed by climate change to livelihoods and the adaptive responses in forests management practices. Over the years, we have documented and disseminated many lessons about how we understand forestry and environmental problems in light of the competing visions of stakeholder groups, and illustrated ways that these divergent views can be reconciled.

In this issue, we have included six articles developed from empirical research about different aspects of forest governance and land use. **Paudel et al.** analyse the patterns of Community Forest User Groups' (CFUGs) income and expenditure based on formal financial transactions. They conclude that community forestry is dominated by a techno-bureaucratic, corporate culture — replacing indigenous ways of community governance. In the next paper, **Pokharel** argues that timber management could be a potential source of sustainable income for CFUGs as it has contributed substantially to household incomes in some instances. In the third paper, **Jha and Paudel** analyse the existing forest resource monitoring system in Nepal with reference to requirements for REDD measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) design. They focus on current policy provisions and institutional arrangements and identify existing gaps with respect to meeting the international standards for REDD MRV.

Similarly, **Ghate and Ghate** discuss the autonomy of local users and its importance for effective functioning of self-governing associations in common pool resources. Using IFRI methods, they conducted a comparative study of community forestry in Nepal and Joint Forest Management in India. **Dahal and Bajracharya** analyse CO₂ emission from the soil and its potential implications for climate change, highlighting that better soil management could be an effective strategy to reduce CO₂ emissions. **Bishwokarma** analyse the community dynamics during the Maoist led struggle between 1996-2006 to explain how local communities were affected from the then conflicting parties, and how CFUGs in rural areas were less vulnerable than other rural institutions at that time.

Finally, we are grateful to all the contributors, anonymous reviewers and readers for their contributions, feedbacks and encouragement. These supports will help us putting more resources and efforts to maintain a timely production of this Journal with quality articles on relevant issues on forest policy and practice.