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Introduction

Since the 1990s, local communities responsible for the protection or exploitation of forest resources have started to organize themselves into community-based networks, with the objective to respond to increasing State pressures (economic interests, government’s variability...). In Mesoamerica, diverse secondary-level organizations representing indigenous peoples or forest communities have emerged (such as the Panama’s National Coordinating Body of Indigenous Peoples (COONAPIP), or the Association of Forest Communities of Petén (ACOFOP) in Guatemala), aiming to claim their collective rights and autonomy on forests. The literature on common goods addressed this empirical reality, with some authors who tried to overcome the “tragedy of the commons” (Hardin, 1968), to highlight the possibility to create self-organizing systems between individuals at the local scale in
order to sustainably manage resources (Ostrom, 1990). At the global scale, more than one billion people depend directly or indirectly on forests to sustain their livelihood, out of which 18% are managed by communities\(^1\). Community forestry really started to be taken into consideration in the 1970s, with the introduction by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of forestry programmes in collaboration with rural populations, and the rising recognition of the importance of forests for human development\(^2\). This governance model gradually increased in developing countries through decentralization programmes, covering from 200 million hectares (ha) of forests in 1980 to 450 million in 2000\(^3\). Despite their number and important contribution to the improvement of basic services to the populations, community organizations often remain invisible or little recognized beyond the local scale.

In addition, they are part of a wider context of global forest governance, which may have a significant impact back at the local scale. It is important to mention both the fragmented nature of global forest governance, which is not formally recognized as an international regime (Giessen, 2013), and its conflictive aspect regarding the definition of norms of governance by multiple actors (fight against climate change, biodiversity conservation...). Consequently, several authors rather speak of a “regime-complex” to describe the diversity of institutions and initiatives developed to address the limitations of interstate governance and the failure for the adoption of an international convention on forests (Biermann and al., 2009; Howlett and al., 2010; Keohane, Victor, 2011). Moreover, the multidimensional nature of forest governance has encouraged its connection to other international regimes, such as biodiversity and climate change, which benefit from a more structured regulatory framework (McDermott and al., 2010). For example, the UN-REDD Programme (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation) was launched in 2008 under the international climate change regime. This programme aims to fight deforestation by creating a financial value for the carbon stored in forests. It is essentially built on a market-based approach around the concept of payment for ecosystem services, and a distributive conception of equity around the principle of efficiency. However, this type of global programmes is facing some problems of mismatch between local realities and international conceptions (Cashore and al., 2012). As an example, REDD programmes are blamed for leading to a recentralization of forest governance at the national scale, and to an exacerbation of social inequalities between local actors (Agrawal and al., 2010).

Therefore, many authors point to the need for community systems to organize at other scales than the local one, to adapt to contemporary changes and acquire a role in international mechanisms of discourses and norms construction (Young, 2006; Armitage, 2009). Indeed, community organizations are often part of multi-level processes that involve various changes in their modes of governance. These processes particularly encourage going beyond self-management limits (low technical and financial resources) through the establishment of partnerships between organizations at national and transnational scales (Dedeurwaerdere, 2005). Various transnational initiatives have emerged to consolidate the efforts of community organizations to promote their model of governance, such as the recent Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests (AMBP), in the context of forest governance globalization and local communities’ relative absence into international negotiations. AMBP was founded in 2010 in the context of the COP16 in Cancun, Mexico, and is composed of both indigenous and community forestry organizations. One of the major challenges AMBP is facing is the construction of common claims between heterogeneous actors with sometimes opposed traditions regarding the conservation or the exploitation of forests.

It is consequently pertinent to scrutinize the concrete mechanisms mobilized by these community-based networks to construct common claims at the transnational scale, and to transform norms of
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\(^2\) Community forestry can be defined as: “the exercise by local people of power or influence over decisions regarding management of forests, including the rules of access and the disposition of products” (McDermott, Schreckenberg, 2009: 158).

forest governance between global and local scales. Particular attention will be paid to the position of community forestry organizations in this network. The paper will pursue the following research question: to what extent does community organizations’ transnational action induce both a globalisation of norms and a territorialisation of decision-making authority?

This paper will use an interdisciplinary theoretical framework based on a constructivist perspective of international relations and a geographical approach of transnational social movements to answer this problematic. The analysis relies on an in-depth empirical study of the Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests (AMPB), through fieldwork interviews (AMPB’s representatives and its allies from the international cooperation, community forestry organizations in Guatemala), and direct observations of one AMPB’s Executive Commission meeting in Mexico and the 2014 Climate Change Conference (COP20) in Lima, Peru. First, the construction of a transnational identity around territorial authorities and sustainable forest management will be analysed. Second, an analysis of the AMPB’s global orientation toward the indigenous rights agenda and the territorialisation of international forest programmes will be conducted. Overall, this paper contributes to the reflection on the concrete mechanisms of norms translation between local and global scales, and the retroactive effects of transnational action on community organizations’ practices and structures.

1. Theoretical and methodological framework: a discursive construction of scales by transnational networks

a. An alternative conceptualization of transnational networks

The recent transnationalization of community forestry organizations questions existing approaches and concepts in both the study of common goods and the study of transnational civil society networks. The literature provides different conceptualizations of transnational networks. From a sociological perspective, “transnational collective action” can be defined as “the coordinated international campaigns on the part of networks of activists against international actors, other states, or international institutions” (Della Porta, Tarrow, 2005: 7). In the field of international relations, the dominant concept of “transnational advocacy networks” refers to networks including “those actors working internationally on an issue, who are bound together by shared values, a common discourse, and dense exchanges of information and services” (Keck, Sikkink, 1999: 89). This type of network acquired an important role in the regulation of globalization, seeking primarily to influence States and International Organisations. International NGOs mainly prevailed in this process of redefining global norms, which highlights their key role as an intermediary between local actors and their global claims. In a broader sense, these approaches go beyond the one-way perspective that decisions taken at the international scale, primarily by States, would automatically apply to the national and local scales through a cascade effect. Instead, the transnational perspective allows for a more dynamic vision of civil society actors, seen as both agents and subjects of change (Khagram, Riker, Sikkink, 2002).

However, these concepts are failing to adequately capture the complexity of transnational community forestry networks. Indeed, they do not take into account the diversity of civil society actors, beyond the dominant category of NGOs, to assess their role in global governance processes (Vielajus, 2009). They neither take into account the existence of more sustainable networks, beyond only protesting actions carried out at the international scale (Siméant, 2010; Caouette, 2010). In parallel, little research addresses the question of a possible role for community forestry organizations at a transnational or even an international scale despite the proliferation of studies on the scaling-up of these organizations and their integration into multi-level processes (Cronkleton, 2008; Taylor, 2010; Benjamin and al., 2011; Garcia-Lopez, 2013).

The transnational organizational form adopted by community organizations appears relatively complex as lying at the intersection of transnational social movements (local roots), transnational
advocacy networks (defence of an issue) and non-governmental organizations (formal structure). Therefore, it seems relevant to consider an alternative concept inspired by the idea of “transnational grassroots movements” (Guarnizo, Smith, 1998), to link these different approaches: the concept of “transnational self-help networks”. The particularity of these networks lays in their self-management and membership, as they are exclusively composed of grassroots’ organizations, both providers and recipients of a collective service, and therefore directly concerned by the issue they are defending. This concept echoes the idea of “cosmopolitan localism” (McMichael, 2004), referring to the active role played by local communities to regain ownership of global issues directly affecting them. This can happen through their participation into transnational networks, and the increased awareness of shared interests and values with other local actors previously isolated from each other (Cauette, 2010). This new category of analysis takes into account the specificities of transnational action of community forestry organizations and the corresponding issues of scalar dynamics.

In addition, it is also necessary to redefine the concept of norm to suit our object of study. The constructivist approach of international relations developed a theoretical model of norm “life cycle” around three phases: emergence, diffusion and internalization (Finnemore, Sikkink, 1998). However, this model does not recognize the active role in this process of civil society, and even less of local organizations. Other authors then proposed to construct a new category of “transnational norm-building network” (Mückenberger, 2008; Hein, Kohlmorgen, 2009), in order to give these actors a key role in each phase of norms life cycle. This concept implies an alternative perspective that recognizes the existence of subsidiary and informal norms. These norms have an important role to play in the context of global forest governance, characterized by the absence of central authority. It also recognizes the existence of transnational norms, reflecting their circulations between local and global scales, and their limited scope to a certain type of actor or a geographical area. Finally, it acknowledges the influence of these norms, beyond the States, on the behaviour of actors directly affected by the promoted norms.

This conceptual approach is oriented to consider transnational community forestry networks as full-fledged actors in the global forest governance system. These actors have the capacity to transform norms of forest governance, particularly those directly affecting the model of community forestry. It is now necessary to develop a theoretical framework to understand the specific mechanisms of norms translation, using a sociological and geographical approach.

b. Political rescaling, mediators and transnational social movements theory

The sociology of transnational social movements is the field that brought the most attention to the forms of civil society’s networked organization, including grassroots organizations (Khagram, Riker, Sikkink, 2002). It developed a theoretical model defining three factors to explain the transnational social movements’ political impacts. These three factors are the mobilizing structures (number, strength and articulation among members; degree of centralization; human, political and financial resources), the structures of opportunity (political, institutional and cultural context, both national and international) and the movement strategies and frames (continued mobilization in time; influence on targeted actors and issues) (Smith, Pagnucco, Chatfield, 1997).

The first factor, namely mobilizing structures, contributes to identify which actors have a central function within the network. In the case of transnational community networks, the national or sub-national federations, representing the local organizations of their country, will have a determinant role of mediator, in order to translate local claims into official discourses. In addition, the degree of
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4 The concept has been inspired by a Conference Report titled “The Access of Self-Help Networks to the International Arena”, Institute for Research and Debate on Governance, Rambouillet, 2009.

5 Norms are understood as “standard of appropriate behavior for actors with a given identity” (Finnemore, Sikkink, 1998: 891).
homogeneity of members within the network is crucial in the construction of a common discourse. On the contrary, a high degree of heterogeneity could lead to a multiplication of potentially conflicting discourse coalitions, and then to the impossibility to impose one vision of norms.

The second factor, namely structures of opportunity, is particularly crucial in the context of the fragmented global forest governance. Indeed, the actors who will have access to international decision-making arenas, and therefore flow in key places of discourse production, would benefit from an important position in the process of translating norms. These actors are primarily the highest representatives of the network. As mentioned earlier, global forest governance is increasingly centralized around powerful actors, mainly States and International Organizations. Therefore, it can be assumed that community foresters’ discourses will be orientated to the contestation of the growing centralization of decision-making processes.

Finally, the third factor, namely movement strategies and frames, measures the degree of cooperation and the type of relationship established with other actors outside the network, such as international NGOs or UN agencies. Depending on the strategies employed, these external actors may acquire a role of mediator in the process of norms translation. This implies a potential loss of autonomy for the network’s members involved in these processes. The establishment of partnerships with actors which often have an international character may influence network’s members to globalize their claims. Conversely, the adoption of protesting strategies against external actors may contribute to localize norms of governance, for example through the claim of an indigenous identity.

In each of the three factors presented above, scale appears at the cornerstone of the mediators’ strategies of norms translation. Indeed, the transnational form of action adopted by community forestry organizations raises new questions about the implications of scales dynamics for collective action. The concept of “political rescaling”, found in the field of geography, emphasizes the importance of socio-political dynamics at work in the rescaling processes of collective action (Smith, 1993; Swyngedouw, 1997; Dufour, 2009). In that perspective, scale is meant as an interactional process under power relations between actors. On one side, it is necessary to deconstruct the network in order to show the internal processes of fragmentation, division and differentiation between its members (Swyngedouw, 2004). On the other side, the concept of scale also contributes to understand the construction of transnational claims and identities. As Dufour mentions it:

“These processes of identity convergence require an important political work, allowing the formulation of compromises between previous militant identities sometimes rival (as an example the ecologist identity and the labourer identity), through negotiation processes that entail the organization of actions’ purposes and articulations into hierarchy (for what and for whom we are fighting for in priority, or how to make conflicting purposes compatible). This type of works also contributes to enlighten power relations at stake into transnational networks under construction” (Dufour, 2009: 120).

If scale is meant as an interactional process, it is therefore necessary to identify the actors who are connecting scales of action, and how they are themselves connected by some discourses, ideas or norms conceptions. The sociology of translation (Akrich, Callon, Latour, 2006) developed an interesting theoretical model to explain how norms and ideas are translated from one scale of action to another. Accordingly, an important distinction is made between the role of “intermediary” and the one of “mediator” in the translation process (Latour, 2005). Mediators are those actors who, benefiting from their capacity to circulate between scales, contribute to transform norms and ideas according to their own representations. This notion of mediator is particularly interesting to highlight the existing power asymmetries between actors within the networks, not all of them accessing this central function. As an example, the highest representatives of AMPB, also members of the executive commission, benefit from a strategic position between local members and international actors, in order to transform both local and global norms according to their personal conceptions.
In a nutshell, mediators can use different scalar dynamics to build common discourses and transform norms: their intermediate position between local and international scales within the network structure, their ability to circulate into international arenas, and their mimicry or opposition to existing international actors.

c. A discursive analysis of scalar dynamics and transnational networks

It is important to mention that norms translation mainly occurs through discursive strategies, so mediators can be seen as true “agents of discursive change” (Arts and al., 2010). In fact, according to the culturalist approach, discourses are the result of a process of interpretation and bargaining between actors (Keller, 2013). This approach helps to detect power relations of exclusion and inclusion in the constitution of discourse coalitions and norm-building. The materials used for the discourse analysis in this paper are of two types: semi-structured interviews conducted with different types of actors involved in AMPB (transnational, national and local community leaders), and AMPB’s strategic allies (INGOs, international donors) and written documents elaborated by AMPB’s transnational leaders and its allies (international declarations and internal reports about events or strategic planning). According to Adger, three elements have to be taken into consideration in discourse analysis and will therefore structure the study presented in this paper (Adger, 2001).

Firstly, the recurrence of key expressions used in the discourses has to be examined. In this regard, some key-words have been identified in the discourses of community actors and allies, partly corresponding to central norms of forest governance: territory, rights, governance, forestry, community, indigenous, enterprise, REDD. Beyond a statistical research on these key-words, an analysis of the concordances between them has been conducted, as to understand the permanence or the evolution of their meanings.

Secondly, it is important to identify how actors produce, reproduce or transform discourses. In order to do so, an analysis of the construction of identities and the degrees of differentiation has been determinant, taking into consideration both negative identity (us versus them), or positive identity (us with them) (Fairclough, 2003). A distinction in the discourse analysis was made between community actors and allies, and between their respective scale of action or authority (local, national, transnational and international).

Thirdly, the social and political impacts of the discourses have to be analysed. In this regard, it is important to take into account the context in which the discourse has been produced, in particular the scale to which the discourse has been addressed. The analysis of a discourse produced during a semi-structured interview in the local forest governance context of a particular country is very different from a discourse produced for an official report dealing on global forest governance challenges.

Furthermore, the process of translation implies different transformations in the scalar dimension of norms and networks’ structures. As Hajer and Versteeg mention it, “Discourse analysis has three particular strengths; the capacity to reveal the role of language in politics, to reveal the embeddedness of language in practice and to illuminate mechanisms and answer ‘how questions’” (Hajer, Versteeg, 2005: 176). To operationalize the discourse analysis, it is then possible to identify four scalar mechanisms from the literature, representing the “scale shift” in the study of transnational discourses (see graph 1). According to Masson, these scalar dynamics correspond to two major rescaling directions, namely the “discursive rescaling” and the “organizational rescaling” (Masson, 2009: 120).

On one side, the literature dealing with political rescaling provides a useful distinction between “localization” and “globalization” processes (Swyngedouw, 2004; Cash and al., 2006; Compagnon, 2009).

The analysis of concordances between key-words has been made using the software AntConc.
2010), constitutive of the “discursive rescaling”. A first transformation can be a localization of global norms that proved to be inconsistent with local realities in order, for example, to advance an alternative global interpretation of norms. On the contrary, local norms can be the object of globalization processes, for example to build a common identity or gain more influence in higher decision-making arenas. Moreover, Swyngedouw uses the concept of “glocalization” to define the co-existence of these two scalar dynamics simultaneously, especially with actors involved in a transnational mobilization (Swyngedouw, 2004).

On the other side, the literature dealing with transnational social movements provides a distinction between “centralization” and “decentralization” processes, constitutive of the “organizational rescaling” (Chatfield, Pagnucco, Smith, 1997; Saunders, 2013). The first dynamic is the centralization of networks, with the shifting of decision-making authority toward the transnational network and the formalization of its structure, through for instance a process of “NGOization” (Rouillé d’Orfeuil, 2005). Conversely, a decentralization process occurs when the transnational network structure remains flexible, and local organizations’ autonomy is preserved.

Moreover, the concept of “(de)territorialisation” can be useful to cross discursive and organizational rescaling (Swyngedouw, 2004; Escobar, 2008). On one hand, the process of “territorialisation” is made of an intersection between norms localization and decision-making decentralization, in which small-scale frontier delimitation is pursued. On the other hand, the process of “de-territorialisation” consists of an intersection between norms globalization and decision-making centralization, in which frontiers are blurred.

Graph 1: The four scalar dynamics and their dimensions (personal design)

It is therefore possible through the transnational approach to break the dichotomy between actor and system, and between micro and macro. Instead of a truly global or local scale, it is more suitable to speak about a continuum of interactions between the two, with an intrinsic dynamic structure. This perspective confirms the important role transnational self-help networks could play in the transformation of norms, using their strategic position between local and global scales. The next two parts are dedicated to the analysis of one case study representing a transnational community forestry network: the Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests (AMPB). After an analysis of the construction of a transnational identity inside the network, a study of the discourses diffused into international arenas will exemplify the interesting discursive disparities between scales.
2. Toward the construction of a transnational identity around “territorial authorities”

In this part, the concept of “transnationalization”, or “glocalization”, will be used to outline the intersection between the process of norms localization and globalization. Indeed, this concept reveals the possibility for AMPB to globalize a certain form of Mesoamerican identity around “territorial authorities”, which in turn involves a localization process differing from other types of international actors.

   a. An initial heterogeneity among the transnational network’s members

The study of the Mesoamerican region is particularly interesting to highlight recent changes in the forms of governance of community forestry organizations. Indeed, this region appears emblematic of the development of self-help networks and protest movements against international programmes. Whereas Mesoamerica represents only 2.2% of the forests worldwide, with about 86.6 million hectares of forests\(^7\), forest communities and indigenous peoples own or manage over 60% of the region’s forests (Kaimowitz, 2008). For instance, local communities own the majority of forests in Mexico. In addition, the region has experienced large movements of decentralization in recent decades, encouraging a process of securing property rights, and strengthening community forestry organizations (Kaimowitz, 2008). For example, some studies on the region show that forests located on indigenous territories, or governed by community foresters, have lower rates of deforestation (Kaimowitz, 2008).

The issues and roles of community forestry networks are taking another dimension in the context of the increasing globalization of forest governance. The creation of the Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests (AMPB) in 2010, following the 16\(^{th}\) Conference of the Parties (COP) under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), is an emblematic case. The alliance consists primarily of local organizations preserving or managing forests under a communal property. Its purpose is first, the promotion of the community-based model of forest governance in Mesoamerica to face challenges of climate change and sustainable development and second, the consolidation of local communities’ property rights and autonomy facing governments and specific programmes such as UN-REDD. The network structure is made entirely of territorial and community organizations. However, the diversity of members (peasant, forest or indigenous identity), and differences in power, presuppose the existence of a multiplicity of discourses seeking an affirmation of local specificities. Indeed, AMPB is composed of two categories of actors (see Map 1):

- Community forestry organizations: the Association of Forest Communities of Petén (ACOFOP) in Guatemala, the National Alliance of Community Forest Organizations of Guatemala (Alianza OFC), the Honduran Federation of Agro-forestry Producers (FEPROAH), and the Mexican Network of Peasant Forestry Organizations (Red MOCAF);

- Indigenous Organizations: the Miskitu Asla Takanka (MASTA) in Honduras, the Mayangna Nation and the YATAMA organization in Nicaragua, the Embera-Wounaan Comarca and the Guna General Congress in Panama, and the Bribri and Cabecar Indigenous Network (RIBCA) in Costa Rica.

Two main interrelated disparities can be identified among these actors: biodiversity conceptions and REDD+ programmes acceptation. Firstly, a major distinction exists regarding the representations of forest between actors. On one hand, indigenous organizations tend to stress the cultural value of forest and defend a historical tradition of forest conservation. On the other hand, community forestry organizations often defend a more economic value of forest, highlighting the compatibility between biodiversity conservation and forest exploitation. As ACOFOP’s director explains it: “Many people talk about the value of forest in terms of biodiversity, but the peasant, the indigenous who doesn’t receive a profit from this forest, has another value of forest [...] Therefore, what happened here is that the forest was converted into an additional asset, more than natural, also economic for the people”.

Secondly, an opposition among AMPB’s members exists between actors who are reluctant to adopt REDD+ programmes for their communities, as the National Coordinator of the Indigenous Peoples of Panama (COONAPIP), and others who are seeking to create their own structure to manage these new funds, as ACOFOP in Guatemala. As an example, COONAPIP opposed UN-REDD and stopped the project in March 2013, following allegations of the lack of consultation during the implementation of the national strategy by the Government of Panama’s National Environment Authority (ANAM). The case of ACOFOP in Guatemala can be mentioned here to stress an opposite trend. ACOFOP is a sub-national network founded in 1995 to develop the model of community concessions in the Maya Biosphere Reserve, and to promote community forestry. ACOFOP created in 2006 its own REDD initiative, “Guatecarbon”, to ensure an adequate participation of local communities and a fair redistribution of funds. As its director mentions it: “some organizations in the Mesoamerican Alliance don’t share our agenda on Guatecarbon, as an example they have a different position because people fears what is REDD, this trend of REDD about reduction of emissions from deforestation and degradation, because people believes that it is a greenwashing for developed countries”.
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9 Interview with the President of RIBCA and of the AMPB’s Executive Commission, 15/07/14, Puebla, Mexico.
10 Interview with the Director of ACOFOP, 29/08/14, Santa Elena, Guatemala.
12 Interview with the Director of ACOFOP, 29/08/14, Santa Elena, Guatemala.
From the analysis of the major disparities between AMPB’s members, it is then possible to classify their main discourses in three narrative profiles (see Table 1). These profiles correspond to distinct normative projects, separated or associated in the discourse of the different types of actors involved, from indigenous organizations to community forestry organizations, and international allies.

Table 1: Three main discourse profiles among AMPB’s members and allies (personal design)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territoriality</th>
<th>Sustainable Forest Management</th>
<th>Community Entrepreneurship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous peoples and territories</td>
<td>Forest communities</td>
<td>Forest enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial governance</td>
<td>Forest Management</td>
<td>Forest exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial rights</td>
<td>Community rights</td>
<td>Forestry community rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The different representations on forest among AMPB’s members are translated into the development of two separate agendas by AMPB, one dealing with territorial rights and the other with forest governance. This separation aims principally to respect the autonomy and identity of each member. As the president of AMPB’s executive commission mentions it: “We have separated this in the Alliance, the organizations depending on their approach. Therefore, indigenous issues are managed by indigenous peoples, and forest issues by foresters. The decision-making system in the non-indigenous world is not the same as the decision system in the indigenous one.”

Nevertheless, a detailed discourse analysis of the actors’ scales of action reveals that this separation mainly occurs at the global and transnational scales of the network, through the highest representatives and technical advisers. As it will be developed in the next sub-part, a transnational diffusion of practices and discourses occurs between national and local organizations, permitted by internal knowledge exchange and circulations in the region.

b. Toward an internal transnationalization of discourses and practices

A new transnational identity around the category of “territorial authorities”

One of the major challenges faced by AMPB is to define a common transnational identity beyond national and local specificities as to create shared goals within the network. AMPB’s secretary concedes this necessity when he says: “in the framework of the Alliance, we succeeded in hatching and seeing what are the issues in harmony in the region.” Therefore, instead of classifying AMPB’s members by their ethnicity or type of activity, AMPB has created a new category of “territorial authorities”. This new category highlights the commonalities of the members around their property rights or their historical influence on forests and encompasses both types of members. Indeed, the term “territorial authority” is often associated in the discourses with “indigenous peoples and local forest communities”.

This new framing can also be interpreted as a differentiation against traditional international actors who were representing their voice on the global arenas until recently. Indeed, the term “territorial authorities” appears in the discourses in opposition to “intermediaries” or “paternalism”. The idea is
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13 The table was elaborated through the discourse analysis of 14 written documents and 20 semi-structured interviews made with AMPB’s representatives, ACOFOP’s local members and international allies.

14 Interview with the President of RIBCA and of the AMPB’s Executive Commission, 15/07/14, Puebla, Mexico.

15 Interview with the AMPB’s secretary, 13/07/14, Mexico.
then to retake the control on decision-making processes regarding their own reality, “from the territories” and not “for the territories”. This distinction is extensively used in AMPB’s written reports, for example when mentioning the “Mesoamerican consultation on common approach for the environmental and social safeguards of the FCPF in the framework of REDD+ from the territories”\textsuperscript{16}. Therefore, “from those who produce a policy to those who execute it, there are only two actors, the government and the territorials […] All these intermediaries, NGOs, universities, started to feel displaced of their function and way of life, and this made universities and people from cooperation change their view”\textsuperscript{17}.

Beyond the criticism of traditional international intermediaries, AMPB’s members are also opposed to the leaders who represent an “indigenous international bureaucracy”. These actors are interestingly compared to the metaphor of the “TACA group”, in reference to the Latin-American airline. The metaphor is used to describe a type of leadership spending most of the time in international events without a legitimate representation of community-based actors. As ACOFOP’s director mentions it: “these failures also taught us that maybe the most important thing is the territorial agenda”\textsuperscript{18}.

Beside the construction of a new category to define a common identity within the network, another manifestation of the transnationalization of discourses and practices between AMPB’s members can be showcased through different examples of a regional exchange of knowledge and best practices.

\textit{From indigenous territories to forest territories}

As mentioned above, the concept of “territory” is explicitly or implicitly associated in most of discourses to “indigenous”, “ancestral” or “entitlement”. Nevertheless, the concept is interestingly also associated in some of the discourses to “forest” or “rural”, calling for a more detailed analysis. Firstly, the concept of “forest territory” is used to highlight the idea of a direct representation and legitimacy of local communities, in a large sense, to take decisions over their resources. As an example, two different AMPB’s reports mention that “community actors have proved to be the most effective counterparts for the development of sustainable strategies in rural territories”\textsuperscript{19}; or “to gather a large bloc of forest territories, a large number of hectares, they needed enter into Mexico”\textsuperscript{20}.

Secondly, it is possible to observe an important learning of community forestry actors from the conception of territoriality originating in indigenous organizations. As an example, most of ACOFOP’s members, specialized in community forestry entrepreneurship, mention the important learning from their indigenous counterparts in AMPB on issues linked to the “defence” or “fight” for the territory. Some concrete mechanisms brought from indigenous peoples to community foresters are the Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), or the concept of cultural mediators\textsuperscript{21}. The adoption of this territorial narrative among ACOFOP’s members is particularly linked to the context of renewal of forest concessions, that were accorded for a period of 25 years and whom the majority will expire in the 2020 decade. Indeed, it corresponds to an explicit strategy from ACOFOP’s highest leaders to convince community forestry entrepreneurs of the vital importance to adopt a territorial narrative and consciousness for the future of the concessions\textsuperscript{22}.

\textsuperscript{16} “Consulta Mesoamericana sobre enfoque común para las Salvaguardas Ambientales y Sociales del FCPF en el marco de REDD + desde los territorios”, AMPB, COONAPIP, Septiembre 2011
\textsuperscript{17} Interview with the President of RIBCA and of the AMPB’s Executive Commission, 15/07/14, Puebla, Mexico.
\textsuperscript{18} Interview with the Director of ACOFOP, 29/08/14, Santa Elena, Guatemala.
\textsuperscript{19} “Pueblos Indígenas y Comunidades Rurales Defendiendo Derechos Territoriales”, AMPB/Prisma, Abril 2014.
\textsuperscript{20} Interview with a staff from the CCMSS, 11/07/14, Mexico.
\textsuperscript{21} Direct observation of the Indigenous Pavilion, during the COP20, Lima, Peru, from 01/12/14 to 09/12/14.
\textsuperscript{22} Interview with the Sub-Director of ACOFOP, 25/08/14, Santa Elena, Guatemala.
Therefore, the concept of “forest territory” implies the representation of territorial rights defence. As an AMPB’s report mentions it: “considering territorial governance as the combination of conditions generated when forest lands property ownership is clear and respected, and when it exists norms of access and use of natural resources and institutions able to ensure that these norms are functioning. These conditions are an attribute of forest territories in the hands of the Alliance’s associates”. It is possible here to observe an inclusion of both indigenous and community forestry organizations in the concept of “forest territory”.

From community forestry entrepreneurship to indigenous forest management

Conversely, it is possible to observe an adoption of the forest narrative in discourses and concrete practices of AMPB’s indigenous member organizations. A first association is made with the narrative of “sustainable forest management”. Indeed, it is possible to find concepts of “indigenous forest management” or “community forest management in territorial indigenous governments”. As the Cacique of the Embera Comarca mentions it: “If there is the possibility to make this activity of sustainable forest management, so we will have to make it [...] It is not necessary for us to have this forest here without giving it a utility, there are many forms to give it a utility but in an orderly way”. However, other actors highlight the important necessity to translate the model of community forestry from forest organizations as ACOFOP to the specificities of indigenous context. This concern is apparent in the discourse of a staff from IUCN Mesoamerican office when he says: “the logic of peasants goes more through the issue of commercialization and basically market practices, and probably they will advance toward forest certification because at the end, what they want is to enter markets. Most probably, in the case of indigenous peoples this is not the view they adopt [...] We want to stimulate this discussion on what are the models they believe could function for them”. Therefore, sustainable forest management can be associated with a diversity of activities related to forests beyond a pure exploitation, such as community tourism, handicraft or agroforestry.

Beyond this differentiation, a more radical change can be observed with the adoption by some indigenous organizations of the “forest entrepreneurship” narrative. It is a more radical shift in the sense that for several actors, mainly outside AMPB, “indigenous identity” and “forest entrepreneurship” are still completely incompatible. ACOFOP’s sub-director mentions this dilemma when he says: “the entrepreneurial cannot combine with the communitarian, this is a very strong position of indigenous peoples from Peru, and I was telling them the contrary because you have to break the traditional scheme, you have to create a different form of entrepreneurship which satisfies your necessities and for this reason, we talk about community enterprises”. On the contrary, different experiences sharing between AMPB’s members revealed the potentialities of a forest entrepreneurship for indigenous organizations. In 2011, AMPB was already demanding the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) to “boost productivity for peasant and indigenous enterprises”, in the framework of its thematic programme on Community Forest Management and Community Enterprises. Different AMPB’s videos present interviews of national leaders who demonstrate the compatibility between forest exploitation, entrepreneurial view and indigenous
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23 “La forestería comunitaria base de la gobernanza forestal y punto de partida para FLEGT y REDD”, AMPB, Nota conceptual, Septiembre 2013.
24 Interview with the Cacique of the Embera Comarca, 15/07/14, Puebla, Mexico.
25 Interview with a staff from IUCN Mesoamerican Office, 01/09/14, San José, Costa Rica.
26 Interview with the Sub-Director of ACOFOP, 25/08/14, Santa Elena, Guatemala.
27 “Declaración de La Antigua Guatemala, de los dueños de bosques y productores forestales de Mesoamérica”, AMPB, Noviembre 2011.
territorial governance and life plans. This is the case of the Embera-Wounaan Comarca in Panama, which created the community enterprise Tupiza already in 2004 to exploit forest resources.

It is now interesting to analyse the transition from an internal transnationalization between AMPB’s members around the category of “territorial authorities”, to an external differentiation between actors into global arenas around the category of “forest owners”.

3. Toward a territorialisation of global forest governance through “forest owners”

In this part, the concept of “territorialisation” will be understood at the intersection of the process of norms localization and decision-making decentralization. Indeed, this concept is useful to reflect the complexity of the AMPB’s global strategy, relying both on a localization of norms around indigenous identity, and a decentralization of decision-making authority linked to REDD+ programmes.

a. A prioritization of the indigenous rights agenda into global forest governance arenas

When moving to the global scale, it is puzzling to observe back the presence of the initial differentiation between AMPB’s members. Indeed, the indigenous rights agenda and the discourse profile on “territoriality” are prominent at this scale while the forest narrative is almost absent of the discourses. The most interesting example is the recent action of AMPB’s leaders related to the 2014 Climate Change Conference (COP20) in Lima and the COP21 in Paris, toward a 2015 renewed international agreement. An integration of the indigenous rights agenda into global climate change arenas can be observed. As an example, AMPB’s leaders have created an international mobile cinema campaign, called “If not us then who?” (see Image 1), aiming to raise global awareness on indigenous rights violations, and their vital role in forest preservation worldwide. One of the various videos shows indigenous peoples of the Awas-Tingi territory, in Nicaragua, defending their rights against “speculators” and “colonist invading territories”. The idea is to present indigenous peoples as local “heroes” in the defence of forests and territories, reflected by the emblematic case of the Edwin Chota Asheninka native’s death in September 2014, for his environmental activism in the Peruvian amazon forest.

Image 1: “If Not Us Then Who?” AMPB’s international campaign (Source: AMPB website)
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28 Foro Mesoamericano “La gestión territorial indígena en Mesoamérica”, AMPB, 2013, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_uTlgDnEDB0
30 Press Conference during the official launch of the International Mobile Cinema Campaign “If not us then who?” in Peru, http://ifnotusthenwho.me/conferencia-de-prensa-por-primera-vez-la-viuda-de-edwin-chota-y-otros-asheninkas-asesinados-en-la-selva-lunes-17-de-noviembre-las1400-h-2/
Moreover, a special agenda around indigenous rights was launched in the framework of the New-York Climate Summit in September 2014, in parallel with the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples. These two key global events were the opportunity for AMPB to prioritize the territorial rights agenda, through three main demands to the international community:\(^{31}\): respect and reconstitution of ancestral territoriality; territorial climate funding; auto-determination and free, prior and informed consent (FPIC). In this global agenda, indigenous peoples are framed as the “guardians” or the “owners” of the global equatorial region. Indeed, these claims were defined in the framework of a global alliance of “forest owners” from Mesoamerica (AMPB), the Amazon Basin (the Coordinator of Indigenous Organizations of the Amazon River Basin (COICA); the Interethic Association for the Development of the Peruvian Rainforest (AIDESEP)), the Congo Basin (the Network of Indigenous and Local Peoples for Forest Ecosystem Management (REPALEAC)), and Indonesia (the Indigenous Peoples Alliance of the Archipelago (AMAN)).

This orientation of the global agenda around indigenous rights appears as a deliberative strategy from AMPB’s technical advisers and highest leaders\(^{32}\), traduced in the metaphor of “acupuncture”. AMPB’s secretary explains this strategy as followed:

“The agenda is focused, in national spaces, on the forest agenda, and in regional spaces, on the territorial rights agenda. As an example, this year the COP will position the issue of territorial rights and the forest governance agenda is not the priority [...] Therefore, it depends on how you identify spaces and you position issues depending on the international or regional agenda [...] It is like having this instinct, one of the colleagues says it is like Japanese, like acupuncture”\(^{33}\).

This statement reveals the prioritization made between AMPB’s internal agendas. The relative absence of indigenous issues into international negotiations on climate change until now, compared to forest issues, justifies this overrepresentation of the indigenous rights agenda\(^{34}\). The direct observation of the COP20 in Lima confirms this orientation, with the creation for the first time of an “Indigenous Pavilion” within the official venue. Moreover, the acquisition of territorial rights is presented as a prior fundamental step before talking about community forest management models. A report from the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) confirms this regional trend to eclipse debates on forest management models to the one of property rights\(^{35}\). It adds that this is due most of the time to a lack of effective implementation on the ground of legally recognized property rights, leading to a continued and time-consuming transnational mobilization from community actors. Therefore, coming back to AMPB’s global discourses, a shift from the category of “territorial authorities” to the one of “forest owners” can be observed. Once again, this latter excludes in some way community forestry organizations, which cannot easily pretend to the property of their forests when depending on the legal figure of temporary concessions attributed by the government\(^{36}\).

A differentiated influence from strategic international allies

Beyond AMPB’s technical advisers and highest representatives, this global discursive strategy is also related to an important influence from its international allies. Indeed, the network engaged in many partnerships with important external actors, such as international donors (Ford Foundation, Climate Works Foundation…), and international cooperation agencies and organizations (IUCN, the
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32 Direct observation of the AMPB’s Executive Commission meeting, 14-15/07/14, Puebla, Mexico.
33 Interview with the AMPB’s secretary, 13/07/14, Mexico.
34 Direct observation of the Indigenous Pavilion, during the COP20, Lima, Peru, from 01/12/14 to 09/12/14.
36 For example, this is the case for ACOFOP in Guatemala and FEPROAH in Honduras.
interchurch organization for development cooperation (ICCO)...). These international allies support AMPB’s priorities through funding or political advocacy. Most of them are clearly oriented in their own internal agenda toward the defence of indigenous rights in relation to climate change issues. For example, IUCN is mostly working with indigenous communities in the region, as a staff mentions it: “the famous overlaps existing between indigenous territories and protected areas [...] All these things we were working on in the region, we want to share it at the end of the year during the COP of climate change, the COP20 in Lima, with the Alliance”37.

However, other allies mention the limitations of this global focus on indigenous and territorial rights, interpreted as the neglecting of the forest productive agenda. The latter is then more financed through local projects directly with community organizations or national networks. As a staff from ICCO highlights it:

“It is an interest of ICCO global, also an interest of the Alliance to strengthen this territorial management [...] But we have some global indicators emerging from the contract with the Dutch government and many of these indicators are focused on the specific case of climate, they are focused on carbon markets, based on REDD or voluntary markets. Related to this, we have some differences because the Alliance is not focused on that”38.

Despite a focus on indigenous peoples’ rights, forest communities are most of the time included in the strategic plans of AMPB’s international allies. For example, one of the main objectives of Ford Foundation, through the Climate and Land Use Alliance (CLUA), is to “increase recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples and rural communities over forests as a critical part of achieving clear and more coherent land and resource tenure”39. Therefore, the prioritization of indigenous peoples’ rights in global AMPB’s discourses can be interpreted more as an influence from other transnational indigenous networks, part of the global alliance of forest owners mentioned before, than an influence from classical allies from the international cooperation.

b. An embedded interest to territorialize international forest programmes: the case of REDD+

It is interesting to raise two interrogations in relation to the previous demonstration of a prevalence of the indigenous rights agenda at the global scale: to what extent are the indigenous rights agenda and global climate arenas linked?; and what are the interests of AMPB’s community forestry organizations to support this global strategic orientation toward indigenous rights?

To answer the first interrogation, global climate arenas and the indigenous rights agenda defended by AMPB are mainly linked through the issue of deforestation and REDD+ programmes. In the academic field, many scientific studies raise the argument that greater autonomy in decision-making processes at the local scale meant higher carbon storage and improved living conditions for the communities (Chhatre, Agrawal, 2009; McDermott, Mahanty, Schreckenberg, 2012). A study mentions for example that “the government engagement of large networks of community forest user groups with national forestry initiatives has been instrumental in fast-tracking improved tenure security for forest communities, and in the creation of strong additional enabling conditions for REDD+” (Bolin, Lawrence, Leggett, 2013: 6). Territorial rights are presented here as a necessary prerequisite for the implementation of REDD+ programmes, in the broader sense of both forest and indigenous communities’ rights. AMPB’s technical advisers developed partnerships with key research institutes, as Prisma Foundation or Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI), with the objective to strengthen the scientific relevance of their discourses framing the indigenous peoples as the best

37 Interview with a staff from IUCN Mesoamerican Office, 01/09/14, San José, Costa Rica.
38 Interview with a staff from ICCO, 15/07/14, Puebla, Mexico.
suited guardians of forests and carbon in the framework of REDD+ programmes. As an example, RRI launched in 2014 a report, ahead of the COP20 in Lima, titled “Securing Rights, Combating Climate Change. How Strengthening Community Forest Rights Mitigates Climate Change.”

However, AMPB’s involvement in REDD+ debates can be interpreted more as a “pretext” to position indigenous rights into international decision-making arenas than a real conviction of the programme essence and values. A staff from IUCN mentions this duality: “if REDD gives them the opportunity to consolidate their territorial rights, then they are going to opt for REDD. Anything that gives them the recognition to the territorial rights they have managed for such a time, they will accept it.” Indeed, several AMPB’s members oppose in their discourses the market-based and redistributive equity conception of REDD+ to their more social and procedural conception of the programme. This alternative view corresponds to the “community roadmap” elaborated by AMPB, called Mesocarbon, in which the expressions of “REDD experts” and “briefcase advocacy” are opposed to “local capacities” and “territorial governance.” The Mesocarbon project traduces a will to build a Mesoamerican model of REDD+, transcending the diversity of models and perceptions of forests in the region. As an AMPB’s report states, “these experiences contain critical lessons for large forested regions in other areas of the world – in particular for REDD+ – where many large forests are in the hands of governments with little capacity to manage them effectively.” It also traduces a will to demonstrate with empirical evidence, through the experimentation on the ground beyond just international abstract discussions, if REDD+ mechanisms can function or not. Moreover, AMPB’s South-American partner COICA adopted the same position, titling its declaration toward the COP20: “REDD+ beyond carbon and market: integrality of the Amazon Indigenous REDD+.” In a broader sense, AMPB’s declarations during the COP20 demonstrate the will to diffuse the territorial narrative toward international actors, traduced by the use of a metaphor on the “territorial acid.”

To answer the second question, it is interesting to observe in AMPB’s internal discourses and strategies the inclusion of both indigenous peoples and forest communities as beneficiaries of the “territorialisation” of REDD+ programmes. The idea is that community forestry organizations could take advantage of the higher visibility of indigenous peoples in global climate arenas to position their own demands. As AMPB’s secretary mentions it:

“In the framework of the Alliance, the issue of REDD is not important as such, but what matters about REDD is that REDD allows you seating in the bargaining table with the government and in the international negotiations to position your issues [...] Before implementing REDD, let’s talk first about entitlement, let’s talk first about territorial consolidation, let’s talk about previous, free and informed consent, and let’s talk about territorial financing [...] these are the cross-cutting and transversal issues to all the organizations.”

The case of ACOFOP is particularly interesting here to understand the interest of forest communities to support indigenous rights at the global scale. First of all, it is important to stress the existence of a plurality and mixing of identities in the Petén region in Guatemala, revealing an inclusive definition.

40 Direct observation of the AMPB’s Executive Commission meeting, 14-15/07/14, Puebla, Mexico.
42 Interview with a staff from IUCN Mesoamerican Office, 01/09/14, San José, Costa Rica.
43 “La Hoja de Ruta Comunitaria para REDD en Mesoamérica”, AMPB (Internal document).
44 “Mesoamerica at the forefront of community forest rights: Lessons for making REDD work”, AMPB/Prisma, Oct. 2013, 8p.
45 Interview with the Director of ACOFOP, 29/08/14, Santa Elena, Guatemala, when talking about the “Guatecarbon” project.
46 “Redd+ más allá del carbono y del mercado: Integralidad del Redd+ Indígena Amazónico”, nota conceptual, COICA, 2014
47 Direct observation of the Indigenous Pavilion, during the COP20, Lima, Peru, from 01/12/14 to 09/12/14.
48 Interview with the AMPB’s secretary, 13/07/14, Mexico.
by ACOFOP of who can be categorized as “indigenous”49. ACOFOP’s involvement into international REDD+ programmes through its own initiative “Guatecarbon”, represents a decisive opportunity to put pressure on the Guatemalan government to extend forest concessions contracts in the Maya Biosphere Reserve. Indeed, REDD+ programmes are only feasible with the stability over time of local property rights, so the government should renew concessions as to benefit from these funds. In this case, AMPB plays the role of a direct intermediary between international programmes and funds, and their implementation on territories. In the context of the COP20 negotiations, AMPB suggests the creation of an Indigenous and Territorial Fund, as a subsidiary fund within the Green Climate Fund of the United Nations50. This role of intermediation reveals a double dynamic of decentralization (territorialisation) of global programmes through AMPB’s advocacy structure, and centralization (institutionalisation) of its territorial members as ACOFOP. Finally, the prioritization of the indigenous rights agenda into global climate arenas can be interpreted as a voluntary strategy by AMPB to raise awareness on territorial rights for the benefit of all its members, included forest communities.

Conclusion

The initial problematic raised in this paper aimed to analyse the concrete mechanisms mobilized by transnational community forestry networks to build common claims at a transnational scale, and to transform norms of forest governance between global and local scales. More generally, it aimed to understand how transnational action contributes to the renewal of the community-based model of forest governance, in a context of increasing State pressures and globalization. The research question pursued was the following: to what extent does community organizations’ transnational action induce both a glocalization of norms and a territorialisation of decision-making authority?

The main result of this paper is the demonstration of the existence of a multi-scalar discursive dynamic implemented by the transnational community-based network studied, the Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests (AMPB). Indeed, beyond an initial heterogeneity within the network between indigenous and community forestry organizations, an important internal diffusion of practices and discourses occurred through a process of norms “transnationalization” or “glocalization”. The creation of forest enterprises by indigenous communities or conversely the involvement of forest communities in territorial advocacy mobilisations are good examples of this internal diffusion. Moreover, the observation of a paradox between this internal discursive dynamic and the external one brings interesting elements to the discussion. Indeed, when moving to the international arenas, AMPB’s discourses are highly oriented toward a differentiation and a prioritization of the indigenous rights agenda, compared to the forest governance agenda. However, this prioritization is embedded in an attempt to territorialise international forest mechanisms, such as REDD+, for the benefit of both indigenous and community forestry organizations. This multi-scalar discursive dynamic demonstrates the capacity of transnational actors to link previous separated agendas or arenas, as the indigenous, climate and forest ones.

Therefore, beyond an apparent fragmentation of discourses and practices between actors and scales, the discursive analysis of scalar dynamics helps making intelligible transnational networks’ action. Indeed, the four scalar dynamics presented in the theoretical framework of this paper – localization, globalization, centralization, decentralization – and their interrelations – glocalization, (de)territorialisation – reveal the strategic articulation between the multiplicity of scales and actors, in a cross-scale perspective. It highlights the importance of both normative and organizational changes brought by transnational action. Moreover, the analysis demonstrates the relevance to

49 Interview with the President of Utz’ Che’ in Guatemala, 03/12/14, Lima, Peru.
combine the transnational social movement theory with a geographical scalar approach. Firstly, the analysis of the internal structure of the network shows how the degree of heterogeneity among local members is decisive in the construction of transnational discourse and norms of governance. Secondly, the study of the external context in which actors are included is determinant to understand the adaptation of discourses in function of existing arenas and their particular scale. Finally, the analysis of the network’s partners reveals the important influence of these external actors depending on their type and their own scalar power.

In the end, this type of analysis also helps recognizing the power of community-based actors to renew their mode of community forest governance and to suggest an alternative way to manage forest, through a more holistic and collective conception. In the case of AMPB, this alternative conception is traduced by the construction of a transnational discourse around “territoriality”. The progressive empowerment of these self-help networks reveals the emergence of a new type of “community experts” able to find solutions to global challenges, such as deforestation and climate change, through the advantage of their multi-scales position.
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