

International Journal of Human Sciences Research

COMMUNITY LAND IN PORTUGAL: NEW DYNAMICS OF INSTITUTIONAL ARTICULATION FOR TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT

Claiton Mello

Universidade de Trás-os-Montes
and Alto Douro (UTAD)

Vila Real, Portugal

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7390-5914>

All content in this magazine is
licensed under a Creative Com-
mons Attribution License. Attri-
bution-Non-Commercial-Non-
Derivatives 4.0 International (CC
BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Abstract: This article aims to understand the theme of rural common land, a space known in Portugal as community land or common land, to relate this type of territory, which is characterized as rural with low density, with the perspective of development and community governance. For this, a literature review will be presented, to focus on the social, economic and environmental issues linked to the theme of the common land, and on the conceptual framework developed by Elinor Ostrom, to then apply the framework of analysis of socio-economic systems. ecological surveys on a grouping of common land, to understand the governance and management dynamics that permeate these territories.

Keywords: Common land, development, governance, socio-ecological system.

INTRODUCTION

The rural common land in Portugal, a space known as communal land or common land, comprises 820 common land in the central and northern regions, where 406,700 Portuguese live and who enjoy these territories (Baptista, 2010, p. 27). Such communities face the challenge of finding solutions to this type of territory, marked by population aging, depopulation, weak economic dynamics, as well as the constant threats of forest fires, characteristics of low-density rural areas (Baptista, 2006, 2018).

This type of territory is inhabited by communities originating or heirs of these secular lands, not being private property, not even state property, but community property, according to the Constitutional Law in Portugal (Bica et al., 2018). From an environmental point of view, these lands are home to diverse and complex ecosystems of fauna and flora, as well as mineral wealth and countless springs and bodies of water that form important hydrographic basins. Thus, the perspective

of social and economic revitalization and environmental care of these territories by the communities are fundamental for ecological balance and sustainable development.

To understand the dynamics of this theme, a literature review will be presented, to focus on social, economic and environmental issues linked to common land in rural areas, bringing conceptual, historical elements and indications for analysis, together with aspects of the reality of Portuguese common land. in its organizational dynamics and territorial governance (Lopes et al., 2013). Elements of the literature review will be complemented by reading Ostrom's work on community governance of common-use resources and socio-ecological systems (SSEs).

That said, the reality perspective of Portuguese common land will be confronted with the conceptual framework of analysis of SSEs, with the application of the multi-level analytical framework on the governance strategy of a group of common lands. Thus, it is intended with this analysis to perceive possible nodes that can promote or prevent the process of governance and sustainable management of this type of territory.

The search for the territorial development of common lands in rural areas is intertwined with the contemporary challenges of sustainable development (UN, 2018), however, theses still prevail that defend the need for the privatization of these territories, for the exploitation and private control of resources. However, the historical processes and analysis presented in this article point to the resilience and sustainable governance of the commons by local communities themselves and their organizations.

METHODOLOGY

This article will be presented in two combined parts: a first part consisting of two stages of literature review, and a second

part with the application of an analytical framework on the reality of common lands in northern Portugal. The articles from the first phase of the literature review were extracted from the Scopus platform, as it is considered one of the largest bases of existing peer-validated scientific articles (Zhu & Liu, 2020). The search was based on the keywords “common land” and “rural”, using the Boolean operator “and” as a connector, on article titles, abstracts and keywords, with the publication interval between 1985 and 1985. 2020. The result of this search was 129 documents. Therefore, the following limitation items were established: study area, social sciences; document type, article; and, publication phase, final. This filtering resulted in 62 documents that were processed by the Vosviewer bibliometric analysis software (Eck & Waltman, 2009). First, the main bibliographic references were identified by co-citation analysis, by cited references, with at least three citations, and which are part of the Literature Review, point 3 of this investigation. Then, the articles were identified by bibliographic coupling, with the establishment of at least one citation, with 17 articles showing greater strength of bibliographic linkage, which were analyzed in item 3.1 below (Zupic & Čater, 2015).

A second complementary stage of this literature review is composed of other articles, book chapters and gray literature, mainly related to Portuguese common land, as well as other articles that present investigations on the management of common use resources and socio-ecological systems, items 3.2 to 3.4.

After reviewing the literature, the results and the discussion make up the second part of this article, point 4 and other items, with the application of the framework of analysis of socio-ecological systems on the reality of common land, as well as with the framework on the strategy of Agrupamento de Common

lands undertaken by communities and their organizations in the Municipality of Mondim de Basto, northern Portugal. For this application and analysis, the reports and communications provided by the National Federation of Common Lands (BALADI) will serve as a database, as well as the information obtained through observation and dialogues established in a technical visit carried out in five common lands of that Municipality, in June 2021. Subsequently, point 5 follows with the conclusion of this article.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The theoretical framework of the articles of the first stage of this literature review is based on four main works: Hardin (1968), Runge (1986), Ostrom (1990) and Short (2000), presented below in chronological order of publication. Hardin (1968) points out the unfeasibility of managing common goods, considering that individual freedom over collective goods leads to the extreme of their use, causing irreparable environmental damage. For this, the author uses the example of the shepherd who puts one more sheep to graze on the common land. With this, the shepherd in question would have a greater profit than the others, having a larger flock and using a finite resource of the collectivity, thus promoting the tragedy of the commons. The indication that Hardin makes is for the privatization of common goods, as a way of not having a depletion of natural resources, because free access makes the individual want to obtain more advantages for himself, while the private good would be controlled with restricted access and with specific care about resources.

The article by Runge (1986) aims to study the management of common property resources in developed countries. The author explains the difference between open access spaces without restrictions and spaces of

common use rights, which already contradicts Hardin's general premises. Runge defines that the private right, which restricts and excludes the access of others, differs from the type of common property, when the right of use is collective. The author also warns that many privatization policies were guided by premises that avoided the "tragedy of the commons". In contrast, Runge points out that the "Guarantee Problem", which prevents overuse and degradation over common resources, is solved when individuals who use the resources are "free to innovate self-binding property rules that best meet their needs".

Elinor Ostrom (1990) seeks to understand how a group of people can organize and govern resources of common use, Common Pool Resource (CPR), original name in English. The author presents a critique of the alternatives imposed on the management of common goods: privatization, with restricted property rights, and the centrality of state control, with the definition of authoritarian rules. Ostrom analyzes several successful cases in the governance of the commons in several countries, and many other failures, to seek to understand the contexts of collective governance.

The fourth article is by Short (2000), who criticizes the Environmental Land Management Schemes (ELMS), which is the standard established in the United Kingdom for the general treatment of land and the environment. The ELMS starts from a conception of private land, and then inadequately deals with the issues of common land, which in the United Kingdom represent more than 5% of the territory. The author points out three categories of environmental threats to common lands: the first would be the active pursuit of singular and non-common goals, when local communities seek to acquire rights over other community lands to benefit from subsidy policies on land surface

control; or when environmentalists isolate land for conservation, including agricultural areas, in accordance with national public policies for environmental conservation. The second refers to the inadequate process of central administration by the State, due to abandonment and non-application of the law. And the third threat would be the reduced interest in the common land: when one observes the decline of local uses and customs, such as grazing, due to the cost of time and money being greater than the return on traditional activity.

FROM COLLECTIVE MANAGEMENT TO LAND PRIVATIZATION: THE ROLE OF THE STATE

The history of the commons goes back centuries and reveals the great social, economic and environmental organization of the rural population in medieval times, according to research on the region of Aragon, Spain (Echegaray, 2011), which indicates the existence of an institutional arrangement that guaranteed the reproduction and political participation of the "vecinos", the community residents, who defined the level and permission of access to common lands and about the grazing times. According to the author, "the village controlled the pressure on natural resources". However, with the beginning of liberal ideas and the establishment of the capitalist system, the State started to promote the process of privatization of common lands. However, there were processes of resistance by communities against the private appropriation of land, and for the defense of "traditional institutions" (Beltrán Tapia (2015).

The current consequences of privatization processes are decisive for the discontinuity of traditional production models, such as the blockade suffered by cattle herders who need to travel with their animals and travel tens of kilometers (Bassett, 2009; Magole, 2009;

Upton, 2012). In addition, the new institutional arrangements established by States, as in post-colonial independence countries in the 20th century on African and Asian continents (Davenport & Gambiza, 2009; Kumar et al., 2000) resulted in a weakening of associations between peasants and herders, economic and social deterioration and maladjustments of their productive cultures and collective social reproduction. On the other hand, the abandonment or non-existence of the State leaves the process of privatization of common lands to be carried out by village chiefs, for enrichment and increase of power, according to a study by Turner & Moumouni (2019), in Niger, Africa.

Currently, the conflict over land use is recurrent and involves different economic, social and environmental interests. Research by Gómez-Vázquez et al. (2009) analyzes the situation of common lands in Galicia, Spain, called Montes Veciñais in Man Común (MVMC). The authors identify that the main problems are related between the community and the State, whether due to cost issues or charges for government services not recognized by the communities, or due to state contestation of community practices and customs.

Another movement that generates conflicts concerns tourism businesses that explore the landscapes of common lands. A study by Lapeyre (2006) presents the situation of rural communities that are at a disadvantage vis-à-vis the private tourism sector when negotiating and defining land use contracts, according to a case study in Namibia. Similarly, Luz (2017) presents the constraints imposed on common land communities in Portugal by European Union programs that define the maintenance of the landscape in order to receive subsidies to tourism. However, the community's ability to control the territory that is freely

accessible still remains a challenge for community management. Likewise, Wilson & Wilson (1997) point out the mismatch and maladjustment of state information in Wales for the monitoring and environmental management of common lands, which represent 7% of that country's territory. Through legislation based on interests contrary to rural communities, and weak and confused management levels, the State becomes a component for the generation of private profits, which generates the expulsion of communities from their traditional jobs and pushes them to dependence. of public subsidies and the interests of local governments.

From another perspective, Banks (2001) analyzes land management by pastoralists and peasants in the North of China, which has mixed characteristics of family ownership, defined after 1978 with the state land reform, and common ownership, attributed by the Revolution. and 1949. The author indicates that there was no "tragedy of the commons". Even with the continued mobility of animals and herders, there was no depletion of environmental resources. Likewise, group herding activities demonstrate strong collective action. On the other hand, Yang (2012) analyzes the condition of the social security policy of the Chinese State to peasants who are expropriated from their lands, for the realization of new investments, such as the expansion of cities and industrialization. The author points out that the bonds of compensation funds are related to collective groups and not to individual families, a situation that can increase inequality and poverty.

A different problem posed for the State is analyzed by Crisologo-Mendoza & Van de Gaer (2001) on statistical data related to the population growth of the Cordillera region, in the Philippines, which is greater than the

capacity to attend to the customary law for the distribution of common lands, by inheritance, to all those born in that territory. According to the authors, considering the demographic increase and the decrease in arable land, more than 70% of future children with customary rights will have to seek another place for survival, outside their homeland.

The action of States from Western European countries subordinates the autonomy and governance of common lands by their communities, through dynamics and pressures of an economic, political, social and cultural nature. Brown (2006) points out the economic pressures that limit local production, considering the market supply, an issue that is directly combined with the demographic aspects of population aging, as well as cultural values that are not compatible among the youngest. From a policy point of view, they tend to empty spaces for community management and governance and devalue local businesses. These factors impact on the moral axes in internal community relations, both on practices, which generate disputes between its members, and on identity, with the appreciation or contempt of individuals in the community (Brown, 2006b), relationship conditions that weaken the sense of community and compromise the possibility of cohesion and governance.

THE COMMON LAND IN PORTUGAL: THE COMMON LANDS

The common lands covered an area of four million hectares, corresponding to almost 40% of the Portuguese mainland, still in the 19th century, and were based on an agricultural and local economy. As a result of the rise of the capitalist system, the common lands were reduced to just over 500 thousand hectares, as measured by the State in 1940 (Miranda, 2018, p. 4), a measure that is currently observed.

With the Salazar dictatorship, starting in 1926, the common lands were invaded by the State through the 1938 Forest Settlement Plan (Skulska et al., 2020), and through colonization actions, for afforestation and agricultural production. In this process, the inhabitants who depended on those lands to collect firewood, brushwood, and graze cattle were prevented from using them. This situation led to depopulation through forced expulsion, without any compensation to the people who had lived there for centuries, which generated a large exodus.

A new change took place from 1974, with the Democratic Revolution, when the common lands were returned to the local communities, with the Constitution of Portugal of 1976, and, later, in 1986, with the entry of the country into the European Union and subordination to the Agricultural Policy. Common (PAC). Currently, community autonomy over land use by “compartes” has been ratified by the new Common lands Law Number 75/2017 (Bica et al., 2018, p. 59).

The attacks suffered by the common land communities on their collective properties, through State policies, added to the productive changes, with the strong devaluation of the rural environment and the traditional ways of agriculture (Baptista, 1994), reveal the present diagnosis of abandonment of the interior of the country and, consequently, of the common lands. However, threats to common land continue to consider the value of these lands, which concentrate approximately 14% of the country's forests (ICNF, 2021). Since 1976, different draft laws (Grupo Parlamentar PSD and CDS-PP, 2014) have been presented to the Assembly of the Republic, providing for privatization or some kind of change in the status of these lands.

THE COMMON LANDS GROUPING STRATEGY

With the Common lands Law of 2017, a new administrative regime can be applied, called Agrupamento de Common lands. It is a governance strategy that enables a new form of joint administration of the common land, with common land forming and integrating associations and cooperatives with each other or with other entities in the social sector (Bica et al., 2018, p 87). By law, the management of common land takes place through the Board of Directors and an Inspection Committee, which are elected by the Shareholders' Meeting. Shareholders are the holders who are entitled to usufruct the common land and are recognized and registered in the assembly.

The individual management of common land can be carried out in two ways: autonomously, through self-management, or through co-management with the State. The autonomous form comprises management of common lands directly by the compartes and their management and supervisory bodies. The form of co-management, implemented in the 1930s, implies the relationship with the State, currently, through the Institute for the Conservation of Nature and Forests (ICNF), which defines the plan for the use of the common land, including the sharing of possible gains from the commercialization of wood products.

The new modality of management of common lands in a grouped way allows three or more common lands to come together to promote common and shared management. Each Common lands Group must contain a minimum territorial area of 2,500 hectares and a maximum of 7,500 hectares of forest areas. In the event of establishing a partnership with municipalities, the area may exceed 7,500 hectares of forested areas. Each common land interested in participating in a grouping must approve such decision at the Shareholders'

Meeting. This way, each Agrupamento de Common lands must formally constitute itself as an association, define its statute and internal regulations (BALADI, 2019a).

The objective of the Agrupamento de Common lands is to promote the social, economic and environmental sustainability of community areas, making it possible to generate synergy and gains in economies of scale, considering that this is a larger area than individual areas. Also, this management modality has the purpose of improving administrative processes and collective learning, facilitating the circulation of internal and external information to the commons. The Grouping form provides for establishing greater capacity for negotiation and attracting investments to the territories (BALADI, 2019b). The establishment and formalization of the Common lands Groupings is being organized through a project prepared by the National Common lands Federation (BALADI), with financial resources from the Institute for the Conservation of Nature and Forests (ICNF). 2022, for the formation of 10 Common lands Groupings.

The project is in its final phase, with the involvement of 55 common land units that form ten common land clusters, which corresponds to more than 56 thousand hectares of land area, with almost 50 thousand hectares in forest area. The territories of these Groupings belong to six Portuguese districts, namely: Braga, in Cabeceiras de Basto and Terras de Bouro; Castelo Branco, in Covilhã; Coimbra, in Arganil and Oliveira do Hospital; Guarda, in Guarda; Porto, in Amarante; and Vila Real, in Mondim de Basto, Chaves, Boticas, Montalegre, Vila Pouca de Aguiar and Terras de Bouro. Among the common lands in the grouping process, 21 are managed in the form of self-management and 34 are under the regime of co-management with the State.

COMPLEX SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SYSTEMS

It is possible to perceive the varied studies on common lands and the different analyzes of how the management of collective use resources takes place. It will be, then, from the studies of Elinor Ostrom, that the second stage of this literature review will be established. From the perception of these areas as complex environments, through the combination of their social, economic and environmental aspects. It is possible to summarize the concept of these territories as being socio-ecological systems or also as a human-environment system (Ostrom, 2007).

The theoretical elaboration to understand and analyze community management of common goods is driven by Ostrom (1990, p 90), who sought to understand the functioning and governance of resources in common use. The author defined eight design principles assigned for groups to be able to perform good governance of common resources: 1. definition of who can access resources; 2. rules of duties and rights compatible with the use; 3. the rules must be made by everyone; 4. self-management and self-control process, to avoid deviations; 5. application of sanctions for violators of the rules; 6. definition of conflict resolution forms; 7. search for recognition of the common institution with governments and external bodies; and 8. guarantee of participation of all those involved. On these principles, Agrawal (2001) promotes a critique of its model and content for not considering other more specific variables related to ecological resources.

Subsequently, Ostrom (2007) proceeds with the elaboration of an analysis framework based on the concept of Socio-Ecological Systems (SSEs), and establishes new variables and conceptual classes for the study of common goods and collective governance. The author points to the conceptual

partitioning of variables into classes and subclasses; the existence of independent subsystems, but interrelated in their functions and development, as well as the understanding that complex systems are greater than the sum of their parts.

It is from the accumulation of studies that the analysis framework is updated by a multi-level structure, highlighting the four main first-level subsystems of an SSE: the Resource Systems; the Resource Units; the Governance Systems; and Users. Four other levels are still considered as subsystems: o Social, political and economic scenario; the Interactions; the results; and related Eco-systems. In addition, each subsystem can be composed of second-level variables (Ostrom, 2009).

Several changes were made by McGinnis & Ostrom (2014) on the SSE analysis framework. Among the most significant aspects is the possibility of including several instances of first-level categories in the application of the framework, as well as changing the term Users to Actors in the first-level category. The logical relationships between the first-tier categories were also defined, where the Resource Units are considered part of the Resource Systems and the Governance Systems are the ones that define and establish rules for the Actors. The authors changed the label of Interactions and Results to also include the Action Situation concept, established as a space for interaction and which seeks to give greater dynamics and movement to collective relationships, as well as promoting changes and inclusion of second-level variables.

Different studies were carried out using the SSE analysis framework, such as Delgado-Serrano & Ramos (2015), who analyzed three different territories in Latin America that, in addition to adapting the second-level variables, the authors built a set of 119 third-level variables for the study. According to Hinkel et al. (2015), "the long-term objective

of developing the framework is to derive conclusions about which combinations of variables explain the results in different types of SSEs”.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: APPLICATION OF THE SSES ANALYSIS TOOL

The SSE analysis framework is flexible in application, designed to identify parts and elements essential for the perception and understanding of these systems, and which provides a list of concepts and variables that can be used in different cases (Mcginnis & Ostrom, 2014). This way, the analysis structure on the reality of the Agrupamento de Common lands de Mondim de Basto (ABMB) will be applied, with a view to identifying the governance system and participation of actors in forest management, as well as analyzing the other subsystems, their instances and second-level variables.

ABMB is made up of five local communities in Vilarinho, Pardelhas, Campanhó, Tevão, Paradança Ponte de Olo and Carrazedo, and covers an area of 3,824 hectares. The commons are managed in self-management. With the Common lands Grouping strategy, the communities obtained reinforced technical, associative and legal support, which resulted in greater care and investment in the forest. The constitution and institutional articulation of the ABMB also allowed the elaboration of forest management plans, the rigorous survey of its limits, registration with the finance bodies, among other actions to improve the management and governance of the territory. Examples of this were the execution of controlled fire for the renovation of pastures and the creation of secondary network strips; the implementation of afforestation projects and the use of natural regeneration, as well as the opening of new paths within the forest.

Through the articulation of financing from the Forestry Fund, the amount of 1,245,000.00 euros was invested in the forests of common land, with 128,000.00 euros in resources from the communities themselves, which ensured that 830 hectares were treated, with cleaning and planting. ABMB's revenue sources come from the wind farm, resin and woody material. Between 2019 and 2021, the sale of wood from an area of 65 hectares generated 214,900.00 euros for the community coffers. According to the projections presented by the ABMB management, the stock of forests under its management can represent an economic value in the order of 32,000,000.00 euros.

From the information obtained by this investigation, it is possible to perceive the composition of the Governance System of the ABMB, composed of the decision-making bodies of the Shareholders' Assembly and the Board of Directors of the Agrupamento de Common lands; parish and council councils; the common land associations represented by BALADI; and the decisions of the national government and its bodies. The actors can be defined, by instances, as being the compartes and directors of the ABMB; the leaders of the parish and council councils; the common land associations, BALADI; and representatives of the national government and its bodies.

In the Resource System, forest areas, pasture areas and the wind farm are considered as instances. Likewise, Resource Units correspond to Resource System items quantitatively; in the case indicated, the instances are the amount of area per hectare of forest and pasture, as well as the amount of turbines in the wind farm.

The Action Situation space, which concerns the dialogue, conflict and decision-making environments, is represented by the common land management processes in the new configuration, through the Common Land Grouping. The other Action Situation



Figure 1: Application of the SSE analysis framework to ABMB.

corresponds to the process of fighting forest fires in the territory. As the analysis structure proposes, the Governance System defines the rules for the Actors and the conditions for the Action Status process. The Resource System subordinates and controls the Resource Units, and these point information to the decision-making of the Actors in the Action Situation, which can be perceived by the information of the second level variables, as described below.

SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL SETTINGS (C)

The process of economic development and demographic trends follow the dynamics and characteristics of low-density rural areas (C1 and C2). There is relative political stability within the commons, without explicit contradictions among their leaders (C3), and without significant interference from other governance systems (C4). Markets are controlled by large corporations, with prices reducing the value of local production (C5). It was not possible to perceive the

relationship of the community and its leaders with the media organizations (C6). As for the technology and its applications, no significant variations were identified, with the use and contracting of conventional tools (C7).

GOVERNANCE SYSTEM (SG)

The Governance System (SG) can be seen in its dynamics of relationship between governmental, local and national organizations, as well as with non-governmental organizations operating in the territory (SG1 and SG2). There is a network structure between the communities, formalized by the creation of the ABMB (SG3). Property rights systems are in place, with clear delimitation of areas (SG4). Operational rules, collective choice rules, as well as constitutional rules are respected (SG5, SG6 and SG7). Monitoring rules are enforced by Organs governing bodies of common land, while sanction rules could not be identified (SG8).

ACTORS (A): MEMBERS AND DIRECTORS OF ABMB

There are a number of relevant actors in common land communities, and some parishes are managed by compartes (A1). The socioeconomic attributes are unique among the communities, characterized as family farmers, for the most part (A2). Community history and past experiences are valued (A3). The location of communities, even if distant from each other, does not prevent relative coexistence, except in the absence of a pandemic (A4). Most leaders have entrepreneurial characteristics, with forestry-agro-pastoral multi-activities (A5). The behaviors and attitudes of trust are noticeable, which strengthens the social capital (A6). Likewise, knowledge and concern about the situation of the territory (socio-ecological system) is shared among the leaders (A7), as they understand the importance of the resources they have, and their dependence on them (A8), a reason that mobilizes them to identify available technologies to improve production and management processes (A9).

RESOURCE SYSTEM (SR): FOREST AREA

Regarding the Resource System, the sector is well defined, with the forest as the main resource base (SR1). There are clear limits and system size (SR2 and SR3). There are facilities built by man and under care and use by the community, such as family houses and buildings for collective use (SR4). The system's productivity can be perceived, according to values obtained from the commercialization of woody materials and resin (SR5). The properties are in balance (SR6), and there is a possibility of predictability of the system dynamics, from its management (SR7). Storage needs and characteristics do not generate inconvenience and their location is delimited (SR8 and SR9).

RESOURCE UNIT (UR): FOREST AREA

There is no mobility of forest units (UR1). Its growth or replacement rate is slow, requiring more than 40 years for the final cut and new planting, in the case of maritime pine, which represents almost the entire common forest (UR2). There is no interaction between resource units (UR3). The economic value is close to 3,300.00 euros per hectare, in final cut, in addition to yields with resin and intermediate cuts (UR4). ABMB has more than 3 thousand hectares of forest (UR5), in five common lands (UR6). This way, forest resources have a wide spatial and temporal distribution (UR7).

ACTION SITUATION (SA): COMMON LAND MANAGEMENT

Interaction (I)

The interaction aspects are related to business expectations with the forest (I1). The management and sharing of information between stakeholders is perceived as efficient (I2), which leads to decision-making in participatory deliberation processes (I3). Conflicts were not perceived (I4), and decisions about investment activities appeared to be consensual I5. The directors promote lobbying activities with local authorities, mainly due to the good relationship with the Municipality of the Municipality (I6), while the self-organization and community network activities, on the monitoring and evaluation of the actions are accompanied by the stakeholders. and managed by ABMB directors (I7, I8, I9 and I10).

Result (R)

As a result, good measures of social performance and sustainability (R1) can be perceived, as well as measures of ecological performance, with care for the land and the forest (R2).

RELATED ECOSYSTEMS (ECO)

Positive externalities in the relationship with other SSEs are also noticeable, such as other areas and neighboring forests that are not at risk of fire, for example, from the wasteland forests that were treated and managed, generating a positive impact on other related ecosystems, with reduction or mitigation of climatic risks and pollution caused by fires (ECO1, ECO2 and ECO3).

CONCLUSION

The confrontation between the analyzed literature and the work in the field brought new knowledge on the subject of common lands in rural areas of the northern region of Portugal, in the case in question about the common lands of the Municipality of Mondim de Basto. The perception of the challenges for territorial development in all its social, environmental and economic dimensions, from multiple visions and interdisciplinary analytical perspectives, and in case approaches from different countries, contribute to obtaining a broader view of the issues and challenges for the sustainability and development of community lands.

The support of the main bibliographical references identified in this investigation, like authors such as Hardin and Ostrom, are essential for the analysis and understanding of the role of the State and of the political forces in each territory, which establish a dispute, with contradictions, between the privatization of common lands and the defense of community management. The case of the Portuguese common lands is striking, insofar as these territories have numerous resources, in addition to forests, reason for disputes over land control, either by the State, as in the years 1930 to 1970, or by private capitalist interests, in the attempts to change the law. The establishment of the new legislation on common land, from

2017, presents the possibility of a new organizational and governance level, based on the new institutional dynamics provided by the group of Common lands.

The reading of reality from Ostrom's conceptual elaboration brings the understanding of the relationships and nodes that involve the collective management of common use resources, from the elaboration of the analytical framework of socio-ecological systems (SES). The study and analysis of the SSE framework, on the Mondim de Basto Group, points to strong indicators of self-management and community trust.

ABMB presents a positive dynamic, mainly with regard to the elements of the Governance and Resources System, insofar as the Action System for the management of common land, results in investments in the forest. Thus, it is clear that the Actors, members and directors of ABMB, understand that the benefits of collective management are greater than individual actions, which contradicts Hardin's (1968) theses, and points out that the probability of self-organization is high (Ostrom, 2009).

The State's relationship with the communities of common lands can result in public policies and investments favorable to territorial development and the desired sustainable development. However, for this, policies need to be discussed and implemented together with the social subjects in the territories, so that a new configuration is produced for these places, which are complex human and environmental systems that are fundamental for ecological balance.

This study sought to apply the SSEs analysis framework on the ABMB, but it had limited information for a more comprehensive investigation. Example of limitation is related to the instances, which were analyzed only the forest within the Resource System; the

management of common lands in the Action system; and the compartes and directors of ABMB as Actors, which resulted in instances without analysis. For this, it was supported by the framework of second-level variables established by McGinnis & Ostrom (2014), without creating new variables. This way, it is recommended that future investigations can

explore the other instances of the analytical framework, as well as develop new second and third level variables. It is also recommended that the production of responses to the analysis framework and its variables can be prepared together with social actors, through participatory methodologies.

REFERENCES

- Agrawal, A. (2001). Common property institutions and sustainable governance of resources. *WorldDevelopment*, 29(10), 1649–1672. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X\(01\)00063-8](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(01)00063-8).
- BALADI. (2019a). Nova dinâmica para a gestão participativa e integrada em áreas comunitárias - Grupo de Common lands (PPT Slides). In *VI Jornadas Florestas: Inovação e Futuro da Floresta (UTAD)*. Federação Nacional dos Common lands (BALADI).
- BALADI. (2019b). *Protocolo: Constituição e Dinamização de Agrupamentos de Common lands (2019-2021)*. Federação Nacional dos Common lands (BALADI).
- Banks, T. (2001). Property rights and the environment in pastoral China: Evidence from the field. *Development and Change*, 32(4), 717–740. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7660.00223>.
- Baptista, F. O. (1994). A agricultura e a questão da terra - do Estado Novo à Comunidade Europeia. *Análise Social*, 29(128), 907–921. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41011193>.
- Baptista, F. O. (2006). O Rural depois da Agricultura. In *Desenvolvimento e Território: Espaços Rurais Pós-Agrícolas e Novos Lugares de Turismo e Lazer* (pp. 85–106). Centro de Estudos Geográficos da Universidade de Lisboa.
- Baptista, F. O. (2010). *O espaço rural. Declínio da agricultura*. Celta.
- Baptista, F. O. (2018). Rural e floresta, caminhos por definir. In *O rural depois do fogo* (pp. 45–60). ESAC/SPER.
- Bassett, T. J. (2009). Mobile pastoralism on the brink of land privatization in Northern Côte d'Ivoire. *Geoforum*, 40(5), 756–766. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2009.04.005>.
- Beltrán Tapia, F. J. (2015). Social and environmental filters to market incentives: The persistence of common land in nineteenth-century Spain. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 15(2), 239–260. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12056>.
- Bica, A., Carvalho, A., & Gralheiro, J. C. (2018). *Breve enquadramento histórico e jurídico em áreas comunitárias*. Federação Nacional dos Common lands (BALADI).
- Brown, K. M. (2006a). New challenges for old commons: The role of historical common land in contemporary rural spaces. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 122(2), 109–129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00369220600917412>.
- Brown, K. M. (2006b). The role of moral values in contemporary common property enactment. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift*, 60(1), 89–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00291950500535293>.
- Crisologo-Mendoza, L., & Van de Gaer, D. (2001). Population growth and customary land law: The case of Cordillera villages in the Philippines. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 49(3), 631–658. <https://doi.org/10.1086/452519>.
- Davenport, N. A., & Gambiza, J. (2009). Municipal commonage policy and livestock owners: Findings from the Eastern Cape, South Africa. *Land Use Policy*, 26(3), 513–520. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2008.07.007>.
- Delgado-Serrano, M. D. M., & Ramos, P. A. (2015). Making Ostrom's framework applicable to characterise social ecological systems at the local level. *International Journal of the Commons*, 9(2), 808–830. <https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.18352/ijc.567>.

Echegaray, E. P. (2011). Communities and sustainability in medieval and early modern Aragon, 1200-1600. *International Journal of the Commons*, 5(2), 535–556.

Eck, N. J. van, & Waltman, L. (2009). Software survey: VOSviewer, a computer program for bibliometric mapping. *Springer*, 523–538. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-009-0146-3>.

Gómez-Vázquez, I., Álvarez-Álvarez, P., & Marey-Pérez, M. F. (2009). Conflicts as enhancers or barriers to the management of privately owned common land: A method to analyze the role of conflicts on a regional basis. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 11(8), 617–627. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2009.09.001>.

Grupo Parlamentar PSD e CDS-PP. (2014). *Projeto de Lei Nº 528/XII: alteração à Lei dos Common lands*. [http://app.parlamento.pt/ARSearch/Search.aspx?Text=baldio 528](http://app.parlamento.pt/ARSearch/Search.aspx?Text=baldio%20528).

Hardin, G. (1968). The Tragedy of the Commons. *Science*, 162, 1243–1248. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.162.3859.1243>.

Hinkel, J., Cox, M. E., Schlüter, M., Binder, C. R., & Falk, T. (2015). A diagnostic procedure for applying the social-ecological systems framework in diverse cases. *Ecology and Society*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-07023-200132>.

ICNF. (2021). *Comissão Nacional para a Valorização dos Territórios Comunitários (CNVTC)*. [http://www2.icnf.pt/portal/florestas/gf/common lands/CNVTC](http://www2.icnf.pt/portal/florestas/gf/common%20lands/CNVTC)

Kumar, A., Bren, L., & Ferguson, I. (2000). The use and management of common lands of the Aravalli, India. *International Forestry Review*, 2(2), 97–104.

Lapeyre, R. (2006). Conflits d’usage et gouvernance décentralisée du tourisme en zones rurales namibiennes: peut-on privatiser le bien commun touristique? *Mondes En Développement*, 4(136), 67–84.

Lopes, L. F. G., dos Santos Bento, J. M. R., Cristovão, A. F. A. C., & Baptista, F. O. (2013). Institutionalization of common land property in Portugal: Tragic trends between “Commons” and “Anticommons.” *Land Use Policy*, 35, 85–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2013.05.007>.

Luz, A. L. (2017). Entre subsídios e turismo: instituições e poder na gestão dos common lands do Parque Nacional da Peneda-Gerês. *Finisterra*, 52(105), 7–27. <https://doi.org/10.18055/Finis9824>.

Magole, L. (2009). The “shrinking commons” in the Lake: Ngami grasslands, Botswana: The impact of national rangeland policy. *Development Southern Africa*, 26(4), 611–626. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03768350903181399>.

Mcginnis, M. D., & Ostrom, E. (2014). Social-ecological system framework: initial changes and continuing. *Ecology and Society*, 19(2). <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-06387-190230>.

Miranda, A. (2018). A economia tradicional dos povos serranos. In *Associativismo em áreas comunitárias* (pp. 1–19). Federação Nacional dos Common lands (BALADI).

Organização das Nações Unidas. (2018). Guia sobre Desenvolvimento Sustentável. In *Centro de Informação Regional das Nações Unidas para a Europa Ocidental*. www.unric.org/pt.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: the evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, E. (2007). A diagnostic approach for going beyond panaceas. *PNAS*, 104(39), 15181–15187. <https://doi.org/www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0702288104>.

Ostrom, E. (2009). A General Framework for Analyzing Sustainability of Social-Ecological Systems. *Science*, 325, 419–422. <https://doi.org/10.5055/jem.2013.0130>.

Runge, C. F. (1986). Common property and collective action in economic development. *World Development*, 14(5), 623–635. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(86\)90128-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(86)90128-2).

Salman, M. S., & Munir, A. (2016). Common land resources, livelihood and sustaining the rural poor in India, a geographical analysis. *European Journal of Geography*, 7(4), 6–18.

Short, C. (2000). Common land and ELMS: A need for policy innovation in England and Wales. *Land Use Policy*, 17(2), 121–133. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0264-8377\(00\)00007-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0264-8377(00)00007-7).

Skulska, I., Montiel-Molina, C., & Rego, F. C. (2020). The role of forest policy in Mediterranean mountain community lands: A review of the decentralization processes in European countries. In *Journal of Rural Studies* (Vol. 80, pp. 490–502). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2020.10.033>.

Turner, M. D., & Moumouni, O. (2019). Mosaics of property: control of village land in West Africa. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 46(6), 1167–1191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2018.1439931>.

Upton, C. (2012). Managing Mongolia's commons: Land reforms, social contexts, and institutional change. *Society and Natural Resources*, 25(2), 156–175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2011.597494>.

Wilson, O. J., & Wilson, G. A. (1997). Common cause or common concern? The role of common lands in the post-productivist countryside. *Area*, 29(1), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.1997.tb00006.x>.

Yang, Y. (2012). Basic land security and livelihood: a study of compensation and social security policy for land-expropriated peasants in China. *Public Administration and Development*, 32(4–5), 385–401. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.1615>.

Zhu, J., & Liu, W. (2020). A tale of two databases: the use of Web of Science and Scopus in academic papers. *Scientometrics*, 123(1), 321–335. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03387-8>.

Zupic, I., & Čater, T. (2015). Bibliometric Methods in Management and Organization. *Organizational Research Methods*, 18(3), 429–472. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114562629>.