

**FINAL REPORT (Part 2)**  
**COMMUNITY CONSERVED AREAS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA**  
December 15, 2002

By Maurizio Farhan Ferrari

**CONTENTS**

- I) **List Of Cases To Illustrate Regional Issues And Lessons Learned And Individuals Who May Profitably Report On Those At The Durban WPC In 2003**
- II) **Preliminary Definition, Typology And Database Of CCAs In Southeast Asia**
  - 1) Working definitions of community conserved areas and co-management protected areas.
  - 2) Typologies of community conserved areas and co-management protected areas considered relevant for Southeast Asia.
  - 3) Database of CCAs

**I) LIST OF CASES TO ILLUSTRATE REGIONAL ISSUES AND LESSONS LEARNED AND INDIVIDUALS WHO MAY PROFITABLY REPORT ON THOSE AT THE DURBAN WPC IN 2003**

This is a list of the cases presented in boxes in the paper on lessons learned. Next to them are the names of individuals who may present case studies at the Durban WPC or earlier regional workshops.

- 1) Coron Island, Philippines (see box 1): Mr Rodolfo Aguilar, chairman of the Tagbanwa Foundation of Coron Island (TFCI) and Mr Dave De Vera, PAFID.
- 2) Zaragosa Island, Philippines (see box 2): Mr Pedro Valparaiso, Zaragoza-Badian Island Multipurpose Cooperative (ZBIMC), and Mr Arsenio Tanchuling, Tambuyog Foundation.
- 3) Pathoumphone District, Laos (see box 3): Mr Ian G. Baird and Somphong Bounphasy, Global Association for People and the Environment (GAPE), Laos. (deals with communities within and outside Dong Houa Sao and Xe Piang National Biodiversity Conservation Areas).
- 4) Thateng District, Laos (see box 12): Mr Sengthong Vongsakid, Oxfam - Community Aid Abroad, and local villager (?).

- 5) Chambok, Cambodia (see box 20): Ms Amanda Bradley, Mlup Baitung and local villager (deals with Kirirom National Park).
- 6) Tinangol, Sabah, Malaysia (see box 11): representative from Tinangol People's Organization, and representative from PACOS (?).
- 7) Endah, Malaysia (see box 18): Nirmal Aruyapala.
- 8) Sarawak, Malaysia: Mr Thomas Jalong, Sahabat Alam Malaysia.
- 9) Kayan Mentarang National Park, Indonesia (see box 5): Ms Christina Eghanter and local villager.
- 10) Minahasa, Indonesia (see box 10): Mr Johnnes Tulangen, Projek Pesisir and local villager (?)
- 11) Mandailing, Indonesia (see box 16): Mr Zulkifli Lubis.
- 12) AMAN, Indonesia (see boxes 9 and 17): Rukka Sombolinggi
- 13) Trang CBCRM and CBNRM, Thailand (see box 7 and 13): Mr Pisit Charnsnoh, Yadfon Association and local villager (?).
- 14) Pred Nai, Thailand (see box 8): Ms Jaruwan Kaewmahanin, Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC), and local villager (?)
- 15) Burma: Mr U Ohn, Forest Resource Environment Development and Conservation Association (FREDA), an independent NGO (made up of retired forestry officials).

Note: several people were contacted in Vietnam and some replied but none could provide case study material. I would suggest to carry out some follow up in January 2003 in order to have one representative from there. Despite the effort to gather material and contact people in all the 11 countries of the region, no replies have been obtained from the three smallest countries, namely Brunei Darussalam, East Timor and Singapore.

## II) PRELIMINARY DEFINITION, TYPOLOGY AND DATABASE OF CCAs IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

### 1) WORKING DEFINITIONS OF COMMUNITY CONSERVED AREAS AND CO-MANAGEMENT PROTECTED AREAS

#### 1.1: **Community Conserved Areas**

- There is likely to be a different definition of CCA for each of the cases submitted to the CCA project. In an effort to synthesize various aspects of CCAs and keeping into consideration the initial working definition (from the concept note), the following working definition is proposed: areas comprising natural and modified ecosystems (forests, grasslands, wetlands, coastal/marine, and others), containing significant biodiversity value (in terms of large biodiversity range, threatened or endemic species, unique assemblages); providing critical ecological services (such as watersheds, wetlands etc); acting as active repository of cultural values and potential environmental education and awareness; providing economic incentives (such as traditional and evolving livelihoods, particular economic species), being conserved by indigenous and local communities (with or without external support) which depend on these resources culturally or for livelihood.

#### 1.2: **Co-Management Protected Areas**

- officially designated Protected Areas (as per IUCN categories I-VI) where the power to decide over management policies and practices of the protected area is shared between state agencies and the indigenous and local communities whose livelihoods depend partly or fully on resources within or adjacent the protected area.

Note: Co-management in PA is still a new concept in Southeast Asia and it is being tried out in a few countries mostly in limited pilot cases and in varying degrees of power-sharing (Philippines, Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia). Much longer-term research is required in the future.

### 2) TYPOLOGIES OF COMMUNITY CONSERVED AREAS AND CO-MANAGEMENT PROTECTED AREAS CONSIDERED RELEVANT FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA.

2.1: **Community Conserved Areas:** This is a very rough shot at a CCA typology. It is based on the cases studies under analysis and needs much refinement. It is not so easy to develop a typology as the CCA matter is so multidimensional and each experience is unique. We need to develop a list of parameters to try to develop a coherent typology. Some of the parameters used here were:

- internally or externally initiated;
- legal backing;
- tenure security;
- government support;
- NGO support;
- good ecological results
- social cohesion
- length of time the initiative has been sustained.

However, not all the parameters are applied to each case. This draft roughly moves from "weak" to "strong" CCA, but needs much future development and refinement.

<b>Typology</b>	<b>Characteristics of each type</b>
<i>1. Legal backing, temporary tenure, externally-started and weak NGO support, dubious government</i>	The community-based initiative is externally introduced, it has legal backing securing temporary (25-50 years lease) land tenure rights and it takes place in an authoritarian (and illegitimate) state with little (if any) independent NGOs (e.g. Burma).
<i>2. Legal backing but insecure tenure</i>	The local community tries its best to manage an area of ecological, cultural, economic importance as a conservation area, it has legislative support to do so, but lacks land rights, so the state can allow overlapping activities in the area (e.g.: logging operations in CCA in Laos).
<i>3. No legal backing and insecure tenure, but strong determination by local community and NGO support</i>	The local community (with strong determination and NGO support) tries its best to manage an area of ecological, cultural, economic importance as a conservation area (with relatively good results so far) but there is no clear legal backing for its activities and lacks tenure security over the area, eg. state land, overlapping claims (e.g.: Tinangol watershed area, Sabah).
<i>4. Weak legal backing, externally-started and relatively strong NGO support</i>	The community-based initiative is externally-introduced, it has government permission (but not law on community forests), insecure tenure, but quite strong NGO support (e.g.: Chambok, Cambodia).
<i>5. Weak (Eroding) legal backing, State opposition, internally-initiated, strong determination</i>	The local community tries its best to manage an area of ecological, cultural, economic importance as a conservation area but there is facing State opposition and weak and eroding official legal backing. The community, however, has a long history of resistance and strong determination, as well as strong NGO support (e.g.: Uma Bawang, Sarawak).
<i>6. CCA long-established, well-recognized, strong NGO support and good networking, but still lacking legal backing and secure tenure</i>	The community has a long-established and successful experience in community-based natural resources management, its effort is well-recognized for good ecological and social results, and seen as a model by other communities and even some government departments, but it lacks land and sea tenure security as the community forestry bill has been highly contested at the national level and not passed yet (e.g.: Trang coastal communities, Thailand).
<i>7. Internally-initiated, strong NGO support, good relationship</i>	The community has focused on environmental education (internal first, external later, turning into ecotourism), biodiversity diversification (especially medicinal plants) local livelihoods and good relationships with neighbouring communities and government agencies. It is well

<i>with government, despite not having clear legal backing</i>	recognized by the government (one of the very few in the country) and sits on the state-level environmental board (the only one in the country). It has not been encroached upon by intrusive industries so has not conflict with private sector or the government while it has benefited from NGO support and internal social cohesion (e.g Kg Endah, Peninsular Malaysia).
<i>8. Internally-initiated, well-established, partial legal backing, strong NGO support, good ecological results</i>	Part of the community very determined to set up a marine sanctuary, managed to get legal backing for it, but failed to have legal backing to protect its traditional fishing grounds. Ecological improvements in the CCA are good, the community is expanding it to mangroves and fishing grounds, with strong NGO support and community group cohesion, but conflicting with local and external vested interests (e.g.: Badian)
<i>9. Internally-initiated, strong NGO support, legal backing, good networking</i>	Internally-initiated, strong NGO support, legal backing, promising although still young, with developing social cohesion (e.g.: Minahasa, Sulawesi, Indonesia)
<i>10. Internally-initiated, strong NGO support, strong legal support, secure tenure rights</i>	Internally-initiated, strong NGO support, strong legal backing through national law on the rights of indigenous peoples (IPRA, Philippines), which granted a Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title to the community, which in theory has full ownership rights over its territory. Strong social cohesion (e.g.: Coron Island, Philippines)

**2.2: Co-Management Protected Areas:** I feel that I have not received sufficient information from the different countries to put together a comprehensive typology. Here is what I can put together with the info received. I am expecting more information and possibly more cases.

<b>Typology</b>	<b>Characteristics of each type</b>
<i>Government still advocating people's resettlement</i>	Although the conventional model of excluding local communities from PAs has been widely discredited, some governments (also with the support of "green" NGOs) are still advocating peoples' resettlement, especially in hilly (watershed) areas (e.g.: North Thailand)
<i>Government starting to accept that local communities cannot be ignored and marginalized</i>	After decades of setting up PA following the exclusionary model of resettling communities or ignoring their rights to land and resources, several governments are starting to realize that communities cannot simply be ignored or marginalized, or, worst, resettled (although some pressures towards that still exist). The concept of participation in PA management has started to be adopted (in non-core parts of the PAs, but whether that really means meaningful respect and power sharing is still to be seen (e.g.: Malaysia, Viet Nam, Laos, Cambodia).
<i>Favourable changes in</i>	Changes in policy and practice are starting to take foot in Indonesia. The Kayan Mentarang National Park (largest in Borneo), for example

<i>policy and practice taking shape</i>	was established as a Nature Reserve in 1980, with strict protection status according to which no human activities were allowed. However, subsequent research pointed out that the local Dayaks had rightful claim over land and resources and the status was changed to National Park in 1994. With the help of an NGO, there is now an active IP's organisation, which is part of a legally-established Policy Board (April 2002) for the co-management of the park.
<i>Favourable national policy, legal backing, NGO support, but implementation limitations and problems</i>	The Philippines was the first country in Southeast Asia to try to bring about change in the way PAs are established and managed. The National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS) Act 1992, was introduced with the objective of developing a comprehensive protected areas system and integrate the participation of local communities in protected areas management and decision-making. The participatory approach is supposed to happen mostly through the Protected Area Management Board (PAMB), which is composed of government officers, NGOs, and local community representatives. Several NGOs and CBOs, however, point out that in many cases the PAMB has not been functioning effectively due to a number of limitations varying from lack of documents in local languages and resources for meetings and workshops, to the fact that the PAMB's chairperson is a government officer and that local people are usually shy to voice their concerns in the presence of government officials. So, at the end, the decision-making power still remains firmly in the government's hands

### 3) DATABASE OF CCAs

Data concerning community involvement in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use is scattered in many different organizations and networks and it has so not been possible within this limited amount of time to put together a database. Rumours have it that there are about 800 community forests in Thailand, 400 community-based coastal resource management projects in the Philippines and probably more in the highlands, there is a growing number in Indonesia. Some contacts have been established with key networks (such as the Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC) in Thailand and the CBCRM Resource Centre in the Philippines) to try to collect this data, but it is in no coherent form yet and will need follow up work during 2003. One of the only countries for which a document summarizing various CBNRM projects has been produced is Cambodia.