

# CM NEWS

NEWSLETTER OF THE IUCN

COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP

No. 3, December 1999

## LETTER FROM THE CHAIR

At its General Assembly in Montreal in 1996, the membership of IUCN adopted an exciting and ambitious programme of work in the field of collaborative management. Under this framework, it mandated the Working Group on Collaborative Management to assist in the implementation of the programme, and to provide support to the activities of the Secretariat in this field. Following the changes brought to the IUCN Secretariat at the beginning of 1998, the Working Group has focused its limited resources on its continued involvement in a number of on-going activities, including the provision of technical assistance to a major regional co-management project in the Congo Basin, the preparation of a book on *Co-management of Natural Resources: Learning by Doing*, and the establishment, with the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA), of a Task Force on Protected Areas and Local Communities. These and other activities are described in this third issue of our newsletter.

The Working Group now faces a number of challenges. A priority among these is the need to develop a realistic programme of work, and to re-structure the Working Group so as to compensate for the loss of the support initially provided by the IUCN Secretariat. Thanks to IIED, this process has started, and we expect that the Group will be completely revitalised by the beginning of next year. In the months to come we also hope that increased communication among group members will allow for the identification and initiation of new programme activities and for the meaningful participation of all in the life of this important professional network.

But the main challenge faced by the Working Group probably relates to the thematic focus of its work. In a world where the usefulness and relevance of participatory approaches to natural resource management are increasingly accepted and recognised, there is a need for instruments which can help governments, non-governmental organisations and communities to apply the policies and principles of participation. Co-management, conceived as the formal mechanism by which partners share rights and responsibilities, is one of these instruments. Members of the Working Group are currently engaged in various parts of the world in innovative experiments aimed at developing, testing and disseminating approaches to and forms of co-management. The challenge for us is to build on this work and to provide a mechanism whereby new ideas and critical lessons can be generated and shared. This newsletter is a small but important contribution to this process, and the Working Group is extremely grateful to Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend who helped drive the process and gathered the material, to Catherine McCloskey and Michel Pimbert at IIED who have helped to pull the newsletter together, and to the contributors, Jessica Brown, Champion Chinoyi, Taghi Farvar, Pascal Girot, Hugh Govan, Eri Leong, Peter Schachenmann, Bharat Shrestha, and Liz Wily.

*Yves Renard*  
*Chair, Working Group on Collaborative Management*

## CONTENTS

<b>Letter from the Chair</b> <i>Yves Renard</i>	1
<b>News from around the world</b>	
The collaborative management of protected areas in Mesoamerica <i>Pascal Girot</i>	2
Andringitra National Park: a success of learning by doing <i>Peter Schachenmann</i>	3
International Working Session on Stewardship of Protected Landscapes <i>Jessica Brown</i>	4
Towards co-management of an indigenous protected area in Colombia <i>Hugh Govan</i>	4
Community forest management in Tanzania <i>Liz Alden Wily</i>	5
Collaborative management in West/Central Asia and North Africa <i>Taghi Farvar</i>	5
The Campfire Programme <i>Champion Chinoyi</i>	6
Dugong management in the southern Great Barrier Reef <i>Eri Leong</i>	6
Collaborative management of degraded lands in Nepal <i>Bharat Shrestha</i>	7
Institutionalising participatory natural resource management <i>Michel Pimbert</i>	8
<b>News in brief</b>	8

This issue of CM News was edited by Catherine McCloskey, IIED.  
Production by Bridget Tisdall, IIED. Printed by Fastpoint Graphics

## PROTECTED AREAS IN MESOAMERICA: A NEED FOR A SYSTEMATIC APPRAISAL

by Pascal Girot

The conservation and sustainable use of the world's common-pool natural resources can no longer be the exclusive responsibility of nation-states and of a few environmental organisations. Increasingly, the long-term management of these resources involves the forging of alliances between governments, NGOs, businesses and community-based organisations. Assuming growing responsibilities over dwindling resources with ever-shrinking financial resources, most Central American governments face a serious dilemma at the dawn of the 21st Century. Most governments have subscribed to a growing number of international agreements and conventions which bind them to change the way they have traditionally dealt with biological diversity, desertification, sustainable use of wetlands or climate change. Half of the 400 protected areas currently declared in Central America have been created since 1990. On the other hand, most governments have followed strict structural adjustment policies, which have consistently curtailed the capacity of public agencies in complying with these conventions, and administering their natural heritage. While this paradoxical situation has, in many cases, led to the emergence of 'paper parks' – whose existence is chiefly circumscribed by their legal description – it is also creating many opportunities. What can be coined as a governance crisis of the National Parks System in many Central American countries has forced many government agencies in charge of administering their country's natural heritage to turn to innovative ways to manage responsibly and in a sustainable way the region's extraordinary biological and archaeological resources. Two clear tendencies can be identified at this stage, as a response to the ineffectiveness of state managed parks systems. The first seeks to strengthen the role of local civil institutions, local governments and the natural resource management of communities. It is often subsumed under the concept of decentralisation. The second tendency aims at increasing the role of private businesses in conservation, including the role of NGOs in managing private reserves, or receiving public protected areas in concession for their administration and management.

The emergence of collaborative management of protected areas in the environmental agenda of Latin America during the 1990s is no coincidence. Even though participatory and community-based natural resource management is not a new issue in and of itself, having been widely studied by anthropologists, geographers and resource economists for years, it has suddenly regained currency over the past years as a response to the paradoxical state of affairs in the public agencies in Latin America responsible for the administration and management of natural resources. Collaborative management therefore emerges as an alternative to state-led or business-driven parks management. It also constitutes an innovative way of shoring up the deficiencies of both state and local actors, building on their complementarity rather than on their differences. More interestingly however, it is also a way of solving conflicts over natural resources, land tenure and

access regimes to parks in a creative fashion. A recent survey of social and environmental conflicts in Latin America identified that a considerable proportion of these conflicts are borne of the way in which protected areas were delimited and declared (Borel, R. et al 1999). As such, collaborative management arrangements have emerged as institutional mechanisms capable of both defusing social conflicts between authorities, local resource users and landowners, and of providing opportunities for pooling resources, and sharing knowledge and benefits from the long-term conservation and sustainable use of natural resources.

While practically everybody agrees in principle that collaborative management is desirable, and that most government agencies and park authorities pay lip service to the concept, there is a gaping abyss between theory and practice in Latin America. Beyond tokenism, there is growing pressure to address the rapid degradation of livelihood systems around national parks, and natural resources and ecosystems within parks. The two tendencies mentioned above seem to be at odds in spite of aiming at common goals through different means. One major obstacle in Central America for the effective spread of collaborative management as a viable form of natural resource administration has been of a legal nature. In most countries, collaborative management does not constitute a clearly established legal entity. In countries where law-makers determine to a large degree the feasibility of governance arrangements, there has been considerable debate about the validity of co-administration or co-management agreements signed by several governments in the region. At this stage we find a very wide spectrum of shared governance of protected areas which span very different types of tenure regimes, administrative responsibilities and relative autonomy. In a survey of the Central American System of Protected Areas (SICAP) conducted in 1997-98 by IUCN's Forest Conservation and Protected Areas Programme for Mesoamerica, over 84 collaborative management initiatives were identified making this a major form of parks administration in this region. However, a closer look at the specifics of these institutional arrangements reveals that the terminology officially employed by parks authorities covered very different situations. Even within a single country such as Guatemala in which the national parks system relies on a complex array of institutional arrangements with both state agencies and NGOs for the administration of parks. Some of these institutions have legal tenure over the areas, others simply administer the park, while yet others have an institutional presence without a clear mandate for managing the park. At least four collaborative management figures have been identified in Guatemala, in an on-going study by Oscar Núñez, through a USAID-PROARCA funded research of civil society's role in biological diversity conservation in Latin America.

During the first Latin American National Parks Congress in Santa Marta, Colombia in May 1997, a workshop was held to address the theme of collaborative management. In this exchange of experiences in which over 150 people participated, it clearly emerged that there is an extremely rich array of on-going initiatives which can be classified as collaborative management. A clear need for a simplified legal framework, practical guidelines and a reformulation of management categories was defined during this meeting. The

## RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE WORKSHOP ON COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT OF PROTECTED AREAS

first Latin American Congress of National Parks,  
Santa Marta, Colombia, May 21-28 1997

1. Encourage the review of the legal framework of participating countries so as to favour the decentralisation of environmental management, local participation and the collaborative management of protected areas. Where it exists, develop the related by-laws and technical guidelines so as to strengthen and broaden their application.
2. Bolster the decentralisation process of public agencies in charge of the administration of natural resources and strengthen local institutions and the participation of civil society in the management of the region's natural heritage.
3. The management of protected areas can no longer be the sole responsibility of the state, and the participation of local populations must entail more than periodic consultation, as it implies a process of democratic participation in environmental management. There is a need for a greater openness and flexibility in formal institutional arrangements, greater access to information, and the creation of fiscal and economic incentives to promote the participation of all sectors of Latin American societies in environmental management.
4. Review the nomenclature of management categories at the international level and adapt these categories to the realities of the Latin American context. Propose new management categories which contemplate situations of collaborative management, co-administration and shared governance of protected areas, explicitly defining aspects of tenure regimes, management responsibilities and regulations governing access to and use of natural resources.
5. Create a Latin American network of collaborative management initiatives which would enable institutional actors, local actors, researchers and public administrators, among many others, to gain access to databases on collaborative management experiences, theoretical and practical literature, participatory methods and adapted legal frameworks. This network should organise future encounters to enable the exchange of experiences and pool efforts and resources to document on-going collaborative management initiatives and to foment new initiatives in Latin America.

There have been many new developments since the Santa Marta meeting, and an increasing array of collaborative management initiatives are taking place in Central and South America as well as in the Caribbean. There is, however, an urgent need for a systematic appraisal of these on-going processes and institutional arrangements. Hopefully, the IUCN CMWG can provide a timely sounding board from which to exchange information and share concerns.

*Pascal O. Girot is CEESP Regional Vice Chair for Mesoamerica; Tel/Fax: (506) 280 96 06*

## ANDRINGITRA NATIONAL PARK (MADAGASCAR): A SUCCESS OF LEARNING BY DOING

by Peter Schachenmann

The Andringitra mountains provide a spectacular example of an ecosystem where landscape, biodiversity, habitats and human cultures have developed through history in an inter-related way. In 1993, at the beginning of our work on an Integrated Conservation and Development Project (ICDP) there, our participatory appraisal exercises highlighted a conundrum. While the natural resources, in particular the forests and the Andringitra Strict Nature Reserve, belonged to the state, it lacked the means to manage them. The resources were in fact 'illicitly' used by local communities to meet their livelihood needs. *The owner had no uses and the user had no rights.* With the primary objectives of the two key stakeholders effectively disconnected, their relationship could only be a classic game of cat and mouse. The most important challenge to be addressed by the project was to improve the relationship between land, resources, owners and users.

Six years later, on 8th October 1999, Andringitra was inaugurated as the 14th National Park in Madagascar. A national decree assures the enjoyment of traditional grazing rights, the collection of renewable natural resources for domestic use (within jointly established limits of ecological sustainability) and customary traditions such as passage on trails and access to sacred sites. How was all this achieved?

Our strategy was one of 'learning by doing', an open ended and flexible combination of research, analysis, intuition, interpretation, informed trial and error and adaptation. Many interested stakeholders developed the curiosity and courage to join us in our collaborative, holistic, 'multi-lens' vision. At the scale of a wide angle lens, we dealt with cattle pasturing on altimontane prairies. At the scale of a pair of glasses, we dealt with the sophisticated rotational grazing system used by local people. At the scale of a microscope, we dealt with the impact of cattle-grazing on soil erosion, biodiversity, and water pollution. The scientists learned from the observations, experiences, intuition, legends and taboos of local people, and interested villagers learned to become excellent *para-scientists*, integrating their traditional knowledge with modern databases. State legislation allowed the integration of traditional 'law' (Dina) with techniques for conflict resolution. Different land-use patterns, such as pastoralism and tourism, were made compatible with conservation. In all, the project managed to create a synergy between multiple objectives and multiple land-use systems.

The *paramo* and *punoid* altimontane prairies inside the protected area are a unique ecosystem in Madagascar and attract strong conservation interests. The prairies have been 'managed' for centuries through seasonal cattle grazing and sporadic fires lit by the pastoralists. This 'sustainable disturbance' created a natural vegetation mosaic with enhanced aesthetic, biodiversity and socio-cultural values for multiple stakeholders. Contrary to conventional conservation wisdom, the project was able to demonstrate scientifically that traditional land use systems can be compatible with (or even necessary for) landscape and biological diversity. In this light, the notion of a 'pristine environment' appears rather mythical. The landscape keeps a memory of human footprints and impacts. Conversely, the cultural history of people is intertwined with the natural history of the land, with its geo-morphology, climate, flora and fauna. Land-users are also land managers, and thus 'relationship managers', as they continuously interpret, modify and adapt to physical, ecological, economic, social and political contexts, processes and interactions between nature and people. In our case, conservation objectives needed to include rather than exclude people, and require a creative and respectful interaction and co-evolution among different stakeholders behaving as equal partners.

final recommendations of this workshop can be found on the

*Dr Peter Schachenmann was the Chief Technical Advisor to the*

# INTERNATIONAL WORKING SESSION ON STEWARDSHIP OF PROTECTED LANDSCAPES

by Jessica Brown

Twenty-two protected landscape practitioners from around the world recently participated in a special meeting of IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) to discuss new challenges and opportunities for protecting working landscapes. The working session, convened by QLF/Atlantic Center for the Environment and the U.S. National Park Service's Conservation Study Institute, was held during 16 – 18 June at the Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park in Woodstock, Vermont (USA). Several members of the Collaborative Management Working Group participated in and/or contributed to the working session.

In convening this meeting, WCPA and its partners recognised the pressing need for new models of protected areas that respond to the pressures on rural landscapes in many countries around the world. As countries world-wide move to expand and strengthen their national protected areas systems, greater attention must be paid to protecting working landscapes – places where people live and work. The Protected Landscape Approach (Category V in the IUCN system of management categories) can provide valuable models for integrating biodiversity conservation, cultural heritage protection and sustainable use of resources. With its emphasis on the value of the interaction of people and nature over time, the Protected Landscape Approach relies on collaborative approaches to management. It presents new opportunities to support leadership by local people in stewardship, accommodate traditional management regimes, and to develop institutional arrangements based on partnerships.

The aims of the working session were to:

- Shape the planning of a multi-year program in which WCPA and a consortium of partners will work together to advance the protected landscape approach globally;
- Develop an action-orientated project proposal to test and apply these ideas in selected regions, beginning with the Andean region;
- Bring international experience to bear on the protection of

- working landscapes in Vermont and elsewhere in New England; and
- Foster an exchange of ideas among practitioners from diverse regions.

Presentations and discussions during the working session explored topics such as:

- What are the opportunities and challenges of protected landscapes?
- What new skills are needed to manage these landscapes?
- What is the relationship between Category V Protected Landscapes and Cultural Landscapes?

Participants from Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru presented case studies demonstrating new opportunities for the application of the protected landscape approach in the Andean region. Finally, participants met in small working groups to develop plans for both a global WCPA programme and a regional programme in the Andes.

Other elements of the event included a field trip in the Champlain Valley region of Vermont, part of a proposed Heritage Corridor, in which participants were introduced to initiatives to protect working dairy farms, interpret cultural resources along Lake Champlain, and develop Burlington as a 'sustainable city'. The meeting concluded with a day-long public forum and workshop on 'Protecting Working Landscapes: An International Perspective,' which brought over 60 conservation practitioners from the New England region and eastern Canada for discussions with their international counterparts.

A key outcome of the working session was the creation of a WCPA Task Force on Protected Landscapes, charged with developing a three-year global programme to promote and demonstrate the use of the Protected Landscape designation. The programme will identify key partners; evaluate and research existing protected landscape areas; organise and develop case study material; help to develop training and build professional skills; and work closely with specific regional protected landscape projects. Another important outcome was a planned pilot project on protected landscapes for the Andean region, focusing on themes which recognise the great diversity of cultural and natural resources of the region.

*Proceedings will be available next month. Contact IUCN or QLF/Atlantic Center for the Environment (55 South Main Street,*

## TOWARDS CO-MANAGEMENT OF AN INDIGENOUS PROTECTED AREA IN COLOMBIA

by Hugh Govan

The Second Meeting of the Environmental Alliance for Colombia held in Cartagena de Indias, Colombia, on the 6th of May of 1999 saw the signing of what may prove to be an historic accord.

The Colombian Ministry of the Environment, the Colombian National Parks Service (UAESPNN), the Inganos of the Amazonian Piedemonte and the Virginia-based NGO, the Amazon Conservation Team (ACT) agreed to work together to establish a new category of conservation and sustainable management area in the Fragua River region of the Colombian Amazon.

This formal commitment to develop a co-management process for the conservation of both biological and cultural diversity in Ingado territories marks a milestone in what has been a ten-year process. Although the Ingado have always asserted the vital cultural importance of land, they have also been clear that without a sound social and cultural base their aspirations were unlikely to be realised.

Thus the Ingado embarked on a number of programmes aimed at building or reinforcing what can be broadly termed social capital, supported since 1994 by ACT. These programmes include recovery of traditional practices including the shamanic tradition central to the Ingado cosmivision, the consolidation of Ingado political organisation in the form of an extremely proactive confederation of councils, the capacity-building in sustainable agriculture, networking with other indigenous groups and organisations, provision of primary healthcare and, most recently, the establishment of an Ingado school.

The Ingado feel that the time has now come where they can work as equal partners in the design of a joint sustainable management plan for the protected area. As the Cartagena Accord suggests, their initiative may be falling on fertile ground as the UAESPNN implements new policy in line with their 'Parks with People' initiative.

# COMMUNITY FOREST MANAGEMENT IN TANZANIA

by Liz Alden Wily

Community-based forest management [CBFM] got underway in Tanzania just five years ago, when eight villages successfully declared themselves the legal owners and managers of the 9,000 ha Duru-Haitemba Forest – which government had demarcated as a National Forest Reserve but was having difficulty protecting or managing. From that small and incidental start in the field, there are today some 570 villages in eighteen districts which have declared their own Village Forest Reserves. In addition some fifty or so community groups have established Group Forest Reserves and at least 800 households have set aside part of their private woodlands as Private Forest Reserves. Together these locally-owned and managed forests account for some 264,000 hectares of prime woodland.

Community involvement in the management of the government-owned Forest Reserves is also steadily emerging, with four National Forest Reserves now successfully managed by sixteen adjacent communities. Increasingly referred to as 'Village Forest Management Areas' to distinguish them from community-owned forests, these include prime catchment and even some industrial forest, amounting to more than 20,000 hectares. The arrangements vary from genuine state-people co-management to the increasingly preferred designation of the community as the manager, with the Government's role as strictly advisory. Comparable developments are underway in some ten other government reserves.

Meanwhile new National Forest Policy [1998] and new forest law [in its third draft] establishes CBFM as a prime strategy of future forest conservation and management. It provides not only for devolved management of the 500 or more government Forest Reserves of all classes, should this prove to be the locally-acceptable way forward, but for the creation of new Forest Reserves at all levels – household, group and village. New basic land tenure law [The Land Act and The Village Land Act, 1999] endorses this approach with a widened definition of 'reserved', where state ownership is not necessarily implied, and where every one of Tanzania's 9,400 villages, identify and register their communal resources before issuing individual title deeds over remaining land in the village vicinity. This step is expected to do much to secure the abundant open-access woodlands of Tanzania as intact, community-owned resources.

With some 19 million hectares of such unreserved forest and another 14.5 million hectares of poorly protected forest within government reserves, the need and potential for CBFM is immense, but its implementation, so far, modest. Still, a good start has been made, which is all the more successful for working from the grassroots and for allowing practical solutions to lead the way. The emerging paradigms of CBFM in Tanzania differ from mainstream community forestry or joint forest management in significant ways, in that they are founded upon the devolution of management authority to local people, not upon the introduction of communities into state regimes and on state terms, or as partners or co-users who secure access through provision of protection services. Already there are apparent distinct advantages to this power-sharing rather than product-sharing approach. As essentially autonomous managers, communities are able to adopt longer-term perspectives, such as closing forests to any access at all until they have recovered, and to be interested in securing management authority over forests which are less useful for their products than for their existence as locally-managed resources and environmental support functions. By the same token, through tackling the fundamental custodial and tenure concerns of modern forest management, Tanzanian CBFM suggests a transformation in state-people relations which is not always welcomed, and the road ahead in the first decades of the millennium, will not necessarily be smooth.

*Liz Wily is an adviser on independent land tenure & forest*

# COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT IN WEST/CENTRAL ASIA AND NORTH AFRICA

by Taghi Farvar

The countries in IUCN's WESCANA Region (West/Central Asia and North Africa) have many features in common. Chief among those is their rich biodiversity in spite of widespread aridity and desertification (many of the world's major staple foods and fruits were originally domesticated and dispersed from here). Also of primary importance is their rich and highly diverse history of indigenous collaborative management (CM) systems (e.g. for water, rangelands, forests, wildlife, watersheds, etc.). I say 'history' as the present is often depressing. In Yemen, the famous 'Hanging Gardens of Arabia' – extensive terracing for multipurpose collaborative management of mountainsides – are fast deteriorating because of a mixture of neglect and destructive new initiatives (e.g. roads that cut through water channels). In the vast rangelands of Iran, pastures are fast deteriorating through being managed by government experts, resulting in the alienation of the nomadic pastoralists from their communal use and ownership rights. In the Caspian Sea, environmentally conservative communal fishing is being replaced by state-run fisheries and careless smuggling. The list goes on...

Modern governments of diverse political systems have used a heavy hand in taking over the ownership and management of the natural resources of their countries. Both the ecosystems and the social systems that used to manage them have suffered as a consequence. In fact, even the rich experiences of the communities of farmers and peasants, nomadic and transhumant pastoralists, fishing men and women, and hunters and gatherers of the region now run the risk of disappearing forever.

A number of IUCN initiatives in the region are attempting to reverse this picture. Examples include:

- a current project to revitalise indigenous systems of participatory, natural resource management in Yemen;
- a current project to support community management of oasis resources in Egypt;
- a proposed regional project on water resources (Water for Life) focusing on community participation and collaborative management;
- a proposed regional project on measures to combat desertification and sustain biodiversity rooted in indigenous practices;
- a proposed GEF Collaborative Management Initiative to conserve the cheetah as the flagship species of a complex ecosystem in Iran; and
- the recently completed Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan for Palestine, which sees a very strong role for local CM initiatives.

Significantly, nearly all programming exercises that took place in 1998-99 emphasised the rehabilitation of CM systems.

*Taghi Farvar is the chair of CENESTA: Centre for Sustainable Development, Tehran, Iran. Email:*

# CAMPFIRE PROGRAMME

From a paper by **Champion Chinhoyi,**  
**Zimbabwe Trust**

In 1989 the Bylilmamangwe and Tsholotsho districts of Zimbabwe were chosen to pioneer a programme involving collaborative management of their natural resources. Hitherto, wildlife management in these districts – as in the whole of the country – had been under the jurisdiction of the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management (DNPWLM), which was widely viewed as a government law-enforcement agent. Its protectionist approaches to wildlife management often served to deny communities free access to wildlife resources. The Campfire Programme, designed to foster participation between all interest groups, including the DNPWLM, the Rural District Councils (RDC) and the communities themselves, proved highly successful, not only in wildlife conservation, but also in improving the standards of living among rural communities. The success enjoyed by the Campfire Programme in the two pilot districts provided an example, which has since been followed by other districts adjacent to National Parks.

The communities in Bylilmamangwe and Tsholotsho consist of San, Kalanga and Ndebele people. These communities have a long history of association with the wilderness through the use of indigenous knowledge systems, and still derive their livelihoods from wildlife, grazing, forestry and water resources. The links in both districts have been further strengthened by inter-marriages. Because of these ethnic relationships, both districts have a long-standing mutual agreement of sharing natural resources on the adjacent grazing area, separated by the natural administrative boundary of Manzanymyama river. As well as being used for cattle relief grazing in the event of shortages in pasture around settlement areas, this land also provides thatching grass, water, mopane worms and wildlife.

As part of the Campfire project, the two RDCs formed a joint safari operation and wildlife management programme in the wilderness area with the assistance of the DNPWLM. A safari operator was engaged for two years before the Councils decided to manage the safari hunting activities independently. Since the start of the programme, the DNPWLM, charged with the overall responsibility for wildlife management, has provided technical advice to both communities and Rural District Councils on planning for wildlife management. The Department advises on the designation of suitable areas for buffer zones for the adjacent Hwangwe National Park, carries out animal censuses using different counting techniques, and produces annual sustainable quotas. It trains communities, game guards, and council staff on monitoring habitat, and carries out research to make sure that the utilisation of natural resources are ecologically, economically and socially sustainable. The Department attends meetings at RDC district level, inter-district level and Campfire regional meetings to provide inputs on safari industry hunting operations, tender procedures and drafting of contracts. The current co-management of the wilderness area has been made possible as the districts are adjacent to one another, separated by a natural administrative river boundary and allowing free movement of people, livestock and wildlife across the boundaries.

In conjunction with the National Parks and ward communities, the RDCs produce natural resources management plans and related programmes for the implementation of the Campfire Programme, and establish and maintain the physical infrastructure – such as fences, boreholes, dams and hunting camps. Trained game scouts are employed by the Parks Department and are supervised by the Councils.

The designated areas within the Campfire wards cover a total area of 253,500 hectares, forming the largest conservancies or wilderness areas under a communal land. The project has promoted wildlife conservation and created a buffer zone for Hwangwe National Park, while generating revenues for communities and RDCs at the same time. Benefits are derived from sport hunting, grazing and forestry resources, perennial dams supplying water to wildlife, human and domestic livestock and by women harvesting thatching grass for both domestic use and income generation. With the permission of the DNPWLM, communities access thatching grass from inside the national park under the department's supervision.

## Conclusion

The Campfire Programme is witnessing a close collaboration between the two RDCs and the DNPWLM in areas of training and co-ordination. Technical input is promptly provided to achieve the objectives of conservation of wildlife, and to generate incomes for communities to address development needs.

While the Programme is moving towards addressing its objectives, there is a need to reinforce the implementation of by-laws that will reduce the negative impact on veldfires, unregulated movement of livestock into designated wildlife areas, subsistence poaching and Problem Animal Control.

## DUGONG MANAGEMENT IN THE SOUTHERN GREAT BARRIER REEF

by **Eri Leong**

Dugongs (*Dugong dugon*), are large, long-lived sea mammals that graze on certain sea grasses found in shallow coastal waters. The extensive seagrass beds of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area, off the coast of northern Queensland, Australia, provide one of the largest remaining dugong habitats in the world. As dugongs are considered 'vulnerable to extinction' (IUCN 1996), Australia has a special responsibility to protect and manage these animals and their habitats. Management responsibility is shared between the Commonwealth Government's Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA), and Queensland government departments, particularly the Department of Environment.

Many coastal Aboriginal groups and Torres Strait Islanders have long regarded dugongs as of particular cultural significance, and dugong hunting for subsistence and ceremonial purposes continues in many areas today. Even where hunting is no longer pursued, many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people retain strong feelings of interest and responsibility in the animal's survival, reflecting the people's traditional ownership and custodianship roles. While these aspirations are currently unrecognised within management and control structures, some small steps towards collaborative management have taken place, providing optimism for further cooperative decision-making in the future.

One key initiative has been the devolution of authority to grant traditional hunting permits, from GBRMPA to several Councils of Elders, the traditionally recognised decision-makers within each coastal indigenous community. GBRMPA allocates hunting quotas to each Council based on environmental sustainability considerations, and Councils are then free to issue permits to community members having regard to cultural values. Councils are further responsible for management of the permits, and for ensuring environmental and cultural conditions are

complied with. Data on harvest rates is collected by the community and returned to GBRMPA, increasing the shared knowledge base on dugongs and promoting liaison between indigenous groups and the government. The process is thus valuable in allowing a degree of self-management of a valued traditional resource, at the community level.

In the densely populated southern Great Barrier Reef, however, unsustainably high rates of dugong decline have been detected over the past decade, causing dugongs in this region to be considered 'critically endangered' (Marsh et al 1996). Councils of Elders have responded to this decline, recognising that hunting may be inappropriate so long as dugongs are in danger of extinction. One Council has formally agreed not to hunt dugongs for the time being, signing a Memorandum of Understanding with GBRMPA to that effect. All but one of the other Councils (representing 5 communities) have also voluntarily agreed to moratoria on hunting in their local areas.

The Government has also responded in various ways to the urgent situation in the southern Great Barrier Reef. A draft conservation and management plan by the Queensland Department of Environment has been released, and in line with Commonwealth and State ministerial commitments, the plan promises to continue to develop and formalise joint custodian arrangements with representative Aboriginal bodies (Queensland Government 1997). How this will be implemented remains to be seen, but such a commitment is at least a first step in the sharing

of responsibility.

Further, a Dugong Cooperative Management Working Group comprising indigenous and government representatives has been established, with the aim of developing a framework for cooperative management arrangements between indigenous groups and GBRMPA. The process is still in its formative stages, but should be welcomed as an opportunity for indigenous peoples to reassert traditional and cultural rights to manage an aspect of their sea country.

## References

**IUCN, 1996.** 1996 IUCN List of Threatened Animals, Gland, Switzerland.

**Marsh, H, Corkeron, P, Lawler, I, Lanyon, J and Preen, A 1996.** The Status of the Dugong in the southern Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, Research publication No. 41, Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, Townsville.

**Queensland Government 1997.** Conservation and management of dugong in Queensland – Draft, Department of Environment, Queensland, November.

*For further information, contact: Eri Leong, c/o Faculty of Law, Australian National University Canberra (Australia); email:*

## COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT OF DEGRADED LANDS IN NEPAL

by **Bharat Shrestha**

The Hills Leasehold Forestry Programme is a recent initiative of the Government of Nepal to manage the degraded forest land of the hill areas in partnership with local people. The programme started as a project in 1992, with financial support from the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). The emphasis was on increasing the economic standard of poor households, particularly those below the poverty line, through leasing of degraded forest land.

The project has the twin objectives of raising the income of families below the poverty line and contributing to improving the ecological conditions in the hills. This is done through leasing blocks of degraded forest land to groups of poor households. The project's target groups are farm families with less than 0.5 hectares of private land and/or an annual per capita income of less than Rs. 2500 (US\$ 50). Female-headed households and tribal communities including Chepangs and Tamangs are especially targeted. The exploratory phase of the project began in 1992/93 in 6 contiguous hill districts of Nepal and continued into a second phase of four years, covering 12 hill districts in total.

To date, the project has formed over 599 groups, covering more than 14,500 households in districts of different tribal communities, and has leased a total of 2,900 hectares to members of those groups. Each of the members is entitled to an average of a hectare of land to manage for domestic use and for land and forest improvement. The groups are responsible for clearing this and cultivating recommended annual crops together with the tree crops (eg: for use of fodder, timber, fruits, firewood etc.). They are provided with grasses and forest crop seedlings, training and technical advice in land development and management, and access to credit for income generating activities. In all, many people below the poverty line have benefited from the project by obtaining (a) access to land (b) access to credit and (c) a rehabilitated environment.

The members of the groups who are assigned land are entitled to lease it for 39 years, with the the right to decide their own form of management and the use to which the products will be put. It is assumed that the land leases will be extended for a further 39 years if they are successfully managed.

The project is jointly implemented by the Department of Forests, the Department of Livestock Services and the Agriculture Development Bank and Nepal Agriculture Research Council in partnership with local non-governmental organisations.

*Bharat Shrestha is a member of the CMWG and is based in Nepal.*

# INSTITUTIONALISING PARTICIPATORY NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

by Michel Pimbert

With few exceptions, participatory approaches to natural resource management (NRM) have been limited to single and specific instances and initiatives, from village-based planning to the development and implementation of co-management agreements. Recently, however, the focus on a case-by-case approach has given way to attempts by large, public and private agencies, including government departments, development agencies, non-governmental organisations, international research agencies and universities, to adopt and apply participatory approaches on a large scale.

The rapidity of this trend is both remarkable and alarming. While it offers tremendous scope for expanding the active involvement of local resource users in processes that have a direct bearing on their livelihood security and well-being, there is a serious danger that they may be misapplied and abused in the rush to scale up and spread the new innovations. This, in turn, could lead to widespread disillusionment among conservation and development agencies with these people-centred approaches and result in the discrediting of 'participation' itself. Clearly, if participatory natural resource management is not to become yet another 'passing fad', we must learn more about the ways in which large bureaucracies function, learn, improve and transform themselves.

The emphasis on diversity, decentralisation and devolution of decision-making powers in the co-management of natural resources implies procedures and organisational cultures that do not impose 'participation' from above through bureaucratic and standardised practices. How can bureaucracies and their staff become flexible, innovative and transparent? Under what conditions can they ensure that their outcomes (policies, programmes, resource allocation and projects) promote some real, and not stereotyped participation in natural resource management? What are appropriate roles for bureaucracies in supporting the engagement of local players throughout the whole participatory management process – from appraisals and preparing for partnerships, planning and developing co-management agreements, negotiating resource allocation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation – to reviewing and revising the means and ends of the participatory process?

These are some of the questions examined by an action research initiative undertaken by the International Institute for

Environment and Development (IIED), London, and the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom. National partners associated with this action research are currently analysing the dynamics of institutionalising and scaling up participatory processes and approaches for NRM in the following contexts:

- Senegal and Burkina Faso: *gestion des terroirs* (village resource management)
- India: participatory watershed management
- Indonesia: farmer-centred, participatory, integrated pest management
- Mexico: local sustainable natural resource management plans

Participatory research methods are employed by multidisciplinary and inter-organisational teams of researchers and local resource users for policy analysis, stakeholder analysis, organisational analysis and impact analysis. The case studies seek to identify key constraints as well as favourable conditions and prerequisites for success.

The project focuses on:

- institutional dynamics, procedures and cultures of large, public bureaucracies that make policies, plan, implement, monitor and evaluate NRM interventions;
- institutional dynamics of civil society organisations involved in these NRM interventions;
- well-being and livelihood security of vulnerable social groups who are frequently marginalised by large-scale conservation and development initiatives, such as women, children, low-income people, migrants and landless or near-landless people;
- state of the physical environment and natural resources in which these participatory programmes and projects have been implemented; and
- state of knowledge among policy makers, practitioners and local people about human-environment relations, the dynamics of environmental change and the nature of conservation and development.

*For more information please contact the co-ordinator of the joint IIED-IDS initiative: Dr. Michel Pimbert, Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods Programme, International Institute for Environment and Development, 3, Endsleigh Street, London, WC1H 0DD, UK; email: michel.pimbert@iied.org*

## NEWS IN BRIEF

### CMWG Members Meet with IUCN Director General

Taghi Farvar

After a long period of uncertainty about the future of the Collaborative Management Working Group, a number of the group's members were able to meet with the new IUCN DG, Dr. Maritta von Bieberstein Koch-Weser in May. They discussed the willingness and capacity of the Union's Secretariat to pursue the implementation of the Montreal Resolution on Collaborative Management. With Secretariat staff fully engaged in alternative activities, it seemed the Secretariat was not in a position to offer support to the Group, despite the growing need.

Expressing great personal interest in collaborative management of natural resources, the DG said that this was one of her priorities. The Contact Group followed up with a letter to the DG, written at her request, in which a road map was proposed for the revitalisation and ongoing support of the Working Group. The DG replied that she could not offer any specific support to the group, but she encouraged the Social Policy Group to collaborate with it.

As of now, the revitalisation of the CMWG membership and production of CM News 3 has been done entirely on a voluntary basis by members of CMWG with the institutional support of IIED in London.

### Resources on the World Wide Web

- Excellent website on co-management available at: <http://www.massey.ac.nz/changelinks/>
- Fisheries Co-management Newsletter now available at: <http://www.co-management.org/public.htm>