

## **Rapporteur Report on Session 1.1:**

### **Opening Plenary – Governance of Protected Areas: a topic whose time has come**

**Chair: Aroha Mead (New Zealand)**

**Presentations by: Achim Steiner (Germany); Ashish Kothari (India); Janis Alcorn (USA); Bruce Amos (Canada); Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend (Italy)**

**Rapporteurs: Andrew Tilling (New Zealand) and Chimère Diaw (Senegal)**

**Aroha Mead** (New Zealand) chaired the session. The keynote speaker was **Achim Steiner**, the Director General of the IUCN. Other speakers were Ashish Kothari (India), Janis Alcorn (USA), Bruce Amos (Canada) and Grazia Borrini Feyerabend (Italy). A full room of participants attended the session.

In her introduction, **Aroha Mead** stated that governance is about power and accountability and also about responsibility. It is about unlocking the conservation estate for greater participation. There has been progress, treaties between tribes and government, but there are still disagreements. There is a need to elaborate on the principles of governance.

**Achim Steiner** stated that governance is the word of the day; it is a key issue not only for protected areas but also for society as a whole; the two should not be taken in isolation. Governance is also about relationships, some dysfunctional, some highly functional, between people, communities, central government and the private sector. The question is how can conservation be part of an enabling force to allow these relationships to grow. Because of history and many other reasons, the discussion on this issue will not be easy.

We have actually achieved targets - the only target that the international community has actually achieved. We must not forget that PAs have a long history, predating the 19<sup>th</sup> century designation of parks; but communities are now facing far greater competition for resources and have increasing difficulties in enforcing long-standing rules.

This congress has an opportunity to bring about real change, to right some of the wrongs and to improve the PA framework. The conservation estate is about 10% of the surface of the earth. This is a manifestation of power. We have introduced a system for which the price is high. There's been a loss of access. The question is whether this is for the public good. Is it for the public good if people can't access protected areas because of inability to pay?

Governance needs to focus on different forms of conservation: private, community and government. Conservation is not static and has to evolve and adapt to new forms of management and government.

Finally, we need to empower people who have the means and interest to invest in conservation

**Ashish Kothari** (India) provided an historical perspective of conservation, highlighting the multiple nature of social histories. History depends on who writes it. The problem is that those who can write or go to conferences have written the history of conservation.

Today conservation policies are a-historical and simplistic; most don't deal with longer history. As a result we keep assigning blame and end up repeating the same mistakes. The people most affected by PAs are the dis-privileged, who are also the closest to the land and whose traditions show an almost seamless integration of resource management and use with social, cultural, economic and political life. This traditional system has been eroded by the colonial take-over of community lands and modernism. The paradox is that we had a colonial system that ignored people, and now we have a benign system that also ignores them.

There is now a significant revival of Common Pool Resources, with community conserved areas, collaborative management and restitution.

**Jannis Alcorn** (USA) stated that global change is affecting PAs and their governance: There are three trends:

- i) Biophysical, such as climate change, sea level rise, habitat loss;
- ii) Socio-economic, such as growing populations, increased land use, increased demand for government services; and
- iii) Governance trends, such as democratization and globalization.

Globalization and democratisation bring new global norms; e.g. indigenous rights to self-determination, political and human rights. They also bring increased public access, large-scale migrations of people and rising power and presence of international NGOs and indigenous federations, as well as neo-liberal markets. These don't recognise traditional systems or conservation. Existing institutions resist change. This leads to unrest and armed conflict and militarisation of remote areas by dominant nations. But there exist diverse PAs and opportunities for new and cross-scale alliances. There is a trend of conservation NGOs working with people.

The key message is that civil society is not waiting for central government to forge new alliances. Civil society is forging global linkages and establishing learning networks.

**Bruce Amos** (Canada) outlined the five Principles of Good Governance, which are fundamentally about Power, relationships and accountability. He made the distinction between Government (the institutions) and Governance (the process). Good governance is a means to achieve ends, plus an end in itself. Many different actors are involved and the balance between them shifts over time. We were striving for a universal set of principles, but these can be controversial.

The question is how do protected areas respect these 5 principles? The paper developed criteria related to Legitimacy and Voice, Direction, Performance, Accountability and Fairness to address the question.

**Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend** (Italy) outlined the diversity of governance types and proposed a new dimension for use in the IUCN classification of protected areas. The motivation is not to create new classes but to recognize types of governance systems, which up to now have not been given due recognition by the IUCN.

To distinguish among these types, we can ask who holds management authority and responsibility. There are four possibilities:

1. *The government* (Government managed protected areas, including management by park agencies and ministries, as well as delegation of authority to NGOs).
2. *Private owners* (PPAs). Private protected areas have a long history (from the landed aristocracy to today's princes of the world, the large NGOs which have the means to buy large tracts of land. PPAs can also be run by for profit organizations)
3. *Indigenous and local communities* (CCAs). Community conserved areas are the oldest type of conservation, widespread and poorly recognized.
4. *Various actors together* (Co-managed protected areas - CMPAs).

Better governance is going to give us better conservation, combining effectiveness with equity.

The time has come to recognize CCAs, CMPAs and PPAs to complete existing official protected areas systems. Recognition of different types is not enough; a number of policy measures are necessary, as is the recognition of rights.

### **Questions from the floor**

Q. Richard Cellarius - Sierra Club: He was puzzled by the use of governance rather than management types. People will be confused by the term 'governance types' rather than 'management type'.

A. Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend: We're not talking of management objectives, but governance types. This is identified by who holds responsibility and authority, irrespective of management types. We are talking of different things. It's not 'what for' but 'who' manages.

Q. Andrew Wilson, Director of a national park in the UK: What is good governance about? In Yellow Stone, the whole cultural element was denied. The categorisation that we have keeps ignoring the cultural elements. As long as we have that we will not move ahead.

A. Ashish Kothari: I agree. The cultural and livelihood aspects are missing. For example, category Ia is strictly limited to protection. It doesn't even mention culture or sacred groves.

Q Anita Beyer, German Government: Is it 'government' of the protected areas or 'governance' of protected areas? You can have co-management with bad governance.

A Bruce Amos: It's a question of the use of words. 'Government' is too narrow and has other connotations. Governance goes beyond authority to a number of other issues.

Q A representative of South African National Parks: When we do conservation it is for the public good. Now you are including private people, which will make it a private good. How are you going to finance the monster of government if you bring in the private sector?

A Bruce Amos: What is the concern? The idea isn't to break down what exists today with a new typology. We want to increase complementarity, for more overall effectiveness.

Q Pihopa Kingi: We need to add 'sensitivity' to 'legitimacy and fairness'. Add 'equity' and 'fairness'

Q Wastamali (India): We indigenous people have protected areas created within our areas. What is the action plan for addressing this problem?

A Ashish: This will be addressed throughout the coming days. We have difficulty in recognizing traditional systems; communities are more complex than in the past. There are more complex arrangements to work out. Every site has its specificity to take into account. We're talking of the recognition of traditional rights, not just the restitution of rights.

A Taghi Farvar: There is a cultural/linguistic issue. Governance is a new word; it took us twenty years to get an acceptance of the word management; it is going to take us another 20 years to come to term with governance. Don't forget that we are discussing in English, which is not the language of the majority of the people of the world. Sometimes I wish we could convey all these concepts in Chinese pictograms, so that everybody would understand what is meant.