

Rapporteur Report on Session 2.1.C
On Territories and resources conserved by indigenous and local communities in partnership with governments and other stakeholders (Co-managed Protected Areas – CMPAs): From Conflict to Collaboration

Chairs: Arthur Mugisha (Uganda), Gonzalo Oviedo (Ecuador)

Presentations by: Jackson Mutebi (Uganda); Dewi Suralaga (Indonesia) and Mario Piu (Ecuador);

Discussants: Pippa Heylings (UK), Rowan Martin (Zimbabwe)

Rapporteurs: Mark Infield (Vietnam), Regina Birner (Germany)

Jackson Mubeti (Uganda): *Co-managed Protected Areas: from conflict to collaboration. Experience in Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Uganda.*

Key points and topics:

Collaborative management is being carried out in a Protected Area containing high biodiversity values, including the endangered Mountain Gorilla.

The Collaborative Management process began in response to high levels of conflict caused by the ending of access to forest resources and the lack of consultation, leading communities to damage the protected area. The process was stimulated by outside agents.

Agreements on community access to restricted elements of the park's natural resources (non-timber forest products) were the entry point for the collaborative management process and have had a positive impact on community attitudes and behaviour towards the park and its managers.

Key questions or concerns:

Unequal power relations between partners in the collaborative management process led to contracts negotiated over resource access to favour the government/conservation position.

Local institutions participating in the collaborative management process were institutionally weak. They were also dependant on the Protected Area authority for financial support to allow their participation in the Collaborative Management process. This made them easily co-opted.

The Batwa people, historical residents of the forest and strongly dependant on it in cultural and economic terms, were unable to articulate their perspectives in the Collaborative Management process and their interests are not strongly reflected in the resulting agreements.

Dewi Suralaga (Indonesia): *Power Matters: prioritizing local communities in managing multi-stakeholders to promote sustainable parks management - a case study from Kayan Mentarang National Park – Indonesia*

The presentation dealt with a case study on co-management in the Kayan Mentarang National Park in Kalimantan, which is considered to be one of the world's ten biodiversity hotspots. WWF facilitated the establishment of a co-management approach for the Park, which is surrounded by approximately 50 Dayak villages. The process started in the beginning of the 1990s with sociological research that led to the reclassification of the area from a Nature Reserve to a National Park in 1996. The reclassification allows for traditional activities inside the area. After jointly developing a Management Plan, a Collaborative Management Mechanism was established and backed up by a Decree of the Ministry of Forestry in April 2002. The local communities are represented in a forum representing the traditional (*adat*) leaders of the communities. The case study identified the following challenges to the co-management approach:

The case study showed that the following principles are conducive for co-management:

- an organizational commitment to promoting good governance
- Clear “Rules of Engagement”
- “Precautionary” principles (avoiding false expectations of communities, e.g., on the possibilities to renegotiate the Park boundaries)
- Protection of community rights
- Transparency
- Linking conservation with sustainable livelihood in more effective ways
- Sustaining credible representation of local communities.

Responding to questions, the presenter explained that training and conflict management are an essential element of co-management systems. It was acknowledged that past mistakes by the Suharto government should be addressed, but that a restitution of rights in a big country like Indonesia appears to be politically difficult. The presenter cautioned against the view that economic benefits can be traded-off against empowerment, as suggested by one of the discussants. According to the experience in Indonesia, economic gaps and needs are often so severe that economic issues simply cannot be ignored in creating co-management systems.

Mario Piu Guime: *The Galapagos Marine Reserve and its Participatory Management Model*

This presentation dealt with the Galapagos Marine Reserve, a case that offers a unique opportunity to study a co-management approach that is backed up by a special legal framework. The co-management system in Galapagos was created by consensus following a participatory process that started in 1997 and involved more than 70 meetings organized by a “core group” (grupo nucleo) of stakeholders. Severe conflicts between fishermen, the tourism industry and the public administration motivated the establishment of a co-management system. The co-management structure includes a local stakeholder forum (Junta de Manejo Participativo, JMP), a higher-level decision-making body comprising representatives of different ministries and stakeholders (AIM), and the Park Management. Industrial fishing has been forbidden in the reserve. Monitoring of the collaborative management system is facilitated by a comprehensive data base on the meetings held, the participation of the stakeholders and the decisions taken at different levels. The data show that it is a challenge to maintain stakeholder interest in the management, and that the knowledge of the different constituencies differs among stakeholder groups. Nevertheless, after severe conflicts, the establishment of a co-management system led to the successful creation of the reserve with a zoning system and a management plan, as well as to ongoing management decisions that are accepted by the stakeholders concerned.

Questions on this case referred to the creation of legitimacy, the influence of lobbying, the problem of heterogeneity among stakeholder groups themselves, the possibility to use co-management as a mechanism to spread benefits to a wider group of stakeholders, including marginalized groups. Responding to questions, the presenter explained that the participative process leading to the co-management arrangements was more important in creating legitimacy than the establishment of the specific legislative frame conditions. He explained that the local stakeholder forum (JMP) represented an institutionalization of the core group of stakeholders that negotiated the establishment of the co-management system. The case showed that co-management can be a solution not only to situations where local and indigenous communities are the most important stakeholders, but also to extreme conflicts involving recent migrant settlers.

Discussants, Chairs:

Three large and ‘important’ protected areas responded to failures of central government control systems by opting for collaborative management as the way to design and implement a system that would deliver sound management of a protected areas with high legitimacy in the eyes of all stakeholders.

The three case studies made evident the link between the search for good governance, the pursuit of consensus, and the use of democratic and inclusive processes.

As the collaborative management process must result in clear 'hardnosed' agreements, the negotiation skills of all parties are important to the process. Conflict management skills must be built and the collaborative management process may require outside, 'neutral' moderation.

Collaborative management processes and outcomes must be analysed throughout their development and implementation.

We must be clear about the distinction between collaborative management and co-management. If the existence of the protected area and other key issues are not 'on the agenda' then the basis of negotiation is not equal. The inequalities in starting positions must be recognised, and the potentially coercive element of collaborative management processes controlled and minimised.

The agenda behind co-management is empowerment. If real authority to manage resources is given to communities, they will participate actively even in the absence of significant tangible benefits. They will also participate without significant authority if the tangible benefits are high. However, participation is likely to be poor if both responsibility and tangible benefits are low.

The processes of participation are costly. Therefore, the processes to be undertaken must be realistically designed in relation to funds available, and sources of funds for collaborative management processes must be identified.