

Governance of Protected Areas— Innovation in the Air...*

Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend

Governance is about power, relationships and accountability. It is about who has influence, who makes decisions, and how decision-makers are held accountable. It can be defined as *the interactions among structures, processes and traditions that determine how power is exercised, how decisions are taken on issues of public concern, and how citizens or other stakeholders have their say*¹. In a protected area (PA) context, governance covers a broad range of issues— from policy to practice, from behaviour to meaning, from investments to impacts. Governance has an influence on the achievement of protected area objectives (management effectiveness) but also determines the sharing of relevant costs and benefits (management equity). And it affects the generation and sustenance of community, political and financial support.

The Vth World Congress on Protected Areas has chosen to dedicate a three-day workshop stream to the topic of “Governance of Protected Areas.” The stream has grounded its work in the history of conservation up to the current broad trends in institutional change and explored two crucial themes:

- What “types” of governance exist for Protected Areas? How do they fare in terms of conservation and equity?
- What constitutes “good governance” for a Protected Area? What principles can help us understand and evaluate it?

This article summarizes some of the relevant concepts and examples that have been brought to the attention of the Congress, and briefly explores why they are important for conservation.

Governance Types

Given the size, complexity and impending global changes facing protected areas (PA) systems in the XXI Century, it is increasingly recognized that national governments confront an impossible task in attempting to ensure, alone, the accomplishment of all their conservation objectives. Fortunately, an impressive wealth and diversity of conservation-relevant knowledge, skills, resources and institutions is also at the disposal of indigenous, mobile and local communities, local governments, NGOs and the private sector. A diversity of models delivering conservation and other objectives is in operation throughout the world. In addition to the park systems comprising lands and waters owned by the state, there are areas managed by provincial or local government units, co-managed arrangements with local communities and other stakeholders, territories and sea areas managed by concerned indigenous and local communities for livelihood,

* A prior version of this paper was published in the IUCN/CEESP Journal *Policy Matters*, Issue 12, Community Empowerment for Conservation, Sep. 2003.

cultural and conservation purposes, private protected areas run by their landowners, and trans-boundary reserves managed jointly by two or more governments. National governments are becoming more and more aware of the potential represented by this “governance variety” and have begun to harness it through appropriate forms of recognition, support and collaboration.

The conservation potential represented by various types of governance systems is arising at a time when the world is experiencing rapid and profound social, technological, cultural, demographic and environmental changes. Indeed, the governance arrangements that some considered appropriate in the last century may no longer be appropriate or sustainable in the face of the trends and challenges that countries and civil society contend with in this century. There has been, for instance, a worldwide trend towards decentralizing authority and responsibility in a variety of sectors, and “partnerships” among social actors are becoming common.

In the last decade, protected area researchers and practitioners started analysing forms and types of governance in some detail. Through their efforts, recognition has emerged that PA governance is a complex system of perceptions, decision-making and action, and cannot be appropriately assessed by any one single property or indicator. Indeed, the variables potentially describing PA governance are many and combinable in various ways. Yet one property of a governance system—namely “who” holds management authority and responsibility and is expected to be held accountable to others — appears more characterizing than others. In other words, different governance types can begin to be distinguished on the basis of where decision-making authority, responsibility and accountability ultimately lie.



Figure 1: People from local communities, NGOs, government agencies and outside advisors collaborate for the management of the Bijagos biosphere reserve (Guinea Bissau). (Courtesy Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend)

Early attempts to characterize PA governance proposed a continuum between total government control and total control by local actors (e.g., a local community or a private landowner), with various co-management options in between.² More recently, a proposal³ has been gaining momentum to distinguish four main types of PA governance, i.e., control by governments, control by private landowners (individuals or NGOs), control by communities with customary and/or legal rights, and control by various social actors together (co-management). The distinctions among these types are not air tight, but this is relatively unimportant for the purpose of the typology, as it will be discussed below. The four governance types and several sub-types are presented in graphic form in Table 1, in combination with the IUCN/WCPA category system based on priority management objectives. Interestingly, the four main governance types introduced in Table 1 are fully complementary to the IUCN categories (they are category-neutral) in the sense that protected areas exist that fill each possible combination of IUCN category and governance type. To exemplify this, I have “filled in” within the matrix a few names of existing co-managed protected areas and community conserved areas described in recent literature.⁴ These attributions are my own and have *not* been discussed with the authors whose papers are cited below, nor with the relevant authorities on the ground. They are offered here only as preliminary and indicative, more as opportunities for discussion than as positive attributions. Though there are no cases of strict government managed PA’s listed here, this model remains the prevalent governance arrangement in many parts of the world. Increasingly, private protected areas are also encompassing large stretches of land and resources. For instance, as discussed during the Congress, the amount of land now under private conservation in South Africa is estimated to be larger than the amount under official protected area status.

Table 1: Four Types of Protected Area (PA) Governance

Governance type IUCN Category (management objective)	A. Government Managed Protected Areas			B. Co-managed Protected Areas			C. Private Protected Areas			D. Community Conserved Areas	
	Federal or national ministry or agency in charge	Local/ municipal ministry or agency in charge	Government-delegated management (e.g. to an NGO)	Trans-boundary management	Collaborative management (various forms of pluralist influence)	Joint management (pluralist management board)	Declared and run by individual land-owner	...by non-profit organizations (e.g. NGOs, universities, etc.)	...by for profit organizations (e.g. individual or corporate land-owners)	Declared and run by indigenous peoples	Declared and run by local communities
I - Strict Nature Reserve/ Wilderness Area										Sacred lakes in Coron (Philippines) ⁵ Sacred mountain of Forole	“New” sacred forests in India ⁸ Part of Shimshal (Pakistan) ⁹⁴⁰

										(Kenya, Ethiopia) ⁶ Rusito forest (Zimbabwe) ⁷	
II – National Park (ecosystem protection; protection of cultural values)				Park W (Bénin, Niger, Burkina Faso) ¹⁰	National Parks in the UK Italy ¹¹ , Spain ¹² , Uganda ¹³ Rumania ¹⁴ Australia ¹⁵	KAA Iya, (Colombia) ¹⁶ Kayan Mentarang, (Indonesia) ¹⁷ Galapagos Marine Reserve (Ecuador) ¹⁸ Gwai Haanas, (Canada) ¹⁹				Kuna Yala (Panama) ²⁰ Alto Fragua Indiwasi (Colombia) ²¹ IPAs in Australia	Pohnpei, (Micronesia) ²² Mataven, (Colombia) ²³ Parco Naturale Dolomiti d'Ampezzo (Italy) ²⁴
III – Natural Monument										Sacred trees in India ²⁵	Burial sites in Madagascar ²⁶
IV – Habitat/Species Management						Lore Lindu, (Indonesia) ²⁷ MERs Brazil ²⁸	Pantanal (Brazil) ²⁹			Heronries & village sanctuaries in India ³⁰	APCs (Senegal) ³¹
V – Protected Landscape/Seascape						PNRs, (France) ³²				Formosa (Guinea Bissau) ³³ Setulang (Indonesia) ³⁴	Mirafior (Guatemala) ³⁵ Pastoral landscapes (Iran) ³⁶ Island of Eigg (UK)
VI – Managed Resource					NFs in USA ³⁷ Buffer zones of Nepal ³⁸					Mendha forest (India) ³⁹ Common property under GELOSE agreements (Madagascar) ⁴⁰	Chile's fisheries ⁴¹ UPs (Senegal) ⁴² Port.Honduras, (Belize) ⁴³ Part of Shimshal, (Pakistan) ⁴⁴

- A. GOVERNMENT MANAGED PROTECTED AREAS** – Authority, responsibility and accountability for managing the protected area rest with a government ministry or agency that has formally subjected it to a conservation objective (such as the ones that distinguish the IUCN categories). The government level in charge may be the national (provincial in case of a federal country) or the local/ municipal. The government may also have delegated the management to a body (a para-statal organization, NGO or even a private operator or community) but it retains full land ownership and control/ oversight. The government may or may not have a legal obligation to inform or consult other identified stakeholders prior to making or enforcing management decisions.
- B. CO-MANAGED PROTECTED AREAS** – Authority, responsibility and accountability for managing the protected area are shared in various ways among a variety of actors, likely to include one or more government agencies, local communities, private landowners and other stakeholders. The actors recognize the legitimacy of their respective entitlements to manage the protected area and agree on subjecting it to a specific conservation objective (such as the ones that distinguish the IUCN categories). Distinct sub-types may be identified. In collaborative management, formal decision-making authority, responsibility and accountability still rest with one agency (often a national governmental agency), but the agency is required – by law or by policy – to collaborate with other stakeholders. In its strongest form, ‘collaboration’ means that a multi-stakeholder body develops and approves *by consensus* a number of technical proposals for protected area regulation and management, to be later submitted to the decision-making authority. In joint management, various actors sit on a management body with decision-making authority. Again, the requirements for joint management are made stronger if decision-making is carried out by consensus. When this is not the case, the balance of power reflected in the composition of the joint management body may *de facto* transform it into a different governance type (e.g., when government actors or private landowners hold an absolute majority of votes). A likely case of multi-stakeholder management is the one of trans-boundary PAs, whereby two or more parties manage co-operatively an “area of land and/or sea that straddles one or more boundaries between states, sub-national units such as provinces and regions, autonomous areas and/or areas beyond the limits of national sovereignty or jurisdiction, whose constituent parts are especially dedicated to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity, and of natural and associated cultural resources, and managed co-operatively through legal or other effective means”⁴⁵. The parties in question could just be the concerned governments or the concerned bordering communities (for some commentators these cases would not represent genuine “co-management” examples and should be subsumed under type A or type D) but could also include various parties across the border at various levels of needed decisions (e.g., two or more national governments and PA agencies, several local communities, mobile peoples, private entrepreneurs, etc.). In particular, a co-management setting has been suggested for the high-sea trans-boundary marine PAs beyond the jurisdiction of any one country.

- C. PRIVATE PROTECTED AREAS** – Authority and responsibility for managing the protected area rest with one or more private landowners. In some cases the owner is a non-profit organization (e.g., an NGO, foundation, research institute or university) but in others it is a for-profit corporation. The owners of the land and natural resources subject them to a specific conservation objective (such as the ones that distinguish the IUCN categories), and are fully responsible for decision-making, subject to applicable legislation and the terms of any agreements with the government, but their accountability to the larger society is usually quite limited. Some forms of accountability may be negotiated with the government in exchange for specific incentives (as in the case of Land Use Trusts).
- D. COMMUNITY CONSERVED AREAS** – Authority and responsibility for managing the concerned territory and resources rest with the indigenous peoples and/or local communities with customary and/or legal claims over the land and natural resources through a variety of specific forms of customary governance or locally agreed organizations and rules. Land and resources are usually collectively managed, a fact that may or may not have been legally sanctioned in the specific national context. The community customarily (and/or legally) owning the land and natural resources formally subjects them to a conservation objective (such as the ones that distinguish the IUCN categories) and/or to other objectives that demonstrate long-term success in achieving conservation outcomes. Management is through a locally agreed form of governance, which generally has roots in traditional, customary or ethnic practices.⁴⁶ It is because of this characteristic that the term used is “conserved area” rather than “protected area”, which for many communities carries the unmistakable connotation of “imposition by the state”. The community’s accountability to society may be defined as part of broader negotiations with the national government and other partners, possibly as a counterpart to being assured, for example, of the recognition of collective land rights, respect for customary practices, the provision of economic incentives, etc. Such negotiations may even result in a joint management arrangement among indigenous and local communities, government actors and other stakeholders (thus changing the governance type from D to B). Some communities organize themselves in various ways, including legal forms such as NGOs, to manage their resources. This does not change the governance type from D to C provided that the NGO effectively represents the concerned community and not only some particular interests within it.

Most of us are familiar with type A governance, with a government body (such as a Park Agency or a para-statal institution responding directly to the government) in charge of management. The ownership of the relevant land and resources is generally with the government. In Sweden, for instance, a protected area cannot be declared until the government has managed to buy all land supposed to be included under protected status, a process often long and painful. In other countries, state ownership has come from top-down, unilateral declarations by the state, under colonial or other regimes that considered “despoliable” the indigenous and local communities and/or local landowners with pre-existing rights. Recently, government structures at sub-national and municipal levels have become more and more frequently active in declaring and

managing their own protected areas. In some cases (e.g., Belize) the state retains control of protected areas but delegates their management to an NGO.

Type B governance is also quite common, especially where the constituencies calling for the establishment of a protected area are prepared to face a variety of interlocked forms of sovereignty and entitlements. Under a democratic government, legally established rights cannot be taken away by the stroke of a pen or a roll of barbed wire. Complex processes and institutional mechanisms are instead set into place among a plurality of actors—from different national states to sub-national authorities, traditional authorities, elected leaders, private entrepreneurs, land-owners, and so on. An emerging subgroup of type B comprises land recently “restituted” by the state to its legitimate community owners and still retained under a protection status under some explicit contractual agreement. Given the complexities at play, several sub-types of Type B can be identified, but for all of them the very plurality of recognized relevant social actors (“stakeholders”) makes it imperative to achieve some form of consensus/compromise.



Figure 2: Everyone can do something for conservation, if informed and empowered to act. For instance, community fishery regulations are well known and respected in many Asian countries. (Courtesy Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend)

Type C governance has a relatively long history, as kings and the powerful tended for centuries to preserve for themselves certain areas of land or the privilege to hunt wildlife in a given territory. Such private reserves had important secondary conservation benefits. Today, private ownership by non-state actors directly aimed at conservation is skyrocketing, with conservation NGOs buying large areas exactly for that purpose. Individual landowners are also choosing to pursue conservation objectives, whether out of a sense of respect for the land and a desire to maintain its beauty and ecological value or for more utilitarian purposes, such as gaining from ecotourism or reducing levies and taxes.

Community Conserved Areas

The governance type with which many conservation professionals may not be entirely familiar is type D, i.e., governance by indigenous and local communities. Yet, this is the oldest and one of the most widespread types of governance of natural resources existing on the planet. Throughout the world and over thousands of years, human communities have shaped their lifestyles and livelihood strategies to respond to the opportunities and challenges presented by their surrounding land and natural resources. In so doing, they simultaneously managed, conserved, modified, and enriched their environments. In many cases, the communities’ interaction with the environment generated such close

“symbiotic” relationships that some speak in terms of “bio-cultural units” or “cultural landscapes/seascapes”. Importantly, much of this interaction happened not for the intentional conservation of biodiversity but more spontaneously or, shall we say “organically”, because of a variety of interlocked objectives and values (spiritual, religious, security-related, survival-related, etc.). What is important is that in many cases locally-based land and resource management *does* result in the conservation of ecosystems, species and ecosystem-related services. We refer to the lands in which local communities achieve such conservation as Community Conserved Areas or CCAs.⁴⁷

The joint CEESP/WCPA Theme on Indigenous and Local Communities, Equity and Protected Areas (TILCEPA) has promoted and synthesized⁴⁸ a number of regional reviews of existing community-based conservation cases and developed a broad definition of Community Conserved Areas:

Community Conserved Areas are natural and modified ecosystems including significant biodiversity, ecological services and cultural values voluntarily conserved by concerned indigenous and local communities through customary laws or other effective means.

Conservation efforts may be initiated and/or achieved with or without outside support, but there are three essential characteristics for CCAs:

- The relevant indigenous and local communities are “concerned” about the given ecosystems—usually being related to them culturally and/or because of livelihoods;
- Voluntary management decisions and efforts lead toward the conservation of habitats, species, ecological services and associated cultural values, although the protection status may have been set up for a variety of objectives, possibly unrelated to conservation *per se* (in other words CCA’s are examples of *effective* and *demonstrable* conservation, not examples of areas set aside *for the purpose* of conservation);
- Indigenous and local communities are the major players (power-holders) in making and implementing decisions on the management of the ecosystems at stake, implying that some form of community authority exists and is capable of enforcing regulations.

It is worth remembering that CCAs can only be understood within a particular historical and social context, often as key indicators of institutional continuity, strength or change. The “modernization” processes currently occurring throughout the world have tended to devalue and crush both the existence of indigenous and local communities and the roles they play in natural resource management. Certainly collective customary institutions and values fit neither the socialist dogma of the controlling state nor the capitalist dogma of the perfectly free and selfish individual. Their “re-discovery”— which should remain critical and aware of the many constraints and pitfalls faced by local communities and their CCAs— is part of a third way, a way that values and adopts complexity and cultural uniqueness, and struggles to advance in a world of sweeping simplifications.

What are the Advantages of Recognizing Different Governance Types for Conservation?

There would be no point in complicating the field of conservation without real necessity and benefits. As mentioned, however, national protected areas systems have progressively become more ambitious, enlarging their size and assuming more complex tasks, while irrevocable damages to the natural non-protected environment have also become progressively more visible and worrying. People are more conscious now than ever before of the need to establish comprehensive and effective conservation systems, and yet, also as never before, the challenge appears to be of staggering proportions. The challenge involves extending current protected areas systems to close the gaps that still exist regarding specific ecosystems and species, and to ensure the physical connectivity essential for their long-term survival. It also involves, however, uplifting and dramatically improving the management of existing protected areas.

If different governance types were officially recognized, Community Conserved Areas and Private PAs would acquire “full legitimacy” alongside Government-Managed PAs and Co-Managed PAs. This would greatly enhance their chances of combining and optimizing their overall conservation potential. Surveys of existing or potentially adoptable conservation practices by local communities and private landowners could be carried out as part of regional planning exercises and offer unexpected avenues to complete and integrate existing official protected area systems. Obviously, a variety of policy measures—from the recognition of indigenous and customary rights to the provision of economic incentives for conservation — would sustain and add value to these practices. Also rather obviously, the dialogue and collaboration with communities and landowners would enhance public support for conservation and tend to strengthen the relationship between people and nature.

A conservation system comprising territories and resources under various governance types would have a better chance of addressing currently existing conservation gaps (e.g., connectivity gaps). Such systems would be more complete and arguably more resilient, responsive and adaptive, since different economic, social and ecological changes unequally affect different social actors. Wars and civil strife, for instance, may lead a government agency to withdraw from a territory, but local communities may remain in place and know a variety of ways to preserve their traditional systems. In other cases, a fast management response may be needed to avert an impending danger and a private owner may be able to effect that swiftly, without waiting for rules to be changed. By combining different capacities to respond to both threats and opportunities around conservation, such a “pluralist governance” system would be more effective overall and more sustainable in the long run.

Last but not least, the acceptance and legitimization of a pluralist conservation system could promote relationships of mutual respect, communication, and support between and amongst people managing protected areas under different governance types. It could also promote much needed exchanges and action-research to explore governance principles, requirements and results and to enhance capacities and promote management effectiveness, in particular through learning

by doing. Even something as simple as an agreed-upon nomenclature of governance types would set the conditions for dialogue and create a foundation upon which to explore subtleties. Dialogues, exchanges and research are exactly what it is needed to explore and diffuse, in all its facets and complexities, the art of conservation.



Figure 3: Local forest residents can recognize tens of tree species even in their very early forms, a feat not mustered by many biologists. (Courtesy Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend)

Principles of Good Governance

It is generally recognized that “good governance” is a good thing. And yet, while the two words are becoming accepted jargon in all sorts of documents and official declarations, their actual meaning is still not universally clear. What does “good governance” mean? Some tend to stress a connotation of “openness”— a governance system should be open to innovation and advice, and possibly even to scrutiny. A reductive understanding of the term may even equate good governance with “open to foreign investments and the market system.” Fortunately, others understand “good governance” in a much more complex and rich way. Considerable work toward establishing a set of principles of good governance has been done by the United Nations as part of both its overall work on human rights and the promotion of public involvement in environmental governance⁴⁹ prompted since the UN Conference on Environment and Development of 1992. In the UN discussions, it is generally understood that governance principles are to be interpreted within their particular context of application (history, culture, technology, economic conditions, etc.) and that complexities abound (indeed, “the devil is in the detail”).

Two recent publications,⁵⁰ prepared in view of the World Parks Congress, take inspiration from the UN work and recommend that both protected area systems and individual protected areas engage in participatory governance evaluation processes. This is the ideal way to proceed, as no one better than the relevant social actors (stakeholders) can understand and define what constitutes good governance in a given situation. Table 2 below draws from such publications and from the work of the UN that inspired them and takes the reflection forward to address the specific responsibilities of protected areas managers. The table can be a starting point for a specific PA-based reflection, supplemented by other principles or considerations. In Europe, for instance, the principle of “subsidiarity” embraced by the European Union could be profitably added. As brought out clearly in discussions at the Durban Congress, the over-arching principle to which conservation in general and governance of protected areas in particular should refer to, remains the respect of human rights. Today, after the Millennium Declaration fused the world’s

will toward the aim of poverty eradication, it is no longer admissible to justify conservation interventions that in any way impoverish people and deprive them of their rights.

**Table 2: Principles of Good Governance for Protected Areas:
What could they mean for PA managers?**

Five Principles of good governance for PA's	The United Nations Principles on which the principle is based	Related PA governance responsibilities
1. Legitimacy and Voice	<p>Participation: All men and women should have a voice in decision-making, either directly or through legitimate intermediate institutions that represent their intention. Such broad participation is built on freedom of association and speech, as well as capacities to participate constructively.</p> <p>Consensus orientation: Good governance mediates differing interests to reach a broad consensus on what is in the best interest of the group and, where possible, on policies and procedures.</p>	<p>Promoting the free expression of views, with no discrimination related to gender, ethnicity, social class, etc.</p> <p>Fostering dialogue and negotiating collective agreements on management objectives and strategy, activities and tools to pursue them.</p> <p>Fostering relations of trust among stakeholders.</p> <p>Making sure that rules are respected because they are “owned” by people and not solely because of fear of repression.</p>
2. Accountability	<p>Accountability: Decision-makers are accountable to the public, as well as to institutional stakeholders. Accountability differs depending on the organizations and whether the decision is internal or external.</p> <p>Transparency: Transparency is built on the free flow of information. Processes, institutions and information are directly accessible to those concerned with them. Enough information is provided to understand</p>	<p>Making sure that stakeholders possess an adequate quantity of knowledge and quality of knowledge regarding what is at stake in decision-making, who is responsible for what, and how the responsible actors can be made accountable.</p> <p>Making sure that the avenues to demand accountability are accessible to all.</p> <p>Making sure that accountability is not</p>

	and monitor institutions and their decision-making processes.	limited to verbal exchanges but linked to concrete and appropriate rewards and sanctions .
3. Performance	<p>Responsiveness: Institutions and processes try to serve all stakeholders.</p> <p>Effectiveness and efficiency: Processes and institutions produce results that meet needs while making the best use of resources.</p>	<p>Ensuring the achievement of the management objectives.</p> <p>Making certain there is a competent administration and sufficient institutional and human capacity to carry out the required roles and assume the relevant responsibilities.</p> <p>Ensuring a management structure that is robust and resilient, i.e., able to overcome a variety of threats/obstacles and come out strengthened from the experiences.</p>
4. Fairness	<p>Equity: All men and women have opportunities to improve or maintain their well-being.</p> <p>Rule of Law: Legal frameworks are fair and enforced impartially, particularly the laws on human rights.</p>	<p>Making sure that conservation is undertaken with decency, without humiliating or harming people (do not harm!). In particular, poor people should never be further impoverished in the name of conservation.</p> <p>Ensuring that the governing mechanisms (e.g., laws, policies, conflict resolution forums, funding opportunities, etc.) distribute equitably the costs and benefits deriving from conservation.</p> <p>Ensuring public service promotions that are merit-based.</p> <p>Being consistent through time in applying laws and regulations.</p> <p>Providing fair avenues for conflict management and, as needed, non-discriminatory recourse to justice.</p>

<p>5. Direction</p>	<p>Strategic vision: Leaders and the public have a broad and long-term perspective on good governance and human development, along with a sense of what is needed for such development.</p> <p>Embracing complexities: The historical, cultural and social complexities in which the long-term perspective is grounded are understood and effectively taken into account.</p>	<p>Listening to people, understanding their concerns, being able to propose specific initiatives to respond to those.</p> <p>Providing effective leadership by fostering the generation and support of innovative ideas and processes.</p> <p>Providing a model of good conduct.</p> <p>Being consistent in what is said and done.</p>
----------------------------	---	---

Notes

¹ Graham, Amos and Plumtree, 2003.

² Borrini-Feyerabend, 1996.

³ This proposal responds in part to the 2002 mandate of the joint CEESP/WCPA Theme on Indigenous and Local Communities, Equity and Protected Areas.

⁴ Issues 12 and 13 of the IUCN/CEESP journal Policy Matters contain articles describing several examples of the co-managed protected areas or community conserved areas noted here. The journals can be accessed via the CEESP website at <http://www.iucn.org/themes/ceesp/Publications/Publications.htm#policy>. Individual articles are cited in the references list below.

⁵ Ferrari and De Vera, 2003.

⁶ Ganya et al, 2004.

⁷ Chidhakwa, 2003.

⁸ Kothari and Pathak, 2003.

⁹ Ali and Butz, 2003.

¹⁰ Price, 2003.

¹¹ Borrini-Feyerabend et al, 2004.

¹² Synge, 2004

¹³ Blomley and Namara, 2003

¹⁴ Borrini-Feyerabend et al, 2004.

¹⁵ Kerins, 2003.

¹⁶ Winer, 2003.

¹⁷ Eghenter and Labo, 2003.

¹⁸ Heylings and Bravo, 2001 and Borrini-Feyerabend et al, 2004.

¹⁹ Gladu et al, 2003 and Borrini-Feyerabend et al, 2004.

²⁰ Madrigal and Solis, 2003.

²¹ Zuluaga et al, 2003.

²² Tilling, 2003.

²³ Luque, 2003.

²⁴ www.regole.it and Borrini-Feyerabend et al, 2004.

²⁵ Gadgil, 1998.

²⁶ Tengö et al, 2005.

²⁷ Birner and Mappatoba, 2003.

²⁸ Pinto da Silva, 2004.

²⁹ Santos et al, 2003.

-
- ³⁰ Kothari and Pathak, 2003.
- ³¹ Thiaw et al, 2003.
- ³² Allali-Puz et al, 2003.
- ³³ Maretti, 2003.
- ³⁴ Setulang village, 2003.
- ³⁵ Ravnborg, 2003.
- ³⁶ Farvar, 2003.
- ³⁷ Randall Wilson, 2003.
- ³⁸ Bajimaya, 2003.
- ³⁹ Kothari and Pathak, 2003.
- ⁴⁰ Ramiarison and Razafindrakoto, 2004.
- ⁴¹ Aburto and Stotz, 2003.
- ⁴² Ly and Niamir-Fuller, 2004.
- ⁴³ Maheya, 2003.
- ⁴⁴ Ali and Butz, 2003.
- ⁴⁵ Sandwith et al, 2001.
- ⁴⁶ Some people are very concerned about the relationship between traditional/ customary practices and the principles of good governance discussed later in the article, in particular because of their real, or apparent, lack of popular participation in decision-making. While these concerns are at times justified, they are so for both customary practices and formal legal practices.
- ⁴⁷ Pathak, 2002.
- ⁴⁸ Borrini-Feyerabend et al, 2004.
- ⁴⁹ Bruch, 2002; UNDP Human Development reports 1999 and 2002.
- ⁵⁰ Graham, Amos and Plumtree, 2003 and Abrams et al, 2003.

References

- Abrams, P., G. Borrini-Feyerabend, J. Gardner and P. Heylings, *Evaluating Governance— a Handbook to Accompany a Participatory Process for a Protected Area*, Parks Canada and TILCEPA, draft, 2003.
- Aburto, J., and W. Stotz, "Las Jreas de manejo de administracion pesquera en Chile," *Policy Matters*, 12: 200-204, 2003.
- Ali, I. and D. Butz, "The Shimshal governance model – a CCA, a sense of cultural identity, a way of life," *Policy Matters*, 12: 111-120, 2003.
- Allali-Puz, H., E. Bechaux, and C. Jenkins, "Gouvernance et démocratie locale dans les Parcs Naturels Régionaux de France," *Policy Matters*, 12: 225-237, 2003.
- Bajimaya, S. Shyam, "Nepal's experience in participatory biodiversity conservation & buffer zone initiatives," *Policy Matters*, 12: 276-282, 2003.
- Birner, R. and M. Mappatoba, "Community agreements on conservation in Lore Lindu, Sulawesi (Indonesia)," *Policy Matters*, 12: 254-263, 2003.
- Blomley, T. and A. Namara, "Devolving rights or shedding responsibilities in Uganda's Protected Areas?" *Policy Matters*, 12: 283-289, 2003.
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G., *Collaborative Management of Protected Areas: Tailoring the Approach to the Context*, IUCN Gland (Switzerland), 1996.
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G., A. Kothair, and G. Oviedo. *Indigenous and Local Communities and Protected Areas: Towards Equity and Enhanced Conservation*. IUCN Gland (Switzerland) and Cambridge (UK), 2004.

- Borrini-Feyerabend, M. Pimbert, M.T. Farvar, A. Kothari and Y. Renard, *Sharing Power: Learning by Doing in Co-management on Natural Resources throughout the World*, IIED and IUCN/CEESP, Cenesta pub., Teheran, 2004.
- Bruch, C. (ed.), *The New Public: the Globalisation of Public Participation*, Environmental Law Institute, Washington DC, 2002.
- Chidhakwa, Z., "Traditional institutions manage their forests in Zimbabwe," *Policy Matters*, 12: 132-140, 2003.
- Eghenter, C., and M. Labo, "The Dayak people & Kayan Mentarang – first co-managed protected area in Indonesia," *Policy Matters*, 12: 248-253, 2003.
- Farvar, M. Taghi, "Myths, challenges and questions on mobile pastoralism in West Asia," *Policy Matters*, 12: 31-41, 2003.
- Ferrari, M. and D. De Vera, "Coron island and rights-based conservation in The Philippines," *Policy Matters*, 12: 166-170, 2003.
- Gadgil, M., "Grassroots conservation practices: revitalizing the traditions", pages 219-238 in Kothari, A., R.V. Anuradha, N. Pathak and B. Taneja (eds.), *Communities and Conservation: Natural Resource Management in South and Central Asia*, Sage Publications, New Delhi and London, 1998.
- Ganya, C., G. Haro, and G. Borrini-Feyerabend, "Conservation of dryland biodiversity by mobile indigenous people – the case of the Gabbra of Northern Kenya," *Policy Matters*, 13: 61, 2004.
- Gladu, J.P., *Aboriginal Experiences in Canada. Parks and protected areas*, Boreal Footprint Project and Taiga Rescue Network, <http://www.taigarescue.org/index.php?sub=2&cat=41>, Snabba Tryck, Visby (Sweden), 2003.
- Graham, J. B. Amos and T. Plumptree, *Governance Principles for Protected Areas in the 21st Century*, Institute on Governance in collaboration with Parks Canada and CIDA, Ottawa (Canada), 2003. See also Session 1.1 Plenary, this volume.
- Iwan, R. (on behalf of the Setulang village), "Setulang village in Kalimantan: we protect our river!" *Policy Matters*, 12: 152-153, 2003.
- Kerins, S., "A legal breakthrough for Aboriginal Australians!" *Policy Matters*, 12: 109-110, 2003.
- Kothari, A. and N. Pathak, "Communities Conserved Areas in India," *Policy Matters*, 12: 141-144, 2003.
- Luque, A., "Mataven forest: creating a Community Conserved Area in Colombia," *Policy Matters*, 12: 145-151, 2003.
- Ly, A., and M. Niamir Fuller, "La propriété collective et la mobilité pastorale in tant qu'alliées de la conservation – expériences et politiques innovatrices au Ferlo (Sénégal)," *Policy Matters*, 13: 162, 2004.
- Madrigal, P. and V. Solis, "¿Son los comunes una tragedia o una oportunidad?" *Policy Matters*, 12: 53-54, 2003.
- Maheya, W., "Port Honduras Marine Reserve," *Policy Matters*, 12: 246-248, 2003.
- Maretti, C. Carrera, "Bijagos Islands: resistance and conservation," *Policy Matters*, 12: 121-131, 2003.
- Pathak Broome, N., "Communities do conserve! Learning from Community Conserved Areas in India and Elsewhere", *Policy Matters*, 10: 60-62, 2002.
- Pinto da Silva, P., "History, culture and participatory marine conservation in a Brazilian fishing community," *Policy Matters*, 13: 86, 2004.

- Price, T., "The "W" Park of Benin, Burkina Faso and Niger," *Policy Matters*, 12: 290-293, 2003.
- Ramiarison, C., and T.E. Razafindrakoto, "Les contrats sociaux traditionnels (*dina*) et le transfert de gestion des ressources naturelles renouvelable (GELOSE) – une alliance clé pour la conservation et le développement durable à Madagascar," *Policy Matters*, 13: 242, 2004.
- Ravnborg, H., "Protecting Mirafior . . . or protecting the livelihood of small-scale farmers?" *Policy Matters*, 12: 196-199, 2003.
- Sandwith, T., C. Shine, L. Hamilton and D. Sheppard, *Trans-boundary Protected Areas for Peace and Cooperation*, Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series, no. 7, IUCN, Gland (Switzerland) and Cambridge (UK), 2001.
- Santos, E. Rodrigues, J. Marques de Souza, J.P. Delorme, and R. Lima de Barros, "Une filière économique pour préserver les paysages du Pantanal," *Policy Matters*, 12: 238-245, 2003.
- Synge, H. (ed.), *European Models of Good Practice in Protected Areas*, IUCN and the Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, IUCN, Cambridge (UK), 2004.
- Tengö, M., K. Johansson, F. Rasoarisela, J. Lundberg, J.A. Andriamaherilala, E. Andersson, J.A. Rakotoarisoa and T. Elmqvist, "Local protection of tropical dry forest: taboos and ecosystem services in southern Madagascar," paper available from Thomas Elmqvist (thomase@ecology.su.se), submitted for publication, 2005.
- Thiaw, W., S. I. Sylla, and J. Lariviere, "Les Aires du Patrimoine Communautaire au Sénégal," *Policy Matters*, 12: 156-165, 2003.
- Tilling, A., "Politics and participatory planning of Pohnpei's Watershed, Micronesia," *Policy Matters*, 12: 192-195, 2003.
- Wilson, R., "Community-based management of national forests in the Western United States," *Policy Matters*, 12: 216-224, 2003.
- Winer, N., "Co-management, oil & gas industry & indigenous empowerment in Kaa Iya del Gran Chaco, Boliva," *Policy Matters*, 12: 181-191, 2003.
- Zuluaga, G., J.I. Giraldo, and M.J. Larrarte, "Conservacion bio-cultural: el Parque Nacional Natural Alto Fragua-Indiwasi en Colombia," *Policy Matters*, 12: 171-180, 2003.

Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend (gbf@cenesta.org) is the current Chair of CEESP/CMWG. She is Vice-Chair of CEESP and Vice Chair of WCPA for the Theme on Indigenous and Local Communities, Equity and Protected Areas (TILCEPA). She would like to thank Diane Pansky, Jacques Weber and Charles Besançon for their very kind comments on prior versions of this article.