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Conservation and multi-level governance

• Pluralistic approaches to conservation
• Participatory, people-oriented
• Requires balancing use and conservation, as in conservation-development projects
• Community conserved areas, another example
• Re-connecting social-ecological systems

Community conserved areas (CCAs or ICCAs)

• “Natural and/or modified ecosystems containing biodiversity values, ecological services and cultural values, voluntarily conserved by indigenous and other communities through local or customary laws”
• ICCAs as a category, introduced by IUCN’s TILCEPA, Theme on Indigenous and Local Communities, Equity and Protected Areas
• Follows IUCN’s Fifth World Parks Congress in Durban in 2003

ICCAs provide a convenient category for:

• Durban commendation to “recognize the diversity of protected area governance approaches, such as community conserved areas, indigenous conservation areas, and private protected areas”
• Indigenous rights
• Cultural landscapes
• Integrated conservation-development projects

UNDP Equator Initiative

• Encourages cons-dev projects in the biodiversity-rich tropical counties
• Holds an international competition every 2 yrs for examples of cons-dev integration
• Has a large data base of cases, 2002 on
• U Manitoba involved in field studies of cases, 10 grad student projects since 2003

Preliminary study from UNDP EI database: Who are the partners? (N=42 indigenous cases)

Linkages involving partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Type</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local NGOs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National NGOs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local governments</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional/state governments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National governments</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial institutions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International organizations</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary study of UNDP EI cases: What kinds of partnerships? (N=42)

Kinds of partnerships for:
- Business networking: 33
- Fund-raising: 21
- Training/research: 18
- Technical support: 13
- Institution building: 15
- Legal support: 2
- Innovation and knowledge transfer: 24
- Gender empowerment & equity: 27
- Unclear: 17

UNDP EI case studies with graduate student field work

Three of ten cases discussed here:
- Iwokrama Forest conservation area, Makushi people, Arapaima conservation project, Guyana (Damian Fernandez)
- Pred Nai mangrove rehabilitation, a non-indigenous case, Thailand (Jason Senyk)
- Namibia, Herero people, Ehi-rovipuka Conservancy and Etosha National Park (Arthur Hoole)
Arapaima conservation case, Guyana

- Four levels of organization; 16 partners
- A diversity of roles of partners
- Note key partnership: Iwokrama (a national NGO) and NRDBB (a regional body)
- Key role: knowledge transfer
Pred Nai mangrove rehabilitation case, Thailand

- Five levels of organization; 20 partners
- Key partnership: RECOFTC (a SE Asia regional institution, based in Bangkok)
- Key function: capacity-building
Major findings (summarized in Berkes 2007 PNAS)

- Partnerships typically spanned four levels of organization (local, regional, national, international)
- Involved ten to fifteen partners each
- Almost always there is/are key partnerships, a bridging organization
- The definition of community-based conservation needs to be extended:
  - Governance that starts from the ground up and involves networks and linkages across various levels of organization

UNDP Equator Initiative cases and number of partners (horizontal linkages)

- Medicinal Plants Conservation Centre, India 11
- Arapaima conservation, Guyana 16
- Honey Care Africa Ltd., Kakamega, Kenya 8
- Honey Care Africa Ltd., Kwale, Kenya 6
- Cananeia Oyster Producers Cooperative, Brazil 14
- TIDE Port Honduras marine reserve, Belize 13
- Pred Nai mangrove rehabilitation, Thailand 20
- Casa Matsiguenga indigenous ecotourism, Peru 7
- Nuevo San Juan forest management, Mexico 22
- Torra Conservancy, Namibia 8

UNDP Equator Initiative cases and number of levels of organization in partnerships (vertical linkages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Levels of Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicinal Plants Conservation Centre, India</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapaima conservation, Guyana</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey Care Africa Ltd., Kakamega</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey Care Africa Ltd., Kwale</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cananeia Oyster Producers Cooperative, Brazil</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIDE Port Honduras marine reserve, Belize</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pred Nai mangrove rehabilitation, Thailand</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa Matsiguenga indigenous ecotourism, Peru</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo San Juan forest management, Mexico</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torra Conservancy, Namibia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There was an international NGO level until 2003

1. Conclusion: partnerships

- ICCA need partners to work
- Large number of partners, horizontal institutional linkages
- Successful conservation-development cases tend to be those very well networked
- These networks evolve in time; mature cases have mature networks with redundancy of linkages
2. Conclusion: Bridging organizations

- Large number of **vertical** institutional linkages from local to international
- **Bridging organizations** play an important role (examples Iwokrama in Guyana; RECOFTC in Thailand)
- Coordinating information flow across scales is a key role (bridging organizations; leadership) in successful projects.

3. Significance of multi-level governance

- Multiple partners and multi-level linkages required for successful ICCAs, cons-dev
- Conservation cannot be conceived and implemented at any one level
- Need ways to connect the various levels; build horizontal and vertical interplay
- Such linkages result in networks for learning and joint problem-solving.