

# id21 insights

communicating international development research

## People and protected areas

### New agendas for conservation

**F**or many threatened plants and animals, protected areas are a vital refuge in the face of declining natural habitats. However, across the world they face increasing pressures. Some conservation policies are also disadvantageous for local people. What does the future hold for protected areas?

The number of public protected areas has increased more than tenfold since the first United Nations list in 1962, to 102, 102 sites covering an area of 18.8 million square kilometres (World Conservation Monitoring Centre, 2003). Despite this, species and habitat loss is high. Population pressures, particularly the expansion of urban areas and agriculture, lead to protected areas becoming islands or increasingly fragmented habitats.

Even with current conservation areas, it is estimated that up to 50 percent of the world's biodiversity will be lost this century. Furthermore, there is little consistency between countries and regions on the criteria used to designate protected areas.

This issue of *id21 insights* discusses the challenges facing people living and working in or near publicly designated and locally defined protected areas, particularly in developing countries.

A woman from the Lisu ethnic minority group in north west Yunnan Province, China. Conservation International has named the mountains in south west China as a biodiversity hotspot. Diverse wildlife includes endangered species such as snow leopards. Seventeen ethnic groups, including the Lisu and Tibetans, live in the region. Collecting wood is permitted under the National Natural Forest Protection Programme but poses a threat to ecosystems. The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund focuses on increasing the capacity of emerging conservation leaders to preserve biodiversity and to ensure that community groups, NGOs and the private sector work together and complement government strategies – see [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net)

Photo by Alexander Robin



Current debates on conservation include:

- Human activity in protected areas. Is forced resettlement of local people acceptable? Can conservation goals be integrated with land and resource use strategies of local communities, such as hunting and fishing?
- Funding is inadequate and declining. How should increasingly scarce global funds be allocated? How can initiatives be made sustainable in the longer term?
- New management approaches are expanding. How can protected areas create conditions for community management of conservation and support local projects? Can these approaches be applied to areas that cross international or state boundaries? What role does education play in these?
- The role of ecosystem services. Many ecosystems provide important

### In this issue

#### Editorial

#### Marine Protected Areas

#### Forced displacement

#### Learning to learn

#### Nature, culture and people

#### Agriculture vs conservation

#### Tourism in Nepal

#### Governance issues

#### Useful web links

Kerry Albright from NR International provided academic advice on this issue:  
[k.albright@nrint.co.uk](mailto:k.albright@nrint.co.uk)

services, such as cleaning water and absorbing carbon dioxide. Can paying people to protect habitats provide funds for conservation efforts and local economies?

#### Human activity in protected areas

Human presence in protected areas can be high; nearly half of the 17,000 larger protected areas have agriculture within their boundaries and at least one third of developing country protected areas overlap with indigenous peoples' traditional homelands – see articles by **Sara Scherr** and **Gonzalo Oviedo**.

Creating public protected areas historically meant declaring ecosystems as public lands and resources, often overruling existing local rights. This process sometimes includes the forced removal of people from protected areas, as **Kai Schmidt-Soltau** describes. A lack of attention to traditional resource use patterns and tenure rights often resulted in deep-rooted conflicts and unexpected pressures on natural systems caused by the disruption of well established human-nature balances.

Identifying conservation projects that help communities maintain or improve their environment is a priority. This supports human rights, is consistent with the devolution of government roles to other parties, builds on long-term social and cultural initiatives, and combines economic interests with other incentives to increase the likelihood of success.

### ► Funding is inadequate and declining

There has been a substantial decline in Overseas Development Aid to the forestry and conservation sector (from US\$ 2.2 billion per year 1991 to 1992 to US\$ 1.1 billion 2002 to 2003) and most government sector budgets have remained the same (about US\$ 3 billion a year). By comparison, community conservation initiatives invest between US\$ 2 and US\$ 5 billion annually and, where economic returns permit, these are increasing. In Mexico, Guatemala and Nepal, communities invest more than US\$ 2 per hectare a year in managed forests and conservation areas. Many donors and governments expect

community conservation enterprises to be self-sustaining when their own programmes are not.

Donors should support local innovation and form alliances with local communities and their supporting organisations. If protected areas are managed for local needs, they can be a good source of environmental services and employment. There is pressure from governments, private donors and conservation organisations to demonstrate quick and visible success. This makes it difficult to support long term processes which respect local cultures. There is also limited support for experimentation in management approaches. The global conservation community must reconsider their funding criteria, as suggested by **Kent Redford**.

**Policies are increasingly recognising indigenous access rights and management responsibilities are being transferred to local people**

### New management approaches

For many years, protected areas were dominated by governments, conservation organisations or private landowners. Many countries still have such arrangements. However, these conservation models are controversial, especially in developing countries, where a significant number of arrangements are with absent land owners and managers, or where conservation agreements are a way to avoid the redistribution of large landholdings amongst poorer farmers. Pro-poor, pro-human rights and pro-indigenous peoples voices are starting to alter conservation approaches.

New approaches focus on integrating protected areas with wider uses and values, including cultural assets, livelihood uses and ecosystem services. Policies are increasingly recognising indigenous access rights and management responsibilities are being transferred to local people **Nakul Chettri** explains. **Katrina Brown** and **Sergio Rosendo** show how boundaries are also changing; there is increased maintenance and, in some places, an expansion of community conserved forests, coastal mangroves and pastoral ranges, including a growth in the number of transboundary parks such as marine parks in the Caribbean.

Where in-country governance is improving, as discussed by **Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend**, local governments and

non-governmental organisations are also taking a more active role with international conservation agencies and donors and debating the human-nature issues from new perspectives. Environmental education, which captures the complexities of this interaction, can have a very positive role to play in local societies looking forward.

### The role of ecosystem services

Protected area management must consider market issues as well as conservation. Supporting local economies will complement conservation budgets. With emerging markets for ecosystem services, there are new opportunities to complement existing funding sources. For example, more than two thirds of forestry employment is in small enterprises, many within protected areas. Non-timber forest products (such as traditional medicines) are finding lucrative market niches that provide incentives to switch from timber harvesting to non-timber product management and biodiversity and landscape conservation. Assuring water quantity and quality is another vital service – 40 of the world's largest cities depend on healthy forests for their water supply.

The conservation community faces a huge challenge. Expanding public protected areas is impractical in many places. The model of 'wilderness' preservation exported from North America is clearly inadequate in developing countries, even with increased local involvement. The articles in this issue demonstrate that protected areas cannot follow one management approach.

There is increasing recognition that:

- people in protected areas and other high priority conservation areas need secure tenure and access rights
- traditional and indigenous knowledge and culture are hugely beneficial to protected area management
- community conservation initiatives can be successful
- biodiversity needs protecting in larger landscapes, including transboundary areas and agricultural systems
- conservation that excludes people is much more costly than collaboration.

These strategies, which respect human rights and apply creative approaches, need to be implemented more widely. The future of protected areas lies in a mix of new management approaches and conservation models, increased local involvement in conservation and the development of fair and dynamic tourism and ecosystem service markets ■

#### Augusta Molnar

Forest Trends, 1050 Potomac Street NW, Washington, DC 20007, USA  
T +1 (0)202 298 3000 F +1 (0)202 298 3014  
amolnar@forest-trends.org

#### See also

*Who Conserves the World's Forests? Community-Driven Strategies to Protect Forests and Respect Rights*, Forest Trends, by A. Molnar, S. J. Scherr and A. Khare, 2004  
[www.ecoagriculturepartners.org/pdfs/Who\\_Conserves\\_final\\_11-04.pdf](http://www.ecoagriculturepartners.org/pdfs/Who_Conserves_final_11-04.pdf)  
*Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities*, Nature 403, pp.853-858, by N. Myers, R. A. Mittermeier, C. G. Mittermeier, G.A.B. da Fonseca and J. Kent, 2000

## Making waves

### Unique challenges for Marine

#### Protected Areas

Protecting marine and coastal areas involves many similar issues to terrestrial protected areas, including balancing conservation and development needs and managing tradeoffs between multiple users. However, they also present unique challenges: they often cross international boundaries and the high mobility or migration of many marine species makes protection beyond boundaries difficult.

Research in the Caribbean by the University of East Anglia in Britain emphasises the following trans boundary challenges:

- Property rights are often unclear, given the overlapping institutions, rules and jurisdiction from different countries.
- Negotiating new regulatory frameworks for transboundary management is complicated and it takes time to build trust between partners concerned.
- Working across different governments and departments creates fundamental problems in terms of a failure to communicate and to share information and resources.

Even where Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) are not transboundary in nature, managers must be capable of addressing huge complexities; reconciling competing user demands for both the present and future and taking management decisions on potential impacts in a context of uncertain science.

A new international research project entitled TRANSMAP (by a partnership of 12 research institutions from the United Kingdom, Portugal, Mozambique, Tanzania, South Africa and Sweden) investigates these issues in more detail in east African transboundary MPAs. It aims to propose policy options for the creation and management of protected marine areas across the Tanzania-Mozambique and Mozambique-South Africa borders which maximise ecological sustainability, stakeholder needs and management feasibility. Initial findings show:

- MPAs often incorporate several dynamic ecosystems which change over time, such as mangrove systems, tidal estuaries and deltas. An adaptive approach to management is therefore highly relevant, which responds to change rather than trying to suppress it and enhances ecological and social resilience.
- Given competing user demands, all relevant stakeholders must be involved in planning from the outset if management of MPAs is to be successful.

#### Katrina Brown and Sergio Rosendo

School of Development Studies and Overseas Development Group, University of East Anglia, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, UK  
T +44 (0)1603 593529 F +44 (0)1603 451999  
k.brown@uea.ac.uk s.rosendo@uea.ac.uk  
[www.transmap.fc.ul.pt](http://www.transmap.fc.ul.pt)

#### See also

*Making Waves: Integrating Coastal Conservation and Development*, pp. 164, Earthscan, by K.E. Tompkins and W.N. Adger, 2002



# Is forced displacement acceptable in conservation projects?

**O**ver ten million people have been displaced from protected areas by conservation projects. Forced displacement in developing countries is a major obstacle to reducing poverty. It should no longer be considered a mainstream strategy for conservation and only applied in extreme cases following international standards.

Our understanding of forced or involuntary displacement has increased in recent years. In the 1970s and 1980s only physical displacement was considered; current understanding includes all situations in which a project reduces the decision making powers of people over land and resources.

Officially, protected areas in developing countries are established by national governments. In reality, they are often designed, demarcated and managed by international non-governmental organisations (NGOs). While all international donors have policies on involuntary resettlement – even for resettlement which occurred before the implementation of a project – none of the major international conservation NGOs, including the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) or the Wildlife Conservation Society has one.

Recent research in 12 protected areas in 6 central African countries (Nigeria, Gabon, Cameroon, Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea and Central African Republic) shows that:

- 120,000 people, around five percent of the overall rural population of these countries, have been displaced since 1990
- a further 170,000 people face a significant risk of displacement from planned conservation activities, such as the increase in size of protected areas in the sub region, adopted by national governments on the basis of a WWF proposal
- an additional 250,000 people will become 'hosts' for these people displaced against their will.

Forced displacement is being used widely and systematically to 'cleanse' protected areas, in other countries (such as India and Thailand) as well as central Africa. Further findings include:

- Conservation projects which use resettlement as a conservation tool impoverish people's livelihoods instead of improving them.
- Host populations are often negatively affected as much as displaced communities.

Despite our improved understanding of the process, the risk of increased poverty remains for both displaced and host communities. Furthermore, many displacement programmes have had negative effects on biodiversity which are more damaging



**Takamanda forest reserve in South West Cameroon. Women from Kekukessim 1 village (top) and the Takpe village chief (bottom). Villagers obtain around 90 percent of their livelihood from the forest. However, the forest reserve was established as a national park in 2003 without any consultation and which the villagers are no longer allowed to enter. Local people are building up resistance against the decision although their voices are not heard anywhere outside the forest. Photos by Kai Schmidt-Soltau 2000**

## None of the major international conservation NGOs has a policy on involuntary resettlement

to the environment than those generated by people in parks. For example, when pastoralists are displaced, new agricultural practices put greater pressure on the environment.

If conservation projects accept responsibility for restoring the livelihoods of displaced people, protected areas do not need to increase poverty. This is expensive:

to compensate the people affected by the 13 new national parks in Gabon would require up to US \$80 million. However, implementing social safeguards for involuntary resettlement is the only way to reduce poverty and conserve biodiversity. Considering this, projects should:

- negotiate mitigation strategies and compensation schedules with the affected people in free, informed consultations prior to resettlement
- guarantee that the living standards of the affected people after resettlement are at least the same as they were prior to the project implementation
- allow indigenous people to continue using their land even in national parks ■

**Kai Schmidt-Soltau**  
B.P 7814, Yaoundé, Cameroon  
T +237 (0) 980 8825 F +237 (0) 2215048  
SchmidtSol@aol.com

### See also

*Conservation, Human Rights and Poverty Reduction: A progress report of an ongoing debate*, Conservation Biology, 19(4) by D. Brockington, J. Igoe, K. Schmidt-Soltau, 2005

*The Environmental Risks of Conservation Related Displacements in Central Africa*, by K. Schmidt-Soltau, pp.282-311 in 'Displacement Risks in Africa', Kyoto University Press, Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press, edited by I. Ohta and Y. D. Gebre, 2005  
*National Parks and Poverty Risks: Policy Issues in Conservation and Resettlement*, by M. Cernea, and K. Schmidt-Soltau, World Development, 2005 (forthcoming)

## Subscribe to id21 insights

To subscribe to *id21 insights* for free please send us your full postal address. You may also like to subscribe to *id21 insights health* and *id21 insights education*.

id21  
Institute of Development Studies  
University of Sussex  
Brighton BN1 9RE, UK  
email [id21@ids.ac.uk](mailto:id21@ids.ac.uk)

## Learning to learn

**Societies place a high value on addressing two of the world's most pressing problems – alleviating poverty and protecting the world's biological diversity. A lot of money has been spent on these two objectives, international treaties have been signed and countless organisations have devoted time to implementing funds in projects.**

However, many of those engaged in funding and implementing conservation and poverty alleviation initiatives are not taking the necessary steps to ensure learning as to which approaches work and which do not. Analysis is often short term and focused on a single site, or is so ideologically based it only gives predetermined conclusions. None of this makes learning easy. Several factors restrict effective and open evaluation of the successes and failures of conservation and poverty alleviation efforts:

- Learning often requires an unbiased written record but many are not an accurate account of where projects have succeeded and failed.
- Where evaluations are undertaken, they are rarely published; if they are usually only the positive lessons are promoted.
- Few studies include a careful, long-term analysis of single projects, or cross project comparisons.

- Donors and implementers want to prove that funding leads to success and may only disseminate successful projects to governments and other organisations.
- Local community organisations are often not part of the official learning process.
- Studies seldom adequately link analysis of conservation outcomes with poverty alleviation outcomes.
- Some academic-based critiques of poverty and conservation efforts bring ideological perspectives that dissuade practitioners from sharing experiences.

Funders, academics and implementers in the conservation and development community are failing in their responsibility to address these factors. Conservation and development communities have little time to learn from past failures. Until there is better analysis of best practice, biodiversity will continue to decline and poverty will remain in rural communities. We need to work together to create a learning environment in which the culture of fear has been changed to one in which failure is a valued component of success. Several things would be necessary to achieve this 'safe-fail' culture:

- Donors must accept project failures as a key part of the learning process.
- Project implementers must be honest

**We need to create a learning environment in which failure is a valued component of success**

about successes and failures and share their experiences.

- All parties should be required to show how learning from implementation has been used to improve subsequent action.
- Governments and academic institutions need to help create an environment in which learning from implementers is valued and rewarded.
- Learning must involve all parties, not just NGOs and funders, but local communities and government organisations too.

- Research scientists must work across sectors and measure results and their implications and not just confirm current ideological models.
- Rather than an evaluation being undertaken as a short-term project 'snapshot', there should be efforts to strengthen participatory monitoring and evaluation systems and reflective learning throughout a project.

The first step in correcting a learning 'disability' is to recognise its existence. Let's start learning from our failures and successes ■

**Kent H. Redford**

WCS Institute, Wildlife Conservation Society, 2300 Southern Boulevard, Bronx, NY 10460, USA  
T +1 718 220 5889  
kredford@wcs.org  
www.wcs.org

## Protecting nature, culture and people

**Indigenous peoples' traditional ownership and use of land and resources has often been eroded by protected areas. Their consent has rarely been sought for establishing protected areas on their lands, nor have they received adequate compensation. But are conservation organisations and government protected area agencies beginning to recognise the important role these peoples can play?**

It is possible that more than 50 percent of existing protected areas have been established on the ancestral lands of indigenous and other traditional peoples. While no complete data exists, there is little doubt that the impacts of protected areas have often been harmful:

- Restricting access to land and resources causes deprivation and marginalisation.
- Protected area management systems have removed traditional authorities and institutions.
- Indigenous communities experience poverty and food insecurity from loss of access to resources, relocation to marginal areas or emigration to cities.
- Violence has been used to force people to accept new rules restricting access to resources.
- Negative cultural impacts include the loss of indigenous knowledge about managing environmental resources.

Protected areas can, in certain conditions, cause social exclusion. They do not create it – social exclusion is rooted in broader social and economic systems – but have been used to advance and justify it. For example, the Sri Lankan government denied the remaining Wanniyala-Aetto (Veddah) communities

access to the last patch of tropical dry zone forest in Maduru Oya National Park relocating them to 'rehabilitation' villages. This was not an isolated protected areas policy but part of a broader policy of forced assimilation of the Veddahs into mainstream society.

Yet, protected areas can benefit local users and inhabitants by protecting their lands and resources from external threats: in Venezuela, the Alto Orinoco Biosphere Reserve has helped protect the traditional territory of the Yanomami and Yekuana Indians against developmental pressures.

Cultural awareness is crucial. Conservationists are beginning to appreciate the value of indigenous knowledge and local conservation practices. Many now accept that socially and culturally sensitive protected area policies must include indigenous and local knowledge for effective management and for ethical reasons. The World Conservation Union 5th World Congress on Protected Areas in 2003 was a key moment in this process, putting social and cultural values at the centre of the new 'paradigm' for protected areas, recognising that policies must be inclusive and relevant to local people's rights and needs.

Indigenous peoples are also interested in

protected areas; a growing number of their organisations negotiate with their national governments to establish protected areas which recognise territorial rights and protect their land and resources. Imposition and conflict are now giving way to understanding and reconciliation, protecting biodiversity and culture.

Further policies for successful indigenous-managed or co-managed protected areas include:

- Governments need skilled staff to understand cultural shifts, deal with social, cultural and technical issues and resolve conflicts.
- Indigenous communities and organisations may need support such as funding, access to information and training in negotiation skills to take part in management discussions.
- Conservation organisations need better skilled staff and more appropriate technical tools to deal with the implications of these changes and clearer policies for engaging with indigenous peoples and local communities ■

**Gonzalo Oviedo**

World Conservation Union, 28 Rue Mauverney, 1196 Gland, Switzerland  
T +41 (0)22 999 0287 F +41 (0)22 999 0020  
gonzalo.oviedo@iucn.org

**See also**

*Indigenous and Local Communities and Protected Areas: Towards Equity and Enhanced Conservation*, by G. Borrini-Feyerabend, A. Kothari and G. Oviedo, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK, 2004

*Indigenous and Traditional Peoples and Protected Areas: Principles, Guidelines and Case Studies* edited by J. Beltrán, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK and WWF International, Gland, Switzerland, 2000

## Agriculture vs protected areas

**Agriculturalists strive to increase crop production to provide poor communities with incomes and a secure food supply whilst environmentalists want to expand protected areas and reduce the intensity of farming.**

While many protected areas officially limit agricultural activity within their boundaries, the World Conservation Union reports that satellite images show almost half of the world's 17,000 major nature reserves are still heavily used for agriculture. Disruption of traditional agricultural activities for people living in or near protected areas can lead to extreme hunger and malnutrition.

Agriculture has often been a major cause of habitat destruction and encroachment into protected areas:

- millions of hectares of forests and natural vegetation have been cleared for agriculture and timber
- misuse of pesticides and fertilisers pollutes water, soil and coastal areas
- agriculture fragments natural ecosystems, breaking wild populations into smaller units that are more vulnerable to extinction
- farmers often eliminate wild species from their lands to reduce the negative effects of pests, predators, and weeds.

Farming communities often value biodiversity and play an important role in its conservation. Poor rural people rely heavily

on wild species for food, medicine and fuel. Many vulnerable wild species inhabit landscapes that also supply resources of economic or cultural value. Ecosystem conservation can provide communities with vital services such as supplying clean water, mitigating the effects of natural disasters, guaranteeing the health of pollinator species and controlling pests. Hungry people can only protect ecosystems if this contributes to their livelihoods in the short term.

Some approaches to conservation recognise agricultural communities as guardians of biodiversity. In eco-agriculture landscapes food is produced in a sustainable and profitable way which also protects wildlife and other ecosystem services. These approaches are important within protected areas and throughout the wider farming system as protected areas alone will not conserve global biodiversity.

Farmers, scientists and environmentalists are finding previously unrecognised 'win-win' solutions that increase food productivity and benefit conservation:

- Communities in Costa Rica have planted trees on intensively farmed land to protect crops from birds and livestock from strong wind. This has improved yields and provided a biological corridor between forest areas.
- Pastoral communities in Kenya and Tanzania have established ecosystem

balances between people and wild animals using water and fodder resources at complementary places and times, and controlling stock and wildlife diseases.

- Some farming, pastoral, and forest communities are informally conserving natural habitats over millions of hectares outside public protected areas.

Conservationists and agriculturalists are working with farmers, forest users and pastoralists to develop landscapes that provide for production and conservation needs. These partnerships are important for negotiating interactions and trade-offs (such as access rights), providing technical assistance for poor communities, supporting research initiatives and implementing ecosystem monitoring strategies.

The challenge is to research and implement new technologies, management practices and policies more widely so that increased agricultural production contributes to economic growth and the protection of wild species and natural habitats ■

### Sara Scherr

Ecoagriculture Partners, 1050 Potomac Street NW, Washington, DC 20007, USA  
T +1 (0)202 298 3004 F +1 (0)202 298 3014  
sscherr@ecoagriculture.org  
www.ecoagriculturepartners.org

### See also

*Ecoagriculture: Strategies to Feed the World and Save Wild Biodiversity*, Island Press: Washington DC, by J. A. McNeely and S. J. Scherr, 2003  
*Agri-culture: reconnecting people, land, and nature*, London: Earthscan Publications, by J. Pretty, 2002

## Tourism in Nepal

**Tourism in the Greater Himalaya supports the local economy with foreign exchange and by creating opportunities for local employment. Mass and unregulated tourism, however, can cause environmental damage, particularly in ecologically fragile areas. Is ecotourism – responsible travel that aims to conserve the environment and improve local people's welfare – an effective compromise?**

### Conservation in Annapurna

The Greater Himalaya is a critical ecosystem, one of 34 biodiversity 'hotspots' worldwide. About 11 percent of the region is managed as protected areas. The Annapurna Conservation Area Project (ACAP), established in 1986, is the first and largest conservation area in Nepal.

Before ACAP, trekkers exploited local forests for firewood and left behind huge amounts of rubbish. The average trekker spent US\$3 a day, 20 percent of which reached local people. Since the ACAP began, satellite mapping shows a dramatic increase in forest cover and cleaner trails. The study also revealed that, over time, about 50 percent of tourist revenue stays in the local economy.

Annapurna is a good model as local people have strong decision-making powers based

on negotiation and are testing management solutions. Success factors include:

- Tourist money is going directly into the local economy as tourists spend money on lodging, porters and food.
- A revitalised local craft industry and the potential for farmers to grow food for tourists.
- Tourism revenues benefit local health and education – to repair and construct schools and health clinics and to promote sanitation through the construction of pit latrines and rubbish pits.
- Local people are undertaking management activities through conservation area management committees that work with political organisations to improve environmental protection and train local workers.
- Alternative energy sources and fuel-efficient technologies in some tourist areas are minimising the need to cut trees for firewood, reducing deforestation.
- Walking trails, information posts and Conservation Education Centres encourage tourists to be aware of and reduce the effects they have on the environment.

### A word of warning

Often located in remote and inaccessible areas, ecotourism has clearly benefited people as an alternative income source. However, the benefits and overall potential of ecotourism are sometimes overstated.

Successful projects are rare and efforts to replicate them limited. In some places ecotourism is damaging rather than protecting fragile areas, as it opens up previously fragile destinations to tourism.

### How much impact is acceptable?

Too many visitors may damage protected areas, leading to degraded surroundings and a decline in tourism, leaving local people without an income source. Other ecotourism ventures such as trekking in Bhutan and watching mountain gorillas in Rwanda and Uganda are solving this problem by limiting visitor numbers and introducing high tourist fees.

While ecotourism in Nepal is currently accessible for many, the number of visitors may cause problems in the future. Making ecotourism practical and sustainable is a challenge for tourism entrepreneurs and protected area managers ■

### Nakul Chettri, Eklabya Sharma, Kamal Banskota

International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, GPO Box 3226, Kathmandu, Nepal  
T +977 1 552 5313 F +977 1 552 4509  
nchettri@icimod.org.np www.icimod.org

### See also

*Ecotourism and Biodiversity Conservation*, by N. Chettri, ICIMOD Newsletter 45: 17-19, 2004  
www.icimod.org/downloads/nls/45.pdf  
*Ecotourism and Conservation: Hand in Hand in the Annapurna Region of Nepal*, by P. C. Gurung, Tigerpaper 25 (2):19-23, 1998  
*Annapurna Conservation Area Operational Plan*, by M. N. Sherpa, B. Coburn and C. P. Gurung, KMTNC, Kathmandu, 1996



## Governance of protected areas

**The 2003 World Parks Congress and 2004 Programme of Work on Protected Areas of the Convention on Biological Diversity brought unprecedented attention to the concept of governance of protected areas, with crucial implications for conservation worldwide.**

Attention to governance has:

- broadened the spectrum of people recognised as legitimate protected area managers
- broadened the perspective on what can be included as part of national protected area systems
- introduced considerations of principles and values, affecting what is perceived as possible and desirable for protected areas.

A specific governance setting reflects what a society enables or is prepared to accept as fair in terms of who has authority, who is responsible and how this works in practice. For a specific area, governance is concerned with power, relationships, responsibility and accountability. Yet, it depends on more than formal institutions and processes; it also depends on history, culture, legal and customary rights, access to information, markets and informal influences on decisions.

Governance is clearly important, yet it was ignored for a long time. At the 2003 Congress, a first attempt was made to define the multidimensional concept of governance by asking: Who holds decision-making authority for protected areas? Who is responsible and can be held accountable for it? This led to the designation of four main types of governance:

- government protected areas (government agencies at various levels)
- co-managed protected areas (various actors together)

**Examples of biodiversity well managed by indigenous peoples and local communities can be found in terrestrial and coastal and marine ecosystems on all continents**

- private protected areas (individual landowners)
- community conserved areas (indigenous peoples or local communities)

The fourth uses the term 'conserved' rather than 'protected' as indigenous peoples and local communities govern protected areas very differently to others.

The 2003 Congress and 2004 Programme of Work recognised that any World Conservation Union (IUCN) category, from strictly protected reserves to cultural landscapes, can be effectively governed by any governance type. In particular, examples of biodiversity well managed by indigenous peoples and local communities can be found in terrestrial and coastal and marine ecosystems on all continents.

Territories and resources managed by indigenous people and local communities (agricultural, fishing, herding) are the oldest form of governance of natural resources, often revealing a close association between people and nature. Established and managed by customary institutions, they follow interlocking objectives and values (spiritual, religious, security- and survival-related). Biodiversity is thus conserved to respect sacred areas and species, to maintain the use of natural resources over time, or to ensure community safety and wellbeing. Communities are very able to conserve, alone or in co-management settings. This is what really counts.

Quality – or good governance – is also important, however. The Congress and Work Programme state that societies should seek to achieve good governance by establishing criteria, principles and values to guide action such as respect of human rights, equity, participation and voice, performance, transparency and accountability.

Clearly, the emergence of the concept of governance highlights some of the most delicate and powerful questions in the world of conservation. Real conservation – not a bureaucratic pretence – has everything to gain ■

### Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend

Chair, Governance, Equity of Rights (TGER)  
Co-chair, Indigenous & Local Communities, Equity & Protected Areas (TILCEPA)  
IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy  
Ancienne Ecole, CH 1180 Bugnau, Switzerland  
**gbf@cenesta.org** [www.iucn.org](http://www.iucn.org) (search for TGER and TILCEPA)

### See also

*Indigenous and Local Communities and Protected Areas, Towards Equity and Enhanced Conservation, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK* by G. Borrini-Feyerabend, A. Kothari and G. Oviedo, 2004

[www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/pubs/pdfs/guidelinesindigenouspeople.pdf](http://www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/pubs/pdfs/guidelinesindigenouspeople.pdf)  
*Sharing Power: Learning by Doing in Co-management of Natural Resources throughout the World, IIED and IUCN/CEESP/CMWG, Cenesta, Tehran* by G. Borrini-Feyerabend, M. Pimbert, M.T. Farvar, A. Kothari and Y. Renard, 2004

[www.iucn.org/themes/ceesp/Publications/sharingpower.htm](http://www.iucn.org/themes/ceesp/Publications/sharingpower.htm)

## Useful web links

Protected Areas Learning Network

[www.parksnet.org](http://www.parksnet.org)

Community Based Natural Resource Management Network

<http://cbnrm.net>

IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy

[www.iucn.org/themes/ceesp/index.html](http://www.iucn.org/themes/ceesp/index.html)

UNEPTIE Tourism and sensitive areas

[www.uneptie.org/pc/tourism/sensitive/home.htm](http://www.uneptie.org/pc/tourism/sensitive/home.htm)

Pro-poor tourism research group

[www.propoortourism.org.uk](http://www.propoortourism.org.uk)

International Indian Treaty Council

[www.treatycouncil.org/home.htm](http://www.treatycouncil.org/home.htm)

International Network on Displacement and Resettlement

[www.displacement.net](http://www.displacement.net)

International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests

[www.international-alliance.org](http://www.international-alliance.org)

2003 World Parks Congress

[www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/wpc2003](http://www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/wpc2003)

Marine Protected Areas News

<http://depts.washington.edu/mpanews>

Marine Protected Area Management Effectiveness Initiative

[www.effectivempa.noaa.gov](http://www.effectivempa.noaa.gov)

Global Transboundary Protected Areas Network

[www.tbpa.net](http://www.tbpa.net)

Biodiversity and livelihoods group (IIED)

[www.iied.org/blg/index.html](http://www.iied.org/blg/index.html)

Center for International Forestry

[www.cifor.cgiar.org](http://www.cifor.cgiar.org)

Claudia Townsend

[claudiatownsend@wanadoo.org](mailto:claudiatownsend@wanadoo.org)



*id21 insights* is published nine times a year and is online at [www.id21.org/insights](http://www.id21.org/insights). The id21 site also offers free access to hundreds of short easy-to-read highlights on international development topics such as health, natural resources, education and social policy. To subscribe to our email newsletter email [id21@ids.ac.uk](mailto:id21@ids.ac.uk) with the words 'subscribe id21 news'. To subscribe to id21 insights see [www.id21.org](http://www.id21.org) or contact us at the address below.

**id21**  
**Institute of Development Studies**  
University of Sussex  
Brighton BN1 9RE, UK  
T +44 (0)1273 678787  
F +44 (0)1273 877335  
Email [id21@ids.ac.uk](mailto:id21@ids.ac.uk)

id21 is hosted by IDS and supported by the UK Department for International Development. Views expressed in id21 insights do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, IDS or any other contributing institution. Unless rights are reserved in specific cases any article may be copied or quoted without restriction, providing the source (id21 insights) and author are properly acknowledged and informed.  
© Institute of Development Studies 2005;  
ISSN 1460-4205 IDS is a Charitable Company no.877338 limited by guarantee and registered in England

**IDS**  
Institute of Development Studies  
Sussex

Natural Resources Editor: **Tim Woods**  
Senior Editor: **Louise Daniel**  
Editorial & technical support: **id21 team**  
Design: **Robert Wheeler**  
Printed by: **Colorscope Printers Ltd**  
Printed on paper produced from sustainable forests

**Keywords:** agriculture, biodiversity, conservation, displacement, education, funding, indigenous, land, management, protected areas, resettlement, tourism