SHARING POWER

LEARNING-BY-DOING IN CO-MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

SHARING POWER

LEARNING-BY-DOING IN CO-MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, Michel Pimbert, M. Taghi Farvar,
Ashish Kothari and Yves Renard

with Hanna Jaireth, Marshall Murphree,
Vicki Pattemore, Ricardo Ram□rez and Patrizio Warren

iied IUCN CEESP CMWG Cenesta Sida gtz

The designation of geographical entities in this publication and the presentation of the material do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the sponsoring organisations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of the sponsoring organisations.

Published by: *The Natural Resources Group and the Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods Programme of the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and the Collaborative Management Working Group (CMWG) of the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP) of the World Conservation Union (IUCN)*

Copyright ©: *(2004) by Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend and Michel Pimbert. Reproduction of this publication for educational or other non-commercial purposes is authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of this publication for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without prior written permission by the copyright holders.*

Citation: Borrini-Feyerabend, G., M. Pimbert, M. T. Farvar, A. Kothari and Y. Renard, *Sharing Power. Learning by doing in co-management of natural resources throughout the world,* IIED and IUCN/ CEESP/ CMWG, Cenesta, Tehran, 2004.

ISBN *1 84369 444 1*

Lay out and art work: *Jeyan Farvar jeyran@cenesta.org and Fabrice Prati pratigraphe@bluewin.ch*

Available from: *International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)*
3, Endsleigh Street, London WC1H 0DD, United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)20 7388 2117 Fax:+44 (0)20 7388 2826
Email: info@iied.org Site: www.iied.org

World Conservation Bookstore
219c Huntingdon Road Cambridge CB3 0DL, United Kingdom
Tel: +44 1223 277894 Fax: +44 1223 277175
E-mail: books@iucn.org Site: http://www.iucn.org/bookstore

Collaborative Management Working Group (CMWG)
IUCN Commission on Environmental Economic and Social Policy (CEESP)
c/o CENESTA: Centre for Sustainable Development
5 Lakpour Lane, Langary Street 16939 Tehran, Iran
Tel.: +98 21 2964114/5/6; fax +98 21 2954217
Email: comanagement@cenesta.org
Site: http://www.iucn.org/themes/ceesp/Wkg_grp/CMWG and www.cenesta.org

***Picture credits**: The pictures reproduced on the cover are by Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, Taghi Farvar, Tom Kuckertz (Prince William Regional Citizens' Advisory Council) and unknown author (indigenous person on top right corner). The pictures reproduced and used for the art work inside the book are all by Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend except the ones on pages 48 and 337 by Maryam Rahmanian, pages 64, 188, 273, 289 and 342 courtesy Wet Tropics Management Authority, page 74 by unknown author, pages 91 and 191 by Josiane Olff-Nathan, page 95 courtesy of North York Moors National Park Authority, page 109 by O. Andre, pages 115 and 270 by Jose Pablo Jaramillo for the Asociaci□n de Cabildos Tandachiridu Inganokuna, page 129 by Jean Larivière, pages 136 and 140 by Linda Norgrove, page 144 by Hal Noss, page 146 by Patrizio Warren, page 153 by Randall K. Wilson, page 156 by Pierre Campredon, page 200 by Jean Marc Garreau, page 228 by P. Khosrownezha, page 231 by Stan Jones, page 245, 296 and 400 by Ashish Kothari, page 251 by Bernard Toutain, page 281 by Stéphane Boujou, page 285 by Cristina Eghenter, page 305 by Doriano Franceschetti, page 328 by P. Khosronezhad, page 338 by Juan Mayr, pages 341 and 392 by Maurizio Farhan Ferrari, page 364 by Ralph Buss, page 370 by Christian Chatelain, page 384 by Ahmad Reza Siapoosh, page 389 by Patricia Pinto da Silva, page 414 courtesy Regole di Cortina d'Ampezzo and page 423 by Ajit Pattnaik.*

This book is dedicated to the memory of the many thousands of people, most of them unknown by us and the world at large, who offered their feelings and intelligence, their time, resources, their health and too often their life, in solidarity with their communities and in the struggle to conserve the wonders of life.

CONTENTS

Foreword by Juan Mayr Maldonado XIX

Preface and acknowledgements XXI

Introduction XXVII

Part I. TOWARDS A CONTEXTUAL FRAMEWORK 1

Chapter 1. Managing natural resources: a struggle between politics and culture 3

1.1 From local livelihood strategies to global agro-industrial markets 3

Livelihood systems 10

1.2 The interface between indigenous/ local NRM systems and the modern/ a-local agro-industrial market system: five field examples 17

Field example 1.1 The Shuar and the colonisation frontier 19

Field example 1.2 Erosion control, indigenous know-how and economic change in Oued Sbahiya watershed 21

Field example 1.3 The Qashqai: nomadic pastoral livelihoods against all odds… 23

Field example 1.4 Managing the sustainable use of wildlife 27

Field example 1.5 Don Emiliano's farm 31

1.3 Contemporary indigenous NRM systems and co-management 33

Chapter 2. Actors, entitlements and equity in natural resource management 37

2.1 Management actors 37

Indigenous and local communities 43

2.2 Entitlements to manage natural resources 47

2.3 Equity in managing natural resources 52

Chapter 3. Co-management of natural resources 64

3.1 What is in a name? 64

3.2 Practising co-management 71

… in agriculture 71

… in water and watershed management 73

… in agricultural research 75

… in rangeland management 76

… in forest management 78

… in the management of coastal resources 81

… in the management of freshwater wetlands 84

… in fishery management 86

… in mountain environments 88

… in managing migratory wildlife 90

… in managing protected areas 93

… for private property under stewardship conditions 98

... promoted by conservation and development projects 99
... with indigenous peoples 100
3.3 The characteristics of co-management systems 103

Part II. TOWARDS EFFECTIVE PROCESSES 109

Chapter 4. A point of departure 110
4.1 What is to be managed? Who is to be involved? 110
The natural resource management unit 117
The relevant social actors 124
4.2 Is co-management needed? Is co-management feasible? 128
The feasibility analysis 133
4.3 Gathering resources and creating a Start-up Team 135
4.4 The special case of indigenous peoples: can co-management help them assert their rights to land and natural resources? 140

Chapter 5. Preparing for the partnership 146
5.1 Gathering relevant information and tools and promoting social communication 146
Gathering information and tools 147
Social communication 151
5.2 Engaging the partners in participatory action research 157
5.3 Assisting local communities to organise 164
Acquiring specific capacities 168
Developing an internal agreement on their own values, interests and concerns about the territory or natural resources at stake 172
Appointing a representative to convey the "internal agreement" to the negotiation forum 175
5.4 Preparing for the negotiation meetings: procedures, rules, logistics and equity considerations 178
Procedures, rules and logistics 178
Equity considerations 182

Chapter 6. Negotiating the co-management agreement and organisation 188
6.1 Agreeing on the rules and procedures of negotiation 188
The first procedural meeting 191
The role of the facilitator 193
Fairness, conflicts and power differentials 195
6.2 Developing and "ritualising" a common vision of the desired future 197
6.3 Developing a strategy to approach the common vision 203
6.4 Negotiating and legitimising the co-management agreement and organisation 210
Agreements, disagreements, consensus and compromise 213
Managing conflicts 219
Taking the process to a productive close 222

Part III. TOWARDS EFFECTIVE INSTITUTIONS 233

Chapter 7. Co-management agreements 234

7.1 Customary and non-notarised agreements 236
7.2 Formal legal agreements 243
7.3 The components of a co-management agreement 251
Title 251
Preamble and statement of purpose 251
Definitions 252
Scope of authority of the parties in the agreement 253
General covenants 254
Powers and responsibilities of co-management organisations 258
Dispute resolution and amendment procedures 258
Information, communication and confidentiality clauses 260
Specific clauses 262
7.4 Recognition of efforts and commitment 262
7.5 Crucial issues for indigenous peoples and local communities 265
7.6 Crucial issues for government agencies 274

Chapter 8. Co-management organisations 278

8.1 Types and characteristics of co-management organisations 279
Functions 280
Composition 283
Scope of authority 286
Size and level of operations 287
8.2 Examples of co-management agreements and organisations 289

Chapter 9. Learning-by-doing in co-management institutions 296

9.1 Making the agreement functional 297
Providing fair support for the parties to join the agreement 297
Recognising and building upon local resources, technologies and natural resource management systems 299
Letting the agreement specify the co-management organisation, and not vice-versa 302
Fostering relatively small, diverse, committed and accountable management bodies 304
Pursuing timeliness, clarity, accountability… but also conviviality and warm human relationships 306
Publicising the agreement until it is widely known 307
Dealing fairly with conflicting interpretations of the agreement 308
Ensuring compliance and effective enforcement of the agreement 309
9.2 "Learning by doing" through monitoring and evaluation 311
Assessing the preparatory phase 315
Assessing the negotiation phase 315
Assessing the implementation phase 316
Assessing the co-management results 317
Who evaluates success? 321

9.3 Promoting effective and sustainable co-management institutions 325
Developing goodwill among the parties 325
Maintaining flexibility and fostering social experimentation 325
Allowing the management partnership to mature 327
Promoting people-centred organisational culture 328
Promoting participatory approaches and learning attitudes at various levels 330
Encouraging "champions" with enabling attitudes and values 336
Ensuring transparency in the distribution of benefits 337
Striving for equity 337

Part IV. TOWARDS AN ENABLING SOCIAL CONTEXT 341

Chapter 10. Natural resource policy and instruments 342
10.1 Enabling policies at the national level 345
Constitution and basic civil law 346
Natural resource management policy 348
Decentralisation, delegation and devolution policies 356
Policies that support the organisation of civil society 359
Policies that strengthen cultural identity and customary governance systems 359
Policies that secure natural resources access and tenure rights 362
Policies that recognise and respond to the rights of indigenous peoples 364
Policies that set the rules and conditions of participation and co-management 366
Financial and economic policies 370
10.2 Enabling policies at the international level 376

Chapter 11. Empowering civil society for policy change 384
11.1 The politics of policy 384
11.2 Methods and approaches for participatory policy processes 389
A glimpse of history 389
Participatory methods for inclusive deliberation 393
Linking deliberative inclusive processes to broader policy change 399
Ensuring safeguards for quality and validity 401
11.3 Strengthening civil society 407
A stronger voice for civil society 408
Federations, networks and policy influence 415
11.4 The challenge of participatory democracy 418
Equity, gender and voice 418
Safe spaces for participation and people's knowledge 420
Deepening democracy in the age of globalisation 422

Concluding remarks 428
References 432

FIGURES

2.1 Towards social actors empowered and responsible in natural resource management 56
2.2 Including equity considerations in the process towards empowered and responsible social actors 63
4.1 The Ring around the Central Desert as the "management unit" for the Asiatic Cheetah in Iran 121
4.2 Phases of a collaborative management process 139
6.1 The co-management setting for the Galapagos Marine Reserve 218
6.2 Composition of the Local Management Structure for Takiéta Forest Reserve, Niger 225

CHECKLISTS

2.1 Categories of social actors possibly relevant in natural resource management 41
2.2 The roots of entitlements: examples of grounds to claim a "title" to manage natural resources 50
2.3 Forms of power that shape and affect environmental entitlements 51
4.1 A snapshot of the interests and concerns at stake 124
4.2 A snapshot of the capacities and comparative advantages at stake 125
4.3 Co-management of natural resources: potential benefits 131
4.4 Co-management of natural resources: potential costs and obstacles 132
4.5 Investigating the co-management feasibility in a specific context 133
5.1 Questions and ranking exercises to engage the relevant social actors in the CM process 162
5.2 Procedures and logistics for the negotiation meetings 180
5.3 Example of rules for the negotiation process 182
5.4 Promoting equity in co-management: some examples and ideas 183
5.5 Evaluating the outcome of a settlement on the basis of its fairness 184
5.6 Some ideas for truly "levelling the playing field" 184
6.1 Qualities and tasks of a good facilitator/ mediator for a co-management process 194
6.2 Methods and tools to identify the components and objectives of a common strategy 204
6.3 Methods and tools to agree on a course of action 212
6.4 Ideas for managing conflict 221
7.1 Questions to address in tourism-related agreements 274
9.1 Examples of process and result indicators to assess the CM preparatory phase 315
9.2 Examples of process and result indicators to assess the CM negotiation phase 316
9.3 Examples of process and result indicators to assess the CM implementation phase 317
9.4 Characteristics of effective indicators 318
9.5 Is co-management "successful"? Does it have a positive social impact? 320
9.6 Towards successful co-management organisations: some implications of going large-scale 334
10.1 Devolving to whom? What kind of organisations can manage common property resources? 357
11.1 A selection of methods that can be used in deliberative inclusive processes for policy-making 393
11.2 Some features of deliberative and inclusionary processes (DIPs) 395
11.3 Criteria and safeguards for public acceptance and effectiveness of a CM process 401
11.4 Broad principles for deliberative and inclusive processes related to policy development 406
11.5 Transforming organisations for deliberative democracy and citizen empowerment 421

TABLES

1.1	Agro-industrial market system and indigenous NRM systems compared	18
2.1	Relevant social actors in Rajaji National Park, India	42
2.2	Local stakeholders in Aveto Regional Park, Italy	45
2.3	Categories of institutional actors	53
2.4	Users of coastal resources in Tanga, Tanzania	54
3.1	Concepts and terms used to understand and describe collaboration in managing NR	65
4.1	Relevant social actors in Kikori watershed, Papua New Guinea	126
4.2	Developing a CM setting in the Sierra Tarahumara (Mexico): are the conditions in place?	135
4.3	Four co-management "models" in Australia	143
6.1	A strategy to reach the shared vision of Wenchi district (Ghana)	206
6.2	Benefit sharing: a company-community agreement in Cameroon	226
6.3	Five Principles of Good Governance	229
8.1	Co-management agreements and organisations	290
9.1	Soil and water conservation in southern Zimbabwe	319
9.2	Indicators to monitor agreements suggested by indigenous knowledge systems	322
9.3	Participatory methodologies and approaches: the spectrum of CM current practice	331
11.1	Examples of deliberative and inclusive processes in environmental policy making	396

BOXES

definitions & general considerations | examples from the South | examples from the North

1.1	Natural resources, property and access regimes	7
1.2	The Beni Halba Tribe— accommodating "foreigners" in resource management	9
1.3	Community tapping and management of ground water in Asia	14
2.1	Institutional actor (also "relevant social actor" or "stakeholder")	40
2.2	Indigenous peoples and mobile indigenous peoples	43
2.3	Entitlements in natural resource management	49
2.4	Social groups organised to manage forests in India	58
2.5	Forms of representation	59
2.6	Asymmetrical rights in Joint Forest Management in India	61
3.1	Co-management of natural resources	69
3.2	The *boneh*— a co-management system based on crop-sharing in Asia	71

3.3	Cultural co-management in Bali	73
3.4	Participatory research with women farmers in dry-land agriculture	75
3.5	Forole, the sacred mountain of the Galbo people (Ethiopia/ Kenya)	77
3.6	Conserving their palm groves: the pride of Gaya communities, Niger	79
3.7	Devolving power: a way to promote management partnerships (Madagascar)	80
3.8	Co-managing the Sian Ka'an Biosphere Reserve (Mexico)	81
3.9	Marine Co-management in Soufrière (St. Lucia)	83
3.10	Community based river conservation in Mandailing (North Sumatra, Indonesia)	85
3.11	Fishery co-management in the Mekong— Khong district (Lao PDR)	88
3.12	Ambondrombe (Madagascar): caring together for a sacred mountain	90
3.13	Private and community conservancies in Namibia	92
3.14	Tayna Gorilla Reserve (Democratic Republic of Congo)	95
3.15	The contractual approach to manage forest resources in Mali	99
3.16	Gwaii Haanas: the bright spot among Canada's co-managed Parks	101
3.17	Contested reefs in the Miskito Coast of Nicaragua: no co-management in sight!	105
4.1	Decentralisation? What type of decentralisation?	111
4.2	A natural disaster gives birth to solidarity, partnerships and participatory democracy in the Andes	112
4.3	Balancing the powers in Makuleke land (South Africa)	114
4.4	Alto Fragua Indiwasi National Park (Colombia): co-management secures land tenure and rights	116
4.5	"Natural" geographic units in aboriginal management systems (Canada)	119
4.6	Conservation of the Asiatic Cheetah in Iran— defining the management "ring"	120
4.7	By splitting the area into five, problems do not hamper progress in Limingalahti Bay (Finland)	122
4.8	The co-management conveners	138
4.9	Mayan resistance in Totonicap□n— a gentle reverberating echo in the volcanic altiplano	141
4.10	The new Indigenous Protected Area model (Australia)	143
4.11	The Kaa-ya Iya National Park: ensuring indigenous territorial recognition in Bolivia	145
5.1	Participatory mapping in the Brazilian Amazon	148
5.2	Examples of People's Biodiversity Registers (India and Costa Rica)	150
5.3	Informal contacts between actors are important!	151
5.4	Social communication for co-management	152
5.5	Accompanying a new perception of problems, actors, resources and opportunities in Madagascar	154
5.6	Participatory land and resource mapping as an empowering, capacity building process (Venezuela)	158
5.7	Community organising: a powerful NRM tool in Mongolia	166
5.8	Organising of the Maya, between tradition and modernity (Guatemala)	167
5.9	What makes an organisation capable of participating in co-management? The answer of CANARI	169
5.10	Collective learning on collaborative management of natural resources in the Congo Basin	171
5.11	Community consensus on fishing rules found essential in Lao PDR	173

5.12 The elusive nature of the "fishing sector" in Galapagos (Ecuador) 173
5.13 Twelve tribes need twelve representatives… not ten and not fifteen! (Sudan) 176
5.14 Traditional *jirga* as a model for round-table meetings (Pakistan) 178
5.15 Strengthening social actors before the negotiation: the case of the Baka People of Dja (Cameroon) 185
5.16 Towards more gender- and equity-sensitive representation in Joint Forest Management (India) 186
6.1 Bicultural co-management in New Zealand 189
6.2 Setting up a partnership to manage a watershed in the USA 190
6.3 Conflict management— Chinese style 196
6.4 Conflict management— Iranian style 197
6.5 A vision for Wenchi district (Ghana) 198
6.6 A vision for Molokai (USA) 200
6.7 Involve the stakeholders and pursue a common vision! 201
6.8 Fusing the traditional and the modern to ritualise a co-management vision (Republic of Congo) 202
6.9 Leaders in the Napa Valley Watershed (California, USA) 209
6.10 Mutual trust built on the respect for local knowledge and practices in Tanga (Tanzania) 210
6.11 Consensus decision-making for aquatic resource co-management in Khong district (Lao PDR) 214
6.12 Zoning as a product of a participatory GIS in the Amazons 216
6.13 Consensus in a co-management board: a key incentive for the Galapagos Marine Reserve 217
6.14 Common themes and considerations in conflict management 220
6.15 Enhanced productive use of natural resources helps solving conflicts in Itoh (Cameroon) 222
6.16 The process we followed in Takiéta: developing a co-management setting in Niger 223
6.17 Developing an integrated, participatory development plan in Richtersveld (South Africa) 228
7.1 Customary management agreements for indigenous agriculture in the Peruvian Andes 236
7.2 Indigenous peoples' "social agreements" on natural resource management (Africa, Pacific, Amazon) 237
7.3 Resource management agreement: who has the right to speak in the Solomon Islands? 239
7.4 Village law and co-management of aquatic resources in Khong district (Lao PDR) 240
7.5 The Protocol for the Community Biodiversity Development and Conservation Programme 241
7.6 The Awa Federation and research agreements (Ecuador) 242
7.7 Conservation easements in the USA 244
7.8 "Les ententes": resource management agreements in Upper Guinea 245
7.9 Gender supportive articles in the local contract/ convention of N'Dour N'Dour (Senegal) 246
7.10 Co-management of landscapes through negotiated territorial charters in France 246
7.11 Gurig National Park (Australia) 247
7.12 The forest use agreement between Mt.Elgon and the people of Ulukusi Parish (Uganda) 249
7.13 The Agreement between Canada and the USA on the conservation of the porcupine caribou herd 250
7.14 Substantial flexibility in NRM agreements accommodates ethnic governance systems 253
7.15 An inclusive management body with consultative power for Retezat National Park (Romania) 253
7.16 Detailed co-management agreements developed for sylvo-pastoral zones in southern Mali 254
7.17 Protecting the investment 256
7.18 Canadians set priority criteria for resolving disputes about resource management 259

7.19	Co-management, the oil and gas industry and indigenous empowerment in Kaa Iya (Bolivia)	266
7.20	The 5th World Parks Congress recommendations on indigenous peoples and protected areas	272
8.1	A co-management organisation with a high-level "brokering" role (Canada)	279
8.2	An innovative co-management organisation for Waza National Park (Cameroon)	280
8.3	A new organisation co-manages a woodland in Scotland	282
8.4	Fishing associations and the co-management of freshwater ecosystems in Sweden	282
8.5	Representation of stakeholders in co-management organisations: two examples from India	283
8.6	The Dayak people co-manage the Kayan Mentarang National Park: a first in Indonesia!	284
8.7	Historical/ institutional change in the management of national forests in the western USA	286
8.8	Co-management organisations with different decision making powers: examples from Australia	287
8.9	A large scale co-management organisation in Australia's Wet Tropics World Heritage Area	287
9.1	"Levelling the playing field" for the Maori to participate…	297
9.2	Financial support from the government helps implement co-management agreements in Australia	298
9.3	The making of unsustainable livelihoods: eroding the landscape of the Oromo-Borana (Ethiopia)	300
9.4	Restoring the traditional tribal organisation— towards a Community Conserved Area in Iran	301
9.5	From social communication to negotiation to co-management in Conkouati (Republic of Congo)	303
9.6	Build on small successes in the USA	306
9.7	Signing and publicising a CM agreement in Bwindi Impenetrable National Park (Uganda)	307
9.8	The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	309
9.9	Enforcing co-management agreements in coastal areas: an example from the Philippines	310
9.10	Local enforcement of forest management rules in India	310
9.11	Enforcing regulation and awareness raising: two faces of the same coin (Lao PDR)	311
9.12	Learning from poor practice in participatory monitoring and evaluation	313
9.13	McKenzie Watershed Council— action at the sub-watershed level in Oregon (USA)	314
9.14	A good impact indicator: percent nutrient reduction for bay tributaries in Chesapeake Bay	318
9.15	Monitoring and evaluation of the CM agreement in Bwindi National Park (Uganda)	321
9.16	Watching for unintended and unexpected consequences…	321
9.17	Government foresters and resource management institutions in Tanzania	323
9.18	The elements of strengths of the participatory management of Galapagos Marine Reserve	323
9.19	Learning by doing in co-managing aquatic resources in Khong district (Lao PDR)	326
9.20	Villagers regenerate *miombo* woodlands in Tanzania	327
9.21	Debunking myths on people-environment interactions	329
9.22	Co-management of natural resources in Gujarat (India): village to village extension	332
9.23	Integrated pest management in Indonesia	333
9.24	How to spoil conservation: CM clashes against the repressive approach (Republic of Congo)	335
9.25	Learning transparency from Mahenye Ward (Zimbabwe)	337
9.26	Women design their own Public Distribution System in Andhra Pradesh, India	339

10.1	Policies defined	343
10.2	Co-management of forests and protected areas in Haiti	345
10.3	Extracts from the Constitution of Ecuador	347
10.4	Constitutional amendments encourage more devolution and subsidiarity in India	348
10.5	The National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, India	349
10.6	Reforming national protected area systems	350
10.7	The Inuvialuit Agreements in the North West Territories of Canada	353
10.8	Provisions made in national legislation and specific co-management agreements	356
10.9	More perspectives on decentralisation and devolution	357
10.10	Examples of government decentralisation policies	358
10.11	Back to the *marga*? Reversing destructive forestry policies in Sumatra (Indonesia)	360
10.12	Discovering and recognising the cultural dimension of natural resource management	361
10.13	The demarcation and titling of indigenous land: a duty of the state?	366
10.14	The Aarhus Convention— promoting access to information, public participation and justice	367
10.15	The Tagbanwa strive for their Community Conserved Area in Coron Island (The Philippines)	368
10.16	Concentration in agri-food business sectors	373
10.17	Regulating corporations involved in natural resource sectors: some initiatives	374
10.18	Policy for local governance	375
10.19	Key rights affirmed by the UN Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples	378
10.20	Ecosystem approach principles adopted as part of the Convention on Biological Diversity	380
11.1	Defining civil society	385
11.2	A history of trial by jury	391
11.3	*Prajateerpu*— a citizens jury/ scenario workshop in Andhra Pradesh (India)	398
11.4	Oversight and transparency in the participatory assessments of policy futures for Andhra Pradesh	402
11.5	Joint planning approaches	410
11.6	New forms of accountability	410
11.7	Participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre (Brazil)	410
11.8	Towards more inclusive representation in local government	411
11.9	The MASIPAG experience (The Philippines)	412
11.10	The Regole of the Ampezzo Valley (Italy) maintain their autonomous status for a 1000 years	414
11.11	Producer organisations, collective action and institutional transformation in West Africa	416
11.12	The Peasant Rights Movement and policy change in Indonesia	417
11.13	Beyond good governance: participatory democracy in the Philippines	418
11.14	Knowledge and power	420
11.15	Civil society imagining other possible worlds	425

ABBREVIATIONS

BATNA	Best alternative to a negotiated agreement
BR	Biosphere reserve
CAMPFIRE	Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources
CANARI	Caribbean Natural Resources Institute
CARE	Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBO	Community-based organisation
CCA	Community conserved area
CEESP	Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy
CENESTA	Iranian Centre for Sustainable Development
CIPM	Community integrated pest management
CM	Co-management
CMNR	Co-management of natural resources
CMPA	Co-managed protected area
CMWG	Collaborative Management Working Group
COP	Conference of Parties
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DGIS	Dutch Development Cooperation Agency
DIP	Deliberative and inclusionary processes
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
FD	Forestry department
FPC	Forest protection committee
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic information system
GM	Genetically modified
GMO	Genetically modified organism
GPS	Global positioning system
GTZ	German Development Cooperation Agency
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICDP	Integrated conservation and development project
IDS	Institute of Development Studies
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFOAM	International Forum for Organic Agriculture
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IPA	Indigenous protected area
IPM	Integrated pest management
IPR	Intellectual property right
IRRI	International Rice Research Institute
IUCN	The World Conservation Union
JFM	Joint forest management
JPAM	Joint protected area management

MAB	Man and the Biosphere
NBSAP	National biodiversity strategy and action plan
NEAP	National environmental action plan
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NR	Natural resource
NRM	Natural resource management
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PA	Protected area
PAR	Participatory action research
PDR	People's Democratic Republic
PIC	Prior informed consent
PLA	Participatory learning and action
PMA	Park management authority
PNR	*Parc naturel régional*
PO	Producer organisation
PRA	Participatory rural appraisal
PRSP	Poverty reduction strategy paper
R&D	Research and development
RRA	Rapid rural appraisal
SAM	Special area management
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SWOL	Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and limitations
SWOT	Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats
TNC	Trans national corporation
TRIP	Trade related intellectual property right
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
US	United States
USA	United States of America
USD	United States dollar
WAMIP	World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society
WHA	World heritage area
WHO	World Health Organisation
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WTO	World Trade Organisation
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

FOREWORD by Juan Mayr Maldonado

"Sharing Power" should be required reading for all of us who, in one way or another, are involved at the local, national or international level in the governance and management of natural resources. But this volume should also be read by those who gain economic benefits from natural resources at a distance thanks to the sophisticated technology of communications and marketing systems. Most of these people are deeply indebted to the labour and creativity of rural communities, whose livelihoods are inextricably related to the natural resources and ecosystems in the different regions of the planet. Above all this volume is a tribute and recognition to the traditional knowledge, rights, skills and institutions of indigenous peoples and local communities and to their daily struggles for a balance between their immediate needs and long term well-being, founded on the sound and sustainable management of our planet's natural wealth.

From a recollection of the political and socio-cultural history of human relationships with nature, the volume moves into a more conceptual analysis of actors, entitlements, equity and co-management itself. Through a series of illuminating examples characterised by cultural and regional diversity, the authors show us the impacts, tensions, inequalities and opportunities that inhabit the field of natural resource management and bear such important consequences for the livelihoods and quality of life of rural communities. Co-management as a process is then unpacked and explored in detail, from its roots in local systems of solidarity to the unlikely and very powerful "syncretic" merging of traditional practices and modern conservation expertise. As a matter of fact, when we are lucky enough to approach sound contemporary natural resource management, this looks more and more like a jigsaw puzzle of new and old knowledge, indigenous and modern elements, practices and values of different "cultural" origin. As in all processes of cultural change, we find in it contradictions and chaotic situations and, exactly because of this, the concept and practice of adaptive management become crucial. This should be appreciated in terms of both conceptual and practical relevance, as top-down inflexible and supposedly a-political decisions have indeed past their time.

For practitioners in search of an open and flexible guide to co-management practice on the basis of lessons learned in a variety of socio-ecological settings, this volume simply has no equal. The "phases" of the process— organising, negotiating, implementing agreements and learning by doing— as well as the agreements and organisations they usually end up developing, are described and appreciated through a wealth of examples, tools and sound advice. The authors have obvious-

ly in mind the real world, where nothing is univocal and fixed and where complications abound as well as unexpected opportunities. The product is a creative tension between realities and visions, what is and what could be, especially in response to external forces and the continual demographic, social, economic and cultural changes that affect both local communities and other actors, and natural resources. If anything, one could fault the authors for being too positive, for compelling us to believe that, even in the worst possible situation, change is possible. But this may be more a consequence of the invigorating feeling that the reader carries away from the reading than of the content of the volume in itself. Examples of problems and failures, in fact, abound, and they are candidly recounted….

It is on the basis of a world perceived in a state of evolution and creative tension that the political proposal for co-management illustrated in this volume— because this is what it is— becomes most compelling. Co-management can involve the gradual harmonising, balancing and adjustment of the interests, aspirations and capacities of a variety of actors both within rural communities and in the world at large. The lamp-posts are intelligence, care and equity— the exact opposite of situations in which the stronger forces impose their will on the weaker ones without regard to understandings, results or even meaning, let alone sustainability. The practices that are here described to make a difference are a careful assessment of issues, dialogue, negotiation, the active mediation of conflicts and the nurturing of joint learning. But we would be wrong if we would think that this applies only to specific contexts where local actors are concerned, let us say, with a specific forest, a pastoral landscape, a rare species of wildlife or a rich coastal fishery. "Sharing power" makes a compelling case that continuous engagement of actors and learning must extend to the policy arena, beyond the command and control operations of policy specialists and non-participatory elected leaders.

"Sharing Power" is an important contribution to environmental thinking and reflection, at a time of great political and economic challenges throughout the world. It invites us to, and equips us for, a dialogue among different cultures, being those of neighbours or of distant actors, in a respectful and equitable search for new forms of natural resource management. I do not advise you to read this volume cover-to-cover— although you may want to!— but I definitely advise you to go through it, be inspired to understand what it contains, and keep it on your desktop. You will find yourself consulting it over and over again when you need inspiration and practical help about more cooperative ways of managing natural resources.

Juan Mayr Maldonado

Member of the Blue Ribbon Panel for environmental policy advice to the President of the IDB
Member of the Panel of Eminent Advisors to the UN Secretary General
on UN-Civil Society Relationships
Former Minister of Environment, Colombia
President of the Extraordinary Session of the Convention on Biological Diversity—
Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety
Deputy Chair of IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy

PREFACE & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This volume had a long gestation. It was conceived in the first half of the 1990s, at a time when the social innovations introduced by the 1992 Earth Summit of Rio were timidly percolating amidst the conservation community. A large part of such community, actually, was still openly weary of participatory processes, let alone co-management settings. Discussing issues of equity and power-sharing in conservation was an uphill job, and social advocacy was barely tolerated. The heart of conservation institutions and resources remained solidly in the hands of conservation businessmen, agency bureaucrats and biological scientists.

It was in this context that Grazia and Michel, at the time staff of the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF International),[1] decided to gather experiences in collaborative management (CM) of natural resources and derive from those some concrete lessons for action. They felt that unspecific advocacy about "community participation" was not sufficient and potentially even damaging. At the same time, the promises as well as the limitations of integrated conservation and development programmes (ICDPs) were becoming apparent, as was the need to utilise more specific methods and tools to engage a variety of social actors in conservation. Crucial issues were not only "participation" (how can people be effectively engaged in conservation?) but also the meeting of local needs in the areas to be conserved, and how to do so in a way that is sustainable in the long term.[2] Interestingly, community empowerment, social justice and human rights, which were the origin and essence of those concerns, could barely be mentioned in an open way. Such terms were not well received in conservation organisations and speaking them was a sure way to raise a backlash.

...unspecific advocacy about "community participation" was not sufficient and potentially even damaging.

The first step towards this volume was a questionnaire which was sent, in three languages, to hundreds of field practitioners of both organisations. The inquiry was about the kind of information and tools sought by IUCN and WWF field practitioners. What would practically help them in their tasks, when dealing with social concerns in conservation? It was also about the experiences and lessons they wished to pass on and share with others. In the meantime, the IUCN was heading towards its first World Conservation Congress, in Montreal in 1996. In the preparatory process, about fifty IUCN members joined efforts to draft and table a Resolution on Collaborative Management for Conservation, which was then approved by the Congress.[3] As part of this, ideas, case examples and reflections on CM were gathered, some of which in the form of papers to be presented

1 Grazia was then Head of the IUCN Social Policy Programme, and Michel was Head of the Biodiversity, Protected Areas and Species Conservation Policy Programme at WWF International.

2 These are dealt with at length in Pimbert and Pretty,1995; Borrini-Feyerabend, 1997; Ghimire and Pimbert, 1997.

3 IUCN Resolution 1.42 on Collaborative Management for Conservation, 1st World Conservation Congress, Montreal, 1996.

[Concepts of] community empowerment, social justice and human rights... were not well received in conservation organisations....

at the Congress in a dedicated workshop that attracted hundreds of participants. A Panel of IUCN Commission members interested in collaborative management was also created at the Congress, with Fikret Berkes and Yves serving as its first Co-chairs. Ashish was also importantly involved in the Congress workshop and in the CM Panel. The replies to the questionnaire, the papers, the relevant correspondence and the results of literature searches carried out also with the help of members of the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP) working as consultants, volunteers and interns were consolidated in a small CM resource centre at the IUCN Headquarters.

Very many people played an important role in gathering and consolidating information and encouraging work in the early stages described above. Among them we would like to thank in particular Fikret Berkes, Christian Erni, Don Gilmour, Pascal Girot, Magnus Ngoile, Hanna Jaireth, Vicky Pattemore and Patrizio Warren. Their early encouragement and the specific experience and insights they shared with us were extremely precious. Many others were also variously involved and we are most grateful for the important ideas and advice they provided. They include Anil Agarwal, Janis Alcorn, Ivannia Ayales, Demba Baldé, Siddarta Bajracharya, Tom Barton, Michael Beresford, Anupam Bhatia, Seema Bhatt, Jessica Brown, Michael Brown, Dianne Buchan, Claudio Carrera Maretti, Monica Castelo, Michael Cernea, Carol Colfer, Gloria Davis, Alex de Sherbinin, Charles Doumenge, Gay Duke, Eduardo Fernandez, Bob Fisher, Krishna Ghimire, Lyle Glowka, Meghan Golay, Hugh Govan, Biksham Gujja, Roy Hagen, Narpat Jhoda, Kirsten Hegener, Peter Hislaire, Michael Horowitz, Chris Horrill, P. Horsey, Ruud Jansen, Sally Jeanrenaud, Andrew Inglis, Aban Kabraji, Graeme Kelleher, Elisabeth Kemf, Omar Asghar Khan, Larry Kholer, John Krijnen, Michel Kouda, Patricia Larson, Connie Lewis, Ken MacDonald, Jeff McNeely, Patricia Madrigal, Juan Mayr Maldonado, Rowan Martin, Robert Monro, Arthur Mugisha, Marshall Murphree, James Murombedzi, Jackson Mutebi, Gayl Ness, Samuel-Alain Nguiffo, Krishna Oli, Elinor Ostrom, Gonzalo Oviedo, Adrian Phillips, Mark Poffenberger, Tom Price, Ricardo Ram□rez, Per Ryden, Bob Pomeroy, Darrell Posey, Mohammad Rafiq, Gabriella Richardson, Guillermo Rodriguez-Navarro, Rodney Salm, Richard Sandbrook, Madhu Sarin, Lea Scherl, Steve Selin, Andrea Simoncini, Vivienne Solis, Andrej Sovinc, Achim Steiner, Chip Temm, Petr Tengler, Anada Tiega, John Thompson, Jim Thorsell, Edgardo Tongson, Jan Teun Vissher, Joyce Wafula, Lini Wollenberg, Jacques Weber, Liz Wily, Nick Winer, Sejal Worah, Barbara Wyckoff-Baird and Marija Zupancic Vicar.

On the basis of the collected materials, Grazia, Michel and Ashish produced a draft of this volume at the end of 1997. The document was widely circulated in 1998 and the comments received were poignant and useful for the versions to come. Among those, we have the great pleasure of acknowledging the reviews by Carmen Aalbers, Anil Agarwal, Ed Barrow, Marcus Cochester, Christo Fabricious, Andrea Finger, Ian Scoones, Neena Singh, Vital Rajan and Peter Schachenmann. Grazia, Michel and Ashish set to revise the work on the basis of the received comments but the task proved more difficult than expected. Both Grazia and Michel— some say precisely because of the key interests and concerns they brought into their jobs— were no longer employed by IUCN and WWF, which rendered the book a full labour of volunteer love. More importantly, a staggering amount of relevant experiences and lessons was accumulating in the field. Co-management was literally growing under our eyes, and taking on

new connotations at every turn. The human rights dimensions of conservation, environmental entitlements, social communication, conflict management, public participation in policy development and many other subjects were being explored in detail by specific constituencies. The subject of our book was dangerously (but excitingly) enlarging….

It was then that the second phase of our work began. On the eve of the second World Conservation Congress (Amman, 2000), which reconfirmed the importance of co-management approaches for conservation,[4] Grazia, Michel, Yves and Taghi— newly elected Chair of CEESP— had a meeting in Switzerland to review the fate of the earlier work on co-management. Over a decade earlier, Taghi had been one of IUCN's earliest and strongest advocates of communities as key actors in natural resource management and conservation. With him as Chair of CEESP, they all felt more hopeful that community concerns could be incorporated in the work of the Union, and were encouraged to proceed with the book. They agreed to gather and synthesise as much new relevant material as they could, privileging field-based lessons for action over theoretical analyses. From the institutional point of view they were going to be supported by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), for which Michel was then working and, as all were long-time members of CEESP, they could also take on writing as volunteers or semi-volunteers for the Commission. Eleven chapters were thus "re-conceived", and the book took its final form.

The subject of our book was dangerously (but excitingly) enlarging.

Grazia took responsibility for Chapters 1 to 6 and weaved in the contributions by Marshall Murphree, Patrizio Warren, Ricardo Ram□rez and Taghi. Michel took responsibility for Chapters 7 to 9, in contact with Hanna Jaireth and Vicky Pattemore. Yves and Michel took responsibility for Chapters 10 and 11, in which they also incorporated the work originally prepared by Ashish and some more recent comments from him. Taghi and Yves, and then Grazia, revised and harmonised the whole. The work for the book proceeded slowly— not least because all the authors were engaged in much CM-related work, in policy and in practice. It was punctuated by a handful of meetings, but most communication proceeded via e-mail. All throughout, invaluable stirring and inspiration were provided by many colleagues through the "sounding board" of the Collaborative Management Working Group (CMWG) of CEESP— a body now encompassing nearly 400 people from over 40 countries dedicated to learning, mutual support and action on co-management.[5]

Among the CMWG members and other colleagues we have consulted and worked with in these last years, we would like to acknowledge with gratitude Cherif Abdellatif, Yéyé Abdoulaye, Mady Abdhoulanzis, Peter Abrams, Abdul Rahman Al Eryani, Janis Alcorn, Inayat Ali, Will Allen, Miguel Altieri, Thora Amend, Bruce Amos, Alejandro Argumedo, Karin Augustat, Didier Babin, Ian Baird, Richard Baker, Tariq Banuri, Chip Barber, Solon Barraclough, Ed Barrow, Christian Barthod, Marco Bassi, Seema Bhatt, Eléonore Béchaux, M'hamed Bendanoon, Judithe Bizot, Tom Blomley, Luigi Boitani, Gianfranco Bologna, Juan Bottasso, Mohamed Nagy Ould Bouceif, Steve Brechin, Dan Brockington, Pete Brosius, Jessica Brown, Michael Brown, Nicole Brown, Martin Bush, Ralph Buss, David Butz, Pierre Campredon, Christian Castellanet, Claudio Carrera Maretti, Michael Cernea, Moreno Chiovoloni, Christian Chatelain, Dawn Chatty, Purna Chhetri, Brian Child, Maurilio Cipparone, Marcus Colchester, Steve Collins,

[4] IUCN Resolution 2.15 on Collaborative Management for Conservation Programme, 2nd World Conservation Congress, Amman, October 2000.

[5] See http://www.iucn.org/themes/ceesp/Wkg_grp/CMWG/CMWG.htm

...invaluable stirring and inspiration were provided by many colleagues through the "sounding board" of the Collaborative Management Working Group....

Gordon Conway, Gillian Cooper, Roger Croft, Alex de Sherbinin, David E. De Vera, Nelson Diaz, Chimère Diaw, Antonio Carlos Diegues, Joanna Durbin, Olivier Dubois, Nigel Dudley, Cristina Eghenter, Azizou El Hadj Issa, Barbara Ehringhaus, Christian Erni, Arturo Escobar, Maria Fernanda Espinosa, James Everett, Kirsten Ewers, Maurizio Farhan Ferrari, Andrea Finger-Stich, Bob Fisher, Phil Franks, Kathryn Furlong, Roberto Gambino, Norbert Gami, Chachu Gangya, Julia Gardner, Jean Marc Garreau, Eric E. Garret, Tighe Geoghegan, Krishna Ghimire, Mario Gonz□lez Mart□n, Hugh Govan, Christiane and Diego Gradis, Jacques Grinevald, Salah Hakim, Mark and Maria Halle, Olivier Hamerlynck, Kirsten Hegener, Augusta Henriquez, Abdellah Herzenni, Ced Hesse, Pippa Heylings, Thea Hilhorst, Mark Hockings, Tarita Holm, Clarisse Honadia Kambou, Jon Hutton, David Hughes, Mark Infield, Andrew Inglis, Jeremy Ironside, Tilman Jaeger, Sally Jeanrenaud, Jim Johnston, Brian Jones, Marilee Kane, Graeme Kelleher, Sandra Kloff, Andrea Knierim, Michel Kouda, Juliette Koudenoukpo Biao, Roger Kouokam, Vijay Krishnarayan, Franco La Cecla, Sarah Laird, Alain Lambert, Patricia Lamelas, Charles Lane, Jean Larivière, Jannie Lasimbang, Andrew Long, Stefano Lorenzi, Marc and Jacqueline Lucet, Andres Luque, Ken MacDonald, Rolf Mack, Francine Madden, Patricia Madrigal, Luisa Maffi, Will Maheia, Abdul Karim Mamalo, Kathy Mangonès, Sheldon Margen, Kwabena Mate, Aldo Matteucci, Juan Mayr Maldonado, Jeff McNeely, Ricardo Melendez, Kenton Miller, Saliou Miscouna, Andrew Mittleman, Rob Monro, Oliviero Montanaro, Antonino Morabito, James Murombedzi, Kawar (Rani) Mumtaz, Alejandro Nadal, Nahid Naghizadeh, Anoushirvan Najafi, Vincent Ndangang, Gayl Ness, Linda Neuhauser, Daniel Ngantou, Jean Claude Nginguiri, Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Léon Nkantio, Josiane Olff-Nathan, Krishna Oli, Elinor Ostrom, Gonzalo Oviedo, Pierre Oyo, Diane Pansky, Neema Pathak, Tonino Perna, Adrian Phillips, David Pitt, Darrel Posey, Thomas Price, Hanta Rabetaliana, Aghaghia Rahimzadeh, Maryam Rahmanian, Claudine Ramiarison, Ricardo Ram□rez, Vololona Rasoarimanana, Shah Rehman, Juan Carlos Riascos, Liz Rihoy, Juan Rita Larrucea, Hernan Rodas, Dilys Roe, Guillermo Rodriguez Navarro, José Sanchez Parga, Park Poffenberger, Madhu Sarin, Trevor Sandwith, David Satterthwaite, Peter Schachenmann, Lea Scherl, Sabine Schmidt, David Sheppard, Ole Simel, Allan Smith, Dermot Smyth, Lars Soeftestad, Hadi Soleimanpour, Vivienne Solis Rivera, Sayyaad Soltani, Andrej Sovinc, Erika Stanciu, Achim Steiner, Rick Steiner, Sue Stolton, Boku Tache, Giuliano Tallone, Marcel Taty, Martjin ter Heegde, Jan Tersdad, Ibrahim Thiaw, Anada Tiega, Camilla Toulmin, Alex Triantafyllidis, Manuel Valdés-Pizzini, Ileana Valenzuela, Jorge Varela, Kit Vaughan, Sonia Vermeulen, Gill and Kees Vogt, Pier Carlo Zingari, Marjia Zupancic-Vicar, Patrizio Warren, Michael Watts, Jacques Weber, Webster Whande, Nathalie Whitfield, Clive Wicks, Andy Wilson, Liz Alden Wily and Nick Winer.

We are very grateful to all the sponsors of this volume. Early work was made possible thanks to the support provided by the Danish Development Agency (DANIDA) to the then Social Policy Programme of IUCN. Most subsequent work was carried out on a volunteer or semi-volunteer basis as part of the initiatives of the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP). This publication is made possible by grants from the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) and the Dutch Development Cooperation (DGIS) in support to IIED's work on the co-management of biodiversity and natural resources as part of on-going action research on food, agriculture and livelihood security and by a grant from the German Technical Cooperation Agency (GTZ) to

CMWG/ CEESP as part of their on-going encouragement to learning the lessons of collaborative management of natural resources in several regions of the world.

We also warmly thank Jeyran Farvar and Fabrice Prati for art work and layout and Hoonam Publishing Services in Tehran, which did the lithography and printing under the technical supervision and management of CENESTA— the Iranian Centre for Sustainable Development— host to the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy.

Our special gratitude and admiration go the multitude of indigenous peoples, local communities and enlightened government and NGO staff who have shown the way to wise co-management of natural resources and who have provided the rich base of experience, practice and policy we have documented here. We hope to have done at least partial justice to their efforts and work.

After these several years of gestation, we confide this volume to print and to its readers with joy and some sense of relief. May it be useful!

Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend,
Michel Pimbert,
Taghi Farvar,
Ashish Kothari,
Yves Renard

INTRODUCTION

The natural and social calamities pass away. Whole populations are periodically reduced to misery and starvation: the very springs of life are crushed out of millions of men, reduced to city paupers; the understanding and the feelings of the millions are vitiated by the teachings worked out in the interest of the few. All this is certainly part of our existence. But the nucleus of mutual support institutions, habits and customs remains alive with the millions; it keeps them together.… In the practice of mutual aid, which we can retrace to the earliest beginning of evolution, we see the origins of our ethical conceptions; and in the progress of man, mutual support— not mutual struggle— has had the leading part. In its wide extension, even at the present time, we find the best guarantee of a still loftier evolution of our race.

— Petr Kropotkin, 1902

Nothing truly valuable can be achieved
except by the unselfish cooperation of many individuals.

— Albert Einstein, 1940

The history of mutual aid and collective action in social and ecological affairs is as ancient as human life. For many thousands of years, human communities established their livelihoods by gathering, hunting and fishing in a collective fashion. Human collaboration within small groups was essential to recognise edible and medicinal plants as well as to overpower animals, build shelter or find and carry water. Through time, "communities" gained their livelihoods by dealing together with the natural threats and opportunities in their surroundings, by developing productive technologies and practices and by producing knowledge and culture in the same process. A feature of most traditional human societies throughout the world is to retain under common property— thus common care and "management"— pasture, forests, fisheries, wildlife and wetlands, including lakes and rivers. Such communal resources are subjected to a variety of rules and regulations devised by the communities themselves, usually embedded in institutions that prove their worth through centuries of trial and errors. For the distant past much of this is inferred from indirect data, but in time closer to us historical evidence abounds of human associations for various livelihood enterprises. In *Mutual Aid*, first published in 1902, Petr Kropotkin draws from the history of guilds and unions in Europe, from travel and colonial accounts

...the more difficult the natural environment, the more necessary is cooperation among the members of a species to be able to survive and prosper.

outside Europe, from the experience of village communities everywhere and even from the biological realm at large, to show how collaboration and mutual support are at the heart of whatever makes our species successful. As a biologist, he stressed that, the more difficult the natural environment, the more necessary is cooperation among the members of a species to be able to survive and prosper.

Negotiated agreements on the roles, rights and responsibilities of different actors in a common enterprise are at the heart of the forms of collaboration described by Kropotkin and celebrated by some of the most imaginative and engaged members of the human race. We have been moved and inspired by the immense richness of the human experience that stirred these insights, and brought to explore contemporary forms of group collaboration and lessons learned along the way. This volume is the result of our efforts in bringing together accounts and reflections on a variety of partnerships for the management of natural resources in different social and ecological contexts, based on both our own experiences and the very rich experience of others. The volume has inevitable limitations and we are aware that we have just touched upon the wealth of existing relevant experiences and insights. We still hope, however, to have provided a stepping stone towards a better understanding of co-management (CM) of natural resources (NR) for conservation, livelihoods, and development purposes.

Social organisation for the management of natural resources is a fundamental attribute of human communities. Not all social responses to resource management challenges, however, achieve appropriate or effective results. Violent conflicts, extreme inequities in access to natural resources, instances of people scrambling for resources in open access situations or major development schemes delivering environmental and human tragedies too often do occur, ushering in human and environmental tragedies. What do we know about the root causes of such tragedies? What distinguishes social progress from destructive change?

…problems often arise when change is imposed by force or is hurried through, without the benefit of slow advances and testing through time. Many such changes are part of a socio-political shift of historical proportion currently well advanced throughout the world.

The analysis of the experiences collected in this volume seems to suggest that problems often arise when change is imposed by force or is hurried through, without the benefit of slow advances and testing through time. Many such changes are part of a socio-political shift of historical proportion currently well advanced throughout the world. From the early agrarian and industrial revolutions to the current dominance of the global agro-industrial-market system, peasants have been progressively reduced in relative numbers, involved in cash crop production and grown dependent on mechanised implements, oil, pesticides, fertilisers and abundant water. Nomadic pastoralists have been forced to settle and become dependent on imported feed for their animals. Hunter-gatherers have also been constrained to settle, become farmers (or "poachers") and link to market economies. The loss of power of local communities has corresponded to a rise in power of national states and private individuals and corporations. New state bureaucracies and economic enterprises, associated with monolithic views of progress and rational order, have expropriated from indigenous and local communities many of the decisions and privileges that used to be their own.[1] From the "scramble for Africa" to the top-down declaration of state jurisdiction on forests, rangelands, waters and coastal resources in Asia, from the state collectivisation of farms and natural resources in the Soviet Union to the imposition of huge-agribusiness ventures upon the common lands of Latin America, from

[1] See the very pertinent analysis of Scott, 1998.

the forced resettlement of nomadic populations in Iran, Turkey, Central Asia and East Africa to the destruction of ancient villages to make room for obscenely anonymous apartment complexes in Rumania— rural communities[2] have been dis-empowered and, in the words of Banuri and Amalric,[3] "de-responsibilised" of taking care of much of their own environment and livelihoods. The phenomenon can be seen as part of the "great transformation" described by Karl Polanyi,[4] by which an idealised economic rationality has been slowly but steadily negating and crushing a whole range of other human and social values and areas of autonomy. Other authors emphasised the scope of this historical process of sweeping and authoritarian domestication of people and nature, highlighting how it influenced biological and cultural diversity, local (community) knowledge and skills, human well being, "common sense" and even the nature of scientific inquiry.[5]

The "great transformation" brought about a variety of consequences throughout the world, among which the fact that many customary and community-based natural resource management (NRM) systems have been overlooked, negated or simply crushed in the name of modernisation and development. Nature has become a collection of "natural resources", to be "managed" through "dismembering" and extreme biological and social simplification in the interest of producing commodities.[6] Many rural communities are no longer in charge of managing their natural resources, and, importantly, they are not "trusted" by state bureaucracies to be able to do so.[7] Their inventiveness and autonomy are brushed aside in the name of state rationality, economic development and conservation. Their viable, relatively simple to operate, modest and time-tested solutions to natural resource management problems, embedded in unique local knowledge and skills, are substituted by powerful and locally-untested solutions, based on a-local ("scientific") understanding of how nature should be managed and "conserved". While the character of rural environments changes under these forces, urban environments are also created or enormously expanded, resulting in new demands and challenges for people. Increasingly, in both rural and urban systems, success is defined in economic terms and the collateral damages in terms of human and cultural losses[8] are perceived as inevitable side effects.

Many rural communities are no longer "in charge" of managing their natural resources, and... not "trusted" by state bureaucracies to be able to do so.

Is the phenomenon unstoppable and irreversible? Should we all resign ourselves to it? But also: is the phenomenon entirely negative and destructive? Or are there also positive changes brought about by the rise of national states, private enterprises, new technologies and globalisation? As always in human phenomena, matters are not sharply defined and history presents us with a never-ending coex-

2 We understand as "community" a human group sharing a territory and involved in different but related aspects of livelihoods— such as managing natural resources, producing knowledge and culture and developing productive technologies and practices. Communities are by no means homogenous, and harbour complex socio-political relations, with diverging and sometimes conflicting views, needs and expectations. Yet, they have major common concerns which, in healthy situations, lead towards various forms of collaboration and cohesion. Examples may be found in Ralston *et al.,* 1983; Reader, 1990; Ghai and Vivian, 1992; Pye Smith *et al.*, 1994; Western and Wright, 1994; Borrini-Feyerabend *et al.*, 2004, (in press); and in this volume.

3 Banuri and Amalric, 1992.

4 Polanyi, 1944.

5 Gramsci, 1947; Goodman and Goodman, 1947; Farvar and Milton, 1972; Georgescu-Roegen, 1971; Mumford, 1971; Illich, 1973; Schumacher, 1973; Berger, 1976; Dupuy and Robert, 1976; Foucault,1977; Hyden, 1980; Merchant, 1980; Franke and Chasin, 1980; Bookchin, 1982; Bodley, 1982; Ralston *et al.*, 1983; Watts, 1983b; Jackson *et al.*, 1984; Richards, 1985; Escobar, 1985; Crosby, 1988; Lindblom, 1988; Gould, 1989; Harvey, 1989; Hacking, 1990; Appfel Marglin and Marglin, 1990; Rosaldo, 1993; Netting, 1993; Altieri, 1995; Scott, 1998; Feyerabend, 1999; Colchester, 2003.

6 Merchant, 1980; Bookchin, 1982; Scott, 1998.

7 This is one of the important insights masterly illustrated by Scott (1998). As a result of this active disempowering, which in some places has been going on for a long time, human communities may have become all but capable of managing their environments and/ or sharing management rights and responsibilities with others.

8 See the lucid description by Berger (1976).

istence of tragedies and miracles of ingenuity and personal and collective strength. In this volume we refrain from interpreting or judging phenomena of historical proportions. We rather wish to point at specific examples of "values in action", instances in which people and nature found remarkable ways of organising their co-existence. Indeed, despite adverse forces of great proportions, local communities are still able to discern and adjust, they can merge their unique heritage with innovations and new structural conditions, they can "re-organise" themselves, re-conquer memories, skills, information, rights. These communities adapt themselves, develop new capacities and weave political and economic alliances with new actors, including state governments, international organisations, individual and corporate businesses. New and at times experimental partnerships are central to these phenomena, involving extensive dialogue and action-research and the recognition, understanding and reconciliation of a multiplicity of capacities and comparative advantages. Traditional knowledge and skills, in particular, are set to work within changed environmental, political and social contexts, including "science-based" innovations. Instead of witnessing the death of local communities in natural resource management we witness at times the birth of many forms of social "syncretism" and synergy— the wise merging of features from different origins. This is at the heart of what we understand as "co-management" in this volume— a process of collective understanding and action by which human communities and other social actors manage natural resources and ecosystems *together*, drawing from everyone's unique strengths, vantage points and capacities.

Instead of witnessing the death of local communities in natural resource management we witness at times the birth of many forms of social "syncretism" and synergy— the wise merging of features from different origins.

This said, we should also stress that our understanding of co-management is not restricted to state-community partnerships. Co-management approaches can be and are applied among and within communities as well. For indigenous peoples in particular, co-management processes, albeit rarely described with this name, are part of traditional ways of relating with common property natural resources and with community conserved areas.[9] In such indigenous versions of co-management, the national state is often not present as a partner because it is perceived as non-legitimate or irrelevant or antithetical to indigenous peoples' self-determination. In this volume, therefore, we do not necessarily refer to co-management as a state-led or even a state-involving process. While we include such cases, we also bring in many instances of cooperative decision-making concerning natural resources held in common property regimes among two or more communities, or between communities and private, NGO, or international actors, or including only interest groups within a local community.

We believe our "open" understanding of the co-management concept is helpful to situate it in a historical context and to avoid using it in a restrictive sense, which is a real possibility as the term, along with the term "partnership", is becoming accepted jargon and even a buzzword. In this sense, we wish to contribute to an empowering adoption of the approach by national decision-makers and, most of all, by indigenous and local communities and civil society at large. We wish this volume to contribute to disseminating valuable experiences, enhancing reflection and capacities, and promoting inter-cultural and international comparison and cross-fertilisation. As "explicit" partnerships to manage natural resources are a growing phenomenon throughout the world[10] and as critical environmental and social situations clamour for action, we believe that our attempt to systematise the co-management concept and practice has a chance to be useful.

9 Posey, 1999; Kothari, 2004; Borrini-Feyerabend *et al.*, 2004 (in press).

10 But they are not a new phenomenon, as described in Chapter 1.

An idea whose time has come

Several reasons help to explain the current interest in the co-management of natural resources for both conservation and livelihood purposes. Among those:

1. **Extensive conflicts in the development and conservation arena**. Top down, imposed development and conservation schemes all too often entail huge social and ecological costs, especially in areas where people are directly dependent on natural resources for their livelihoods. For instance, a growing body of evidence indicates that many state-based development and conservation projects have brought serious adverse effects on the food security and livelihoods of people living in and around major infrastructures or protected areas and wildlife management schemes.[11] Local communities have faced loss of land and restrictions in their use of common property resources for food gathering, harvest of medicinal plants, grazing, fishing, hunting, collection of wood and other wild products from forests, wetlands and pastoral lands. Development enterprises, infrastructures or national parks have denied local resource rights, turning local people overnight from hunters, pastoralists, sea nomads and cultivators into "poachers", "invaders" and "squatters".[12] Resettlement schemes for indigenous peoples removed from areas earmarked for development or conservation have had devastating consequences.[13] No wonder, there are serious conflicts between indigenous and local communities and development managers or park authorities. Such conflicts are burning in many contexts, too often side by side precious natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystem services that should be carefully used and conserved. Co-management processes often provide answers to these conflicts or at least a forum where different views can be vented and confronted, and where conciliation can be attempted.

2. **Increased complexity and uncertainty of ecosystem and natural resource management questions.** Policy processes and resource management regimes involve making decisions under conditions of uncertainty, being largely unable to predict the effects of different courses of action. Indeed, many past and current conflicts in development and conservation have come from the failure of management agencies to accept and embrace this complexity and this uncertainty even in "simple" systems. The science of parts (reductionism), as opposed to knowledge and ways of knowing that integrate the parts, has largely failed to come to terms with dynamic complexity[14] and variation within and among ecosystems. Global environmental change and human-made risks, such as climate change or interactions among genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and the environment at large, exacerbate these variations and uncertainties.[15] In addition, the perceptions of both problems and solutions are value laden and differ enormously within society,[16] and "experts" seem no longer better equipped than any other groups to decide on questions of values and interests. All of the above emphasises the need for flexible responses and adaptive management of natural resources, which can best be

At the heart of what we understand as "co-management" ...[is] a process of collective understanding and action by which human communities and other social actors manage natural resources and ecosystems together*, drawing from everyone's unique strengths, vantage points and capacities.*

11 Cernea, 1985; Kothari *et al.*, 1989; West and Brechin, 1991; Wells and Brandon, 1992; IIED, 1995; Pimbert and Pretty, 1995; Ghimire and Pimbert, 1997.

12 McIvor, 1997; Koch, 1997; Colchester, 2003.

13 Cernea and Schmidt-Soltau, 2003.

14 Variation in response to the same change is enormous in both organisms and biological systems, with daily, seasonal and longer term modifications apparent from the broad landscape to the small cultivated plot. See Gunderson *et al.*, 1995; Holling *et al.*, 1998.

15 The conventional approaches of risk management and cost benefit analysis become more apparently inadequate when "we don't know what we don't know" and where "we don't know the probabilities of possible outcomes".

16 Pimbert and Wakeford, 2001a.

grounded on customary practices and participatory learning and action.[17] In facing these challenges, co-management processes and flexible institutional agreements are increasingly sought to assure new forms of dialogue and participatory decision-making, responsive to the particular contexts.[18]

3. **Globalisation and decentralisation phenomena.** Local resource users and their communities are increasingly caught in the contradictions of global governance systems. Whilst some trends towards devolution and decentralisation foster local awareness and empowerment processes, the global rules of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the agreements of the Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) such as for patents on seeds and medicinal plants, the concentration of economic power in the hands of trans-national corporations (TNCs) and finance markets, and the current widespread privatisation trends related to land, water, forests and public services add to the undermining of community control over natural resources, knowledge and institutions.[19] In the conservation arena, while protected areas demand high management investments by governments and sacrifices by local communities, the majority of benefits accrue to national and international businesses active in tourism, hunting, pharmaceuticals or water-hungry agriculture and industrial production. National states are challenged from both "above", by trans-national corporations and elements of state power acting on their behalf, and below, by local communities. Co-management attempts provide a promising, if uncertain, balancing act among contrasting needs, for instance by setting up "contracts", "agreements" and "partnerships" with various social actors, including local communities, corporations and non governmental organisations (NGOs). Such attempts "legitimate" and guarantee the new roles assumed by the new actors and increasingly blur the conventional divide between the local and global.

4. **Emerging interest in good governance principles and processes.** Governance in general and governance of natural resources in particular are gaining attention in the national and international debates on conservation. Experiences in the governance of natural resources have even proven to be good vehicles for the promotion of local governance in other spheres of social and economic development. On the one hand, governments seek to implement their policies and programmes in so-called cost-effective ways and look for social actors with whom they can share their burdens of responsibility. On the other, civil society demands more influence on decisions affecting their lives and, as appropriate, the redressing of past injustices. Indigenous peoples and local community organisations, non-governmental organisations with environment and development goals, trans-national corporations, bodies of international and national law, scientific and local expert groups and professional associations— all clamour for attention and are actively engaged in influencing policies. Among their results are the increased recognition of the legal basis for the rights of indigenous peoples and the demand for effective access to information and the representation of civil society interests in policy and decision-making. In this dynamic situation, conventional governance structures and roles, based on a centralised and hierarchical authority, appear increasingly inadequate. More flexible institutional arrangements, characterised by interdependence among the actors and shared authority, are being tested both within

17 Gunderson and Holling, 2002; Berkes *et al.*, 2003.

18 Richards, 1985; West and Brechin, 1991; Netting, 1993; Borrini-Feyerabend, 1996; Leach and Mearns, 1996; Pimbert and Pretty, 1999; Posey, 1999; Gunderson and Holling, 2002; Berkes *et al.*, 2003.

19 Korten, 1995; Passet, 2000; Bertrand and Kalafatides, 2002.

national governments and between governments and society.[20] These include various forms of collaboration among local communities, government, business and other actors ("public interest partnerships") with increasing reference to the respect of human rights and the United Nations (UN) principles of good governance ("participation and voice", "accountability", "equity", "direction" and "performance")[21] as reference benchmark. In this sense, co-management can be seen as empowering for some of the social downtrodden, as it helps them find a place at the decision-making forum. Whether that is enough to overcome their problems is a very open question.

A variety of concepts and terms are used to describe partnerships for the management of natural resources. As mentioned, we will use in this volume a comprehensive rather than narrow understanding of what co-management is about, emphasising the following in particular:

1. **Collaboration as a form of self-defense.** Many indigenous peoples and local communities in a changing world need more than ever strong internal and external forms of cooperation to be able to withstand the dangers of environmental degradation and socio-cultural impoverishment.

2. **Collaboration as a response to complexity.** As a result of complex historical developments, the management of natural ecosystems and the natural resource base of livelihoods generally cut across a variety of political, administrative, cultural and social boundaries: a multiplicity of concerned social actors exists for most ecosystems and natural resource units.

3. **Collaboration for effectiveness and efficiency.** Different social actors possess complementary capacities and comparative advantages in management, which, while respecting customary and existing rights, can be profitably harnessed together.

4. **Collaboration for respect and equity.** A fair sharing of the costs and benefits of managing natural resources and ecosystems is essential for initiatives aiming at human development and conservation with equity.

5. **Collaboration through negotiation.** Most institutional arrangements among relevant actors have at their core formal and/ or informal co-management plans, agreements and organisations. Such arrangements need to be negotiated through a fair process and subsequently adjusted in a learning-by-doing mode.

6. **Collaboration as social institution.** The harnessing of complementary capacities and the fair share of the costs and benefits of managing natural resources are the natural roots of many institutional arrangements.

The aim of this volume

This book is designed to support professionals and others attempting to understand collaborative management regimes and interested in supporting them in policy and developing them in practice. The relevant understanding and lessons learned are evolving, and this book is only a stepping stone. Whilst we draw from a large variety of examples of co-management partnerships throughout the

...we wrote this volume to promote action....

[20] Calame, 2003; Fung and Wright, 2003.
[21] UNDP, 2002; Graham *et al.*, 2003; Hickey and Mohan, 2004 (in press).

world, there is no claim or hope to be exhaustive. We only attempt to overview relevant experiences and concerns and, from those, synthesise some key CM features, important steps in developing those and lessons learned regarding management institutions and the evolution of a favourable policy context. There is no "recipe" to develop a co-management partnership capable of fitting the variety of existing contexts and requirements. While recognising this, we wrote this volume to promote action, and thus offer a practical menu of examples, considerations to learn from, tools and reminder checklists. We hope these can be useful and inspiring. The specific co-management path, unique for every context, can only be made by the ones who will decide to walk it.

A guide to this volume

The overall structure of this volume is designed to both draw from and help support co-management practitioners in "learning by doing" in a variety of field contexts.

Towards a contextual framework

In Part I of this volume we explore natural resource management at the historical interface between traditional and "modern" societies and illustrate some complex combinations of the old and the new devised by local communities as a response to current challenges. Five case examples offer a glimpse of the complexities that abound in specific contexts, while pointing at a general pattern of generating syncretic solutions. We then discuss issues of actors, entitlements and equity in natural resource management, setting a conceptual foundation to our analysis. Various types of actors are described, with attention to the unique entitlements of indigenous peoples and local communities and why they are more akin to rightholders than stakeholders. Entitlements are social constructs that find meaning only within the society that created them. In this sense, we explore a number of arguments that have been used to claim entitlements to manage natural resources as well as their interplay with various forms of power. Pathways to move from potential to empowered and responsible actor, and to do so with specific attention to equity, are sketched and illustrated. Ways by which the actors can represent themselves in negotiation or be represented by others are discussed, as well as the development of co-management concepts through the last decades.

Part I closes with a panorama of contemporary forms of co-management in different places and cultures. Examples deal with pastoral societies, forest resources, fisheries and coastal resources, mountain environments, management of wildlife and protected areas, agriculture, agricultural research, and water management. Various common successful characteristics are highlighted but we also include cases in which co-management did not succeed in taking off. The rest of the book analyses in some more detail the constituent elements (components) of co-management: the co-management process, the co-management institution and the social context that makes them possible.

Towards effective processes

A co-management process is the series of events by which a management partnership develops and unfolds. Its key aim is to develop a consensus among the relevant partners on "what to do" about the ecosystem and natural resources at

stake. The term "consensus" is often misunderstood as to convey a sense of total satisfaction achieved by everyone involved. This is not what it represents. A consensus may just imply that a compromise has been achieved by which each party renounced some of its desires but satisfies others. The term consensus means that the phase of negotiation achieved an agreement that everyone "can live with". In Part II of this volume, we begin by describing a number of points of departure and occasions for the co-management process to start. We then explore several preparatory requirements to the negotiation phase and lessons learned during negotiation. We offer a variety of methods and tools, including several checklists. By comparing contexts and examples, we emphasise the need to bend and adjust the process steps in the light of particular situations and conditions. Broadly, such process steps accompany a variety of social actors in organising, expressing and defending their interests and concerns, negotiating the agreement, setting up one or more pluralist management organisations, and learning by doing while implementing their agreement.

These steps are mostly valid for modern and formal contexts and possibly less so for other contexts, where co-management can be practiced in a variety of culture-specific ways (for instance, without developing a written agreement). In the latter cases the process we outline may not be entirely applicable or some of the steps may merge together. In all, no general procedure is applicable to all cases, but we can still examine a number of important experience-based recommendations. Regardless of context, a co-management process is rarely entirely smooth, often complex and lengthy, and sometimes arduous. It may involve changes of plans, surprises, contradictory information and the need to retrace one's own path and re-iterate a number of steps.

Towards effective institutions

The co-management agreement and organisations... are, basically, as good as the process that generated them.

The co-management agreement and organisations negotiated among the parties spell out the consensus reached through the co-management process and are, basically, as good as the process that generated them. In general, the co-management agreement includes a management plan but also accords or initiatives that do not immediately and directly relate to natural resources but complement the plan by creating the conditions that make sound management possible. It may consist of oral understandings or written documents, including project contracts, letters of intent, local by-laws, etc. The co-management plan, whether written or non-written, usually defines the essential management elements for the relevant area and natural resources, including objectives, priorities, expected results, the recognised relevant actors, their functions, responsibilities, entitlement, etc. The agreement often foresees the setting up of one or more co-management organisations,[22] *i.e.*, multi-party bodies with defined functions in the management setting (*e.g.*, an advisory council, a management board, an executive secretariat) usually including the key relevant actors at stake.

Together, the co-management plan and complementary accords represent the overall efforts of the parties to fairly share the relevant management functions, entitlements and responsibilities, and thereby create a co-management institution. And yet, a real institution is more than the sum of its parts. An institution includes expectations and routine reflexes (in particular the sense of shared responsibility in managing natural resources), social norms (such as the habit of discussing decisions with various relevant actors, and accepting that all points of

[22] We understand as organisations "groups of individuals or customary social groups bound by a common purpose to achieve objectives". See also North (1990).

view are valuable) and the use of specific terms and concepts in everyday life (such as co-management, but also entitlements, equity, linking of benefits and responsibilities, seeking good governance in resource management). Agreeing on a co-management plan and setting up a pluralist management board are crucial but not sufficient steps towards institutionalising a co-management regime. This will be achieved only when, besides and beyond rules and organisations, behaviours and ideas become spontaneously pluralist and respectful of a variety of entitlements and concerns in society. For this to be achieved, one of the crucial ingredients of a social institution is time. Only a day-by-day experience through time can give people the sense of normality and the confidence associated with a spontaneous, acquired behaviour and the associated social values. Other essential ingredients are the stability and resilience of the rules and organisations, which need to merge into normal life.

The forms and functioning of co-management agreements and organisations are examined in Part III of this volume, along with the dynamics of institutionalising co-management. We offer several examples of co-management agreements and organisations and discuss what makes them effective and sustainable. We then explore the experience of social actors engaged in "learning by doing" as part of co-management institutions.

Towards enabling policies

A social context favourable to co-management allows the co-management process to take place and fosters the development of co-management institutions. In some cases, key features are specific legislation and policy, while in others political and economic conditions are determining elements. No social pre-condition is always and absolutely necessary for effective co-management regimes, which are largely the products of the wider environment of which they are parts, but can also contribute to shaping and reforming that environment. In other words, practice can be ahead of policy, and co-management processes can have significant impacts on policy environments. In some countries, context-specific changes in natural resource governance towards increased participation and empowerment have even inspired and informed broader processes of decentralisation and democratisation.

Part IV of this volume is concerned with the policy contents and instruments helpful to make co-management work. We focus on the types and content of enabling policies and institutions and seek to address the real problems encountered by policy-makers, managers and social actors. We discuss how a supportive and coherent policy environment can comprise elements at various levels, from the specific deeds of local level bureaucrats and leaders to the founding principles of national constitutions and the carefully crafted wordings of global conventions. International and national policies that enable collaborative approaches to natural resource management and sustainable development are described, and the diversity of possible pathways is emphasized. Far from delivering standardised recommendations, we stress that policies and institutions need to adapt to local and national contexts, although possibly on the basis of an in-depth analysis of what has worked or failed elsewhere. We affirm the importance of local history in co-management processes, and stay away from standardised prescriptions and a "one–size-fits-all" approach.

In the final chapter of Part IV we discuss the policy-making process and specific

ways to change and improve it with an emphasis on participatory democracy, civil society deliberation and mechanisms for social inclusion. In any given society it is important to ask whose perspectives, knowledge and aspirations are embedded in policies, and whose are excluded. Recognising that policies usually reflect and reinforce the interests of the powerful, we describe some of the methods and approaches that foster greater inclusion and democratic pluralism in policy making. After highlighting ways of strengthening civil society, we reflect on key challenges for deepening participatory governance of both natural resources and the broader conditions of social life.

Finally, in the Concluding Remarks, we draw from our own field experience to offer the reader our personal observations and heartfelt commentary.