This third issue of practitioner notes focuses on the lessons learned by protected area project managers, both within and outside the World Bank, about linking participatory conservation to governance reform activities (see Box 1). These insights were gleaned from interviews, a literature review, a 2002 electronic list-serve discussion and a seminar series organized for the World Bank’s Participatory Conservation Initiative. These activities represent a collaboration between the Biodiversity and Participation Teams of the Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Department at the World Bank, as well as the World Bank Institute. Both the Global Environment Facility and the World Bank provided funding. Because conservation and natural resource management projects have been more participatory than some other

1 Sr. Social Scientist consultant, Environment Department, World Bank.
BOX 1: Participation Definition

The World Bank (1996) defines participation as "a process through which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives and the decisions and resources which affect them."

In a similar vein, the term, participatory conservation, refers to activities with conservation objectives that are characterized by stakeholder influence and shared control of decisions and resources.

types of sectoral projects, these lessons can contribute to the World Bank's broader work on participatory development.

Protected areas (PA) and natural resource management (NRM) practitioners increasingly realize the importance of effective governance for meaningful participation in PAs and NRM (see Box 2). Sometimes, it is necessary to work on "changing the box" rather than just "thinking outside the box." Governance-related reforms encompass anti-corruption measures but also include fundamental structural ("systemic") changes (e.g., legal frameworks, land tenure projects & decentralization). While some managers have claimed that these issues are beyond the scope of their projects (which may be true in some situations), others have managed to initiate reforms or link their projects with other governance-related projects. A closer looks is needed at both the impacts of governance reforms on participatory conservation and the impact of participatory conservation upon governance reforms.
BOX 2: Governance Definitions

Governance refers to the roles, rules and relationships involved in making societal decisions. It can include both formal and informal arrangements. Governance encompasses the State and civil society at multiple levels.

Systemic governance reforms include policy and institutional changes beyond those focused exclusively on the environment or other sectors. For this report, we focus on reform efforts that are supportive of participatory conservation.

Targeting and Prioritizing Opportunities

By addressing systemic governance reforms and supporting reform efforts already underway, PA/NRM projects can have impact beyond "little patches of blue" (or green) (Alfred Nakatsuma, USAID, Participatory Conservation Conversation speaker). These reforms can include changes in policy, the processes of decision-making and governmental and non-governmental institutions. Many project and program staff have wondered about the relative value, stability and sustainability of changes that are only happening at the local level. In addition, a number of projects have gotten "stuck," after promising early accomplishments, when key policies, personnel or project allies have undergone unexpected changes (see Box 4). These derailments and delays have usually involved significant financial and other costs. To provide a stable context for local participatory conservation, it is important to institutionalize systemic reforms and build capacity for ongoing advocacy by civil society of community conservation interests.

With limited resources, managers of PA/NRM projects and programs need to be very strategic about working on governance reforms. Clearly, PA/NRM projects will not be able to work on all issues nor should they try. Which reforms address the systemic constraints and incentives

BOX 3: Direct and Indirect Governance Reform by PA/NRM Activities

Projects can reform systemic governance:

- Directly (working alone or in concert with local partners)—for example, PA/NRM projects can promote participatory conservation by linking their efforts to ongoing reforms in decentralization, indigenous and other land tenure, resource concession practices, etc.

- Indirectly (modeling new behaviors, processes and institutions)—some PA/NRM projects have institutionalized participatory processes at the local level and planned strategies to share these experiences with representatives of other communities, provinces, the national government and/or other countries.
BOX 4: Governance Delays and Costs

- An Indian Supreme Court ruling that required forced resettlement after the final notification of park boundaries conflicted with the World Bank's safeguard policies regarding indigenous peoples and involuntary resettlement. As a result, progress was delayed for other forestry and conservation projects that were already underway (source: interviews with R.R. Mohan and Jessica Mott, World Bank Task Manager and Sr. Natural Resource Economist).

- The second phase of the World Bank/GEF Honduras Biodiversity Project will need to address communal land tenure rights within some of the buffer zones because integrated conservation and development activities were de-linked from park management during the first phase of the Honduras Biodiversity Project (source: interview with Augusta Molnar, former World Bank Task Manager).

- In Panama, the World Bank's Darien Project infringed on indigenous lands when it mapped park boundaries. As a result, there were later costly delays and intensive consultations were needed (source: interview with Chona Cruz, World Bank Social Scientist).

Our list-serve and seminar contributors, along with the experienced biodiversity task managers at the World Bank, focused on the desired outcomes of governance reforms related to biodiversity conservation:

**Reductions in poverty.** Some of the economic incentives associated to biodiversity conservation require reforms related to resource tenure, marketing and access to credit. For example, marketing reforms for alternative livelihood products can take pressure off of high or endangered biodiversity areas. Coordination of biodiversity conservation efforts with national poverty strategies and structural adjustment arrangements can also reduce poverty-driven biodiversity destruction.

**The empowerment of local communities and civil society relative to the government** (e.g., altering the balance of power via access rights, skills and resources). Referring to his...
experience with the Annapurna Conservation Area Project in Nepal, list-serve contributor Gehendra B. Gurung focused on “people-centered” conservation where people are “the principal actors and the beneficiaries of conservation” and they have responsibilities for the creation of a management plan and decision-making, along with rights to directly (fuel, fodder, timber, income) and indirectly (tourism, etc.) benefit from resources. Their civil society partners in these efforts are likely to include both national and sub-national civil society organizations.

More relative equity within communities and countries, including issues of elite control and corruption. Steve Shaowei Xu, speaking from his experience with the Shimental Nature Reserve in South China, noted that “the key to the success of ... the governance reforms on participatory conservation hinges on substantially identifying the major interests and consequently helping to add weights in the side of protected area (PA) caretakers.” These weights include institutional reforms, broadening access to decision-making and capacity building.

The creation of a culture of good governance. Often, the governance and government system only reflect elite values and input. To help motivate more broad-based stakeholder participation in conservation activities, improve resource management and decrease corruption, PA/NRM projects can support anti-corruption activities, including participatory resource monitoring, by civil society watchdog organizations (e.g., the Global Forest Watch program at the World Resources Institute). Support can be provided to those advocating reforms for concession bidding processes that increase transparency and provide greater opportunities for local communities. Reforms can reduce the selectiveness of natural resource law enforcement and engage communities in rule creation and enforcement. To promote transparency and equity as well as civic engagement, projects can support advocacy capacity building for civil society organizations and their reform efforts related to NGO registration laws and constitutional reforms (e.g. rights of assembly). Care must be
taken to help develop capacities beyond national level civil society organizations since they are not always representative or accountable.

Preliminary experience suggests that four specific governance reform areas are particularly germane to participatory conservation:

- decentralization,
- land and other resource tenure,
- rights for indigenous peoples, including land and resource rights,
- regional and landscape-level planning,

*Decentralization* has great potential for improving the incentives for participation in conservation activities but also may lead to greater levels of resource exploitation by local elites. In theory, decentralization can lead to increased local community control over resources and lead to more informed national policies. However, other problems may emerge or be exacerbated. These problems include "empowering the local elite to greater levels of exploitation; or allowing a vacuum of accountability through a period of transition; or . . . the problems of oversight and coordination." (Eric Garrette, list-serve contributor). Some specific project actions can be found in Box 5.

For example, NGOs are playing an important role under a GEF grant to the Philippines Conservation of Priority Protected Areas Project (World Bank). NGOs and a newly formed, legally recognized NGO consortium, coordinate support activities for local Protected Area Management Boards, provided technical assistance, monitor implementation and act as trustee and manager for a project Livelihood Fund. This arrangement was made possible by

**BOX 5: Decentralization-Related Activities for PA/NRM Projects**

Increasingly, many PA/NRM projects are adapting to decentralization policies and transitions by taking some or all of the actions below:

- Finding new partners among local government officials and development-oriented civil society organizations,
- Institutionalizing civil society access to governmental bodies for environmental governance bodies.
- Modeling decentralized decision-making and good governance (e.g., transparency, accountability and checks and balances) within local projects.
the decentralization reforms of the Local Government Code of 1991 and the 1992 National Protected Areas System Act. While NGO involvement has broadened input into environmental governance, PA management has remained overly bureaucratic and subject to national-local tensions and financial irregularities, as had been the case with government-only project management. In addition, PA management has suffered badly from lack of financial commitment by the national government. (source: Project documents)

Some policy reforms related to land and resource tenure have motivated community participation in conservation activities. With ownership or more secure access rights, local households generally have more control over resource management decisions. However, list-serve contributor, Jeff Langholz, noted that there has been a growing trend toward private conservation areas that are owned by international and national elites and conservation organizations. Besides not involving local communities in decision-making, these schemes are often subsidized by scarce conservation funds and they further contribute to land concentration.

Indigenous rights, including land and resource tenure, are key to the participation of indigenous peoples in conservation activities. Jorge E. Uquillas, our Participatory Conservation Conversation speaker and a World Bank Sociologist, discussed how indigenous rights often pre-date the claims of the State. In his opinion, this situation obligates States to prioritize basic rights for indigenous people over other social groups. Some PA/NRM projects have been supporting indigenous capacity for resource mapping, building indigenous capacities to advocate on their own behalf and coordinating efforts with others for reforms of indigenous policies (See Box 6).

PA/NRM plans (and mapping) have often provided opportunities for local stakeholder participation and PA/NRM projects can help to institutionalize these participatory approaches into larger-scale regional and landscape-level planning processes. To improve participation for conservation activities, PA/NRM projects can improve community and civil society access to national and local economic development planning. Projects can also help to legitimize community-initiated mapping efforts, particularly for indigenous lands. International and local pressure can ensure that national and local governments address community interests in environmentally sustainable ways. At landscape levels, including transboundary conservation work, PA/NRM projects have the opportunity to structure new opportunities for participation with new transboundary institutions and processes (see the first issue of these practitioner notes on Scaling Up Participatory Conservation).

Creating Checks and Balances

To advance good governance and participatory conservation, checks and balances are needed. Besides working with a diversity of reform-minded partners, PA/NRM projects and programs can support new power-sharing arrangements. They can also support new mechanisms for transparency and accountability.
Nicaragua—Two World Bank activities, the Atlantic Biological Corridor and the Land Administration Projects have helped the Government of Nicaragua and indigenous peoples groups to draft an Indigenous Land Tenure Policy Framework. It aims to safeguard the land and natural resource rights of indigenous communities, promote PA co-management and facilitates access to goods and services for production. The framework uses conflict resolution mechanisms, and promotes the participation of indigenous peoples in permanent consensus building forums, as well as the formulation and implementation of public policy.1

Colombia—Based on ancestral rights, another World Bank Project, the Colombia Natural Resource Management Program, supported the demarcation and titling of indigenous reserves. It also supported the titling of Afro-Colombian community lands and formation of regional committees. Because they met certain criteria, the Afro-Columbians were classified as indigenous communities and were entitled to collective rights to territory under Colombia’s Law 70. However, this situation created some tensions between Indian and Afro-Colombian communities around whose lands were being demarcated more rapidly. The project built capacity for a participatory titling process via legal training and formation and consolidation of community councils. They also regularized natural resources management and worked out definitions and agreements on community boundaries. By June 2000, nearly 20,000 families had benefited from land titling activities.2

Brazil—Because Brazil had already established legal designations for people’s parks and extractive reserves, the World Bank/GEF Amazonian Regional PA project has had fewer structural problems and better local participation than other projects in countries without these legal tenure categories.3

Australia—Australia’s Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act of 1999 provides a framework for cooperative conservation that includes government, communities, landholders and indigenous peoples. The Act recognizes the role of indigenous people in the conservation and ecologically sustainable use of Australia’s biodiversity. It also promotes the use of indigenous knowledge for the management of biodiversity.4

Canada—After decades of negotiations for overall land claims settlements with aboriginal organizations, two new national parks in Labrador Province will be established along with additional and entirely new levels of government for natural resource administration. Similar land claim negotiation processes will be necessary to complete Canada’s National Park System on over more than 50 percent of the country’s land base.5

Sources:
1 Jorge E. Uquillas.
2 Sandy Davis, World Bank Sector Manager & project documents.
3 Claudia Sabrevida, World Bank Task Manager.
4 Hanna Jaireth, list-serve contributor.
5 Stephan Fuller, list-serve contributor.
Power-sharing can be institutionalized for project management and should be addressed at different levels of governance (i.e., national, sub-national and community). In addition to paying attention to which government agency and which levels of government should have authority over PAs, donors can play an important role in institutionalizing a larger role for civil society in PA decision-making bodies. Donors can help to build the capacity of civil society organizations to make more effective contributions to PA management. Most governments are unable to police themselves and civil society representation, transparency and accountability practices are needed to counter-balance these institutions. At the local level, projects can emphasize diverse stakeholder representation rather than accepting elite controlled decision-making.

With project governance, donors can structure models of more participatory decision-making. For example, a Brazilian World Bank biodiversity project (ARPA) diversified representation on its Advisory Committee to include non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to resolve important issues. In the Philippines, NGO and community representation on local Protected Area Management Boards had been legally mandated. In China’s Sichuan Province, every proposed co-management scheme under a GEF-funded wetlands conservation project involved discussion and negotiations about forms of governance and politically acceptable reforms at the provincial, county, town and herder communities levels (source: list-serve contributor, Stephan Fuller).

Transparency and accountability provide incentives for participatory conservation. With more information on resource use, management and benefit distribution, along with an improved
awareness of rights and responsibilities, citizens can take actions to hold their leaders and government institutions accountable for their actions. At the broadest level, this access to information may require support to advocates of constitutional reforms; in some countries, these rights have been secured via environmental laws.

At local and other levels, projects have promoted transparency and accountability using committee procedures, environmental education and communication, civic education and citizen monitoring of resource use and management. Some projects have set up committee procedures that require systematic documentation and dissemination of decision-making procedures and decisions (see Box 7) to all stakeholders, including different interest groups within communities. While environmental education and communication usually have not generated the impetus for citizen reform of governance, this potential exists when they are coupled with civic education and advocacy capacity building. If citizens have rights to access information from government, then citizen participation in monitoring can play an important role in resource management and governance. For example, the Global Forest Watch program is working with NGOs in several countries to train community members in monitoring of forest concessions. In the Philippines, USAID is supporting community sea watch monitoring groups under its Coastal Resource Management Program.

**Partners, Constituents, Critical Mass and Social Capital**

By themselves, most PA/NRM projects lack the resources, expertise and clout to initiate systemic governance reforms related to participatory conservation. One could also argue that these project-initiated reforms are unlikely to be sustainable without a broad-based constituency. In many situations, there is likely to be significant resistance by political and eco-

**BOX 7**: Transparency and Participation for Management of Samoa’s Marine Sanctuaries

To foster a transparent system of decision-making, each village chief brings a “living manual” to district committee meetings held every six to eight weeks. The manuals contain a local project description, past meeting agendas and notes about six-month plans and a project expenditure record, in both Samoan and English. To meet the information needs of the communities, the project added another layer of financial record-keeping about expenditures and budgeting. The procedures help introduce transparency as village-based management of marine sanctuaries is scaled up to the district level. This GEF-funded IUCN project builds upon a successful, village-focused AusAID project

Source: Project documents.
nomic elites to participatory policy making. Often, civic engagement has been discouraged, civil society is weak and constitutional rights are limited. Therefore, whenever possible, it is advisable to work collaboratively with other reform-minded partners on project activities.

Reform partners can be found within and across donor agencies, civil society organizations, communities and government. Within each of these institutions, there is a need to generate critical mass for reforms so that political transitions and other changes are less likely to undermine reforms. Across institutions, there is a need to support social capital formation among reformers.

**Donor agencies.** Increasingly, there has been greater cooperation within donor agencies among PA/NRM projects and those in other sectors working on governance reform, e.g. land tenure, democracy and governance, local government reforms (see Box 8). Working together at the national level or in the same provinces has created synergies around policy reform and institutional changes that support participatory conservation. Professional and personal relationships, shared advisors and local partners, as well as formally structured relationships have facilitated this type of collaboration.

**BOX 8: Examples of Project Partnerships Within Donor Organizations**

- In Nicaragua, two World Bank projects, the Atlantic Biological Corridor (ABC) (including GEF funds) and the subsequent Land Administration (LA) Project joined efforts to advance indigenous rights and biodiversity conservation. Policy reform conditionalities, studies, broad-based consultations and an Indigenous Land Commission supported by the ABC project have set the stage for the drafting of a policy framework that recognizes indigenous land rights under the LA project. A senior World Bank sociologist, Jorge E. Uquillas, has served as a bridge between the two projects and facilitated cooperation between the two task managers.

- In the Philippines, synergies between the Philippines Coastal Resource Management Project and the Governance and Local Democracy Project resulted from USAID mission leadership support, cooperative project managers and contractors, as well as some shared partners. To support the decentralization of municipal resource management, both projects worked with coastal municipalities and used mayor associations to extend their reach. They have helped to establish 232 municipally managed marine protected areas. The PCRMP project manager, Alfred Nakatsuma, noted that "GOLD opened doors" to municipal officials and staff.
While governments in some countries coordinate donor efforts for governance reforms, donors in other settings have needed to coordinate their own reform efforts and work through civil society to promote governance reforms. For example, in Nicaragua, the World Bank and several European donors are working with both government and civil society to promote a deliberative approach to indigenous land law and land demarcation (source: Jorge E. Uquillas).

Civil society organizations and communities. PA/NRM projects and programs have typically partnered with national and local conservation organizations. However, project/program managers are increasingly recognizing that they need to expand their partnerships to include civil society organizations. Potential partners include those with strong community ties, grassroots constituencies and broader development and social justice agendas. To advance participatory conservation, PA/NRM projects and programs need partners who possess advocacy skills that can advance reforms related to community conservation incentives and community empowerment. By pairing up with partners that are already working on reforms supportive of participatory conservation, PA/NRM managers can gain greater credibility with communities. These civil society partners need to be routinely engaged in project management. (See Box 9).

For countries with weak or absent civil society, there are still options. It is possible to diversify partnerships with governmental organizations, including those involved in social welfare. Academic institutions, while not an adequate substitute for civil society because of their government funding, have been important reform partners. It is also possible to expose government officials to other models of environmental and project governance via study tours and exchanges to other countries.

**BOX 9: Supporting Civil Society Networking for PA/NRM Objectives in Indonesia**

USAID's Biodiversity Support Program, via the KEMALA project, supported a set of capacity building activities for civil society organizations working on environmental governance reform in Indonesia. The US-based consortium of Worldwide Fund for Nature, World Resources Institute and The Nature Conservancy, managed the grant program. This off-shore arrangement allowed independence from government for the selection of civil society partners in Indonesia. These national and provincial NGOs were engaged in natural resources advocacy and field activities, usually as part but not all of their organizational agenda. Programmatic grants for up to five years provided organizational security. The project also offered demand-driven capacity building. The project also supported networking activities for policy advocacy, exchange of best practices and peer learning.

To advance the systemic reforms that will support participatory conservation, PA/NRM projects need to build capacity and partnerships, both within and across communities. A list-serve contributor, Eric Garrette, noted that “one must empower communities (or factions and classes) to represent themselves... or you have probably accomplished nothing for the long haul.” Projects can tap into existing efforts and interest in reforming local governance and bringing local issues to national attention. It is important to create systemic reforms that are built upon the community-based opportunities, success and partnerships that are already happening. For example, models for participatory conservation can already be found among those indigenous communities who are already practicing conservation and managing conservation areas. Community mapping and micro-planning have been used as powerful tools to advocate community interests and work needs to be done to legitimize these efforts vis-à-vis local, regional and national development planning processes.

**Government.** There are advocates for reform in most government bureaucracies, including line agencies and politicians. It is important to cultivate a critical mass of reformers across agencies and institutions. For example, some donor projects focus the majority of their attention on cultivating new capacities and attitudes among field staff. But this may create dangerous bureaucratic rifts between lower-level reformists and more powerful, higher level staff. In particular, concessions granted by high-level staff can undermine conservation, participation and improved relations between field staff and communities. To advance reforms in some situations, it may be helpful to coordinate project activities with more than one government agency and branch of government.

Experience from the Annapurna Conservation Area and elsewhere suggests that reforms could be directed toward new roles for local line agency staff including:

- provision of technical support for the creation and effective implementation of management plans,
- process facilitation and conflict resolution,
- support for enforcement of community-created rules,
- prevention of negative external forces.

(Source: List-serve contributor, Gehendra B. Gurung)

With decentralization, elected and appointed local government leaders have become important partners for PA/NRM projects. National and local governments may be at odds. Officials at the national level often want to retain control over logging and mining concessions and colonization. Local government officials are often interested in protecting access to resources for local elites rather than for other stakeholders within communities. It is important to find the reformers at each level and build capacity among a critical mass so that participatory processes
are not jeopardized by frequent staff and elected official turnover. In addition, it helps to reinforce government capacity building and momentum for reforms by coupling these activities with comprehensive public outreach campaigns to build a civic constituency for participatory conservation.

Building Capacities for Conflict Management and Negotiation

Conflicts are inevitable with conservation, participatory conservation and governance reform efforts and they need to be managed and negotiated. These efforts reallocate resources and power, e.g., conflicts arising around boundary setting, resource access and use agreements, benefit distribution and migration. Other types of external conflict, e.g., ethnic, religious, state, civil and economic, can also influence PA/NRM projects and escalate into armed conflict. A number of projects have formalized procedures or set up bodies for resolving conservation-related conflicts. However, government and civil society partners, at all levels, do not always have sufficient skills in conflict management and negotiation, particularly methods tailored to particular cultural settings.

Conservation and reform efforts often translate to winners and losers. Stakeholders must be identified. It is also crucial understand quality of relationships between stakeholders. There are a variety of diagnostic and communication tools available for these analyses (see Box 10 for one example). However, by bringing things out into the open, some of these methodologies have the potential to provoke or reinforce conflicts.

Understanding Communities and Representation Issues

To avoid catering to just elites, PA/NRM projects and programs must avoid “black box” thinking about communities. Too often, project and program staff do not clearly identify the power dynamics and representation concerns within communities, as well as within NGOs and government bureaucracies. Leaders and NGOs are often assumed to represent the best interests of communities but upon closer inspection, many leaders primarily represent elite interests. In addition, many NGOs are not membership organizations nor do they have close ties to communities. To be relevant, governance reforms in support of participatory conservation

**BOX 10: The 4R Framework**

List-serve contributor, Olivier R. Dubois, and his FAO colleagues, offered their “4R” framework as an adjunct to Participatory Rural Appraisal. The four R’s are the balance of rights, responsibilities, revenues/returns and relationships among government, private sector and communities. It would also be important to include civil society organizations and recognize differences within and among communities.
Because of its close coordination with the GOLD project, USAID's Philippines Coastal Resource Management Project measures both conservation and local government results. Indicators include:

- Kilometers of coastline benefiting from improved management
- Greater fish abundance inside and adjacent to marine sanctuaries
- Increased coral cover inside and adjacent to marine sanctuaries
- Increased local budget allocations for CRM
- Number of local governments using CRM best practices
- Expansion in the number of CRM organizations

Donor Leveraging Options

Sometimes, donors have the opportunity to leverage systemic governance reforms in support of participatory conservation. The amount of funding, geographic scope and project governance affect the amount of direct influence that a donor can have on reforms or indirect influence via modeling participatory reforms within projects:

**Funding Scale.** Typical Global Environment Facility grants, in the range of 10-20 million dollars each, typically have less leverage than 800 million dollar infrastructure projects. However, this disadvantage has been partially overcome when protected area projects are linked to other natural resources projects or land tenure projects to create greater incentives...
for governments to reform (source: Claudia Sobrevila and Augusta Molnar, World Bank Task Managers).

**Geographic Scale.** The World Bank's Joint Forest Management projects in India successfully used a state-wide Forestry project approach and were able to create a critical mass of trained staff to make systemic changes at the State level. These projects benefited from the integrated conservation and development experience of the earlier India Eco-Development Project. With only one site per State, the India Eco-Development Project was unable to change State structures and processes but it was able to develop more rigorous models of the integrated conservation and development concept and also a more process-oriented approach. (source: R.R. Mohan, World Bank Task Manager; Jessica Mott, Senior Natural Resource Economist)

**Packaging.** In terms of modeling participatory governance, World Bank projects in the North African Maghreb were able to leverage greater participation of women, the landless and youth because these elements were included as essential parts of the total project package. (source: Idah Psarayi-Riddihough, World Bank Task Manager)

**Project Governance.** Through project governance, project managers also have opportunities to create access to project decision-making for civil society. Projects can make a policy of sharing project information with civil society organizations and use donor social protection policies to encourage civil society involvement. They can encourage plurality in decision-making by using workshops, study tours and field-based trainings to: 1) expose delegations of government officials to more open arrangements with civil society in other countries, and 2) help government and civil society partners to interact on joint country delegations. On project advisory boards, project managers can encourage the representation of both environmental and social NGOs. Both governmental and non-governmental representatives on these boards can often benefit from capacity building related to participatory approaches (source: Claudia Sobrevila, World Bank Task Manager).

**BOX 12: Last Words**

From first principles, every PA project simply must be undertaken in an SD (Sustainable Development) context and I cannot imagine taking on a project without, implicitly at least, fully gauging the governance context, and analyzing every opportunity for reform. My perspective is that this is an essential task—not something that is outside the "box."

Source: Stephan Fuller, List-Serve Participant.
Monitoring and Measuring Change

Monitoring can track participation changes, the progress of governance reforms and the accountability of those making resource management decisions. To date, measures related to participatory conservation have been inadequate (e.g., number of meetings held by protected area committees) and the selection of indicators has generally not been done in a participatory manner. Participation monitoring has tended to be the exception rather than the norm. Qualitative issues are seldom addressed, e.g., access and level of involvement in decision-making, access to benefits from conservation activities, etc. As PA/NRM projects increasingly become involved in systemic governance reform, it will be important to track participation issues related to community empowerment, equity and progress toward good governance.
Linking Participatory Conservation to Governance Reforms

During design and implementation phases, increase timeframes for projects/programs that aim to directly or indirectly influence systemic governance reform.

Identify the root constraints to participation and target policy, institutional reform and capacity building activities to address these issues (e.g., land tenure, indigenous rights, resource concessions, corruption, enforcement).

Aim to improve the system of checks and balances for greater accountability and transparency within biodiversity governance at all levels.

Identify key advocates and opponents to systemic governance reforms.

Locate and collaborate with in-country partners that are already working on desirable systemic governance reforms and/or who can mobilize and build constituencies for reforms that create incentives for stakeholder participation.

Support broad-based consultations on proposed reforms.

Within donor organizations, identify and coordinate with other projects and experts who can provide support for governance reform activities within specific countries. Use multiple smaller projects to leverage governance reforms.

Within countries, identify and coordinate efforts with other donor projects who can provide support for long-term, systemic governance reform in the PA/NRM sector.

Build skills in conflict management and negotiation.

Identify PA/NRM project indicators that will also capture results related to systemic governance reforms (e.g., local government actions,


THE PARTICIPATORY CONSERVATION INITIATIVE

This series of practitioner notes is part of the World Bank’s Participatory Conservation Initiative, which has been sponsored by the ESSD Biodiversity Teams with support from the GEF and the World Bank Institute. In response to the interest of protected area project managers within the World Bank, we designed this interactive initiative to expand the dialogue on key operational issues related to participation for protected area projects. We are focusing on the needs of practitioners, both within and outside the World Bank. To date, we have interviewed a sample of Sages (long-experienced biodiversity project managers within the World Bank) to identify key issues, created an annotated bibliography of relevant internal and external literature, organized an international, electronic list-serve discussion and seminar series on three topics and created a web-site for related documents. In addition, this issue of the practitioner notes represents an earlier electronic dialogue held in 2002 and sponsored by the World Bank Institute. Highlights from these activities are here incorporated. Our future plans involve technical assistance and training directly to World Bank staff involved with protected area projects.

For additional information about this series or the Participatory Conservation Initiative, please contact: Gunars Platais (gplatais@worldbank.org) and Nancy K. Diamond (nkdiamond@aol.com). Please share these publications with interested colleagues. Other issues of these practitioner notes include:


Issue No. 2, “Scaling Up Participatory Conservation”

Issue No. 4, “Crumbs, Christmas Trees, Committees or Control: Buying Constituents for Conservation”