NAPA

News from African Protected Areas

Nouvelles des Aires Protégées en Afrique

N°88
July 2015

Edito

Geoffroy MAUVAIS
PAPACO coordinator

Learning from our failures

The Pendjari National Park (Benin) is a kind of local celebrity in West Africa. Not that it is the biggest or the most beautiful of the parks in this corner of Africa. It is not the richest in terms of biodiversity and it is not the most visited in the sub-region. But over time, this park has gained a notoriety of seriousness and success in conservation.

This has not happened by chance. Supported and sustained by the German Cooperation for many years, the State of Benin has created there the necessary conditions for successful governance. Notably by gradually establishing good relations with all the park's neighbors, including private concessionaires of surrounding hunting areas or, even more crucially, by helping the neighboring communities to contribute to and benefit from the park's benefits (the well-known village associations for wildlife management, AVIGREF).

The park has managed to move from a monolithic State management model to shared governance, which is a precondition for any form of lasting success. For years we have been saying that and we continue to repeat it, even if the archaisms of some national PA systems and those who embody them counteract this trend. It is so much more relaxing to (mis) manage alone...

The park had its golden age. Gradually, the trust was established between men, between structures. The interests of each and all have been considered, discussed, revisited, sometimes compromised but this has resulted in an efficient system which first impacted the wildlife figures. It was believed to be strong and durable and this was, in theory, right. On more than one occasion, I used this park as a model for West Africa where examples of governance involving three or more stakeholders are so rare!

Pendjari NP

And men have changed (well, it is always necessary after a while). And the system in place jammed, old conflicts resurfaced, special interests superseded the common interest; the park was no longer a common good but for each and every one a prey, and a prey, you don't share it. Whatever the reason, and each stakeholder had his own, the dialogue has stopped and returned to the usual confrontation between those responsible for the protection and those supposed to covet the park, not knowing exactly who belongs to which category. The case has gone beyond the borders of Benin and went around the blogosphere, raising thousands of signatures in a global petition...
It was, for all the critics of our efforts on governance, the best demonstration that even

shared governance can do nothing for a park and the only good recipe that still works is the AK- 47 and the dialogue imposed with or by a gun!

Well, I do not think this is the case. What this example shows is just the opposite. When governance is good (and it was), it works. First statement. For good governance to become sustainable, it is necessary to change the structures, not only the people working in them. We need to consolidate the process so that it is not any longer a matter of few good intentions but become the philosophy of all the organizations involved. The Pendjari national park was a victim of its success, and abandoned to its fate too early, before a strong system of governance really be institutionalized... what happened does not question the need to work on governance, just the way by which it is achieved.

This is why our road map for African protected areas associates governance and sustainability: because they are intrinsically linked. We need a governance that is solid, representative, transparent, ethical, accountable, legitimate etc. but conceived on the long term ... and the technical means, the money, politicians, army… will not be enough. This is also why we published in the NAPA since March, analyses and case studies conducted on governance of protected areas: global, state, private or shared, in this edition. We will repeat it, again and again: changing protected areas governance in Africa is necessary if we are to finally succeed ... but yes, it has to be done properly.

Enjoy the reading.

Papaco is also on Twitter @Papaco_IUCN

Registration for our MOOC on management of African Protected Areas is almost open!

More in next NAPA!

Worth a reading: situation analysis of biodiversity in West and Central Africa

At long last, the IUCN Situation Analysis on terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity in West and Central Africa is now online as SSC Occasional Paper #54: http://iucn.org/about/work/programmes/species/news/?21509/West-and-Central-Africas-wildlife-in-trouble-shows-new-IUCN-report.

There is also an extensive set of supporting documentation, available at the same link. The paper will be translated into French by the end of the year and will be summarized in a further NAPA.

Governance of protected areas in Africa – Shared governance of Protected Areas

Directions 1 to 3 of the Road Map for African PAs

*With the support of the French Agency for Development (AfD), the Papaco has conducted a series of studies on governance of protected areas in Africa. This NAPA presents a summary of the results for **shared governance** (study conducted by IIED).*

See the full report on www.papaco.org

This study is part of a series of four studies on PA governance in Africa: the first one presented the global context of this governance, then the followings were about private governance and state governance (*see previous NAPA, 84, 85, 86 and 87*).

This study focuses on shared governance of protected areas (PAs) in sub-Saharan Africa and aims to highlight good governance practices for PAs in the region. Based on 10 case studies of shared governance of PAs from across five countries in Africa, as well as on information from the literature, the study identifies strengths, weaknesses, and conditions for success of shared governance, and provides recommendations on good practices for more effective and equitable shared governance in the future.

The shared governance study presented in this document has been restricted in scope to governance that involves local-level stakeholders (i.e. Indigenous Peoples, local communities and, in some cases, local government) alongside national level state actors – in other words we have excluded government-government forms of shared governance, government-private sector forms of shared governance, and private to community forms of shared governance.

Definition of shared governance

'Protected areas under shared governance are based on institutional mechanisms and processes which formally or informally share authority and responsibility among several actors' (Borrini-Feyerabend et al 2013).

The IUCN classification of PA governance types recognises three distinct forms of shared governance:

I. **Collaborative governance** – where decision-making authority and responsibility rest with one agency but the agency is required by law or policy to inform or consult other rights-holders and stakeholders at the time of planning or implementation

II. **Joint governance** – where the representatives of various interests sit on a governance body with decision-making authority and responsibility and take decisions together

III. **Transboundary governance** – where two or more national governments work together in a shared governance arrangement alongside other stakeholders and rights-holders.

This study focuses on types I and II as there are very few, if any, examples in Africa of type III transboundary governance that also have substantial engagement of local stakeholders. Furthermore it focusses specifically on shared governance between national government and local people or local government.

It can be useful to consider PA governance types as lying on a continuum along which the power balance moves increasingly away from the State and towards other actors moving from left to right (see fig 1). Shared governance is the middle ground, and within the shared governance zone this diagram identifies, from the perspective of the State, three forms of shared governance – on the left consulting with local stakeholders (= collaborative governance), in the centre negotiating specific agreements (relatively weak joint governance), and to the right of centre ceding authority (relatively strong joint governance).

Fig 1: the governance continuum from the perspective of a government agency (reproduced from Borrini-Feyerabend et al 2013)

This continuum helps to clarify the concept of shared governance but there is still considerable uncertainty over where the boundaries lie between – on the left - shared governance and State governance (also known as governance type A), and – on the right - between shared governance and community and private governance (governance types C and D).

Evolution of shared governance in Africa

By the mid-1990s, many countries worldwide were experimenting with shared governance of PAs including several in Africa (notably Uganda). At this stage the terms most widely used were 'co-management', 'collaborative management' and 'joint management' (Dearden and Bennett 2005). The finer details of these agreements differed according to the national and local contexts, but they broadly aspired to foster participation of different local stakeholders in PA governance.

Shared governance: a way to involve all PA management stakeholders (drawing Marc Châtaigner)

The Vth World Parks Congress in Durban in 2003 was a turning point in recognising the importance of governance type as a key characteristic of a PA alongside management category, and recognising that, in principle, all governance types can apply to all management categories (Borrini-Feyerabend, Pimbert, et al 2004). Strongly influenced by this outcome, the VIIth Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in Kuala Lumpur in 2004 adopted a comprehensive Programme of Work on PAs, committing countries through programme element 2 to recognise various PA governance types, and to implement plans to involve communities in PA governance.

Associated with this increased attention to PA governance was growing recognition of the need to differentiate between PA management (what is to be done by whom) and PA governance (who decides what is to be done). Within the world of biodiversity conservation, this led to the PA co-management discourse that started in the mid-90's becoming absorbed into a broader discourse on PA shared governance – a trend which was already clearly evident at the World Parks Congress in 2003. However this shift in the discourse (and associated terminology) from management to governance has not been so evident in the forest and marine sectors where experience (e.g. from participatory forest management (PFM) and locally managed marine areas (LMMAs) reveals many successful examples of what clearly qualifies as shared governance but where the terminology still retains a focus on management. Whether or not PFM sites and LMMAs all "count" as protected areas is debatable since many do not have an explicit biodiversity conservation objective, but even if we use the IUCN definition of a PA[1], which is narrower that the CBD definition[2], a substantial number of forests with PFM and fisheries with LMMA's would certainly still qualify.

Why shared governance?

At the Vth World Parks Congress in Durban in 2003, the recognition of co-management was perceived as an important step to strengthen the management of existing PAs and build the resilience, coverage and connectivity, and sustainability of PA systems worldwide (Borrini-Feyerabend, Johnston and Pansky 2006). Additionally, it was considered that co-management could help augment public support and build strategic partnerships with local communities and Indigenous Peoples who are, alike to conservationists, fighting to retain land in the face of competing interests and demands (Borrini-Feyerabend, Pimbert, et al 2004, Gadgil et al 1993 & Kempf 1993 in Adams and Hutton 2007).

Such expectations were shaped by early experiences in the practice of exclusionary PA models. Although often successful in strict conservation terms many argue that conservation of biodiversity is inseparable from people, and therefore little will be achieved over the longer term without their inclusion (Borrini-Feyerabend et al 2013). In contrast to exclusionary models, shared governance insists that conservation practices should recognise that Indigenous People and local communities have unique knowledge, skills,

[1] A protected area is a clearly defined geographical space, recognised, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values

[2] A geographically defined area which is designated or regulated and managed to achieve specific conservation objectives

resources and institutions that could be invaluable to PA governance and management (Borrini-Feyerabend, Chatelain and Hosch 2011, Borrini-Feyerabend et al 2013). By combining the strengths, and overcoming the weaknesses, of all partners within and across different scales, it is thought that shared governance arrangements can establish coherent and long lasting protected area institutions (Lockwood, Wordboys and Kothari 2006, Kothari, Camill and Brown 2013).

What does shared governance look like?

Analysis of shared governance examples from all over the world has identified the following key ingredients of true shared governance (Borrini-Feyerbend et al 2013): a negotiation process; a co-management agreement; and a multi-stakeholder governance institution. The process of reaching out to different and stakeholders, ideally, begins from the early planning and design of a shared governance system (Borrini-Feyerabend, Pimbert, et al 2004). Different actors are likely to have different stakes and entitlements in a shared governance arrangement and as such, through a negotiation process, they may take on equal or differential weightings in decision-making (ibid).

Features that are perceived as important to systems of shared governance include openness to various types of natural resource entitlements (not just those legally recognised), recognition of civil society's ability to assume significant and more responsible roles, and foresight to link entitlements with responsibilities (Borrini-Feyerabend, Farvar, et al 2007). The recognition of such features can be a good indicator of a strong versus weak governance system, although, it is important to understand that context is important, and a shared governance system should not be judged in isolation (ibid). Above all else, an effective shared governance system should illustrate the greater mutual benefit of collaboration (Kothari 2006).

Trends in shared governance in Africa

An analysis of the World Database on Protected Areas reveals that only 1945 of the total of 7064 PAs in Africa (27%) reported on their governance type and only 2% of these reported their governance type as being shared. The growth in shared governance, such as it is, mainly took place in the 1990s and 2000s, and may now be tapering off. That said, the decline in the percentage of new PAs that are reporting shared governance may also reflect different levels of investment in collecting information from different types of PA and/or incorrect classification of some shared governance as community governance which has seen very large growth over the same period.

Shared governance: more stakeholders, more sustainable decisions (drawing: Marc Châtaigner)

Where shared governance regimes have been attempted, frequently they have involved transferring management responsibilities without conceding significant authority over decision-making. At Moheli Marine Park in the Comoros Islands, for example, the co-management process included community members in park boundary delineation and guideline creation, and transferred responsibility for monitoring and enforcement within the park through training eco-guards (Granek and Brown 2005). However the co-management agreement did not transfer any clear rights to allow local communities to participate and shape decision-making for the marine park.

A similar story emerges from a review of the experience of co-management in Uganda, a country that was at the forefront in developing co-management in the 90s (Blomley and Namarra, 2013). The review concludes that while there has been a substantial transfer of responsibilities from the Uganda Wildlife Authority to local communities and local government, notably in addressing human wildlife conflict, there has been little real devolution of authority and resources. The shared governance institutional arrangements that were established by many PAs in the late 90s in most cases collapsed once the support of NGOs disappeared. However, although Uganda no longer has what can truly described as shared governance, there is some positive legacy from the investment in co-management in the form of local level resource use agreements, and, more broadly, a form of state governance that is more consultative than might otherwise have been the case.

Another common problem for shared governance arrangements is elite capture as illustrated by a review of co-management in the fisheries programmes of Niger, Cameroon, Zambia, Malawi and Nigeria (Bene et al 2009). The review revealed that co-management had altered the distribution of power and responsibilities, but that this had been in favour of local powerful actors (ibid). Where co-management had acted to foster the participation of legitimate groups of end users, participation had commonly been used as an instrument for implementation rather than an effective and empowering involvement in decision-making (ibid).

The limited progress of shared governance regimes for conservation is not unique to Africa, but has been experienced worldwide. While the concept and principles of shared governance are well established, changes to policy and laws have been slow, and progress towards the implementation of these has been slower (Kothari, Camill and Brown 2013). Explanations for slow progress vary from country to country, but common problems include differing expectations as to what devolution is supposed to achieve and how, and a pervasive assumption by public officials that they have the knowledge and moral authority to make decisions (Shackleton et al 2002). However, as documented in some of the case studies that were analysed for this review, there are still some successful examples of shared PA governance in Africa which lead us to believe that there remains an important role for shared governance under certain conditions.

Current status of shared governance five case study countries

Tanzania

Tanzania has a complex protected area network that includes National Parks, Game Reserves, Forest Reserves, Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs), Nature Reserves, Marine Parks and Marine Reserves. This network of protected areas covers about 30% of its territorial area (land and aquatic). Though not all of these PAs comply with the IUCN definition of PAs and PA management categories, the system has a good representation of the IUCN management categories.

Across the wildlife, forest and fisheries sectors mainland Tanzania currently has 215 protected areas with a shared governance type. The majority of these are in the forest sector (171 District forest reserves under PFM) followed by the wildlife sector (38 WMAs) and lastly the fisheries sector (6 Collaborative Fisheries Management Areas (CFMAs). The general trend is to an increasing number of all three types of shared governance PA, particularly CFMAs where key elements of the enabling policy are relatively recent (2003 and 2009), and on-going revision of the fisheries policy is expected to give further encouragement to the establishment of CFMAs.

Namibia

Namibia currently has a total of 270 registered protected areas, including 22 state governance, 153 private governance and 95 community governance. On paper there are no PAs under shared governance as there is no legal provision for this. However, in reality, all four of the state governed PAs that were included in this study have institutional arrangements in place to build relationships with neighbouring communities and are moving towards shared governance arrangements. Two of these state PAs (Bwabawata NP and Mangetti NP) have already moved far enough in this direction to be considered shared governance in terms of the criteria used in other countries to distinguish state from shared governance. However although both display elements of shared management, and provision for stakeholder input into some decisions, ultimately decision-making authority rests with the state. For this reasons we classify these two PAs as being collaborative rather than joint governance.

Namibie (photo : Nils Oddendal)

Madagascar

Madagascar has been undergoing a process of rapid evolution in protected area governance for more than a decade. Prior to this, all PAs within the national network were governed by the state, initially the Ministry of Waters and Forests until a parastatal association, ANGAP[3], was created in 1991 specifically to assume management responsibility. ANGAP was subsequently rebranded Madagascar National Parks (MNP). By 2003 the MNP network consisted of 47 sites covering almost 1.7 million hectares comprising 'strict' protected areas in IUCN categories Ia (Strict Nature Reserve), II (National Park) and IV (Special Reserve). At the 5th World Parks Congress in 2003 Madagascar launched its "Durban Vision" to triple protected area coverage, precipitating the adoption of multiple-use categories (III, V and VI) and other governance models. Two major trends have subsequently developed, i) the establishment of a new generation of multiple-use protected areas, largely promoted by NGOs and administered with shared governance structures involving local community associations and regional authorities, and ii) the progressive transition of the original protected area network from state governance to shared governance between MNP and local community representatives. The two sub-networks (hereafter called MNP and non-MNP) together form the Madagascar Protected Area System (SAPM) which has the objectives of i) conserving Madagascar's unique biodiversity, ii) conserving the country's cultural heritage, and iii) promoting the sustainable use of natural resources for poverty alleviation and development.

Consultation with local stakeholders in Andringitra NP (MNP network)

Within the MNP network all 51 PA's are moving to shared governance in line with the provisions of the 2014 strategic management plan for the MNP network. At present shared governance arrangements within the MNP network are variable. For example, Beza Mahafaly National Park has been co-managed by a University for many years, while the recently created Nosy Tanikely Marine National Park is administered in a three-way arrangement involving MNP, the Commune (municipality) of Nosy Be, and the Nosy Be Regional Tourism Office. In addition, MNP increasingly seeks to establish management partnerships with specialist institutions for the expansion and professionalization of key services, e.g. tourism infrastructure provision, applied research, and small-scale private sector enterprise development. More typically, however, the principal stakeholders in governance are adjacent rural communities.

All protected areas in the non-MNP network – 93 at the time of writing - have a legally recognised "promoter", in most cases Malagasy or international NGOs, although mining companies, universities and private individuals have also taken the initiative to establish new sites. These are largely established as category V or VI, although some have embedded category III zones. Their governance structures have evolved through 'learning-by-doing' over recent years. Early versions of the management plans of some sites proposed community-based management with the promoter NGOs playing only a supporting role, however it was clear that these proposals concealed the reality of promoters as *de facto* co-managers/managers providing the funds, technical capacity, and, most importantly, driving force.

Gambia

The Department of Parks and Wildlife Management (DPWM) is the government agency responsible for the management of protected areas established under the Biodiversity and Wildlife Act 2003. The establishment of protected areas under this act dates back to1968 when the famous Abuko Nature Reserve was established as an important water catchment area, supplying the capital, Banjul and its surroundings settlements. The Government of The Gambia (GOTG) then developed legal and institutional frameworks necessary for the protection, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. To date, a total of seven wildlife PAs have been declared. Two of these can be classified as shared governance but only one of these (Tanbi) involves local communities in the governance arrangement.

In addition to PAs established by DPWM, there are PAs that are under the Department of Forestry (DoF). These are classified under three main

[3] *Association National pour la Gestion des Aires Protégées* or National Association for Protected Area Management

categories – State Forests, Participatory Forest Management (PFM) and private forests (number unknown). As in Tanzania, most of the PFM in Gambia is regarded as a form of shared governance, and these forests have a protection objective alongside other objectives. However, it is not clear to what extent they conform with the IUCN and CBD definitions of a PA and therefore we have not included any as case studies for this review, but it should be noted that Gambia was for some years recognised as a leader in shared governance in the forest sector in Africa.

Republic of Congo

In 2000, the Republic of the Congo began a far reaching reform of the legal and institutional framework of the environment and forest sectors. In this process, the forest code and subsequent texts were revised several times, as was the law on wildlife and protected areas. The current strategy aims to balance ecological, economic and social objectives. In the social dimension there is a commitment to promoting participatory management to boost the involvement of all stakeholders in PA management and make the most of the artistic, artisanal, cultural and spiritual potential of local communities.

Of the total land area of the Republic of Congo 65% is covered by natural forest and a total of 17 PAs make up 12% of the land area. The commitment to participatory management is reflected in the fact that 8 of these 17 PAs are now under shared governance following a major move to bring NGOs into the management, and to some extent the governance, of PAs. In most cases this is based on 5 year renewable agreements, but in one case, Odzala Kokoua National Park, the agreement is for 25 years. We believe that this case should be regarded as private governance according to the IUCN definitions of private governance and community governance which both imply that governance type is defined by where decision-making authority lies rather than ownership per se (all PAs in Congo being State-owned).

Of the remaining 7 PAs that clearly conform to the definition and characteristics of shared governance only one (Lac Tele) has significant community participation in governance and thus only this PA qualifies as shared governance for the purposes of this review. Even in this case the governance type is borderline state/shared governance.

Shared governance strengths and weaknesses

The following sub-sections present an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of shared governance that are evident from the cases studies that we have examined and also from our literature review. We focus in particular on strengths and weaknesses that appear to be inherent to the governance type (i.e. excluding those that are very site specific). As an analytical framework we use the five PA governance quality principles that have been elaborated in the IUCN Best Practice Guidelines on Governance of Protected Areas (Borrini-Feyerabend et al 2013) – legitimacy and voice, direction, performance, accountability, and fairness. These governance principles are drawn from a framework developed by the Institute on Governance (Graham et al, 2003). This framework also includes sub-principles and we use these 9 sub-principles as headings for the sections that follow.

Participation

The defining characteristic of shared governance is the provision of opportunities for local stakeholders to participate in PA governance and thereby have significant influence over decision-making – in some cases across all aspects of PA management while in other cases limited to certain specific areas of PA management activity. This participation of local stakeholders should, if all goes well, improve both the effectiveness and equity of PA management. Furthermore, participation of local stakeholders helps to boost the legitimacy of the PA in the eyes of local stakeholders – increasingly important in an increasingly political debate on alternative forms of land use. Which local stakeholders are invited to participate and how they are represented in shared decision making platforms and processes is a critical issue and it is here that we see the weaknesses emerge. As with other local level decision making processes, PA governance is prone to domination by more powerful social groups and exclusion of other stakeholder groups that tend to be marginalised e.g. by gender and/or ethnicity. Engaging existing customary institutions is generally a good idea but it is important to keep in mind that these institutions may suffer from real governance problems of their own.

Consensus orientation

Good multi-stakeholder governance is characterised by consensus-based decision-making. While this is generally accepted to be best practice, decision-making by consensus can be more time-consuming and costly than might otherwise be the case, and may not always deliver the best decisions. Also, although none of our case studies raised this issue, consensus-based decision-making presumably only works when there is some degree of trust between stakeholders, or, to put it another way, it is unlikely to work, and shared governance itself is unlikely to work, in situations of serious conflict between key stakeholders. Where a top down governance system evolves into shared governance, another key concern is how mind-sets of the past may continue to influence perceptions and attitudes, both on the government side and with local stakeholders who may find it hard to adjust to the idea that they can, and should, have real influence. In other words, consensus that gives the impression of a level playing field may in fact mask power relations that are, in reality, little changed.

There is no minimum age required to engage in shared governance! - Photo: Arsène Sanon (UICN)

<u>Strategic vision</u>

From the perspective of strategic vision, there is a very compelling argument for shared governance – if you accept that a PA is a multi-functional landscape (i.e. it must deliver on multiple objectives of the different legitimate stakeholders) then shared governance is simply an attempt to align the governance of the PA with this pluralistic vision. But what if the vision is predefined and cannot realistically be changed – for example, as illustrated by several case studies, where the PA management category implicitly prioritises the objectives of some stakeholders over the objectives of others. Then you may end up with the situation where the stakeholders whose interest are considered secondary feel that shared governance is little more than an attempt by the dominating stakeholders to co-opt them. Local communities engaged in participatory forest management in Tanzania have found themselves in this situation which they describe as “doing the governments work”.

<u>Responsiveness</u>

Responsiveness is about institutions and processes being responsive to the interests and concerns of all stakeholders, and providing effective and timely responses to reasonable demands. This is clearly an issue not just for shared governance but for all PA governance types. Recent research emphasises the importance of this issue not only in terms of the response itself, but also the fact that PA authorities have taken the trouble to recognise the issue and try to do something about it is important in its own right (Martin et al, 2013). To put it another way, a sense of injustice/inequity is fuelled as much by lack of recognition of a problem as by the actual cost of that problem. Since shared governance enables greater accountability it is likely to lead to more responsive PA management. On the other hand, participatory decision making can be a recipe for inaction – “participatory paralysis”. With our case studies it is hard to tell which predominates – shared governance leading to increased or decreased responsiveness - but since participatory paralysis is one of the main causes of death of shared governance (along with high transaction costs) we might conclude that increased responsiveness is more common.

<u>Effectiveness and efficiency</u>

Effectiveness and efficiency relate to the impact achieved versus resource deployed. Impact will be a mix of biodiversity conservation and sustainable development depending on the situation, but generally more the former. Whatever the balance, shared governance clearly has strong potential to deliver more effective PA management given the potential synergy that can be derived from different stakeholders pooling their knowledge and expertise. However the potential synergies of shared governance can be seriously undermined by the high transaction costs of maintaining the platforms and processes associated with shared governance, and many of our case studies refer to this problem. Although this has not yet proved fatal to any of them, there are other examples of efforts to promote shared governance in Africa that have collapsed mainly due to transaction costs – notably Uganda which was at the forefront in developing shared governance in the 1990’s but abandoned the key institutional arrangements that had been established with NGO support primarily due to the high cost of maintaining them. The up-front cost of establishing shared governance, in particular the investment in capacity building of all stakeholders, is also very high. One way of reducing these costs that is described in several of our case studies is to have localised shared governance arrangements nested within larger protected areas.

Shared or not, PA governance aims at conserving nature at the end (drawing: Marc Châtaigner)

Accountability

A governance arrangement where local stakeholders participate in a governance institution at PA level – fundamental to stronger forms of shared governance – is clearly beneficial in terms of greater accountability to local stakeholders, but it also brings new challenges of accountability. Not only must stakeholders engaged in governance be upwardly accountable to the relevant bodies at higher levels, but also they must be downwardly accountable to the local stakeholders whose interests they seek to address, and, in some cases, represent. Many of our case studies report problems with this downward accountability. A common problem is with defining who the community representatives should be accountable to. This is especially the case where downward accountability relies on existing structures of local government, or existing customary institutions, which may not be well aligned spatially with the PA-adjacent communities that are the main focus. Another common concern is that mechanisms for downward accountability (e.g. regular meetings at village level) are not clearly defined and thus reliant on ad hoc arrangements which are prone to elite capture and/or tokenism. Thus we have a situation where, on the one hand, shared governance has the potential to increase accountability, especially to local stakeholders, but on the other hand, if poorly executed, may make little difference, or even make matters worse by confusing the division of responsibilities and authority and the crucial relationship between these two.

Transparency

While transparency (availability of necessary information) is a prerequisite for good governance and this applies to all PA governance types, shared governance presents an additional challenge in that information must be shared across boundaries where there are often barriers to information flow e.g. government to civil society. A number of the case studies report challenges of this kind particularly in relation to PA-related revenue, and schemes to share part of this revenue with local communities. The key point here is that when government and local stakeholders commit to a shared governance arrangement for a PA they must understand the implications in terms of information sharing both in terms of what information needs to be shared, and how it will be shared. In other words, they must invest in effective communication with the key audiences.

Equity

Equity means different things to different people. Unpacking what equity means in the context of PAs is work in progress (see http://www.iied.org/equity-justice-ecosystem-services-what-do-we-mean).

For the purposes of this study we propose to use the following principle that is included in recommendation #29 of the 2003 World Parks Congress which seems to capture the essence of how equity is defined in the good governance framework that we are using: *Protected areas should strive to contribute to poverty reduction at the local level, and at the very minimum must not contribute to or exacerbate poverty.* This is often summarised as “do no harm and where possible do good”.

With equity defined in this way (i.e. in terms of social impact on local stakeholders) it seems logical that shared governance arrangements that increase the influence of local stakeholders in PA management should be more equitable than state governance or private governance arrangements that don’t. While we do see this in a number of our case studies, we also see evidence of problems that undermine the equity of shared governance, for example:

- Options for use of PA resources by local people can be constrained by the management category of the PA.
- High transaction costs to local stakeholders of participating in shared governance.

- PA benefits that can, by their nature, be targeted are not preferentially targeted at people who experience more PA-related costs

All stakeholders must engage for successful shared governance. - Photo: Arsène Sanon (UICN)

Social safeguards may be used to try to institutionalise equity provisions and Madagascar provides a good example of this where every PA is required by law to conduct a social impact assessment and develop a plan for mitigating any negative social impacts. This has been done in all of the Madagascar PAs included in this review but none has implemented these plans and indeed some aspects of the plans seem unrealistic (e.g. providing compensation for all negative impacts).

Equity is a critical issue for shared governance not only in terms of the ethical principle of do no harm/do good, but also in terms of the feasibility and sustainability of shared governance. If local stakeholders do not see a net benefit from shared governance then once initial expectations prove unrealistic they will drop out of the process.

Rule of law

The rule of law (i.e. legal frameworks should be fair and enforced impartially) is clearly crucial for all PA governance types. This can be a strength of shared governance in terms of the increased accountability that shared governance may provide. On the other hand, shared governance may be more vulnerable than other governance types to rule of law issues as this will undermine trust between government actors and local stakeholders. Our case studies report several examples of this, including a case of powerful interests operating behind the scenes which may be less evident but very damaging to the success of shared governance. One strength of strong models of shared governance that include a joint decision-making platform is that such platforms provide a natural forum to discuss and resolve grievances. Our case studies of state and private governance types did not include any such grievance mechanism. Compared with these other governance types, another potential strength of shared governance with respect to the rule of law is that it may take advantage of customary law and institutions, for example the “Dina” in Madagascar.

Each and every type of actor has the right and duty to participate - Photo: Youssouph Diedhiou (UICN)

Shared governance opportunities and limitations

The following sections describe the external factors that may enable or hinder the success of shared governance.

Long term commitment

Shared governance means that government agrees to share power (at least to some degree) with local communities and frequently with other local stakeholders such as local government. This requires political support at the highest levels within the PA Authority, its line Ministry (and beyond the ministry if changes in legal and policy framework are needed to implement shared governance). There is a very real risk that a country or particular PA may embark on shared governance only to find that the political climate changes and the necessary high level support evaporates. Amongst our case study countries Tanzania is showing signs of this problem – having strong policies and laws for shared governance already in place but, at least in some areas, lacking the political will necessary to implement the level of devolution of authority that is necessary for successful shared governance.

Financial security

The high on-going transaction costs of shared governance is always going to be a limitation of this approach and a potential killer risk, especially where costs of establishing shared governance has been met by an NGO and then the on-going costs have been inherited by government. Of course if shared governance can deliver more effective and equitable PA management, then some increase in financial investment by government would seem justified. However the budget of a PA authority is often capped by factors beyond its control. Even if shared governance delivers better results there simply isn't the finance to sustain this investment. If revenues decline then cuts will have to be made and the transaction costs of shared governance will be cut before law enforcement and other basic PA management functions. However, if shared governance could reduce law enforcement costs to government then we have a different scenario. This seems to be the case in Madagascar where the major expansion of the PA network announced in 2003 would not have been affordable without substantial cost-sharing with the NGO "promoters" and local communities. However, to what extent (i.e. at which sites) this will prove to be sustainable remains an open question.

A certain proximity if not trust between all categories of stakeholders is necessary - Photo: Youssouph Diedhiou (UICN)

Management flexibility

A flexible, adaptive approach to PA management is perhaps even more critical with shared governance than with other PA governance types because of the need to be responsive to a wider set of stakeholder interests, and the risk that a lack of response will undermine the trust on which the whole shared governance arrangement is built.

Local political support

Where local government is empowered to engage in shared governance this can be a strong enabling condition but at the same time poses risks. At least one of the case studies in Tanzania reports problems with local political agendas undermining PA governance. This may be an issue of specific local political issues playing out within PA governance or, more fundamentally, an issue of local government pushing for more pro-development strategies that may conflict with conservation objectives. Although this may look like a limitation of shared governance in the short term, it is perhaps more of a strength in the medium to longer term as it is better to have a platform where conflicting interests can be openly discussed and negotiated, than to ignore them. But this will only work if the local stakeholders feel that the "rules of the game" are fair. This emphasises the critical importance of the enabling policy and legal framework in defining these rules, and, most fundamentally, in defining the overall power balance within shared governance arrangements.

Recommendations for advancing shared governance

The following recommendations for extending shared governance to new PAs and strengthening existing shared governance arrangements are compiled from the case studies that we have analysed, focusing on those recommendations that are broadly applicable (rather than site specific).

Preconditions

- ***Institutionalisation***: shared governance needs to be institutionalised within the PA authority. Experimenting with elements of shared governance in advance of policy development may be OK so long as there is strong political support for the necessary institutionalisation measures.
- ***Financial viability***: there must be a viable financial plan for sustaining shared governance platforms and processes over the medium to longer term.
- ***Incentives for community engagement***: there must be sufficient incentive to motivate and sustain community engagement. Even if financial benefits are small or non-existent, non-financial benefits (e.g. ecosystem service values, sense of ownership) may be sufficient. Where incentives for effective community engagement are low explore ways to generate additional benefits (e.g. sharing revenues, payments for ecosystem services) and/or ways to reduce the transaction costs, e.g. simpler processes, more localised shared governance arrangements.
- ***Local ownership****:* Communities and other key local stakeholders must be actively engaged from the start to empower them and encourage ownership, i.e. avoid externally driven processes.

- ***Ambition***: the ambition for shared governance must cover longer term strategic decisions as well as operational decision-making.

Establishment

- ***Capacity building***: ensure the necessary investments in capacity building of both the PA staff local stakeholders
- ***Access to information***: ensure that all key stakeholders have the information they need to effectively participate in shared governance arrangements
- ***Good stakeholder analysis***: Ensure a robust and objective stakeholder analysis to identify the key stakeholders at all levels and their current and future level of interest and influence.
- ***Build on existing institutions*** of government and communities but beware of existing governance weaknesses in these institutions
- ***Downward accountability***: develop measures to promote and institutionalise downward accountability of community representatives to the people they are supposed to represent.
- ***Role of local government***: ensure that shared governance committees include representation from relevant local government agencies, especially those involved in land use e.g. agriculture.
- ***Formal agreements***: Formalise shared governance arrangements with agreements that clearly specify rights, responsibilities, rewards, grievance resolution arrangements etc.

Shared governance should include all relevant stakeholders, not only the usual ones - Photo: Youssouph Diedhiou (UICN)

Maintenance

- ***Adaptive approach***: ensure a flexible, adaptive approach to PA management planning that enables responsiveness to emerging issues, and shared governance itself to evolve over time.
- ***Regular assessment***: conduct participatory social and governance assessment on a regular basis, even if only at a very basic level.
- ***Foster strong leadership***: identify and support good leaders
- ***Affirmative action***: provide specific support to stakeholder groups that may otherwise be excluded (e.g. women, minority ethnic groups).
- ***Recognise good performance***: look for ways to recognise and, as appropriate, reward good shared governance e.g. through competitions, positive media coverage

Conclusion

This report focuses on shared PA governance where authority and responsibility is shared between state actors and non-state actors at the local level, including indigenous and/or local communities. The overall picture emerging from our literature review and case studies of this form of shared governance in sub-saharan Africa study is one of very mixed results. There are clear examples of success and also of failure, and many sites where the final outcome remains unclear. Which of these end up successful and which fail will depend crucially on the perceived benefits of shared governance in terms of effectiveness and equity, and how the various actors respond to the weaknesses and limitations that we have documented.

There is a clear rationale for shared governance. As reflected in the visions of the PA authorities of our case study countries, a given PA has multiple conservation and sustainable development objectives. These multiple objectives reflect the interests of different stakeholders groups from global to local levels and it makes perfect sense to have the more significant of these groups engaged in PA governance both from the perspective of effectiveness and equity.

More equitable (i.e. fairer) PA management and governance is both a desired outcome of shared governance and also a condition for its success, i.e. local stakeholders will only participate if they feel that they are getting a fair deal, or at least moving towards a fairer deal. Fairness/equity is not only about the balance of financial benefits and costs. It is also very much about factors that cannot easily be valued such as ecosystem services, recognition of rights, sense of ownership, fair processes. A fundamental challenge for shared governance is where the potential to offer local stakeholders a fairer deal is constrained by the interests of more distant stakeholders e.g. in watershed protection, globally important biodiversity, carbon. In the case of PAs this may be reflected in the PA management category that, in effect, predefines some objectives and acceptable trade-offs. So although all PA governance types can, in principle, apply to all PA management categories, shared governance may be less likely to succeed where the objectives of the PA severely constrain the opportunity to address local stakeholder interests.

The success of shared governance is also very much dependent on the transaction costs related to participation of local stakeholders in shared governance – both to the PA authority and local stakeholders themselves. Where external actors such as NGOs have established high cost shared governance arrangements and then handed these over to government they have often collapsed. For local stakeholders another key cost issue is the time that they put into conservation activities (e.g. assisting with law enforcement) that is generally assumed to be a voluntary contribution.

Different approaches to PA shared governance lie on a power-sharing continuum (see fig 1). On the left side there are a large number of State governed PAs that are increasing adopting and institutionalising consultative approaches (i.e. moving into collaborative governance). This may involve creating new multi-stakeholder institutions (e.g. committees) but these are by no means essential in collaborative governance. The benefits to local stakeholders of this form of shared governance may be only modest but where transaction and conservation activity costs to local stakeholders are not high then there seems to be a good chance of success, especially where innovative approaches to enhancing local benefits can be devised, e.g. use of certain PA resources, sharing of revenues. As we have seen from our case studies in Namibia, Congo and the Gambia, there seems to be a real opportunity for many PAs that are currently under state governance to evolve in governance terms to this form of relatively light shared governance.

On the right hand side of the shared governance continuum which borders community governance we have situations where substantial authority has been given to local stakeholders (joint governance). A multi-stakeholder institutions (e.g. committee) where stakeholders make decisions collectively is essential in this stronger form of shared governance. The costs to local stakeholders of this form of shared governance will inevitably be higher and therefore the benefits must also be higher which generally means higher levels of sustainable use. However, non-financial benefits can also be very important in this respect, as illustrated by the success of many Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs) where non-financial benefits are often the main consideration.

While shared governance faces challenges right across the continuum it is arguably the middle ground where the problem really lies. Here the reality of shared governance is often the worst of both worlds – high transaction and conservation activity costs but insufficient authority and benefits to local stakeholders to justify their participation beyond a “honeymoon period” of unrealistic expectations. In conclusion, in the context of countries in sub-saharan Africa where resources for PA management are generally very constrained, the more fertile ground for shared governance seems to be on the left hand side of the continuum (authority largely with the PA authority with communities and other local stakeholders having substantial influence), or on the right hand side (authority largely with local stakeholders but with the PA authority retaining substantial influence and, on some issues, control). The apparent asymmetry of this last statement – that government retains some control at the right-hand side of the continuum while local stakeholders may have no control as such on the left side - simply reflects the legitimate role of any State, in Developed and Developing Countries alike, to retain some degree of control over the use of land and natural resources which exists even in relation to private property (e.g. through planning regulations).

This review charts the rise, and in some case the fall, of shared governance in sub-saharan Africa over the last 25 years with a particular focus on five countries. Although there have been some notable failures, and the rate of growth in shared governance has fallen in the last ten years, there still seem to be many successful examples, and the recommendations from our analysis suggest how these might be further strengthened and effectively replicated.

Read the full report on www.papaco.org

Ranger Training Opportunities in Conjunction with the 8th World Ranger Congress

Together with the World Ranger Congress to be held in May, 2016 in Colorado, USA, the Center for Protected Area Management at Colorado State University (CPAM), will be organizing two nine-day ranger training courses, in English and in Spanish.

These courses will offer hands-on learning opportunities for rangers from around the world, provide participants with an extended technical visit to a variety of types of protected areas demonstrating different management approaches in the western United States, and allow them to form a community of practice and learn together with colleagues from around the world.

The pre-Congress training in English will visit the western part of Colorado and Utah including Mesa Verde, Arches, and Great Sand Dunes national parks and other protected areas managed by federal, state, and local agencies. Dates are May 12-21, 2016.

The post-Congress training for Spanish-speaking rangers will visit Yellowstone and Grand Teton National parks and other protected areas in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. Dates are May 27-June 5, 2016.

Click here http://warnercnr.colostate.edu/world-ranger-congress-2016 to learn more about these courses and potential sources of funding and to submit an application. Applications are due by October 31, 2015 but CSU recommends you apply as early as possible to increase the possibility of scholarship support and to ensure adequate time for applying for US visas where needed.

NAPA – CONTACTS www.papaco.org and www.iucn.org

geoffroy.mauvais@iucn.org Program on African Protected Areas & Conservation
beatrice.chataigner@iucn.org PAPACO - Program Officer – Green List

The opinions expressed in this newsletter do not necessarily reflect those of IUCN