Protected areas under shared governance: inspiring solutions for adaptive co-management

WORKSHOP SUMMARY REPORT

Event co-leaders:	Ro Hill, Alina Ionita, Barbara Lang and Erika Stanciu
Time and date:	15 November 2014, 13:30-17.00 (double session)
Rapporteurs:	Jocelyn Davies
Presenters:	Jean Eric Rajaobelinirina, Dancilla Mukakamari, Klaus Schmitt, Alex Tanody, Glaudy Perdanahardja, Evan Loveless, Doug Neasloss, Michèle Andrianarisata (and team), Ferdy Louisy, Philippe Ospital, Dominique Duval-Diop, Colin Ingram (and team), Alina Ionita, Hubert Geraux, Andrzej Raj, Jan Hřebačka, Marc J. Stern, Ro Hill (and team), Hartono Hartono, Bambang Supryanto, Martin Labo, Rudy Valdivia and Pedro Gamboa

Presentations and discussions were conducted on success stories, progress and enabling factors for sharing power/authority, responsibility and accountability in protected areas under shared governance. Challenges and key recommendations were identified by building on the lessons learned from the diverse case studies presented during the workshop. Presentations made by representatives of different actors involved in shared governance allowed for different perspectives and views.

About 120 people were involved in the discussions during the World Café sessions in which speakers presented their case studies and discussed them in small groups on the 3 main themes of the workshop: Theme A on *Making the case for shared governance*, Theme B on *Moving from top-down to shared governance* and Theme C *Making shared governance work over time*. Workshop facilitators, presenters and participants then together clustered messages from all the small group discussions to arrive at the key ideas, messages or recommendations.

Key emerging lessons:

1. Shared governance brings positive outcomes, notably for communities, in terms of income as well as empowerment or a sense of ownership and control of their local environment. Government benefits include win-win situations in terms of community relationships, and improved understanding amongst government personnel of the perspectives and issues of indigenous, local and other stakeholder groups. Conservation benefits were initiated sometimes by government policy or government endorsed

initiatives that led to reinforcement or change in community norms and behaviours that supported conservation.

2. Shared governance practices are extending, but even when becoming prevalent, sometimes there are still tensions or questions about the extent to which power is really shared equitably. In many cases shared governance is new or still developing, with much to learn about its sustainability over time. A combination of enabling legislation, policies and high-level political will with community motivation and action is important to initiating shared governance and its sustainability.

3. Recognition of rights and title of community actors are commonly seen as important to effective legal frameworks but are not universal practice. Devolution of responsibilities for governance and management through contracts from government to local authorities and communities are amongst alternative arrangements.

4. Capacity building is important for all parties, requiring planning and a coherent approach.

5. The need for building trust among the diverse partners in shared governance arrangements and to secure gender equity and empower women to improve shared governance and secure it in the long term, were considered important by some of the groups.

6. Community based monitoring can become a valuable approach for improving shared governance.

Original presentations and report are available in the event's folder (see link in annexed "Repository of original Powerpoint presentations and Rapporteur reports").

Key recommendations:

1. Legal frameworks need to be very clear about who has responsibilities and power, but should also have flexibility for adaptation and application to diverse local settings. The outcome of whatever legislation and policy is in place must be that communities/local actors are recognised by others including governments as partners who have an assured voice in decisions.

2. Capacity building for all the actors involved in shared governance to develop new skills, knowledge and understandings for effective collaboration, including understanding of each other's perspectives, is essential and should be an ongoing process, based on a capacity building plan. This should include developing a common understanding of terminology used, notably the meaning of and expectations for 'benefit'.

3. Provisions for shared governance need to emphasise and put in place mechanisms for transparency, open access to information and sharing of information as these are essential for creating an environment of trust.

4. Tools, case studies and stories should be shared to help illustrate and build understanding of the many dimensions of trust (rational, related to performance, affinitive, related to relationships; and systems based, related to procedural elements), a key ingredient of effective collaborative processes, including shared governance.

5. Toolkits for community planning and for monitoring the process and outcomes of shared governance should be promoted to contribute to transparency of information, shared learning and adaptation.

6. Explore and raise awareness of benefits to private and public sector actors from partnerships that resource shared governance. It is important to work with stakeholders to identify their ideas about what constitutes benefits from their perspectives and contexts.

7. Gender equity should be given specific attention in governance structures and processes and in planning for and monitoring outcomes.

This event has been instrumental in directly/indirectly shaping the following recommendations of the Stream:

Rec#	Title
1	Enhancing governance
2	Standards and guidance
4	Collective rights and responsibilities
7	Shared governance
9	Aarhus and beyond
15	Governance capacity
16	Innovative legal guidance
17	Justice and redress
18	Governance data and analyses