

The Common Property Resource Digest

NO. 66 QUARTERLY PUBLICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF COMMON PROPERTY Sept. 2003

Greetings. This issue of the CPR Digest features a **Regional Beat** on **Latin America** that explores the biological and cultural diversity of Oaxaca, Mexico— home to the 10th biennial meeting of the IASCP August 9 – 13, 2004.

Regional Editor *Leticia Merino*, along with *Salvador Anta Fonseca*, leads off the CPR Regional Beat with a description of Community Management of Natural Resources in Oaxaca. The combination of natural and cultural diversity found in Oaxaca has led to the development of community-based conservation and natural resource management. Such historical developments, combined with contemporary initiatives touched upon in the article, have ensured that more than 12% of Oaxacan land is under sustainable management. Next *Ricardo Ramírez Domínguez* concentrates on community-based forest management in Oaxaca, explaining that forest management not only ensures sustainable forest use, but also equitable sharing of both benefits and responsibilities among forest owners. *Marco Antonio González Ortiz* concludes the Regional Beat with a description of the specific experience of the municipality of Santa María Huatulco. The municipality of Santa María Huatulco retained control of traditional lands included in a new national park precisely because of the value the community placed on collective decision-making. These essays provide a glimpse of the richness of the diversity found in Oaxaca and the value placed on cultural identity- expressed even through community-based management. This issue of the Digest also features the second announcement of The Commons in an Age of Global Transition: Challenges, Risks and Opportunities, the 10th Biennial Conference of the IASCP which will take place in August, 2004 in Oaxaca, Mexico. **Enjoy!**

CONTENTS	
Community Resource Management in Oaxaca	
El Manejo Comunitario De Los Recursos Naturales En Oaxaca <i>Salvador Anta Fonseca and Leticia Merino</i>	1
Community Management of Natural Resources in Oaxaca <i>Salvador Anta Fonseca and Leticia Merino</i>	3
El Manejo Comunitario De Los Bosques En Oaxaca <i>Ricardo Ramírez Domínguez</i>	5
Community-Based Forest Management in Oaxaca <i>Ricardo Ramírez Domínguez</i>	6
Las Estrategias Comunitarias Para El Mantenimiento De La Experiencia Santa Maria Huatulco, Oaxaca, Mexico <i>Marco Antonio González Ortiz</i>	6
Community-Based Biological Diversity Management Strategies: The Experience of Sanata Maria Huatulco, Oaxaca, Mexico <i>Marco Antonio González Ortiz</i>	7
Recent Publications	8
Announcements	11

REGIONAL BEAT Latin America

El Manejo Comunitario De Los Recursos Naturales En Oaxaca

Salvador Anta Fonseca y Leticia Merino
Consejo Civil Mexicano para la Silvicultura Sostenible, A.C. (CCMSS)
Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico

Oaxaca es el estado de mayor diversidad biológica de México, además de ser la entidad con el mayor número de grupos indígenas del país.

La superficie estatal es de 9.5 millones de Ha. de las cuales 54% está cubierto por bosques y selvas en buen estado de conservación. Los bosques templados abarcan 2.7 millones de Ha. y 2.3 millones de Ha. las selvas húmedas y secas. La diversidad de las áreas forestales de Oaxaca es resultado de su accidentada topografía y variedad climática. En Oaxaca pueden observarse bosques de pino, pino-encino, bosques de encino, selvas bajas caducifolias, selvas medianas subperennifolias, selvas altas perennifolias, bosques mesófilos y manglares principalmente.

En Oaxaca se encuentran los territorios históricos de 16 grupos étnicos: los Zapotecos, Mixtecos, Chinantecos, Mixes, Mazatecos, Chontales, Zoques, Chatinos, Amuzgos, Cuicatecos, Huaves, Ixcatecos, Chocholtecos, Triques, Tacuates y Afromestizos cuya población total suma de 1.6 millones de personas, que representan al 48% de la población estatal.

En el año 2002, 60% de la población oaxaqueña habitaba en áreas rurales lo que da una idea de la importancia de las actividades primarias y de manejo de los recursos naturales de la entidad. De los 9.5 millones de Ha. del territorio del estado, 77% es propiedad de comunidades rurales.

The Common Property Resource Digest

Published with support from
the Ford Foundation

Editor

Douglas Clyde Wilson

Assistant Editor

Alyne E. Delaney

Regional Editors

Salvador Anta, Leticia Merino and James Robson



International Association for the Study of Common Property

Current Officers

President: Erling Berge

President Elect: Narpat Jodha

Immediate Past President: Susan Hanna

Council

Antonio Diegues Owen Lynch

Ruth Meinzen-Dick Calvin Nhira

Dianne Rocheleau

Executive Director	Michelle Curtain
CPR Digest Editor	Doug Wilson
Information Officer	Charlotte Hess
Co-information Officer	Laura Wisen

Conference Coordinators

IASCP 2004

Leticia Merino

2003 Regional Meetings

Pacific Region John Sheehan

© 2000 IASCP
WWW.IASCP.ORG

En los territorios comunales se practican distintos tipos de usos y se reconocen distintos derechos de apropiación. Cada comunero dispone de una o mas parcelas para el usufructo personal que se emplean generalmente para la producción agrícola, además existen terrenos de uso común que se emplean para el aprovechamiento de los recursos forestales, como agostaderos, zonas de protección de sus recursos naturales, o sitios de extracción de especies silvestres.

La combinación de la riqueza natural y sociocultural de Oaxaca ha permitido el desarrollo de procesos históricos de conservación y manejo de los recursos naturales por parte de las comunidades campesinas e indígenas. Factores como la presencia de pueblos indios en gran parte del territorio oaxaqueño, la posesión y los derechos comunitarios sobre la tierra y sus recursos naturales, los extensos conocimientos locales sobre los procesos ecológicos de los ecosistemas y la férrea defensa del patrimonio natural de las comunidades han sido determinantes para mantener importantes áreas de bosques y selvas que presentan adecuadas condiciones de conservación, conectividad, biodiversidad y extensión. Este es el caso de selvas y bosques húmedos de los Chimalapas con mas de 400 mil Ha., de la Chinantla con alrededor de 180 mil Ha., de los bosques mesófilos de la Sierra Norte con 152 mil Ha., las selvas secas de la Costa e Istmo con 80 mil Ha. y los cerca de 1 millón de Ha. de bosques templados de la Sierra Norte y Sur de Oaxaca.

La conservación de estos ecosistemas se ha dado mediante procesos dinámicos de manejo, protección y aprovechamiento sustentable de los recursos naturales. Ejemplo de ello son las cerca de 150 comunidades forestales que cuentan con *Programas de Manejo Forestal*, en 650 mil Ha. bajo aprovechamiento forestal autorizado. La producción comunitaria de madera con fines comerciales genera ganancias anuales de 200 millones de pesos y emplea aproximadamente 22 mil comuneros en el estado.

Por otra Cerca de 30 comunidades cuentan con industrias forestales comunales, que les permite aserrar la madera, y en algunos casos generar productos de mayor valor agregado. El 15% de la superficie forestal con autorizaciones de extracción ha sido certificada bajo los criterios del Consejo Mundial forestal (FSC, Por sus siglas en inglés, Forest Stewardship Council.).

Además de la superficie bajo aprovechamiento forestal, un número importante de comunidades han desarrollado mecanismos comunitarios de protección de sus bosques y recursos naturales estableciendo *Áreas Comunales Protegidas* (ACP), a través de las cuales se conservan especies de plantas y animales silvestres, manantiales y "ojos de agua", reservas de madera, lugares simbólicos y simplemente paisajes. Actualmente 45 comunidades han adoptado este tipo de estrategia. La superficie bajo conservación comunitaria en Oaxaca suma actualmente 175 mil Ha. La extensión del conjunto de las ACP corresponden al 49% de la superficie protegida formalmente a través de *Áreas Naturales Protegidas* por el gobierno federal.

En los últimos seis años, las comunidades oaxaqueñas han incorporado nuevos esquemas de manejo y aprovechamiento de sus recursos a través del establecimiento de *Unidades de Manejo de Vida Silvestre* (UMAS), que el gobierno federal promovió para conservar, proteger y aprovechar las especies silvestres (fauna y recursos forestales no maderables). Las áreas de las UMAS en Oaxaca ascienden a 174 mil Ha. de bosques y selvas.

En estas y otras comunidades se están desarrollando procesos de producción sostenible, como es el caso de la producción de café orgánico. La cafecultura orgánica ha sido una estrategia que ha permitido a los campesinos acceder a mercados alternativos en los que obtienen un sobreprecio por el esfuerzo de proteger a la naturaleza y de producir sin agroquímicos. En el caso de Oaxaca se han establecido alrededor de 20 mil Ha. de café orgánico. Estas áreas se ubican en las zonas de transición entre y que se encuentran establecidas entre las zonas altas forestales maderables y las zonas bajas de conservación de selvas húmedas y secas. Otros productores han comenzado a establecer sus parcelas dedicadas a cultivos, basados en sistemas agroforestales o de agricultura de conservación, bajo los que se produce actualmente vainilla, tepejilote, palma camedor, piña y pita.

Por otra parte 36 comunidades han desarrollado procesos de *Ordenamiento Territorial Comunitario*, mediante los que las comunidades deciden los usos que se asignan a las distintas áreas de su territorio y las estrategias en que el manejo de estas áreas debe basarse. Las áreas de las comunidades que han desarrollado ordenamientos suman a la fecha 400 mil has. Todos estos procesos innovadores de manejo de los recursos naturales han sido apropiados paulatinamente por las comunidades oaxaqueñas, que han desarrollado nuevas normas que se incorporan a las regulaciones que gobiernan la vida comunitaria como lo son Estatutos Comunales y las normas internas de control y acceso a los recursos naturales.

El hecho de que en 12% del territorio oaxaqueño (1.2 millones de Ha) existen condiciones para el buen uso de los recursos naturales resulta sumamente relevante, como también lo es el que los esquemas institucionales y técnicos han sido desarrollados por comunidades indígenas. La conservación comunitaria en Oaxaca tiene como ejes la organización tradicional de los pueblos, la propiedad comunitaria, y la participación en la planeación de los usos de los recursos. Tiene como base el capital social de las comunidades, a la vez que contribuye de manera central a fortalecerlo y desarrollarlo.

Sin embargo es importante señalar que las oportunidades de replicar estas experiencias en otras comunidades y aún la permanencia de estas experiencias se ven limitadas por las condiciones que enfrenta en la actualidad el sector agrario mexicano: los bajos precios de los productos agropecuarios y forestales, el deterioro de las capacidades de competitividad de muchos productores en el contexto de los procesos de globalización y la continua migración que sufren las comunidades oaxaqueñas, y que a menudo las priva de los mejores cuadros de la comunidad.

Por otra parte la adecuación de las políticas de desarrollo agropecuario, ambiental y forestal no llegan a constituirse en instrumentos efectivos de promoción del desarrollo rural integral, además de que la articulación entre ellas es limitada. Los desafíos más importantes que en la actualidad las comunidades oaxaqueñas que han logrado avanzar en el buen manejo de sus recursos naturales son:

1. Avanzar en los procesos de gestión y decisión en el diseño y operación de políticas públicas a nivel regional y estatal.

2. Desarrollo de procesos de mercado y comercialización bajo esquemas alternativos (mercados orgánicos, certificados por su buen manejo, mercado justo)

3. Fortalecer los procesos de organización comunitaria y productiva.

4. Desarrollo de arreglos y acuerdos de gobernabilidad entre diferentes niveles de autoridad y espacios de participación.

5. Reconocimiento por parte de la sociedad de los servicios ambientales generados por estas comunidades, y disposición a pagarles por ello.

6. Diseño y operación de políticas públicas que fortalezcan los procesos de manejo comunitario de recursos naturales.

salvanta@yahoo.com.mx lmerino@servidor.unam.mx

Community Management of Natural Resources in Oaxaca

Salvador Anta Fonseca and Leticia Merino

Consejo Civil Mexicano para la Silvicultura Sostenible, A.C. (CCMSS)

Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

Introduction and Background

Oaxaca is the most biologically diverse state in Mexico as well as being home to the greatest number of indigenous groups in the country.

The state covers an area of 9.5 million hectares, of which 54% is covered by well-conserved forest. Of the total forest area, 2.7 million hectares are made up of temperate forest and 2.3 million hectares are covered by a mixture of humid and dry tropical forest. The temperate and tropical forests of Oaxaca are incredibly diverse, biologically speaking, thanks to the state's varied topography and climatic conditions. As such, Oaxaca is home to a range of forests, including pine, mixed pine-oak, oak, lowland dry forests, as well as humid high tropical forests, cloud forests and mangrove forests. These eco-systems are currently home to approximately 50% of Mexico's plant species, 40% of its mammals, 63% of its bird species, 26% of its reptile species, and 35% of the country's amphibians.

Apart from the state's biological richness, Oaxaca is also home to 16 distinct ethnic groups, these being the: *Zapotecos, Mixtecos, Chinantecos, Mixes, Mazatecos, Chontales, Zoques, Chatinos, Amuzgos, Cuicatecos, Huaves, Ixcatecos, Chocholtecos, Triques, Tacuates* and *Afromestizos*. The combined population of these groups is 1.6 million people, which represents 48% of the total state population.

In 2002, 60% of Oaxaca's population was living in rural areas whilst 40% were concentrated in urban zones. This gives one an idea of the important role that rural activities and natural resource management play within the state. Around 77% of Oaxaca's total land area is under some form of common property rights. This figure becomes much higher for those areas covered by forests. In these regions, land use takes on a dual functionality. Although each *comunero* has his own parcel of land that is typically used for some form of agricultural or agro-fishery.

activity, there are other areas of communal land that are used for: forestry activities; as dry pasture lands; as natural resource protection zones; or for sites devoted to the harvesting of wild animal and plant species.

In Oaxaca, this combination of natural and socio-cultural richness has led to the historic development of community-based conservation and natural resource management.

Thanks to the presence of indigenous peoples across most of Oaxaca – and the property rights they hold over their territories and natural resources, the traditional governance practices, the extensive knowledge they have acquired with regards local ecological processes, and the strong defense of their natural heritage – large areas of important temperate and tropical forest areas have been well conserved.

This is very much the case with the humid temperate and tropical forests of the *Chimalapas* region (over 400,000 hectares), the *Chinantla* region (with around 180,000 hectares), the cloud forests of the Sierra Norte (with 152,000 hectares), the dry tropical forests of the coastal and Tehuantepec regions (with 80,000 hectares), and the 1,000,000 plus hectares of temperate forest in the Sierra Norte and Sierra Sur of Oaxaca.

The maintenance and protection of these ecosystems has been the result of dynamic processes involving the management, protection and sustainable use of natural resources. Such an example includes the *Forest Management Programs* developed by over 150 forest communities, who have applied authorized timber extraction programs (for commercial purposes) to some 650,000 hectares of forest. This initiative has enabled these communities to obtain annual profits of over 200 million pesos (US\$20 million) and generate employment for approximately 22,000 community members. A large proportion of forest incomes has been used to improve communities well being, including investment in schools, health clinics, urban services and libraries.

Of the 150 communities that practice *Community Forestry*, around 30 communities have started their own community-based forest companies. Of the total forest area under authorized forest management schemes, 15% is certified under the criteria of the *Forestry Stewardship Council* (FSC) and corresponds to the communal land of 8 forest communities in the Sierra Norte and Sierra Sur regions.

In addition to the area under forest management schemes, 45 communities have developed community-based measures to protect and conserve their communal forest areas and natural resources, establishing *Community Protected Areas* (CPAs). Within these areas vegetation, wildlife, water sources, timber reserves, symbolic places and landscapes are actively protected. At present, CPAs in Oaxaca are covering an area of 175,000 hectares, which corresponds to almost 50% of the total area covered by all the National Protected Areas formally established by the federal government in this state .

In the last six years, Oaxacan communities have established new natural resource management schemes under the *Unidades de Manejo de Vida Silvestre* (UMAS). These wildlife management units allow communities to conserve and sustainably use local wildlife resources. An additional 170,000 hectares of temperate and tropical forests have now been registered and are being regulated under this new initiative.

Another land use change has seen around 20,000 hectares converted for organic coffee production, the majority of which are found in transition zones located between the higher altitude zones and conservation zones of humid tropical forest. A significant number of communities have developed organic coffee production as a strategy to tap into the alternative markets that provide higher prices in return for protecting the natural environment and producing coffee without the use of agro-chemicals. Most of these communities have been certified as organic coffee growers. Other rural producers have also begun to establish more environmentally friendly forms of land use through the use of agro-forestry or conservation agriculture in the production of vanilla, tepejilote, palma camedor, pineapple, and pita.

New participatory planning instruments looking to promote good local natural resource management and use are also being applied. These *Ordenamientos Territoriales Comunitarios* (or Community Land Use Planning) have been applied in 36 communities, covering a total area of 400,000 hectares. Such regulatory processes have been gradually assimilated by Oaxacan communities and incorporated into the internal norms and rules that govern community life (Communal Statutes).

Thanks to the many processes and initiatives touched upon by this article, more than 12% of Oaxaca's territory (1.2 million hectares) is under some type of sustainable management scheme. The fact that these schemes have been developed by communities of indigenous origin, is of great relevance to both Oaxaca's and Mexico's indigenous population, and above all for those who are interested in promoting sustainable management schemes among such groups.

Community-based organization, institutional arrangements for natural resource management and collective property regimes have enabled communities to manage large-scale resources, while strengthening and developing communities' social capital.

It is important to highlight, however, that the opportunities to broaden these initiatives are limited thanks to the considerable problems presently faced by the country's agrarian sector. The most important of these problems include the current depressed market prices in the agro-fishery and forestry sectors, the impact that globalization is having on the competitiveness of many third world producers, and continued out-migration, which leaves Oaxacan communities with a weakened and less productive resident population.

In addition to these problems, the country's current environmental, land tenure, agro-fishery and forest policies continue to be poorly integrated, and as such Mexico has failed to promote, in any effective way, a model for integrated rural development.

As such, the challenges that are presently faced by Oaxacan communities, as they attempt to strengthen resource management practices, are, among others:

1. To improve management and decision-making processes in the design and operation of public policies at the regional and state level.

2. To develop alternative market and commercialization schemes (organic markets, certified management schemes, fair trade)

3. To strengthen their institutions for communities and natural resources governance.

4. To develop governance agreements between different levels of authority and participatory spaces

5. To increase society's understanding and acknowledgement of the range of environmental services generated by these communities, and the efforts made to maintain them.

6. To design and operate public policies that strengthens communities' natural resource management institutions.

salvanta@yahoo.com.mx lmerino@servidor.unam.mx

REGIONAL BEAT Latin America

El Manejo Comunitario De Los Bosques En Oaxaca

Ricardo Ramírez Domínguez

Proyecto de Conservación y Manejo Sustentable de los Recursos Forestales

Durante los últimos 20 años, comunidades forestales de las Sierras Norte y Sur del estado de Oaxaca han construido esquemas de desarrollo comunitario en torno al uso sostenido de los bosques comunales. Las bases de este proceso ha sido el alto nivel de participación social en la toma de decisiones y la creciente apropiación comunitaria de los procesos y empresas productivas. En este periodo el uso de los bosques ha transitado desde la extracción comercial de madera, como actividad exclusiva, a un aprovechamiento integral del bosque que incluye:

La producción comercial maderable bajo criterios de sustentabilidad y certificación forestal. Esta producción es la actividad económica más importante en las regiones forestales del estado; representa el 10% del PIB estatal y genera alrededor de 40,000 empleos rurales.

Ocho comunidades oaxaqueñas (67,935 ha), han recibido el certificado de buen manejo forestal del FSC (Forest Stewardship Council, Consejo Mundial de Manejo Forestal) y cuatro más (28,001 ha) se encuentran en proceso de recepción del certificado. La certificación garantiza que los procesos de extracción forestal se sustentan en prácticas silvícolas orientadas hacia la conservación forestal, además de favorecer la calidad de vida de los comuneros.

La extracción de resina de pino se practica desde hace cinco años en regiones cuyos bosques poseen recursos maderables de reducido valor comercial, que a menudo son desmontados para ocupar las tierras en la agricultura de subsistencia. La resinación ha permitido generar empleos e ingresos en 13

comunidades de las regiones de mayor marginación social en el estado, a la vez ha favorecido la valoración social y la conservación de bosques que comúnmente han sido considerados "marginales".

La producción comercial de agua de manantial embotellada por empresas comunitarias, ha creado nuevas oportunidades de desarrollo en las 7 comunidades que la practican, generando cupación principalmente para mujeres, y desarrollando nuevas reglas de protección de los manantiales que existen en los bosques comunales.

El ecoturismo comunitario se ha desarrollado en los últimos años en comunidades poseedoras de grandes extensiones de bosques y atractivos naturales. La mayoría de los espacios dedicados al ecoturismo se localizan en las áreas comunales protegidas, definidas por las propias asambleas comunales, como una estrategia para la preservación autogestiva de ecosistemas forestales de interés para la conservación.

Para el uso y acceso a estas áreas se han elaborado también reglamentos y normas, basados en consensos de las comunidades y reglamentos para los visitantes externos.

Actualmente seis comunidades operan proyectos de ecoturismo comunal en áreas boscosas: Pueblos Mancomunados, Ixtlán, Santa Catarina Ixtepeji, San Miguel del Valle, Santiago Apoala y San Sebastián de las Grutas.

La producción de hongos comestibles genera ingresos económicos y alimentos para las familias campesinas y retoma conocimientos ancestrales sobre los recursos naturales. Esta producción se realiza con apeo a la normatividad ambiental y utiliza técnicas de recolección que no ponen en riesgo la permanencia del recurso. Actualmente existen unidades comunitarias de producción para shitake (*Lentinus edodes*) y zetas (*Pleurotus ostreatus*).

La producción de orquídeas y bromelias, se practica también con fines comerciales y se basa en técnicas de propagación vegetativa y por semilla. Algunas comunidades incluso cuentan con laboratorios biológicos atendidos por miembros de las mismas comunidades.

El manejo forestal comunitario en Oaxaca, obedece en todos los casos a reglas locales que buscan tanto el uso sostenido del recurso, como la participación equitativa de los dueños de los bosques en los beneficios y responsabilidades que implica su preservación. Se ha basado en el desarrollo técnico e institucional de las comunidades y en la creación de empresas comunitarias. Estos procesos son expresión del deseo de los pueblos forestales por lograr no sólo la viabilidad económica de sus empresas o la conservación de los ecosistemas, sino la permanencia de pueblos con identidad cultural propia.

rramirez@conafor.gob.mx

Community-Based Forest Management in Oaxaca

Ricardo Ramírez Domínguez

Proyecto de Conservación y Manejo Sustentable de los Recursos Forestales

Over the past twenty years, forest communities from Oaxaca's Sierra Norte and Sierra Sur regions have developed their own community-based schemes to promote the sustainable use of their forest resources. At the heart of this process has been a high level of social participation in decision-making and the increasing appropriation by communities of forest activities, including the creation of community-based forest companies. During this period, forest use has moved away from exclusive timber-based activities to a more integrated use of the forest resource, including:

Sustainable commercial timber production and forest certification. Timber production is the most important economic activity in Oaxaca's forest regions; contributing to around 10% of the state's gross internal product and generating around 40,000 jobs among the Oaxaca's forest communities.

By incorporating best management practices into their logging operations, eight communities in Oaxaca (67,935 hectares), have been awarded the certification of good forest management by the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and four more are in the process of receiving this award (28,001 hectares). Certification guarantees that forestry activities are oriented towards improving the quality and conservation of the forest ecosystem, as well as raising the standard of living of local communities.

The harvesting of pine resin has been practiced for the past five years in forest regions of low commercial value (known as "transition" forests), which are normally cleared to make way for subsistence agriculture. The harvesting of resin has created jobs and generated income in 13 forest communities located in some of the most socially marginalized areas of Oaxaca. One consequence of this new initiative has been the social and economic revaluation of forests by local communities, and renewed interest in the conservation of a previously considered marginal resource.

The commercial bottling of local spring water by community enterprises has provided new development opportunities for the seven communities that have begun such operations. In particular, this initiative has generated new employment opportunities for the women of these communities, and helped to design new rules protecting the springs that are found in the communal forest areas.

Community-Based Ecotourism has developed in recent years among communities whose territory includes large tracts of forest and areas of natural beauty. The majority of these natural spaces are located within community-managed protected areas or other zones that form part of a community's strategy to preserve forest ecosystems of high biological value.

To help govern the use of, and access to, these areas, the community authorities have created a set of rules and norms based upon the consensus of community members, along with regulations to guide the activities and movements of tourist visitors.

There are presently six communities in Oaxaca operating ecotourism projects on their communal forest land: Pueblos, Ixtlán

de Juárez, Santa Catarina Ixtepeji, San Miguel del Valle, Santiago Apoala and San Sebastián de las Grutas.

The cultivation of mushrooms provides both economic benefits and a food source for campesino families, as well as reviving traditional knowledge dating back from pre-Hispanic times. This activity is carried out with respect to local environmental conditions and makes use of harvesting techniques that do not place the resource at risk. At present, community production units are involved with the production of shiitake (*Lentinus edodes*) and zeta mushrooms (*Pleurotus ostreatus*).

The cultivation of orchids and bromeliads is another means of diversifying into a non-extractive, and therefore more environmentally friendly activity. In order to reproduce these plants, communities use both propagation and seed germination techniques; some of which involves work in a community-run biological laboratory, staffed by trained local community members.

Conclusion

Community-based forest management in Oaxaca responds in all cases to local norms and rules that look not just at sustainable resource use but also at the equitable sharing of both benefits and responsibilities among forest owners regarding the conservation of the forest resource. This has been based around technical and institutional development and the creation of community-based enterprises. These processes are an expression of the desire of forest communities to achieve not only economic viability (of their commercial enterprises) or the conservation of the natural resource base but, rather, to safeguard their own existence and unique cultural identity.

rramirez@conafor.gob.mx



Las estrategias comunitarias para el mantenimiento de la diversidad biológica: Revisión de la experiencia Santa María Huatulco, Oaxaca, México

Marco Antonio González Ortiz
Grupo Autónomo para la Investigación Ambiental, A.C.

México es el quinto país de mayor diversidad biológica en el mundo y Oaxaca es el estado de mayor biodiversidad en México. La mayor parte de la biodiversidad de Oaxaca ha sido preservada en ausencia de estrategias convencionales de conservación. Hasta la los 90's únicamente existían allí dos áreas naturales oficialmente protegidas, cuya superficie era menor a 2% del territorio estatal. En el 2000, la superficie de esas áreas representaba 5% de las tierras de Oaxaca.

Aún en ausencia de iniciativas gubernamentales de protección, Oaxaca continúa siendo el estado más bio-diverso del país México. Los actores de la conservación son en su mayoría comunidades cuyos esquemas de gobierno les han permitido establecer sistemas propios de manejo y protección del los territorios y recursos, aún en comunidades que cuentan con grandes

extensiones de tierra. En el marco de las estrategias comunitarias, la diversidad biológica se contempla como parte de los recursos necesarios para el desarrollo cultural y productivo, lo que estimula la inversión de esfuerzos significativos en labores de mantenimiento, resguardo y domesticación (culturización). Este es el caso de las comunidades del municipio de Santa María Huatulco, ubicado en la costa oaxaqueña.

En Santa María Huatulco se encuentra una porción importante de selvas secas con altas concentraciones de géneros y especies de vertebrados endémicos, cuyas poblaciones y hábitats presentan un alto grado de conservación. Esta fue una de las razones que motivó la creación del Parque Nacional Huatulco, cuya delimitación inicial incluía los territorios de la zona turística de Huatulco - expropiada poco antes a la comunidad de Santa María- y algo más de 5,000 has de terrenos también propiedad de esa comunidad. El cuestionamiento que la comunidad realizó a esa propuesta le permitió conservar el control de sus tierras. La exclusión de las tierras comunales de los terrenos asignados al Parque no obedeció a la falta de interés por la conservación por parte de la comunidad; implicaba hacer valer los mecanismos de control y decisión colectiva que la comunidad de Huatulco ha utilizado tradicionalmente.

A partir de la defensa de los derechos comunales, y con el apoyo del Grupo Autónomo para la Investigación Ambiental, la comunidad inició un proceso de reflexión sobre el futuro de las tierras, los recursos y la integridad comunitaria. Se elaboraron así distintos instrumentos que rigen las relaciones de la comunidad con los recursos naturales y el territorio:

- 1) Un plan de ordenación territorial, que redefine los límites de los diferentes usos del suelo y las estrategias para mejorar los sistemas productivos.
- 2) Un Sistema de administración de las áreas de reserva comunal, que asegura el resguardo de los espacios silvestres y permite brindar servicios ambientales.
- 3) Una estrategia de fortalecimiento institucional comunitario, mediante la readecuación del marco normativo, el desarrollo de cuadros técnicos comunitarios y la definición de un instrumento financiero local.

Actualmente el SCAP integra 13 áreas comunales protegidas y cubre una superficie de 8,128 has, 30% más de las del área terrestre del Parque Nacional. Pero además y a diferencia del Parque, el SCAP atiende las áreas de producción y manejo de los territorios comunales fuera de las reservas.

El activo proceso de gestión y capacitación que se desencadenó en Huatulco, generó interés de comunidades vecinas, cuatro de ellas, ubicadas en la cuenca Huatulco-Copalita han decretado zonas de protección comunitaria, integrando el Sistema Comunitario para la Biodiversidad (SICOB), que busca fortalecer los procesos locales de gestión territorial, optimizar las estrategias de uso del suelo, aumentar la estabilidad ambiental y la prestación de bienes y servicios ambientales, dentro de un modelo innovador de manejo de cuencas hidrológicas y preservación de recursos estratégicos

Community-based Biological Diversity Management Strategies:

The experience of Santa María Huatulco, Oaxaca, México

Marco Antonio González Ortiz

Grupo Autónomo para la Investigación Ambiental, A.C.(GAIA)

Mexico is regarded as the fifth richest country in the world in terms of biological diversity and Oaxaca is the state with the highest biological and cultural diversity in Mexico. Most of Oaxaca's biological diversity has been preserved in absence of any conventional conservation strategy. By the 1990s, there had been just two Protected Areas (PAs) officially established by the federal government, which accounted for only 2% of the state's territory. By 2000, although the PA program had increased in size somewhat, it still accounted for a little less than 5% of Oaxaca's total land area.

As such, Oaxaca continues to be the country's most biologically and culturally diverse state despite the absence of any concerted government initiative to protect its natural and cultural heritage. Rather, many Oaxacan communities have established their own resource management and conservation practices that provide them with a degree of protection against environmental change. In a number of regions this has translated itself into the establishment of community-based strategies and schemes that have come to manage and conserve extensive bio-diversity rich areas. Within these strategies, biological diversity is regarded as part of the natural resource base that contributes to the community's cultural and economic development, and, consequently, this has encouraged significant investment (in terms of both time and money) in the maintenance, protection and domestication of such resources. This has certainly been the case for those communities that make up the municipality of *Santa María Huatulco*, on Oaxaca's south coast.

Santa María Huatulco is home to an important area of well-conserved dry tropical forest that is renowned for its high concentrations of endemic vertebrate species. This was one of the main reasons behind the creation of the Parque Nacional Huatulco, whose initial demarcation was to include the tourist area of Huatulco and a little more than 5,000 hectares of land belonging to the community of *Santa María Huatulco*. Community concerns regarding the park's establishment, however, enabled it to retain control of its land. The exclusion of community land from the area assigned to the park was not down to a lack of interest in the area's conservation on the part of the community, but, rather, it was driven by the value the community attached to the long-standing collective strategies and decision-making processes that it had developed over centuries.

With support from the Oaxacan NGO, *Grupo Autónomo para la Investigación Ambiental* (GAIA), 13 communities began a program to promote community and park coexistence. This program included initiatives and activities such as:

- * Territorial mapping and zoning, which helped redefine the boundaries of different land use areas, in addition to strategies to help improve productive systems.

An administrative system to cover the “communal” reserve areas (now called the Sistema Comunal de Áreas Protegidas (SCAP)), which guaranteed the protection of wilderness zones and environmental services.

A community-level institutional strengthening strategy, achieved through the realignment of the community’s normative framework, the creation of community technical teams and the development of a local financial instrument for sustainable development.

At present, the SCAP includes 13 communal protected areas, covering 8,128 hectares, which is 30% more than that covered by the official National Park. In contrast to park management, the SCAP also attends to those communal production and management areas found outside the community reserves.

The negotiation, training and operations that began in Huatulco has attracted the attention of other communities, allowing the program to expand to four more communities of the Huatulco-Copalita water basin. This new regional conservation initiative, called *Sistema Comunitario para la Biodiversidad*, strengthens territorial management processes, improves land use strategies, increases environmental stability, and protects environmental goods and services.

maglezo@mesoamerica.org.mx, gaia@spersaoaxaca.com.mx

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Charlotte Hess

Books

Ainslie, A., and T. Kepe, eds. 2002. *Cattle Ownership and Production in the Communal Areas of the Eastern Cape*, South Africa. Cape Town: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies.

Andersen, L. E. 2002. *The Dynamics of Deforestation and Economic Growth in the Brazilian Amazon*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Denyer-Green, B. 2003. *Law of Commons, Town and Village Greens*. Bristol: Jordans.

Dutta, B. 2002. *Networks and Groups: Models of Strategic Formation*. London: Springer.

Gallardo Fernández, G. L. 2002. *Communal Land Ownership in Chile: The Agricultural Communities in the Commune of Canela, Norte Chico (1600-1998)*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Hoffman, A. J., and M. J. Ventresca, eds. 2002. *Organizations, Policy and the Natural Environment: Institutional and Strategic Perspectives*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kanel, K. R., M. B. Karmacharya, and B. K. Karna, eds. 2003. *Human-Institutional Natural Resources Interactions: Understanding the Interface Between Social and Natural Resource Systems*. Kathmandu, Nepal and Bloomington, IN: Nepal Forest Resources and Institutions and the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis.

Martinez-Alier, J. 2002. *The Environmentalism of the Poor: A Study of Ecological Conflicts and Valuation*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Ostrom, E., and T. K. Ahn, eds. 2003. *Foundations of Social Capital*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Perelman, M. 2002. *Steal This Idea: Intellectual Property Rights and the Corporate Confiscation of Creativity*. New York: Palgrave.

Raiffa, H., J. Richardson, and D. Metcalfe. 2002. *Negotiation Analysis: The Science and Art of Collaborative Decision Making*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rolfe, J. T., ed. 2002. *The Nature and Culture of Forests: Implications of Diversity for Sustainability, Trade and Certification*. Vancouver: UBC Institute for European Studies.

Rosa, Luiz Pinguelli, and Mohan Munasinghe eds. 2002. *Ethics, Equity, and International Negotiations on Climate Change*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Sadoff, C. W., D. Whittington, and D. Grey. 2002. *An Economic Perspective on Africa’s International Rivers: Efficiency, Equity and Environment*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Sager, T. 2002. *Democratic Planning and Social Choice Dilemmas: Prelude to Institutional Planning Theory*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Sell, S. K. 2003. *Private Power, Public Law: the Globalization of Intellectual Property Rights*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Susskind, L., W. Moomaw, and K. Gallagher, eds. 2002. *Transboundary Environmental Negotiation: New Approaches to Global Cooperation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wilson, D. C., P. Degnbol, and J-R. Nielsen, eds. 2003. *The Fisheries Co-management Experience: Accomplishments, Challenges and Prospects*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Articles

Baland, J. M., and J. P. Platteau. 2003. “Economics of Common Property Management Regimes.” *Handbook in Economics* 20:127-184.

Bassett, T. J. 2003. “Dangerous Pursuits: Hunter Associations (Donzo Ton) and National Politics in Côte d’Ivoire.” *Africa* 73:1-30.

Bello, A., and M. Rangel. 2002. “Equity and Exclusion in Latin America and The Caribbean: The Case of Indigenous and Afro-Descendant Peoples.” *Cepal Review* 76:39-54.

Bene, C. 2003. “When Fishery Rhymes with Poverty: A First Step Beyond the Old Paradigm on Poverty in Small-Scale Fisheries.” *World Development* 31:949-975.

Bostrom, M. 2003. “Environmental Organisations in New Forms of Political Participation: Ecological Modernisation and the Making of Voluntary Rules.” *Environmental Values* 12:175-193.

- Boucheron, P.** 2003. "De l'Urbanisme Communal à l'Urbanisme Seigneurial: Cités, Territoires, et Edilite Publique en Italie due Nord (VIIIe-XVe Siecle)." Collection: Ecole Francaise de Rome 302:41-77.
- Bozzo, S. L.** 2002. "Evaluating Capacity Building in the Voluntary/Nonprofit Sector." *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation* 17:75-92.
- Bretherton, C.** 2003. "Movements, Networks, Hierarchies: A Gender Perspective on Global Environmental Governance." *Global Environmental Politics* 3:103-119.
- Bru, L., S. Cabrera, C. M. Capra, and R. Gomez** 2003. "A Common Pool Resource Game with Sequential Decisions and Experimental Evidence." *Experimental Economics* 6:91-114.
- Brumann, C.** 2003. "'All the Flesh Kindred that Ever I See': A Reconsideration of Family and Kinship in Utopian Communes." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 45:395-421.
- Bulkeley, H., and A. P. J. Mol.** 2003. "Participation and Environmental Governance: Consensus, Ambivalence and Debate." *Environmental Values* 12:143-154.
- Carolan, M. S., and M. M. Bell.** 2003. "In Truth We Trust: Discourse, Phenomenology, and the Social Relations of Knowledge in an Environmental Dispute." *Environmental Values* 12:225-245.
- Cline, S. A., and A. R. Collins.** 2003. "Watershed Associations in West Virginia: Their Impact on Environmental Protection." *Journal of Environmental Management* 67:373-384.
- Cole, D. P.** 2003. "Where Have the Bedouin Gone?" *Anthropological Quarterly* 76:235-268.
- Conconi, P.** 2003. "Green Lobbies and Transboundary Pollution in Large Open Economies." *Journal of International Economics* 59:399-422.
- Conley, A., and M. Moote.** 2003. "Evaluating Collaborative Natural Resource Management." *Society & Natural Resources* 16:371-386.
- Corburn, J.** 2003. "Bringing Local Knowledge into Environmental Decision Making: Improving Urban Planning for Communities at Risk." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22:420-433.
- De Cremer, D., and D. van Knippenberg.** 2003. "Cooperation with Leaders in Social Dilemmas: On the Effects of Procedural Fairness and Outcome Favorability in Structural Cooperation." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 91:1-11.
- Dayon, M.** 2002. "An Overview of the Evolution of Agricultural Cooperatives in Quebec." *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 50:497-510.
- Duany, J. A.** 2003. "South Sudan: People-to-People Peacemaking: A Local Solution to Local Problems." In *Artisans of Peace: Grassroots Peacemaking Among Christian Communities*. Pp. 196-225. M. A. Cejka and T. Bamat, eds. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- Ekelund, R. B., and C. Dorton.** 2003. "Criminal Justice Institutions as a Common Pool: The 19th Century Analysis of Edwin Chadwick." *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 50:271-294.
- Fox, K., J. R. Q. Grafton, J. Kirkley, and D. Squires.** 2003. "Property Rights in a Fishery: Regulatory Change and Firm Performance." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 46:156-177.
- Frank, S. A.** 2003. "Repression of Competition and the Evolution of Cooperation." *Evolution* 57:693-705.
- Gale, F.** 2003. "Discourse and Southeast Asian Deforestation: A Case Study of the International Tropical Timber Organization." *Kyoto Area Studies on Asia* 6:236-264.
- Gintis, H., S. Bowles, R. Boyd, and E. Fehr.** 2003. "Explaining Altruistic Behavior in Humans." *Evolution and Human Behavior* 24:153-172.
- Goddard, E., P. Boxall, and M. Lerohl.** 2002. "Cooperatives and the Commodity Political Agenda: A Political Economy Approach." *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 50:511-526.
- Godshall, L. E.** 2003. "Making Space for Indigenous Intellectual Property Rights Under Current International Environmental Law." *Georgetown International Environmental Law Review* 15:497-530.
- Goldfarb, D.** 2003. "NEPA: Application in the Territorial Seas, the Exclusive Economic Zone, the Global Commons, and Beyond." *Southwestern University Law Review* 32:735-760.
- Gorton, M., and J. White.** 2003. "The Politics of Agrarian Collapse: Decollectivisation in Moldova." *East European Politics and Societies* 17:305-331.
- Grunbuhel, C. M., H. Haberl, H. Schandl, and V. Winiwarter.** 2003. "Socioeconomic Metabolism and Colonization of Natural Processes in SangSaeng Village Material and Energy Flows, Land Use, and Cultural Change in Northeast Thailand." *Human Ecology* 31:53-86.
- Harris, A. W.** 2003. "Making the Case for Collective Rights: Indigenous Claims to Stocks of Marine Living Resources." *Georgetown International Environmental Law Review* 15:379-428.
- Hendriks, S. L., and M. C. Lyne.** 2003. "Expenditure Patterns and Elasticities of Rural Households Sampled in Two Communal Areas of KwaZulu-Natal." *Development Southern Africa* 20:105-128.
- Hernandez, A., and W. Kempton** 2003. "Changes in Fisheries Management in Mexico: Effects of Increasing Scientific Input and Public Participation." *Ocean and Coastal Management* 46:507-526.
- Holland, S. P., and M. R. Moore.** 2003. "Cadillac Desert Revisited: Property Rights, Public Policy, and Water-Resource Depletion." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 46:131-155.

- Hsu, S. L.** 2003. "A Two-Dimensional Framework for Analyzing Property Rights Regimes." *Univ. of California Davis Law Review* 36:813-894.
- Jacobs, Jamie E.** 2002. "Community Participation, the Environment, and Democracy: Brazil in Comparative Perspective." *Latin American Politics & Society* 44:59-89.
- Jaspers, F. G. W.** 2003. "Institutional Arrangements for Integrated River Basin Management." *Water Policy* 5:77-90.
- Johnson, R. N., and G. D. Libecap.** 2003. "Transaction Costs and Coalition Stability Under Majority Rule." *Economic Inquiry* 41:193-207.
- Kameda, T., M. Takezawa, and R. Hastie.** 2003. "The Logic of Social Sharing: An Evolutionary Game Analysis of Adaptive Norm Development." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 7:2-19.
- Karjala, M. K., and S. M. Dewhurst.** 2003. "Including Aboriginal Issues in Forest Planning: A Case Study in Central Interior British Columbia, Canada." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 64:1-17.
- Kendrick, Anne.** 2003. "Caribou Co-Management in Northern Canada: Fostering Multiple Ways of Knowing." In *Navigating Social-Ecological Systems: Building Resilience for Complexity and Change*. In F. Berkes, J. Colding, and C. Folke New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kumar, D. S., and C. Ramasamy.** 2003. "Role of Agroforestry in the Household Economy of Resource Poor Farmers." *Journal of Tropical Forest Products* 9:97-108.
- Lane, M. B.** 2003. "Participation, Decentralization, and Civil Society: Indigenous Rights and Democracy in Environmental Planning." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22:360-373.
- Locke, K. D.** 2003. "Status and Solidarity in Social Comparison: Agentic and Communal Values and Vertical and Horizontal Directions." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 84:619-631.
- Low, B., E. Ostrom, C. Simon, and J. Wilson.** 2003. "Redundancy and Diversity: Do they Influence Optimal Management?" In *Navigating Social-Ecological Systems: Building Resilience for Complexity and Change*. Pp. 83-114. F. Berkes, J. Colding, and C. Folke, eds. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kerr, Marla.** 2003. "Ecotourism: Alleviating the Negative Effects of Deforestation on Indigenous Peoples in Latin America." *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy* 14:335-364.
- Mburu, J., R. Birner, and M. Zeller.** 2003. "Relative Importance and Determinants of Landowners' Transaction Costs in Collaborative Wildlife Management in Kenya: An Empirical Analysis." *Ecological Economics* 45:59-73.
- McCay, B. J.** 2003 "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Women's Rights, Community Survival, and the Fisheries Cooperative of Fogo Island" In Reginald Byron, ed., *Retrenchment and Regeneration*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Continued on page 16.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

To the Editor,

The level of regional activity this year is surprisingly high. It reflects the solid foundation laid down since its start in 1999-2000. This year has brought the President to: Prague, attending a workshop on property rights in central and eastern Europe; to Chiang Mai, attending a South Asia conference on the "Politics of the Commons"; and to Anchorage, contributing to the discussion of Joining the Northern Commons.

And as write we have yet another meeting coming up: the second Pacific meeting of IASCP in Brisbane 7-9 Sept. As I regrettably cannot attend this meeting I wish the organisers there as much success as the other meetings.

The three meetings I have attended have been very different. But judged by their own goals each was also a resounding success. On behalf of the council I want to congratulate the organisers. The association is fortunate to have members and partners like these.

The Prague meeting was a small workshop dedicated to explore property rights research issues in Central and Eastern Europe. One immediate result of this is the discussion group

http://uk.groups.yahoo.com/group/property_in_cee

for anyone interested in property rights issues in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE). Another result is a program for CEE scholars to attend the Oaxaca conference.

The Chiang Mai meeting was an ordinary conference both in design and execution. It will probably be our largest meeting this year. In size it might be comparable to the Victoria Falls meeting. Of course, the fact that a clear majority came from Asia and the Pacific region only attests to the interest of the topic of the Commons to the scholars of the region.

Compared to the Chiang Mai meeting the meeting in Anchorage was more like a small workshop dedicated to the commons of the Arctic. Being held at the same time as a meeting of the Northern Forum facilitated the participation of several high level politicians including the President of Iceland. The participants could enjoy first President Olafur Grimsson, then Nobel Laureate Vernon Smith as lunch speakers. Both were a delightful surprise, not only judged by a celebrity index, but also by what they said. We should also note that professor Vincent Ostrom was celebrated for his contribution to the resource paragraph of the Alaska constitution. The commons of the Arctic appears to be extensive, rich, and commanding high political attention. I hope to hear more of them in future conferences. All told, we have had a year the Association can be proud of. Let us hope for good luck in our efforts to obtain funding to continue down this road.

Sincerely,

Erling Berge, President, IASCP

Erling.Berge@svt.ntnu.no

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Sub –Temas

Send Letters and Announcements to Doug Wilson, Editor, CPR Digest, The Institute for Fisheries Management, North Sea Center, PO Box 104, DK-9850, Hirtshals, Denmark. dw@ifm.dk Tel: 45 98 94 28 55 Fax:: 45 98 94 42 68

For membership, dues, back issues, and missing copies Michelle Curtain, P.O. Box 2355 Gary, IN 46409 USA Tel: 01-219-980-1433 Fax:: 01-219-980-2801 iascp@indiana.edu

For questions about IASCP papers and research, contact Charlotte Hess, Information Officer, IASCP, 513 N. Park, Bloomington, IN 47408 USA iascp@indiana.edu Tel: 01-812-855-9636 Fax:: 01-812-855-3150

Upcoming IASCP Meetings

Meeting: IASCP2004, The 10th Biennial Conference of the IASCP

Dates: August 2004

Location: Oaxaca, Mexico

Coordinator: Leticia Merino, lmerino@servidor.unam.mx

Meeting: Pacific Regional Meeting

Location: Brisbane, Australia

Dates: 7-9 September 2003

Coordinator: John Sheehan, qld@propertyinstitute.com.au

Los recursos de uso común en una era de transición global: retos, riesgos y oportunidades

El décimo congreso bienal de la IASCP
Auspiciado por: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Oaxaca, México, 9 – 13 de Agosto, 2004



El Tema

El tema y el título de la conferencia es “*Las comunidades en la época de la Transición Global: Desafíos, Riesgos y Oportunidades*”. Por lo tanto, IASCP 2004 busca estimular la continuación de la discusión a cerca de muchos de los temas que fueron tratados en 2002 en la conferencia de Zimbabwe, donde la “Globalización” fue el tema central. A continuación se plantean diez temas particulares cuyo objetivo es promover discusiones de fondo, incluyendo el análisis de marcos de referencia institucionales, la importancia e influencia de los mercados y el desarrollo de políticas públicas, así como las relaciones entre políticas e instituciones en los ámbitos local, regional, nacional e internacional en el contexto de la transición global. Favor de tener en cuenta que se aceptaran ponencias que cubran tópicos más amplios que atraviesen varios de los temas de la conferencia.

2.1 Grupos indígenas y recursos comunes

Los grupos indígenas y otras comunidades controlan gran parte de la propiedad de recursos comunes en el mundo. No obstante, la histórica lucha de los grupos indígenas por mantener, recuperar y desarrollar derechos sobre sus territorios, recursos, y conocimientos continúa en el presente. Mientras algunos grupos indígenas han obtenido reconocimiento legal de su territorio y sus derechos de propiedad intelectual, estos derechos son típicamente definidos en términos y condiciones establecidos por y para la cultura dominante. Los grupos indígenas enfrentan constantes retos para afirmar sus culturas y derechos sobre sus recursos mientras negocian los problemas e interrelaciones potenciales con los mercados y los grupos dominantes. ¿Cómo enfrentan estos retos los grupos indígenas?, ¿Qué cambios están ocurriendo en las relaciones entre los grupos indígenas y sus recursos tradicionales, territorios y conocimientos?, ¿Cuáles son los impactos de fuerzas externas?, ¿Qué tipos de estrategias y políticas ayudan de mejor manera a los grupos indígenas para ganar o recuperar el control sobre sus patrimonios? En algunos casos, el conocimiento indígena incluye instituciones para el manejo de los recursos comunes, y patrones de uso de los recursos naturales que han resultado sustentables por generaciones, y ameritan mayor consideración y respeto por parte de investigadores y hacedores de políticas. Al mismo tiempo, estas instituciones enfrentan presiones internas y externas que pueden generar transformaciones o deterioro como resultado de la adaptación de los grupos indígenas al cambio de circunstancias. ¿Cuáles son los procesos históricos y modernos por los cuales esto ocurre?, ¿Cómo son creadas, mantenidas, transformadas o perdidas las instituciones de propiedad comunal de recursos?, ¿Qué experiencias pueden ofrecer las instituciones indígenas de propiedad comunal para el manejo de la propiedad de recursos comunales?

2.2 Servicios ambientales y recursos comunes.

Hasta hace poco, los servicios ambientales (mantenimiento y producción de agua, captura de carbono, conservación de la biodiversidad, mitigación o protección frente a desastres naturales), proveídos por sistemas naturales manejados como propiedad comunal, no eran reconocidos o eran considerados de poco valor. Debido a los crecientes niveles de degradación ambiental y problemas a ellos asociados que se viven tanto local como globalmente, el valor de estos servicios se ha hecho evidente y es cada vez más reconocido. En este tema, esperamos ponencias que analicen las relaciones entre los RUCs y los servicios ambientales, su conservación, las oportunidades de mercado asociadas, y el desarrollo de esquemas de gobernanza y pagos por servicios ambientales en los que los derechos de las comunidades puedan ser reconocidos y protegidos. ¿Pueden las comunidades ser resguardos con un papel clave en la producción y preservación de servicios ambientales?, ¿En qué medida la obtención de ganancias económicas de los servicios ambientales puede cambiar fundamentalmente el paisaje y el manejo de los recursos comunes?, ¿Qué tipo de mecanismos se requiere para que las comunidades obtengan beneficios comerciales a cambio de conservar sus recursos naturales de uso común?, ¿Qué ejemplos de contratos existen entre organizaciones conservacionistas y ambientalistas nacionales o internacionales y los propietarios locales de recursos comunes?, ¿Qué tipo y nivel de pago debiera hacerse a grupos locales por la protección y mantenimiento de servicios ambientales?, ¿Qué tipo de leyes y políticas son necesarias?

2.3 Gobernanza, conflictos y reformas institucionales

La gobernanza efectiva y sustentable de RUCs socialmente valorados, representa un reto constante para las sociedades del mundo. El reto es multifacético, porque existen vastas diferencias entre un lugar a otro respecto a las condiciones socio-culturales, políticas, económicas, de infraestructura y ambientales. Los retos tienen muchos niveles, porque la muchos de los sistemas de recursos atraviesan las fronteras políticas, ya sean locales, regionales, nacionales, o internacionales. Dado el carácter multifacético y multi-escala de los retos para el desarrollo de esquemas de gobernanza de los recursos naturales socialmente valorados, ¿qué perspectivas de gobernanza de los RUCs son más prometedoras en nuestro mundo interrelacionado?, ¿Cuáles son las mayores preocupaciones que (deberían) ocupar a los usuarios, a los gobiernos, y analistas al tratar de comprender cómo los recursos comunes

pueden ser mejor aprovechados, asignados, y manejados?, ¿Cuáles son las mayores causas de los conflictos y tensiones que están produciendo una reconfiguración de las estructuras de gobernanza y cómo éstas pueden ser mejor comprendidas y asumidas?, ¿Hay un giro real en la participación de las diferentes instituciones y constituencias?, ¿Qué papel juegan las organizaciones bilaterales y multilaterales y las ONGs?

2.4 Políticas de conservación y manejo de los recursos comunes.

La perspectiva de “Áreas Protegidas” ha sido la estrategia dominante para la conservación de la biodiversidad, la vida silvestre, y los hábitats. Esta perspectiva se basa en el supuesto de que algunos hábitats son “prístinos” y que el manejo de Áreas Protegidas que busca salvaguardarlas de la gente que vive en ellas es necesario para su conservación. Para las sociedades urbanas industrializadas la perspectiva de Áreas Protegidas representa un modelo paradigmático de uso de la naturaleza que se impone a los países en desarrollo. En África, Asia y América, su impacto en el uso de los recursos naturales y los derechos de las comunidades ha sido profundo. Sin embargo, en respuesta a tales actitudes proteccionistas y en medio de conflictos crecientes entre las comunidades locales y los funcionarios de gobierno, en años recientes ha habido cierto giro hacia enfoques más participativos. Estos nuevos enfoques enfatizan la importancia de desarrollar nuevas relaciones de colaboración entre las comunidades locales y las agencias de manejo de Áreas Protegidas. Las ponencias sobre este sub-tema relacionaran la globalización con aspectos de nivel local y aspectos concernientes a la conservación. Identificarán y analizarán las relaciones entre las Áreas Protegidas y otros programas de conservación y comunidades indígenas y locales, especialmente a la luz de los cambios que se han experimentado en esta era de transición global. También serán bienvenidas ponencias que trabajen sobre los diversos problemas contemporáneos que experimentan las Áreas Protegidas y sugerencias de cómo las leyes y políticas podrían mejorarse para promover y balancear las necesidades de conservación y las de las comunidades locales.

2.5 Herramientas analíticas contemporáneas y preguntas teóricas

A lo largo de las últimas dos décadas, los análisis de los RUCs han comenzado a utilizar el método de análisis comparado, y en menor medida, usan herramientas estadísticas y teoría de juegos. El uso del análisis de redes, álgebra de Boole, teoría de decisiones, y modelos basados en los agentes también pueden potencialmente proporcionar nuevos elementos de comprensión sobre las estructuras, procesos, y funciones de los arreglos comunes. Un uso más extendido de múltiples herramientas analíticas es crucial para la vitalidad del campo de los estudios sobre los recursos comunes. En este tema recibiremos propuestas de ponencias y paneles que vayan más allá de la descripción de casos en la que tradicionalmente se basan los estudiosos de los recursos comunes, y en cambio incluyan el uso de nuevas herramientas analíticas e inferencias basadas en él. En particular son bienvenidos paneles que agrupan distintos estudios bajo una idea o argumento comunes.

2.6 Los impactos de las tecnologías de información geográfica y ambiental en los recursos comunes

Los avances en la tecnología de recolección, análisis, y de representación espacial de información crean nuevas arenas para el desarrollo de una teoría mejorada sobre el manejo de los recursos comunes. El sensoramiento remoto de satélites, los sistemas de posicionamiento global, y los sistemas de información geográfica, están cada vez más disponibles para distintos actores desde el gobierno y la academia, hasta las ONGs, los grupos de base, e incluso algunos individuos. Estas tecnologías de información geográfica cambian de muchas maneras la forma en que la gente comprende y reclama derechos sobre recursos comunes. Sin embargo, estas herramientas revelan solo algunos tipos de cambio medioambiental en los recursos comunes, ocultan otros, y privilegian necesariamente a algunos actores y modos específicos de percibir los cambios en el medio ambiente y en los recursos comunes. En este sub-tema se esperan trabajos que clarifiquen los efectos de las tecnologías de información geográfica en la percepción de los recursos comunes, el poder diferenciado de diversos actores en situaciones comunes, la evolución de las instituciones para el manejo de los recursos comunes, y trabajos innovativos que integren datos medioambientales y análisis de datos sociales.

2.7 Mercados y recursos comunes.

Cambios recientes en la oferta, la demanda, y los esquemas de gobernanza, sin embargo, están desarrollando nuevas oportunidades para que los grupos indígenas y las comunidades locales, muchas de las cuales perciben bajos ingresos, obtengan mayores ganancias de los recursos naturales que manejan como RUCs. Mientras la mayor parte de la apropiación de los recursos de RUCs ha sido individual, bajo reglas colectivas, nuevas oportunidades de mercado están fomentando el surgimiento de empresas comunales organizadas alrededor de la producción basada en RUCs. ¿Cuáles son las nuevas formas de acción formalmente colectiva alrededor de los RUCs que están surgiendo en relación con las oportunidades de mercado?, ¿Qué puede aprenderse de la frecuente existencia de manejo de recursos comunes comerciales, como pesquerías de pequeña escala?, ¿Serían las empresas comunales instituciones de mercado viables o resultan los costos de transacción demasiado altos para grupos indígenas y otras comunidades locales?, ¿Pueden las empresas comunales ser competitivas frente a mercados que demandan eficiencia, bajos precios y producción de alta calidad?

2.8 Los nuevos recursos comunes globales.

Las convenciones globales son aun relativamente nuevas, y en la medida en que crece la experiencia, se modifican los modelos de incentivos y las estructuras de asociaciones entre actores globales, las instituciones gubernamentales, los dueños y usuarios de los recursos naturales. En este complejo escenario, existen algunos ejemplos innovadores de políticas, marcos legales y alternativas eficaces para el desarrollo de instituciones para el manejo de recursos y usos que permitan asociaciones entre comunidades, gobiernos, sector privado, y sociedad civil. Algunos de estos ejemplos han sido construidos con base a nuevas oportunidades de mercado para el uso sustentable de los recursos y la producción limpia. Bajo este tema se buscara explorar los arreglos institucionales emergentes así como identificar nuevos ejemplos problemáticos y/o prometedores. ¿Cuáles son los acuerdos, los arreglos, contratos, mecanismos institucionales, y estructuras de asociaciones más prometedores?, ¿Cuáles son algunas de las condiciones básicas de éxito?, ¿Cuáles son los roles de las diferentes partes en la aplicación de las reglas y en el manejo de autoridad?, ¿Cuál es el balance realista entre ajustes realizados en función del mercado y las regulaciones gubernamentales y/o internacionales?

2.9 Globalización, cultura, identidad y recursos comunes

Existen dos visiones contrarias acerca de las influencias de la globalización sobre la cultura y la identidad cultural. Por una parte se argumenta que la globalización genera mayor diversidad, mientras que por otra se asegura que la globalización apoya la homogeneidad cultural. La evidencia sugiere que talvez una combinación de lo mencionado previamente esta tomando lugar. En todo caso, el análisis de los esquemas de manejo de los RUCs y sus instituciones debería realizarse con ambas tendencias en mente. Si la diversidad cultural puede sobrevivir a las presiones de la globalización es vital considerar cómo la participación de grupos indígenas y otras comunidades locales pueden ser aumentadas y fortalecidas, a través de las instituciones que pueden ajustarse a las características de esta nueva configuración social. Por el otro lado, concentrándose en la estandarización cultural como un producto de la globalización es necesario preguntarnos en que manera las instituciones de manejo de los RUCs creadas predominantemente bajo un contexto cultural singular, responden a cambios externos generados por la globalización. Por ejemplo, ¿Cómo podemos incorporar elementos globales o de intereses dentro de identidades locales?, y ¿cómo las practicas tradicionales o las instituciones en cuestión están siendo problematizadas y modificadas mientras los individuos asumen mayor prominencia en instituciones de manejo de los RUCs?

2.10 Cambio demográfico y manejo de los recursos comunes

La migración rural-urbana e internacional ha sido una fuerza poderosa de cambio en áreas rurales a través de todo el mundo. Las comunidades locales están perdiendo a sus jóvenes e incluso a familias completas que emigran en busca de mejores oportunidades económicas. Las instituciones locales más impactadas por los procesos de migración incluyen los regímenes de propiedad comunal y manejo de los recursos comunes. Los acuerdos de trabajo colectivo y los RUCs pueden debilitarse o ser descuidados en la

medida en que disminuye la fuerza de trabajo disponible para mantenerlos. En sentido inverso, el papel de las remesas y el retorno de los migrantes, sea este temporal o permanente, también impactan los RUCs. Las nuevas influencias culturales promovidas por los nuevos ingresos o por los propios migrantes pueden generar nuevas actitudes en torno de los recursos naturales y los RUCs. ¿Cuál es el impacto de estos procesos de globalización en la gobernancia local en general y en la gobernancia de RUCs en particular?, ¿Las influencias urbanas promueven cambios en los patrones de fertilidad en las comunidades?, y ¿cuál es el impacto de esto en los arreglos de trabajo para el mantenimiento de los RUCs?, ¿Existen conflictos emergentes entre los migrantes y aquellos que permanecen en las comunidades para la gobernancia de los RUCs?

LINEAMIENTOS PARA LA ENTREGA DE RESÚMENES

Convocamos a investigadores y personas interesadas en el tema de los recursos de uso común, tradicionales o contemporáneos, a participar en este congreso. Los resúmenes de propuestas de paneles, ponencias individuales y pósters deberán enviarse al comité organizador del congreso a la dirección electrónica: iascp04@indiana.edu, antes del **30 de octubre de 2003**. Favor de enviar los documentos en formato Word o Word-Perfect anexos a su comunicación electrónica CON EL SIGUIENTE FORMULARIO:

Formulario para resúmenes de IASCP 2004

Apellido Paterno

Apellido Materno

Nombre

Dirección

País

Email

Teléfono

Fax

Para mayores informes sobre el congreso IASCP-Oaxaca 2004, los temas y los lineamientos para la entrega de propuestas, consulte la página de Internet: www.iascp2004.org.mx o envíe un correo electrónico a la dirección: iascp04@indiana.edu

FECHAS IMPORTANTES

- **15 de diciembre de 2003** Fecha límite para la entrega de propuestas de ponencias, paneles y pósters
- **1 de febrero de 2004** Anuncio de las ponencias seleccionadas y financiamiento
- **15 de abril de 2004** Fecha límite para la entrega de ponencias.
- **1º de junio de 2004** Fecha límite para el registro anticipado.

Lake Tana Resource Management Research Center

Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia

Call for Papers: National Lake Symposium

Theme: Resource Management of Ethiopian Lakes and Watersheds

Sub-themes: * Land use/ Land cover changes in lake watersheds

* Lake water quality changes * Lake and shoreline biodiversity

* Wetlands * Lake fisheries * Lake resource management institutions

* Shoreline indigenous communities of people * Other related sub-themes

Abstracts, not to exceed 300 words, should be sent by email to yoab11@yahoo.com before December 31, 2003. Abstracts should include the names, e-mail addresses and institutional affiliations of the participants. Also include a date for your convenience for the symposium. The date for the Symposium will be announced after the suggested dates for convenience are collected and tallied.

For further information contact yoab11@yahoo.com.

The Commons in an Age of Global Transition: Challenges, Risks and Opportunities

The 10th Biennial Meeting of the IASCP

Oaxaca, Mexico, August 9 – 13, 2004

Hosted by the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México



1. The Theme

The theme and title for the conference is “*The Commons in an Age of Global Transition: Challenges, Risks and Opportunities*”. As such, IASCP 2004 seeks to stimulate further discussion upon many of the themes that were raised during the 2002 conference in Zimbabwe, where “Globalisation” was the central focus.

Ten sub-themes for the conference have been suggested below. The goal is to foster deeper discussions across all themes, including the analysis of institutional frameworks, the importance and influence of markets and public policy-making, and the interrelationships between policies and institutions at local, regional, national and international levels within the context of global transition.

Please note that broader papers covering topics that cut across more than one of the ten conference sub-themes are also welcome.

Sub-Themes

2.1 Indigenous Peoples and Common Resources.

Indigenous and other local peoples control a large portion of the world’s common resources. Yet the historical struggle of indigenous peoples to retain, recover and develop rights to their territories, resources, and knowledge continues in the present. While some indigenous groups have obtained legal recognition of their territorial and intellectual property rights, these rights are typically defined with terms and conditions established by and for the dominant culture. Indigenous peoples groups face constant challenges to affirm their cultures and resource rights while negotiating the problems and potentials of interrelationships with the market and dominant external groups. How are indigenous groups confronting these challenges? What changes are occurring in the relationships between indigenous groups and their traditional resources, territories and knowledge? What are the impacts of external forces? What kind of strategies and policies best help indigenous groups gain and regain control over their patrimonies?

In some cases, indigenous knowledge includes common resource management institutions and patterns of natural resource use that have proven sustainable for generations, and merit greater scrutiny and respect by researchers and policy-makers. At the same time, these institutions face internal and external pressures that may compel transformations or ties, and

deterioration as indigenous groups adapt to changed circumstances. What are the historical and modern processes by which this occurs and effective common property institutions are created, maintained, transformed or lost?

2.2 Environmental Services and Common Resources.

Until recently, environmental services (water maintenance and production, carbon sequestration, biodiversity conservation, disaster mitigation/protection), provided by natural resources managed as common property, were not recognized or were accorded little value. Due to increasing levels of environmental degradation and associated problems, experienced at both the local and global level, however, the true value of these services has become apparent and is becoming increasingly recognized.

Under this theme, we welcome papers that examine the link between CPRs and environmental services, their conservation, associated market opportunities, and the development of governance and payment schemes in which communities rights are or can be recognized and protected. Can communities be stewards with a key role in the production and preservation of environmental services? To what extent could the achievement of commercial returns from environmental services fundamentally change the landscape of commons management? What kind of mechanisms will need to be in place for communities to realize commercial benefits in return for conserving their common-pool natural resources? What examples already exist of contracts between national or international conservation and environmental? What kind of laws and policies are needed?

2.3 Governance, Conflict and Institutional Reform

Effective and sustainable governance of socially valued, common-pool resource systems represents an ongoing challenge for the world's societies. The challenge is multi-faceted, because vast differences exist from place to place in socio-cultural, political, economic, infrastructural and context contexts. The challenge is multi-leveled, because most common-pool resource systems cross political boundaries, whether local, regional, national or international.

Given the multi-faceted, multi-leveled challenges to effective governance of such natural resource systems, what approaches for CPR governance are most promising in our increasingly interconnected world? What are the major concerns that (should) occupy users, governments, and analysts as they try to understand how common resources can best be used, allocated, and managed? What are the major causes of the conflicts and tensions that are producing a reconfiguration of governance structures and how can they be best understood and addressed? Is there a real shift in the involvement of different institutions and constituencies? What roles do international bilateral and multilateral organizations and NGOs play?

2.4 Conservation Policy and Commons Management.

The "Protected Area (PA)" approach has been the mainstream strategy within the environmental movement guiding the conservation of biodiversity, wildlife and habitat. The approach is based on the assumption that certain areas of habitat are 'pristine' and PA management is necessary to safeguard these areas from people living in, and around them. For urban, industrialized societies the PA approach remains the paramount model for the use of nature, and it is still held out as a paradigm for the developing world. Across Africa, Asia and the Americas, its impact on natural resource use has been profound. However, in response to such protectionist attitudes and amid increasing conflict between local communities and state officials, there has in recent years been a discernible shift towards more participatory approaches.

Papers to be submitted under this sub-theme will link globalization with local-level issues and concerns regarding conservation. They will identify and analyze the linkages between PAs and other conservation programs and indigenous and local communities, especially in light of changes being experienced in this age of global transition. We also welcome papers that offer insights into many of the contemporary problems experienced by PAs and suggestions of how law and policy could be better designed to promote and balance the needs of conservation and local communities.

2.5 Contemporary Analytical Tools and Theoretical Questions

Over the past two decades, analyses of CPRs have begun to use comparative case method, and in rarer cases, game theoretic and statistical tools. The use of network analysis, Boolean algebra, decision theory, and agent-based models can also provide potentially new insights into structures, processes, and functions of commons arrangements.

More widespread use of multiple analytical tools is crucial to the continuing vitality of the field of commons studies. Under this theme, we welcome paper and panel proposals that move away from the traditional reliance of commons scholars upon case study description, but rather include studies that illustrate the use of contemporary analytical tools, and inferences that are based on such use. In particular, panels that bring together several studies under a common idea or argument, will be especially welcome.

2.6 The Impacts of Geographic Information Technologies and Environmental Information on the Commons

Advances in the technology of gathering, analyzing, and displaying spatial information create several new arenas for improved theory building in commons management. Satellite remote sensing, global positioning systems, and geographic information systems, for example, are all increasingly available to actors from government, academia, NGOs, grassroots groups, and even some individuals. These geographic information technologies change the way people understand and make claim to the commons in many ways.

However, these tools reveal only certain kinds of environmental change in the commons, conceal others, and necessarily privilege certain actors and specific ways of perceiving environmental change in the commons. Under this sub-theme we would welcome work that clarifies the effects of geographic information technologies on commons perception, the differential power of various actors in commons situations, the evolution of institutions for commons management, and innovative work that integrates environmental data and analysis with social data and analysis.

2.7 Markets and Commons Resources.

Changes in supply, demand and governance offer new opportunities for indigenous and other local communities, many of which are low-income, to earn more from the natural resources they manage as CPRs. Whereas most appropriation of the resources from CPRs have ultimately been individual, under collective rules, new market opportunities are driving the emergence of community-based enterprises (CBEs) organized around production from CPRs.

What are the new forms of formal collective action around CPRs that are emerging in relationship to market opportunities? What can be learnt from the frequent occurrence of specifically market-oriented commons management, such as small-scale fisheries? Are CBEs viable market institutions or are the transaction costs too high for indigenous and other local communities? Can CBEs be competitive in markets that demand efficient, high quality production?

2.8 The New Global Commons.

Global conventions are still relatively new, and as experience grows the relationships between global actors, government institutions, and natural resource owners and managers are being modified. Within this complexity, there are innovative examples of policy and legal frameworks and alternative institutions for resource management that enable partnerships among communities, governments, the private sector, and civil society. Some of these use market opportunities for sustainable resource use and clean production.

Under this theme, emerging institutional arrangements will be explored and promising and problematic examples identified. What are the most promising agreements, contract arrangements, institutional mechanisms, and structure of partnerships, including those between global and national actors which are most promising? What are some of the basic conditions for success? What are the roles of different players in enforcing rules and assuming management authority? What is a realistic balance between market-driven adjustments and government and/or international regulation?

2.9 Globalization, Culture, Identity and the Commons

There exist two opposing views regarding the influence of Globalization over culture and cultural identity. On the one hand, it is argued that globalization generates greater diversity, whilst on the other it is asserted that globalization encourages cultural homogeneity. The evidence suggests that perhaps a combination of the above is taking place. Analysis of CPR management schemes and institutions should be undertaken with both tendencies in mind.

If cultural diversity can survive the pressures of globalisation it is vital to consider how the participation of indigenous and other local communities can be increased and strengthened, through institutions that can adjust to the characteristics of this new social configuration. On the other hand, if focusing on cultural standardization as a product of globalization it is necessary to ask ourselves in what way CPR management institutions, predominantly created under a singularly cultural context, respond to external changes generated by globalization. For example, how can one incorporate global elements or interests within local identities, and how are traditional practices and institutions being questioned or modified as individuals assume greater prominence with CPR management institutions?

2.10 Demographic Change and Commons Management

Rural-urban and international migration has been a powerful force for change in rural areas throughout the world. Local communities are being stripped of young men, young people in general, or of whole families as they migrate in search of better economic opportunities. Local institutions most impacted by migratory process include common property regimes and common pool resources. Collective work arrangements and CPRs may dissolve or be neglected as few able-bodied people are around to maintain them. Conversely, the role of remittance income and of returned migrants themselves, whether occasionally or permanently, will also impact CPRs. New cultural influences brought by remittance incomes or the migrants themselves can generate new attitudes towards natural resources and CPRs.

What is the impact of the globalization process on local governance in general and the governance of CPRs in particular? Do urban influences drive changes in community fertility patterns and what is the impact of this on local labour arrangements for CPRs? Are there emerging conflicts between migrants and stay-at-homes over the governance of CPRs?

Submission Guidelines

We invite anyone interested in the new and the long-standing commons to participate in the conference.

Individual paper, panel and poster proposals should be submitted to the Conference Committee iascp04@indiana.edu **by December 15th, 2003**

The Fisheries Co-management Experience: Accomplishments, Challenges and Prospects

Edited by: Douglas Clyde Wilson, Poul Degnbol and Jesper-Raakaer Nielsen of the Institute for Fisheries Management
Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers
Fish and Fisheries Series Volume 26

For two decades the idea of governments and fishers working together to manage fisheries has been advocated, questioned, disparaged and, most importantly, attempted in fisheries from North and South America through Europe, Africa, Asia and Oceania. This book is the first time these experiences have been pulled together in a single volume, summarized and explained. The Fisheries Co-management Experience begins with a review of the intellectual foundations of the co-management idea from several professional perspectives. Next, fisheries researchers from six global regions describe what has been happening on the ground in their area. Finally, the volume offers a set of reflections by some of the best authors in the field. The end result describes both the state-of-the-art and emerging issues for one of the most important trends in natural resource management. With an introduction by Svein Jentoft and a conclusion by Susan Hanna, the collection features contributions from experienced co-management scholars such as Evelyn Pinkerton, Bonnie McCay, Robert Pomeroy, David Symes, Kuperan Viswanathan and James Wilson.

Special 25% Discount for Digest Readers

to take advantage of this special offer contact Martine van Bezooijen at martine.vanbezooijen@wkap.nl
<http://www.wkap.nl/prod/b/1-4020-1427-9>

Paid Advertisement

JULY 1, 2003- JUNE 30, 2004 IASCP MEMBERSHIP CARD

Renew your membership now and you will not miss any of your membership benefits, including: subscriptions to The CPR Digest; discount registration at our nearly annual meetings; conference abstracts, and the opportunity to contribute to the growth of the IASCP. Contact the IASCP office for additional information or visit our web site.

MEMBERSHIP INFORMATION: Renewal New (Please check one)
Last Name First Name Middle

Address:

City State/Province: Postal Code/Zip: Country:

Email Address:

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP*	CHECK MEMBERSHIP YEAR(s):
\$50,000 or more.....US \$60.00	_____ July 1, 2003- June 30, 2004
\$20,000 - 49,999.....US \$40.00	_____ July 1, 2004 - June 30, 2005
\$19,000 and less.....US\$10.00	_____ July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006
Total dues payment @US \$60.00.....\$ _____	
Total dues payment @ US \$ 40.00.....\$ _____	
Total dues payment @ US \$ 10.00.....\$ _____	

*Institutional membership fees are a suggested flat rate of US \$120.00.

PAYMENT INFORMATION:

You can return this card to IASCP with:

A check payable to IASCP
 MasterCard Visa Discover | Card Number _____

For either individuals or institutions, if your financial situation prevents you from making a full payment at this time please indicate that and we will contact you.

Signature _____ | Exp. Date: _____ OR Email, phone or fax the information to:

- McLean**, Joanne, and Steffen Stræde 2003. "Conservation, Relocation, and the Paradigms of Park and People Management: A Case Study of Padampur Villages and the Royal Chitwan National Park, Nepal." *Society & Natural Resources* 16:509-617.
- McDaniel**, J. M. 2003. "History and the Duality of Power in Community-Based Forestry in Southeast Bolivia." *Development and Change* 34:339-356.
- Melloul**, A. J., and M. L. Collin. 2003. "Harmonizing Water Management and Social Needs: A Necessary Condition for Sustainable Development: The Case of Israel's Coastal Aquifer." *Journal of Environmental Management* 67:385-394.
- Mokhtar**, M. B., and S. A. Ghani Aziz. 2003. "Integrated Coastal Zone Management Using The Ecosystems Approach, Some Perspectives in Malaysia." *Ocean and Coastal Management* 46:407-419.
- Moore**, E. A., and T. M. Koontz. 2003. "A Typology of Collaborative Watershed Groups: Citizen-Based, Agency-Based, and Mixed Partnerships." *Society & Natural Resources* 16:451-460.
- Mullikin**, T. S., and N. S. Smith. 2003. "Community Participation in Environmental Protection." *UCLA Journal of Environmental Law and Policy* 21:75-95.
- Neugebauer**, G. P. 2003. "Indigenous Peoples as Stakeholders: Influencing Resource-Management Decisions Affecting Indigenous Community Interests in Latin America." *New York University Law Review* 78:1227-1261.
- Nemarundwe**, N., and W. Kozanayi 2003. "Institutional Arrangements for Water Resource Use: A Case Study from Southern Zimbabwe." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 29:193-206.
- Newell**, P. 2003. "Globalization and the Governance of Biotechnology." *Global Environmental Politics* 3:56-71.
- Njoh**, A. J. 2003. "The Role of Community Participation in Public Works Projects in LDCs: The Case of the Bonadikombo, Limbe (Cameroon) Self-Help Water Supply Project." *International Dev. Planning Review* 25:85-103.
- O'Mahony**, S. 2003. "Guarding the Commons: How Community Managed Software Projects Protect Their Work." *Research Policy* 32:1179-1198.
- Ostrom**, E. 2003. "How Types of Goods and Property Rights Jointly Affect Collective Action." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 15:239-270.
- Pechoux**, I., and J. Pouyet 2003. "Regulated Firms with Transboundary Pollution: Does International Competition Improve Efficiency?" *Journal of Public Economic Theory* 5:499-526.
- Pellizzoni**, L. 2003. "Uncertainty and Participatory Democracy." *Environmental Values* 12:195-224.
- Peter**, F. 2003. "Gender and the Foundations of Social Choice: The Role of Situated Agency." *Feminist Economics* 9:13-32.
- Poitras**, J., R. Bowen, and J. Wiggin. 2003. "Challenges to the Use of Consensus Building in Integrated Coastal Management." *Ocean and Coastal Management* 46:391-405.
- Powe**, N. A., and I. J. Bateman. 2003. "Ordering Effects in Nested 'Top-Down' and 'Bottom-Up' Contingent Valuation Designs." *Ecological Economics* 45:255-270.
- Prasad**, B. C. 2003. "Institutional Economics and Economic Development: The Theory of Property Rights, Economic Development, Good Governance and the Environment." *International Journal of Social Economics* 30:741-762.
- Prasad Timsina**, Netra. 2003. "Promoting Social Justice and Conserving Montane Forest Environments: A Case Study Of Nepal's Community Forestry Programme." *Geographical Journal* 169:236-243.
- Ribot**, J. C., and N. L. Peluso. 2003. "A Theory of Access." *Rural Sociology* 68:153-181.
- Robins**, S. 2003. "Whose Modernity? Indigenous Modernities and Land Claims after Apartheid." *Development and Change* 34:265-286.
- Sandler**, T., and D. G. Arce. 2003. "Pure Public Goods versus Commons: Benefit-Cost Duality." *Land Economics* 79:355-368.
- Sanfey**, Alan G. et al. 2003. "The Neural Basis of Economic Decision-Making in the Ultimatum Game." *Science* 300:1755-1758.
- Schneider**, M. et al. 2003. "Building Consensual Institutions: Networks and the National Estuary Program." *Am Jrn of Political Science* 47:143-158.
- Segger**, Marie-Claire Cordonier, Ashfaq Khalfan, Markus Gehring, and Michelle Toering 2003. "Prospects for Principles of International Sustainable Development Law After the WSSD: Common but Differentiated Responsibilities, Precaution and Participation." *Review of European Community and International Environmental Law* 12:54-68.
- Siar**, S. V. 2003. "Knowledge, Gender, and Resources in Small-Scale Fishing: The Case of Honda Bay, Palawan, Philippines." *Environment and Urbanization* 31:569-580.
- Simone**, A. M. 2003. "Reaching the Larger World: New Forms of Social Collaboration in Pikine, Senegal." *Africa* 73:226-250.
- Skogen**, K. 2003. "Adapting Adaptive Management to Cultural Understanding of Land Use Conflicts." *Society & Natural Resources* 16:435-450.
- Starrett**, D. A. 2003. "Property Rights, Public Goods and the Environment." *Handbook in Economics* 20:97-123.
- Stem**, C. J. et al. 2003. "Community Participation in Ecotourism Benefits: The Link to Conservation Practices and Perspectives." *Society & Natural Resources* 16:387-413.
- Stewart**, J. M., and P. D. Callagher. 2003. "New Zealand Fisheries Management: Changes in Property Rights Structure and Implications for Sustainability." *Sustainable Development* 11:69-76.

Swaney, J. A. 2003. "Are Democracy and Common Property Possible on Our Small Earth?" *Journal of Economic Issues* 37:259-288.

Trawick, P. 2003. "Against the Privatization of Water: An Indigenous Model for Improving Existing Laws and Successfully Governing the Commons." *World Development* 31:977-996.

Tsuji, R., and M. Harihara 2003. "Trust Relation in the 'Small World' and Social Order." *Sociological Theory and Methods* 18:15-31.

Van Beek, W. E. A. 2003. "African Tourist Encounters: Effects of Tourism on Two West African Societies." *Africa* 73:251-289.

Van Sittert, L. 2003. "The Tyranny of the Past: Why Local Histories Matter in the South African Fisheries." *Ocean and Coastal Management* 46:199-219.

Vogler, J. 2003. "Taking Institutions Seriously: How Regime Analysis Can be Relevant to Multilevel Environmental Governance." *Global Environmental Politics* 3:25-39.

Watson, E. E. 2003. "Examining the Potential of Indigenous Institutions for Development: A Perspective from Borana, Ethiopia." *Development and Change* 34:287-310.

Weiss, J. N. 2003. "Trajectories Toward Peace: Mediator Sequencing Strategies in Intractable Communal Conflicts." *Negotiation Journal* 19:109-115.