

Community Based Conservation (CBC) (Academic version)

Reclaim Conservation considers local people vital to any conservation planning and implementation. We believe that people living within natural habitats do not have to be persuaded to participate in outsiders' conservation initiatives, but supported in executing their own conservation plans and aspirations. Work with communities must be based on respect and the main methods used are listening and learning from their experience, before making any suggestions for improvements in their conservation methods. Conservation should be done through traditional, existing social organizations instead of creating or promoting new organizations and imposing foreign methods.

The basic concepts of community conservation are:

- Local people depend on their environments, threats to forests are threats to their future.
- Local people are not the problem, but may be the solution.
- Local people have the ability and the interest to efficiently conserve their forests just as they have done throughout the world's history.

Pathak et al. [1] define Community Based Conservation (CBC) as the self-initiated, voluntary conservation of ecosystems, species or cultures by local people, through communal management and institutions, sometimes in collaboration with other stakeholders. Horwich and Lyon [2] define CBC projects as low budget projects which provide stimulus and motivation for local stakeholders to assume ownership and responsibility over natural resources. Formal land protection, through Private Protected Areas, and informal conservation initiatives, through local bans on hunting and deforestation, are the most common forms of Community Based Conservation [3].¹

Community Based Conservation focuses on the ground habitat protection and connects to communities through social values rather than economic incentives, thus leading to stewardship for nature [4, 5]. These projects concentrate on the smallest geographical scale but have the potential to expand to the regional level through reproducing initiatives in neighbouring communities, so called 'contagion' [6]. Although very common and predominantly successful, large conservation agencies seldom acknowledge or support CBC because of its small scale and geographic isolation [2, 7] or because of the inherent characteristics of contemporary mainstream conservation, which concentrates on top down projects and high economic investment such as ICDPs and REDD+ projects [8-12].

Justification given by local people to initiate their conservation projects stem from protecting watersheds, ecosystem services and flagship species, protection of communal

¹ It is important to note that CBCs are practically and ideologically different from the more common forms of work with local communities, for example Integrated Conservation-Development Projects (ICDPs), and Payment for Ecological Services (PES) and Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+).

areas from land traffickers and invaders and in many cases for purely altruistic reasons related to their set of morals and beliefs or as part of their social struggle [2, 5, 13-15].

CBC initiatives in Peru have proven effective in reducing deforestation [16, 17] as well as in threatened species protection [18-20].

Bibliography

1. Pathak, N., et al., *Community conserved areas: A bold frontier for conservation*. 2004, TILCEPA/IUCN, CINESTA, CMWG and WAMIP: Tehran. p. 8.
2. Horwich, R.H. and J. Lyon, *Community conservation: practitioners' answer to critics*. Oryx, 2007. **41**(3): p. 376-385.
3. Shanee, N., S. Shanee, and R.H. Horwich, *Effectiveness of locally run conservation initiatives in north-east peru*. Oryx, 2014: p. On-line early edition.
4. Horwich, R.H., J. Lyon, and A. Bose, *What Belize Can Teach Us about Grassroots Conservation*. Solutions, 2011. **2**(3).
5. Allendorf, T.D., et al., *Motivations of the community forest protection forces of the Manas Biosphere Reserve in Assam, India*. International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology, 2013. **20**(5): p. 426-432.
6. Horwich, R.H., et al., *Preserving biodiversity and ecosystems: catalyzing conservation contagion*, in *Deforestation around the world*, P. Moutinho, Editor. 2012, INTECHOPEN.COM: InTech Rijeka, Croatia. p. 283-318.
7. Horwich, R.H., et al., *Creating Modern Community Conservation Organizations and Institutions to Effect Successful Forest Conservation Change*. 2015.
8. Kiss, A., *Making biodiversity conservation a land-use priority*, in *Getting Biodiversity Projects to Work*, T.O. McShane and M.P. Wells, Editors. 2004, Columbia University Press: New York. p. 98-123.
9. McShane, T.O. and M.P. Wells, *Getting Biodiversity Projects to Work*. 2004, New York: Columbia University Press.
10. Igoe, J. and D. Brockington, *Neoliberal conservation: A brief introduction*. Conservation and Society, 2007. **5**(4): p. 432.
11. Büscher, B. and R. Fletcher, *Accumulation by conservation*. New political economy, 2015. **20**(2): p. 273-298.
12. Mariki, S.B., *Commercialization of Nature: Can Market-Based Mechanisms Deliver Positive Conservation and Development Outcomes?* Open Journal of Social Sciences, 2016. **4**(06): p. 61.
13. Shanee, N., *Campesino Justification for Self Initiated Conservation Actions - a Challenge to Mainstream Conservation*. Journal of Political Ecology, 2013(20): p. 413-428.
14. Shanee, N., *Government and Community Based Primate Conservation Initiatives in Peru*, in *Ethnohistory; Primate Conservation in the 21st Century*, M.T. Waller, Editor. 2016, Springer International Publishing Switzerland. p. 215-231.
15. Shanee, N. and S. Shanee, *Land trafficking, migration, and conservation in the "no-man's land" of northeastern Peru*. Tropical Conservation Science, 2016. **9**(4): p. 1940082916682957.
16. Vuohelainen, A.J., et al., *The effectiveness of contrasting protected areas in preventing deforestation in Madre de Dios, Peru*. Environmental management, 2012. **50**(4): p. 645-663.
17. Schleicher, J., et al., *Conservation performance of different conservation governance regimes in the Peruvian Amazon*. Scientific Reports, 2017. **7**(1): p. 11318.

18. Allgas, N., et al., *Natural re-establishment of a population of a critically endangered primate in a secondary forest: the San Martin titi monkey (Plecturocebus oenanthe) at the Pucunucho Private Conservation Area, Peru*. *Primates*, 2017. **58**(2): p. 335-342.
19. Sam, S. and N. Shanee, *Measuring success in a community conservation project: Local population increase in a Critically Endangered primate, the yellow-tailed woolly monkey (Lagothrix flavicauda) at la Esperanza, northeastern Peru*. *Tropical Conservation Science*, 2015. **8**(1): p. 169-186.
20. Shanee, S., et al., *Protected area coverage of threatened vertebrates and ecoregions in Peru: Comparison of communal, private and state reserves*. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 2017. **202**: p. 12-20.

Questions

In general, does the text gives a good overview of Community Based Conservation, or do you think there are better ways to cover this issue?

Does this need more background info?

Is it easy and interesting to read? Does the English needs editing? Can you suggest edits?

Are parts of the text irrelevant, repetitive, or should be rephrased or deleted?

Are there any relevant issues that are not covered by this text? Would you be able to add them or just list them to be added by us?

Can you suggest a person or an institution that might have the right experience and perspective to rewrite this text? Are you happy to forward this text to them?

Do you know of any academic work related to the subject that can be added to this text?

This is the academic version of this issue. Are you interested in writing the shorter, non-academic version? If not, could you suggest what parts are the most relevant to be kept in the shorter version?

Any other comment?