Center for Community-Based Resource Management (CBRM)

Natural Resources Institute, University of Manitoba

CBRM Database

Date: 12/12/2011	Entry 1145 Number:
Case Study Name:	Community Natural Resource Management: Promise, Rhetoric, and Reality
Author:	Stephen R. Kellert, Jai N. Mehta, Syma A. Ebbin, Laly L.
Document Type:	Paper in scientific journal
Year:	2000
Language:	English
Document Location:	http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/089419200750035575
Full Citation:	Kellert, S.R., Mehta, J.N., Ebbin, S.A. and Laly L. (2000) Community Natural Resource Management: Promise, Rhetoric, and Reality, Society & Natural Resources Volume 13, Issue 8, 2000, pages 705-715
Region:	North America, Africa and South Asia
Country:	USA, Kenya and Nepal
Ecosystem Type:	Terrestrial and aquatic
Social Characteristics:	Coastal/ rural communities
Scale of Study:	Global
Resource Type:	Biodiversity conservation, fisheries
Type of Initiative:	Research driven
Community Based Work:	Resource management

Keywords:	Community Resource Management, Kenya, Nepal, Sustainability
Summary:	Community natural resource management (CNRM) has been extensively promoted in recent years as an approach for pursuing biological conservation and socioeconomic objectives. The rationale for CNRM is often compelling and convincing. Relatively little data exists, however, regarding its implementation, particularly the reconciliation of social and environmental goals. This article summarizes empirical evidence regarding the implementation of CNRM, based on five case studies in Nepal, the U.S. states of Alaska and Washington, and Kenya. Six social and environmental indicators are used to evaluate and compare these cases, including equity, empowerment, conflict resolution, knowledge and awareness, biodiversity protection, and sustainable resource utilization. The results of this analysis indicate that, despite sincere attempts and some success, serious deficiencies are widely evident. In especially Nepal and Kenya, CNRM rarely resulted in more equitable distribution of power and economic benefits, reduced conflict, increased consideration of traditional or modern environmental knowledge, protection of biological diversity, or sustainable resource use. By contrast, CNRM in the North American cases was more successful. Institutional, environmental, and organizational factors help explain the observed differences