Center for Community-Based Resource Management (CBRM)

Natural Resources Institute, University of Manitoba

CBRM Database

Date: August 8, 2012	Entry Number:	1222		
Case Study Name:	A comparative study of two community-based conservation models in Nepal			
Author:	Baral, N. and Stern, M.J.			
Document Type:	Paper in scientific journal			
Year:	2011			
Language:	English			
Document Location:	Biodiversity Conservation 20:2407–2426			
Full Citation:	Baral, N. and Stern, M.J. 2011. A comparative study of two community-based conservation models in Nepal. Biodiversity Conservation 20:2407–2426.			
Region:	South Asia			
Country:	Nepal			
Ecosystem Type:	Forest			
Social Characteristics:	Community inside protected area/community bordering protected area			
Scale of Study:	Protected area			
Resource Type:	Biodiversity conservation			
Type of Initiative:	Research-driven project			
Community Based Work:	Resource management			
Keywords:	Annapurna , Community-based conservation, Community forests, Management effectiveness, Nepal, Park			

	governance, Protected areas management
Summary:	Conservation areas (CAs) and community forests (CFs) are generally considered to be two successful community-based conservation (CBC) models in Nepal. Nepal's two CAs are administered by a nongovernmental organization (NGO), and all of its CFs are administered by a government agency (GA). The goal of this research is to compare and contrast these two models using quantitative and qualitative data collected through field research in the Annapurna Conservation Area in the summer of 2007 and adjacent CFs in the fall of 2008. The Conservation Area Management Committee (CAMC) and the Community Forest User Committee (CFUC) are the functional decision-making entities at the local level in CAs and CFs, respectively. We conducted one-on-one semi-structured interviews with 66 executive members of 10 CAMCs and 67 members of 9 CFUCs. While both models appear to have performed well overall, the CA under the direction of the NGO appears to have fared better with regard to (i) developing trust of local constituencies, (ii) garnering favorable attitudes among villagers, (iii) building capacity of executive members, and (iv) improving standards of living. We suggest that the particular accountabilities associated with NGOs may situate them in a better position to cultivate local governance than state entities on their own.