

# New global guidance on privately protected areas

BRENT A. MITCHELL  
Quebec Labrador Foundation / Atlantic Center for the Environment, 4 South Main Street, Ipswich, MA 01938 USA  
brentmitchell@qlf.org

DOI:10.32525/PARAQUARIANAT.2018(6):14.16  
ISSN 2309-5237  
© Del/de los autor/es.  
Es con licencia exclusiva a Guyra Paraguay.

Recibido: 15 de noviembre de 2018  
Aceptado: 11 de diciembre de 2018

At the global level, attention to the governance of protected areas is a relatively recent phenomenon. Until about two decades ago, it was broadly assumed that protected areas are the responsibility of governments. This thinking persists in many parts of the world, despite the fact that the first private land trusts are as old as the first national parks. Private stewardship of natural resources goes back much further. But as appreciation of different types of protected areas grows, and recognition of the benefits of such governance diversity increases, the potential for success in biodiversity conservation expands as well.

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature, IUCN, has recently released *Guidelines on Privately Protected Areas* (Mitchell, et al. 2018), summarized in this note.

IUCN has spent several decades wrestling with the question of what defines a 'protected area'. In 2008, consensus was reached on a revised definition (Dudley, 2008): "A clearly defined geographical space, recognised, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values." This definition states clearly that nature conservation is the primary function of protected areas, further em-

## ABSTRACT

Privately Protected Areas (PPAs) are under-represented in national protected area systems and under-reported internationally despite the fact that they are a rapidly growing element of the conservation estate. IUCN has released new, global guidelines on PPAs, drawing on current practice from around the world. Thirty-four principles outline how private governance can most effectively contribute to biodiversity and nature conservation.

**KEYWORDS:** private conservancy, governance, guidelines, IUCN categories

## RESUMEN

*Las Áreas Bajo Protección Privada (APP) están sub-representadas en los sistemas nacionales de áreas protegidas y sub-reportadas a nivel internacional a pesar de que son un elemento de rápido crecimiento del estado de conservación. La UICN ha publicado nuevas directrices globales sobre las APP, basándose en la práctica actual de todo el mundo. Treinta y cuatro principios describen cómo la gobernanza privada puede contribuir de manera más efectiva a la biodiversidad y la conservación de la naturaleza.*

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** conservación privada, gobernanza, lineamientos, categorías UICN

phasised by an associated principle: "For IUCN, only those areas where the main objective is conserving nature can be considered protected areas; this can include many areas with other goals as well, at the same level, but in the case of conflict, nature conservation will be the priority." Although application by countries is voluntary, its use has been supported by the IUCN membership through resolution (WCC-2012-Res-040-EN: Endorsement and uniform application of protected area management guidelines) and decisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (e.g. Decision VII/28 on "the value of a single international classification system for protected areas...").

Protected areas as defined by IUCN are grouped into four types of governance based on the underlying tenurial rights and thereby the rights of people to assert decision-making power over an area and its resources. These four types span governance by government, shared governance, governance by private entities, and governance by indigenous peoples and local communities. In certain cases, where tenurial rights are unclear and overlapping as a result of history, contested rights or lack of official recognition of these rights, governance may be conducted de facto by particular local actors, although the underlying legal or customary governance rights may be *de jure* (Borrini-Feyerabend et al. 2013).

## The difference between management and governance

In the context of protected areas, management refers to what is being done in pursuit of given objectives (i.e. the means and actions to achieve such objectives); while governance refers to who decides what these objectives are, what to do to pursue them, and with what means. Examples of governance decisions can include:

- The establishment of a protected area;
- The long-term goal (vision) of the protected area;
- The main management objective;
- How objectives will relate to local livelihoods and development;
- Sanctioning a management plan and/or system;
- Deciding who will implement management;
- Ensuring human and financial resources to pursue management are in place;
- Establishing how the rule of law and broader international legislation (including human and indigenous peoples' rights) are to be respected and enforced (Borrini-Feyerabend et al. 2013).

The new guidelines address the establishment and management of privately protected areas (PPAs) and are aimed at practitioners and policy makers who are or may be involved with PPAs.

A PPA is a protected area, as defined by IUCN, under private governance. This can include governance by individuals and groups of individuals; non-governmental organisations; corporations, including commercial companies and small companies established to manage groups of PPAs; for-profit owners such as ecotourism companies; research entities such as universities and field stations; or religious entities. Not all private conservation initiatives can meet the definition of a protected area nor should they become PPAs. The best practices are grouped under 34 principles, which are summarised below. In the full guidance document, each best practice contains descriptive text and examples including many short-boxed examples and photos. Given the array of individuals and organisations involved in private governance, each section clearly identifies the main audience for the principles and best practices. A further 12 longer case studies from around the world provide details of the best practices being applied.

## Principles

### Section 1: Establishing a privately protected area

- 1.1: A PPA must meet the definition of a protected area
- 1.2: PPA owners and managers should articulate clear conservation objectives from the outset
- 1.3: PPAs are best developed within a clear, supportive institutional framework that empowers governance and management
- 1.4: PPAs can be established through a variety of mechanisms
- 1.5: All PPAs should be established with a long-term strategy and sustainable financing

### Section 2: Managing a privately protected area

- 2.1: Current and potential PPA landholders should have a clear understanding of what is happening in and around the PPA before developing management activities
- 2.2: Management systems should focus on the achievement of defined PPA objectives
- 2.3: The full costs and benefits of the PPA should be understood as the basis for management
- 2.4: Management should be adaptive
- 2.5: Building a team should help develop PPA management capacity
- 2.6: Information about PPA management should be communicated widely

### Section 3: Incentives for privately protected areas

- 3.1: PPA incentives should be carefully designed, communicated and implemented to ensure effectiveness
- 3.2: Incentives should be designed to encourage both PPA establishment as well as long-term governance and management
- 3.3: Perverse incentives should be identified and avoided
- 3.4: Recognition and support are powerful incentives for PPAs
- 3.5: Direct management and technical support are incentives for PPA management, supporting long-term commitment
- 3.6: Marketing assistance is an effective incentive to PPAs that have income-generating potential
- 3.7: Financial incentives are important for the establishment and management of PPAs

### Section 4: Ensuring privately protected area permanence

- 4.1: PPA governance should embody the long-term intent to achieve conservation
- 4.2: Many different private conservation instruments can contribute to PPA permanence

### Section 5: Issues related to specific subtypes of privately protected areas

- 5.1: Specific subtypes of PPAs may require tailored forms of recognition, support and encouragement
- 5.2: Corporate PPAs offer specific benefits to companies and vice versa
- 5.3: PPAs managed by extractive industries must demonstrate contributions to biodiversity conservation
- 5.4: PPAs set up as for-profit companies/enterprises should ensure they achieve their specified conservation outcomes
- 5.5: Religious entities can contribute to conservation through developing PPAs on their own land

### Section 6: Coordination with national protected area systems

- 6.1: Conservation benefits when PPAs are coordinated with other types of protected area as part of a national system of protected areas
- 6.2: PPAs can complement other protected area governance types to develop effective national protected area systems

### Section 7: Recording privately protected areas

- 7.1: PPAs should be recorded in the World Database on Protected Areas

## Section 8: The role of privately protected area networks

8.1: Networks can be effective mechanisms to represent the interests and concerns of landholders

8.2: Networks can provide support structures for PPA landholders

8.3: Networks can have a role in the monitoring and verification of PPAs

8.4: Networks can play an important role in promoting PPA products

8.5: PPA networks should match structures and governance to their mission and objectives

8.6: PPA networks, like any organisation, should find ways to support and sustain their activities

## Why are PPAs important?

To date, the large majority of recorded protected areas have been created on state-owned lands and waters. Despite these efforts, several ecoregions are poorly represented in the global protected areas network. Many of the world's most important places for biodiversity (and geodiversity) remain outside formal protected areas (Dinerstein *et al.* 2017) and occur on private, communal or indigenous peoples' land.

Many thousands of PPAs already exist around the world (Bingham *et al.* 2017), with more being established. But until recently, PPAs have remained a largely hidden resource; they are ignored by some governments, omitted from international conservation reporting mechanisms and left out of regional conservation strategies (Stolton *et al.* 2014). The recognition of existing private conservation efforts, and the establishment of new PPAs, can often fill important gaps in national protected area systems in terms of geographic coverage, ecological representation and protection of endangered habitats and species. Purchase or donation of land and water by individuals can often increase the speed of response to conservation challenges as compared with lengthy government processes of protected area designation (Pasquini *et al.* 2011). PPAs also bring a wide range of stakeholders

into the conservation endeavour, enabling private citizens to contribute directly to conservation efforts through a bottom-up process and private entities to contribute to the public good.

## REFERENCE

Bingham, H., Fitzsimons, J.A., Redford, K.H., Mitchell, B.A., Bezaury - Creel, J. and Cumming, T.L. (2017). 'Privately protected areas: advances and challenges in guidance, policy and documentation'. *PARKS* 23(1):13–28. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.CH.2017.PARKS-23-1HB.en>

Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Dudley, N., Jaeger, T., Lassen, B., Pathak Broome, N., Phillips, A. and Sandwith, T. (2013). *Governance of Protected Areas: From understanding to action*. Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series no. 20. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. Available at: <https://portals.iucn.org/library/node/29138>

Dinerstein, E., Olson, D., Joshi, A., Vynne, C., Burgess, N.D., Wikramanayake, E., Hahn, N., Palminteri, S., Hedao, P., Noss, R., Hansen, M., Locke, H., Ellis, E.C., Jones, B., Barber, C.V., Hayes, R., Kormos, C., Martin, V., Crist, E., Sechrest, W., Price, L., Baillie, J.E.M., Weeden, D., Suckling, K., Davis, C., Sizer, N., Moore, R., Thau, D., Birch, T., Potapov, P., Turubanova, S., Tyukavina, A., De Souza, N., Pinteá, L., Brito, J.C., Llewellyn, O.A., Miller, A.G., Patzelt, A., Ghazanfar, S.A., Timberlake, J., Klöser, H., Shennan-Farpón, Y., Kindt, R., Lillesø, J.-P.B., van Breugel, P., Graudal, L., Voge, M., Al-Shammari, K.F. and Saleem, M. (2017). 'An ecoregion-based approach to protecting half the terrestrial realm'. *BioScience* 67:534–545. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/bix014>

Dudley, N. (ed.) (2008). *Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.CH.2008.PAPS.2.en>

Mitchell, B.A., Stolton, S., Bezaury-Creel, J., Bingham, H.C., Cumming, T.L., Dudley, N., Fitzsimons, J.A., Malleret-King,

D., Redford, K.H. and Solano, P. (2018). *Guidelines for privately protected areas*. Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 29. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. xii + 100pp. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2305/IUCNCH.2018.PAG.29.en>

Pasquini, L., Fitzsimons, J.A., Cowell, S., Brandon, K. and Wescott, G. (2011). 'The establishment of large private nature reserves by conservation NGOs: key factors for successful implementation'. *Oryx* 45:373–380. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030605310000876>

Stolton, S., Redford, K.H. and Dudley, N. (2014). *The Futures of Privately Protected Areas*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. Available at: <https://portals.iucn.org/library/node/44856>

# Investigación participativa entre los tapietes de Argentina: documentación interdisciplinaria del léxico relacionado con el mundo vegetal del Chaco salteño

HEBE A. GONZÁLEZ

Investigadora Independiente del Consejo de Investigación Científica y Tecnológica (CONICET) Profesora de Psicolingüística y Antropología, Departamento de Letras, Universidad Nacional de San Juan (UNSJ) [hebegonz@gmail.com](mailto:hebegonz@gmail.com)

DOI:10.32525/PARAQUARIANAT.2018(6):17.28

ISSN 2309-5237

© Del/de los autor/es.

Es con licencia exclusiva a Guyra Paraguay.

Recibido: 27 de agosto de 2018

Aceptado: 18 del noviembre de 2018

## INTRODUCCIÓN

Los tapietes habitan Argentina, Bolivia y Paraguay, país donde se autodenominan ñandevás. En Argentina, están localizados en dos comunidades de la provincia de Salta: Misión Los Tapietes, ciudad de Tartagal, Departamento San Martín y Misión La Curvita, a orillas del río Pilcomayo, Departamento Rivadavia. Hasta mediados del siglo XX, los tapietes desplegaban un patrón de asentamiento nómada o semi-nómada, con un sistema de subsistencia basado en la caza, la pesca y la recolección, y una agricultura incipiente. Los recursos vegetales ocupaban un espacio importante en su dieta.

A principio del siglo XX, la población criolla comenzó la usurpación del territorio habitado por los tapietes, instalando haciendas y puestos ganaderos. Esto provocó el conflicto con los blancos, a la vez que aceleró el contacto. Paralelamente, en Argentina, se incrementaron las oportunidades de trabajo en los ingenios azucareros y tabacaleros donde muchas etnias del Chaco,

## RESUMEN

El presente artículo describe el desarrollo de un proyecto interdisciplinario que abordó el estudio del conocimiento de la diversidad botánica de la región del Chaco salteño entre los tapietes de Argentina, desde las perspectivas de la lingüística antropológica y la etno-botánica. A partir de los aportes teórico-metodológicos de la investigación colaborativa e interdisciplinaria en la documentación lingüística y cultural, nos propusimos, por un lado, contribuir a la documentación de la lengua tapiete (tupí-guaraní) a través del estudio del léxico etnobotánico y, por el otro, indagar en los diferentes ámbitos culturales dentro de los cuales las plantas adquieren significación, abordando las funciones que desempeñan en sus vidas. El análisis lingüístico tuvo como objetivo identificar los mecanismos de formación de nombres de plantas como paso preliminar para dilucidar los principios que subyacen a la clasificación taxonómica del mundo vegetal entre los tapietes. Las plantas nativas constituyen una de las principales fuentes de alimento. Identificamos 53 especies nativas, pertenecientes a 22 familias botánicas, utilizadas en 115 formas de consumo y preparaciones culinarias. Las familias botánicas de mayor relevancia son las Fabáceas y las Solanáceas, cuyos usos se vinculan principalmente con la alimentación y la medicina, y, en menor medida, con actividades relacionadas al ámbito doméstico y al de los combustibles.

**PALABRAS CLAVES:** lingüística antropológica, etnobotánica, región chaqueña, vocabulario etnobotánico.

## ABSTRACT

This article describes the development of an interdisciplinary project that addressed the study of the knowledge of the botanical diversity of the Chaco region of Salta among the Tapietes of Argentina, from the perspectives of anthropological linguistics and ethnobotany. Through theoretical and methodological collaborative and interdisciplinary research in linguistic and cultural documentation we contribute to the documentation of the Tapiete language (Tupí-Guaraní) through the study of ethnobotanical vocabulary and investigate the cultural areas within which plants acquire significance, addressing the functions they perform in their lives. The objective of the linguistic analysis was to identify the mechanisms of formation of plant names as a preliminary step to elucidate the principles that underlie the taxonomic classification of the plants among Tapietes. Native plants are one of the main sources of food. We identified 53 native species, belonging to 22 botanical families, used in 115 forms of consumption and culinary preparations. The most important botanical families are the Fabaceae and the Solanaceae, whose uses are mainly linked to food and medicine, and, to a lesser extent, to activities related to the domestic sphere and to fuels.

**KEYWORDS:** anthropological linguistics, ethnobotany, Chaco region, ethnobotanical naming.

y con ellas los tapietes, se trasladaron para realizar trabajos temporarios (Hirsch 2006). El permanente contacto con la población blanca desencadenó un proceso de transculturación que implicó un rápido cambio de modo de vida y la adquisición de nuevas prácticas culturales, como la incorporación de nuevos productos alimenticios (Carvajal 1998, Hirsch 2006). En 1983, con el advenimiento de la democracia en Argentina, el Estado Nacional les reconoció el derecho de propiedad sobre su territorio. En Tartagal, se desencadenó un proceso de urbanización que implicó la reducción del espacio que habitaban a cinco manzanas, una de las cuales destinada a la escuela, y la asignación de un pequeño lote a cada familia. Años más tarde, en Misión Los Tapietes se construyeron viviendas de material y se instaló agua corriente y electricidad.

Durante la década del 90 compañías petroleras se establecieron en los alrededores de Tartagal. A medida que la ciudad se desarrollaba económicamente, se constru-

yeron barrios y caminos, lo que condujo a la destrucción parcial del monte que hasta mediados del siglo XX rodeaba la ciudad. Misión Los Tapietes quedó reducida a un pequeño barrio de aproximadamente 750 personas en la zona periurbana de Tartagal, rodeada por otros de pobladores criollos, a doce cuadras del centro (Hirsch, González y Ciccone 2006). En la actualidad, esta comunidad posee, además, 289 hectáreas, lugar que llaman La Colonia, donde cultivan, principalmente, zapallitos, sandías y maíz para consumo propio y para la venta. Todas las familias de la comunidad tienen derecho a la explotación del terreno, aunque no todas hacen uso de este derecho (González 2003).

Una situación marcadamente diferente se observa en Misión La Curvita, pequeño poblado multiétnico de aproximadamente 250 habitantes donde viven seis familias tapietes, todas ellas exogámicas, junto con indígenas tobas, wichíes y chorotes.