

Resource Centres as Communities of Practice: A Preliminary Investigation

Prepared by Jennifer Graham and Rebecca Rivera-Guieb
Catalyst Community Consulting

11 May 2006

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations	3
Acknowledgement	4
1. Introduction	5
2. Objectives	5
3. Methods.....	5
4. Case Study Selection	5
5. Research Questions	6
6. Learning Communities as Communities of Practice	7
7. Main Messages of the Study	10
8. Short Descriptions of the Resource Centres.....	14
9. Findings and Analysis	19
9.1 Organizational Motivation.....	19
9.2 Organizational Function	22
9.3 Organizational Structure.....	25
9.4 Resources, Infrastructure and Sustainability	27
10. Competencies of Resource Centres.....	28
11. Supporting Resource Centres: Emerging Questions.....	28
References	30
Appendix 1: Preliminary Research Questions	31
Appendix 2: Individual Narratives	32
The Legal Rights and Natural Resources Center-Kasama sa Kalikasan (LRC-KSK/Friends of the Earth Philippines).....	32
Community-Based Natural Resource Management Learning Institute (CBNRM LI).....	36
The Regional Community Forestry Training Center For Asia And The Pacific (RECOFTC)	41
Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM Net)	45
The Highlander Center for Research and Education.....	50
Gulf of Maine Resource Centres	57
Cobscook Bay Resource Center.....	60
Community Livelihoods Trust/ Clark House	64
Bay of Fundy Marine Resource Centre	68
Penobscot East Resource Center	72

List of Abbreviations

ALG	Alternative Law Group
CBNRM	Community-based Natural Resource Management
CBNRM LI	Community-based Natural Resource Management Learning Institute
CLT	Coastal Livelihoods Trusts
CoP	Communities of Practice
FoEI	Friends of the Earth International
CPRNet	Common Property Resource Management Network
FTTP	Forest, Trees and People Program
GOM	Gulf of Maine
ICT	Information Communication Technology
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
LeaRN	Learning and Research Network
LRC-KsK	Legal Rights and Natural Resources Center-Kasama sa Kalikasan
MRC	Bay of Fundy Marine Resource Centre
NAMA	North American Marine Alliance
NGO	Non-government Organization
PERC	Penobscot East Resource Center
RC	Resource Centre
RECOFTC	Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and the Pacific

Acknowledgement

We would like to acknowledge the support of the following people and organizations.

The study was conceptualized and directed by John F. Kearney & Associates and funded by a grant from the International Development Research Centre of Canada (IDRC) to the Coady International Institute. Brian Davy of IDRC helped with initial contacts and ideas.

Ken Serey Rotha, Toby Carson and the rest of the staff at CBNRM LI in Cambodia for providing feedback on the draft.

Ly Vuthy, Kim Hor, Tit Phearak, Sim Bunthoeun, So Srey Mom, Peou Neth, Kim Nong for providing feedback during our short presentation of the findings in Phnom Penh.

Arthur Bull, Maria Recchia, Wil Hopkins and Robin Alden for interesting conversations and feedback.

All the resource centres that provided the inspiration and information for this project. .

Resource Centres as Communities of Practice: A Preliminary Investigation

1. Introduction

There has been much discussion among partners of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) in Asia, Latin American, and the Caribbean, and more recently during a North American workshop, about the establishment of “resource centres”, “learning centres”, “institutes”, and “centres of excellence” as institutions for capacity-building in community-based resource management and research.

However, the people involved in these discussions do not necessarily share the same understanding of the role of these centres, and there are many models around the world to choose from. This preliminary study was commissioned by Coady International Institute in Antigonish, Nova Scotia on behalf of IDRC in Ottawa, Canada.

2. Objectives

- a) Identify 5-7 key examples of centres in different parts of the world, both North and South, as case studies that serve to illustrate some key messages about the purpose, structure, function and sustainability of community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) resource centres.
- b) Carry out a preliminary analysis of selected case studies that can contribute to the development of some shared understanding of the various kinds of resource centres available.
- c) Prepare a summary report that can serve as a resource for IDRC partners and suggest areas for further exploration and research.

3. Methods

This study was carried out between February and April 2005 by two researchers working from Canada and the Philippines. The primary data sources were literature and web searches, supplemented by telephone or face to face interviews with key representatives of the selected resource centres.

4. Case Study Selection

Bessette and Vernooy's (2005) description of the characteristics of centres of excellence in CBNRM was taken as a starting point for this study. They describe “centres of excellence” as an effort to institutionalize CBNRM in “places where the future generation of CBNRM scholars, researchers, and practitioners will find a home to learn about,

practice, improve, and disseminate CBNRM concepts, methods, and achievements.”

These centres might have any or all of the following objectives:

- To bring together knowledge and expertise about CBNRM and channel “the state of the art” to its constituents,
- To facilitate the sharing of experiences between communities in addressing CBNRM issues,
- To develop advocacy approaches and plans to explain and promote CBNRM and participatory action research to policy-makers,
- To support networking with other communities and development stakeholders,
- To influence global and regional policies for CBNRM, and
- To develop holistic curricula that integrates the various approaches and tools used in the practice of participatory CBNRM research.

Potential case studies were chosen from among those institutions that most share the objectives listed above or take an even more innovative or unique approach to the goal of institutionalizing CBNRM learning. These potential sites were identified in consultation with IDRC program staff and partners, practitioners working in field such as CBNRM, community development, social justice, forestry and fisheries management, as well as the existing contacts of the consultants. Internet searches were also used to identify potential resource centers for this study.

Ultimately, the short time frame for this study made it simpler to focus mostly on resource centers that are previously familiar to the consultants. This tended to lead site selection towards institutions working directly to support CBNRM, especially fisheries management rather than towards many excellent examples of health, economic justice or immigration resource centres. This study eventually focused mainly on resource centres located in South East Asia (Philippines, Cambodia, Thailand), and North American (US and Canada). We also selected one “virtual” resource centre, CBNRM Net, a network devoted specifically to sharing information about Community-Based Natural Resource Management. CBNRM Net is also set apart from the other selected resource centers by having a global coverage and with a specific focus on Sub-Saharan Africa.

Nonetheless, within the seemingly narrow category of CBNRM resource centres, the case studies in the study reveal an intriguingly wide range of interests and areas of expertise including: fisheries policy, indigenous people, laws and legal support, culture and folklore, popular education, GIS mapping, case study writing, facilitation, conflict resolution, and water quality monitoring. This indicates how deceptive a web search for “CBNRM research centres” can be, as well as the difficulties (discussed in the findings and analysis) for some resource centres to define and stick with their mandate.

5. Research Questions

The preliminary research questions were clustered into four theme areas:

- a) Organizational Motivation: What drives and inspires this centre?
- b) Organizational Function: What does the RC actually do?
- c) Organizational Structure: How is the RC set up, how does it work?

d) **Organizational Resources and Sustainability:** What keeps this RC going?

A full list of research questions is available in Appendix 1.

For each case study site, the researchers used a literature and web search to find some answers to the research questions and prepare an initial narrative summary. As needed, personal and telephone interviews were done as a follow up to validate the information, obtain additional data, and ground truth the results. The featured resource centres were given the opportunity to comment on the completed narratives.

The researchers analysed data by comparing and contrasting points of similarity between and amongst the resource centres to draw out patterns and trends, as well as to identify information gaps and potential questions for further research. We also based our analysis on some of the emerging literature on learning communities, networks, and especially communities of practice (see below).

6. Learning Communities as Communities of Practice

Arthur Bull, Executive Director of the Saltwater Network considers resource centers “as civil institutions that provide support for learning, organizational development, conflict resolution, research, community economic development, and social mobilization.”

Resource centres provide resources for learning, and are often explicitly or implicitly part of learning networks or communities.

This definition is similar but slightly different than Bessette and Vernoy’s (2005) description of “centres of excellence,” with which we began this study. They defined centres of excellence *as an effort to institutionalize community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) in “places where the future generation of CBNRM scholars, researchers, and practitioners will find a home to learn about, practice, improve, and disseminate CBNRM concepts, methods, and achievements.”* They continue by stating that *“the overall goal of these centres is to ensure the promotion and development of CBNRM approaches, concepts, methods and tools among a wide variety of constituents including practitioners, community groups, field researchers, policy makers, students, university scholars, and international organizations.”*

The information led these researchers to believe that a distinction between a resource centre and a centre of excellence may well lie in the difference between being a civil or citizen-run institution as opposed to an institution created explicitly to house and disseminate certain types of information. Similarly, there is also a difference between being a supportive institution, which implies being led or driven by constituents’ needs and priorities as distinct to having an overall goal to ensure the promotion and development of CBNRM approaches.

The resource centres in this study were generally quite explicit in that they existed to “support learning and organizational development.” They understand learning as an active process of engagement and action, and capacity building as something that

happens by bringing people together to share their experiences and generate new knowledge. Consequently, after completing the draft narratives on each centre, the researchers looked at some of the literature on learning institutions in order to help in understanding the motivation and approach of the resource centers in this study. Useful information in understanding resource centres is in the seminal work of Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger on “communities of practice,” a summary of which is found in Smith (2003).

Fundamentally, ***learning is in the relationships between people***. A community of practice (CoP) involves much more than the technical knowledge or skill associated with undertaking some task. Members are involved in a set of relationships over time (Lave and Wenger 1991) and communities develop around things that matter to people (Wenger 1998). The fact that they are organizing around some particular area of knowledge and activity gives members a sense of joint enterprise and identity.

Over time, this collective learning results in practices that reflect both the pursuit of these enterprises (shared activities) and the accompanying social relations. These practices become the property of a kind of community created over time. It makes sense to consider these kinds of communities “*communities of practice*.” Are communities of practice always shaped by regular face to face interaction? CBNRM Net, the only virtual resource centre in our study, sees itself as a network linking a community of practice scattered around the world, as well as an ongoing experiment in learning how electronic communication can facilitate the development of learning communities.

As McDermott (in Murphy 1999:17) puts it:

Learning traditionally gets measured as on the assumption that it is a possession of individuals that can be found inside their heads... [Here] learning is in the relationships between people. Learning is in the conditions that bring people together and organize a point of contact that allows for particular pieces of information to take on relevance; without the points of contact, without the system of relevancies, there is not learning, and there is little memory. Learning does not belong to individual persons, but to the various conversations of which they are a part.

Furthermore, ***there is an intimate connection between knowledge and activity***. Problem solving and learning from experience are central processes. Perhaps one of the most important things to grasp here is the extent to which education involves informed and committed action.

Many of the resource centres in our study emerged as a result of local action. Those involved in the struggle to save the inshore fishery in the Bay of Fundy for example, learned together how to build a movement. Over time, they realized they needed more knowledge and more people involved. The Bay of Fundy Marine Resource Centre was created as a learning and supportive institution for those engaged in community-based fisheries management ***and beyond***.

Moving beyond their own immediate communities through networking is an important aspect of what resource centers do. Linking and expanding connections is a common thread among the resource centers. Salvador (2005) provides some useful distinction and explanation among various terms associated with networking, which are all done in varied mix and match among all the resource centers. First, she makes a distinction between linking and networking. Networking implies a more complex structure (spider web), while linking can be compared to an interlocking chain. It can work either horizontally or vertically, while the web is an infinite cross stitch. Networks can be likened to international alliances because both are organizational creations of autonomous units. A core of networks is like a coordinating body that offers services but does not compromise the autonomy of members. Further, Salvador explains that enlargement refers to the process of widening the scope and membership of a network and may involve further network alliance building with like minded units or organizations while deepening could mean broadening of topics and concerns of a network.

Finally, this study is informed by some of the following thoughts of Etienne Wenger (1998) on communities of practice, as summarized by Hildreth and Kimble (2005):

What it is about: A community of practice as a joint enterprise in as much as it is understood and continually renegotiated by its members. The resource centers in this study are motivated by values as articulated in their mission statements and mandates. There is a deep sense of commitment and service within those resource centers included in our study.

How it functions: People become members of a CoP through shared practices; they are linked to each other through their involvement in certain common activities. It is mutual engagement that binds members of a CoP together as a social entity. The programs and activities carried out by the resource centers and the governing mechanisms that support their decision making are expressions of the shared values and commitment. Long lasting resource centers, such as the Highlander Center in Tennessee have developed consistent program areas that allow them to express their mission and values.

What it produces: The members of a CoP build up an agreed set of communal resources over time. This “shared repertoire” of resources represents the material traces of the community. Written files can constitute a more explicit aspect of this common repository although more intangible aspects such as procedures, policies, rituals and specific idioms may also be included. Many of the resource centers in this study do produce tangible learning material such as curriculum, reports, research or case studies. Others collect and disseminate material produced by others. However, in addition to traditional materials, the resource centres in this study also generate a sense of community, and a shared language and understanding of CBNRM. They also conduct capacity building in support of local action.

Evolution: There is often some sort of evolution in a CoP. It may be that the CoP has developed because of a common interest of a group of people. On the other hand, it may be that the CoP was a formally constituted group that has evolved into a CoP because of

the relationships that have developed amongst the members. Again, most of the RCs in this study are organizations that do change in response to the changing local context and in response to the needs of their constituents. They periodically evaluate their work, re-assess their mandate and objectives, re-define themselves and re-engage in learning and social action.

Relationships: This is a key part of a CoP and is what makes it possible for a team to become a CoP – as the informal relationships develop so the source of legitimacy in the group shifts in emphasis. These relationships are key to the issues of trust and identity in a CoP. The resource centres in this study nurture their relationships with their long term partners, often through mechanisms such as all partner forums that create a shared commitment to a specific activity or strategy.

Narration: Narration (story telling) is very useful in both knowledge sharing and knowledge generation. In Lave and Wenger (1991) stories featured heavily. The quality of the story became the source of the legitimization. From case study writing, to kitchen table meetings, to research forums, to songs, theatre, and testimonials, sharing stories, sharing experiences, sharing time together is something that happens at most of the resource centers in this study. It is one of the functions that is difficult to quantify, and yet adds a richness to the experience of being part of a learning community.

7. Main Messages of the Study

Resource Centres are safe spaces

They allow different groups and interests to sit at the same table (including in some cases, a virtual table) and start a dialogue. Sometimes these different interests come from within community, i.e., different resource user groups, other times resource centres bring together community, government, academics, and law enforcers. Many of the resource centres in this study have played an important role in helping marginalized groups of people, e.g., indigenous peoples and fishing communities, connect with other communities and interest groups.

Safe does not always mean neutral

Many resource centres are value-based organization. Inherent in their commitment to supporting stakeholders working together for community-based management is a commitment to place and to community. Some resource centres are actively (and vocally) engaged in the same struggles as their primary constituents.

Resource Centres can be inclusive and exclusive

Resource centers form around a core group of like minded individuals that create a community of practice, in which their values and needs are *included*. As most individuals involved in a resource center are representatives or connected to a particular

constituency, most resource centers have ready-made groups of partners at their inception stage. Even resource centers with extensive networks and multiple partnerships maintain a core group of strongly connected allies.

Nonetheless, by the very fact that they bring people together, resource centres are always expanding their networks. Networking involves reaching out to groups beyond their primary constituencies, and including other users and institutions. There sometimes is a tension between enlarging and deepening connections, especially if these relationships require becoming actively involved in new projects or causes. These pressures eventually lead some resource centers to formally define their primary partners and allies and exclude (or choose to not prioritize) others. Eventually, many resource centers function on multiple frequencies, as they broadcast and exchange information to a wider audience with one part of their organizational structure, involve a more select group in training and learning opportunities, and remain intrinsically linked to a core group of institutions that help shape the resource centre's agenda and activities and to whom they feel directly accountable.

Resource Centres constantly balance multiple agendas

Resource centres are capacity building and linking institutions, as such they often help connect those working for change and spread their messages. In this sense, they are connecting institutions with a mandate to connect and teach and share knowledge. Nonetheless, a resource centre usually evolves from particular programs or projects. It has an organizational agenda distinct from its function as a convenor or training centre. Most resource centre programs are an expression of their values and priorities as well as the expressed needs of their constituents. A resource centre is almost like a community organizer carrying an institutional mandate when she/he goes to the community. The relationship is based on finding complementary needs, values, and services. How to balance responding to needs and implementing specific programs can be a challenge for some resource centres.

PERC tries to put these values into place by “meeting the community where they are” in terms of defining projects and needs. These smaller projects are a first step towards the changes in attitude and relationship necessary to support CBCRM. As a virtual resource centre, where resources available are almost exclusively directed by what members want to share with each other, CBNRM Net can be driven by its constituents' interests to a much higher degree than other types of resource centres.

Resource Centres build social relationships for learning

Most resource centres are capacity building institutions. This capacity building is borne out of social relationships and engagement. Resource centers are not merely broadcasting information in the form of training materials and curriculum. They are creating and nurturing the kinds of relationships that lead to learning. Furthermore, the reason that resource centres are established is to provide a service to a particular community, often one to which they are in close proximity.

For this reason, it is difficult for purely virtual resource centres such as the web-based CBNRM Net to evolve the same types of communities of practice bound by consistent support and collective action. Perhaps such relationships can be formed online, yet this requires access to Internet and email, and sufficient time to create a virtual safe space. However, while all CBNRM Net member cannot easily – and certainly not on the short term – build such social relationships for learning with other CBNRM Net members, the idea (or ideal) is that s/he establish such relationships and local networks in her/his locality with persons that may or may not be CBNRM Net members, and the CBNRM Net and its extended virtual CoP plays the role of informing and resourcing such relationships and local networks. That is, a global virtual resource center and CoP informs and resources local-level face-to-face networks.

Resource centres take citizenship in a particular location

Resources centres are led by people who have staked a claim to a particular location. They have become citizens of a particular place or of a group of people. They develop their programs and activities with reference to this area or community and not for more abstract potential users. Citizen-based institutions do not always imply that all resource centres are run by local people or civil institutions. This does, however, suggest that those involved see their role as more than just trainers or staff. As Tamarack Institute (<http://www.Tamarackinstitute.org>) explains, organizations are “leaderfull” rather than leader-driven). PERC, which evolved from an existing fishing organization, is a good example of a resource centre with a long term commitment to a place. Unlike many GOMC resource centres, their staff and Board are made up a number of well known and respected local leaders that can complement each other and play a driving role in the organization.

Resource Centers have specific phases of life

Like any institutions, resource centres grow and evolve over time. It may take time to find the right mix of leaders, programs, activities, partners, funding and governance for long term sustainability. Younger resource centres may be in survival mode for years as they struggle to build their own capacity to serve their constituencies. Capacity-building institutions like the Saltwater Network may be critical in supporting resource centres so they can learn and support others. Again, the image is of resource centres nested within their own communities and as part of larger and wider circles and communities, that in turn nurture and support them as they grow.

Long lasting resource centres like the Highlander Center and RECOFT become the institutional memory of a particular movement (civil rights and social forestry in the case of these particular resource centres). They also benefit from support, credibility and alliances that newer centres do not have. In the case of the Highlander Center, over the last 75 years so many people have attended workshops or trainings there that alumni form a large web of support in the rural south of the United States, throughout the US and internationally. Similarly, graduates of RECOFT courses are working in communities,

institutions and governments around Asia. This is the living legacy of a solid resource centre.

Funding often determines the function of the RC and the services they can offer. This is true of CBNRM Net which has evolved creative and inexpensive ways to reach many people.

Influencing Policy

Most of the RCs in this study have had their greatest success at capacity building and connecting people and institutions. Most, however, have also contributed to changing and/or influencing policy change, at least at a local level. Cobscook Bay Resource Center has been able to broker the adoption of Daily Scallop Catch limits in their local area. PERC uses media and education very effectively to influence policy, hosting colloquiums on the fishery in their community to engage fishermen and the non fishing community in the struggles of the inshore fishery. CBNRM LI is making headway in Cambodia as CBNRM approaches become institutionalized in national policy. In both cases, influence is local/country. There is some sense that RECOFTC also has far ranging influence on regional social forestry policy, but this may be more indirect due to their influence and credibility rather than because of direct policy change efforts. Most resource centers in the Gulf of Maine have participated in a policy change activities related to the inshore fisheries and have met with limited success. CBNRM Net provides information to its many members, some of whom include government staff, and they may or may not use this information to change policies and practices. Since the CBNRM Net site makes available information about practices adopted elsewhere, it is a good resource for those involved in policy change work.

Being grounded

Resource centres have to be grounded in real and meaningful practice. They should be providing direct and consistent service to their constituents. In this, communities should be acting as partners, not merely as a source of information or a field site for experimentation. This is about making and honouring a commitment to learn and problem solve together. Resource centres such as the LRC-KsK have extensive programs and activities all over the Philippines in terms, however they prioritize, providing direct consistent support for their main consistency - the indigenous people's groups. Cobcook Bay Resource Center has a similar commitment to ongoing community water quality monitoring in the Cobcook Bay region in Maine.

Resource Centres are microcosms of the wider world

Resource centres cannot stand apart from the questions and dynamics that any community face, in particular how to learn about and address concerns with power, equity and voice. Resource Centres that are concerned with social change should take the time to reflect how their social values are expressed in their internal social relationships and structures. It is worth noting that of the resource centres in this study only LRC-KsK

explicitly notes its concern with gender equity, both in program delivery and by having regular gender orientation sessions for staff. The Highlander Center, while not specifically mentioning gender, does look at oppression within society and tries to focus its programs on the most marginalized groups in society. There seems to be some effort to hire staff from traditionally marginalized communities and educate themselves on oppression and equity issues. For this reason, it is probably easier for very local RCs to be representative than for those working on a larger scale.

8. Short Descriptions of the Resource Centres

Legal Rights and Natural Resources Center-Kasama sa Kalikasan (LRC-KsK)

The LRC-KsK has existed for 18 years and is the third oldest RC in our case studies. It is the Philippine affiliate of the Friends of the Earth International (FoEI). The expertise of the center is on issues of indigenous peoples' rights, resource tenure, natural resource management, forestry, mining, energy and local community initiatives. Presently, it provides direct and consistent legal research and advocacy support to different indigenous groups in 4 areas in the Philippines. The LRC-KsK holds regular policy discussions, and implements a program on gender integration and "budget advocacy" as a way to advocate prioritization of public expenditures in ways that would benefit the poor. The center is a founding member of the Alternative Law Group (ALG), a network of 24 institutions providing alternative or developmental legal service to marginalized sectors of society.

Postal address: No. 7 Marunong St. Central East District, Diliman, Quezon City,
Philippines

URL/website: <http://www.lrcksk.org/index.htm>

Community-Based Natural Resource Management Learning Institute (CBNRM LI)

The CBNRM LI describes itself as an "innovative place for reflective learning, a creative and technical training and resource centre, a nurturing point for building partnerships for mutual learning and sharing of experiences, and a neutral forum for analyzing and improving CBNRM practices." It started as a project that eventually was "institutionalized" in 2001 as a response to the growing need on building CBNRM knowledge, skills, and attitudes. It is now a non-profit NGO with a mission to analyze and improve the CBNRM approach as an integral component of poverty alleviation, sustainable livelihoods and resource management, conservation, and decentralization policies and strategies of the Royal Government of Cambodia. It has programs on training and learning forums, participatory action research and it has links to policy processes, documentation and information dissemination, and networking and partnership building. It also supports the development and dissemination of CBNRM curricula through publication of research reports, it prepares and consults on practical field manuals, and develops extension materials and multi-media productions. The CBNRM LI is strongly connected with national networks and is slowly building up regional

connections. Strategically, it aims to become the “Cambodian node” of regional networks such as the Learning and Research Network (LeaRN) and Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC).

Postal address: 38, Street 9, Tonle Bassac P.O. Box 2509, Phnom Penh, Cambodia
URL/website: <http://www.cbnrmli.org>

Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC)

The RECOFTC was established in 1987 (the second oldest RC in our example) based on several discussions on the need to have a regional institution on community forestry training and research to facilitate the exchange of information and implementation of activities. It was the Asian network facilitator for the Forest, Trees and People Program (FTTP) of FAO until it became an independent organization in 2000. The primary geographical focus of RECOFTC’s program is the Asia-Pacific region covering 47 countries. It is well-placed among national and regional networks and offers a range of integrated training courses and study tours on CBNRM, incorporating case study explorations and analysis, field visits and discussions with experts. It also offers both open subscription and customized training and study tours. The RECOFTC implements programs that support discussions of CBNRM issues in regional and international forums, and that develop capacity-building products and services for stakeholders at all levels.

Postal address: Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand 10903
URL/website: <http://www.recoftc.org>

Community-Based Natural Resource Management Network (CBNRM Net)

The CBNRM Net is a global network with a portal website that provides useful networking tools aimed at linking stakeholders. The World Bank’s Common Property Resource Management Network (CPRNet) and a 1998 international CBNRM workshop provided the initial inspiration and motivation to establish CBNRM Net. Its main constituency is the “global CBNRM community of practice” composed broadly of politicians, public sector officials, project managers, funders, field level implementers, researchers and local people. Presently, there are more than 500 members, but there are a higher number of general users of the website. As a gateway to and clearinghouse for CBNRM knowledge, CBNRM Net is aiming for a broader, more inclusive and interactive model that would eventually contribute in providing the tools and opportunities for CBNRM stakeholders globally to exchange views and experiences and avail of information and resources on CBNRM that are practice-oriented. The CBNRM Net is managed by an NGO based in Norway.

Postal address: P.O. Box 1600, NO-4688 Kristiansand, Norway
URL/website: <http://www.cbnrm.net>

Highlander Center for Research and Education

The mission of the Highlander Center is to work with people struggling against oppression, supporting their effort to take collective action to shape their own destiny. Founded in 1932, it is the oldest RC in our study. The Highlander Center's approach is relevant to CBNRM practitioners as their focus is working to support marginalized communities in harnessing their own capacity to bring about change. Secondly, for the last few decades the Highlander Center has devoted considerable resources to environmental issues. The recognition that resource dependent communities should be able to manage and benefit from and not be harmed by effects of resource extraction activities in their communities has parallels with CBNRM. Lastly, the Highlander Center is rooted in a sense of place, of connectedness to certain geographic communities, and their people and resources. In support of their vision, the Highlander Center conducts research, develops organizing and educational strategies, collects and produces resource materials for popular educators and organizers. They also compile information on many topics related to economic justice, civil rights and globalization from Appalachia, the American South and around the world. The Highlander Center also sponsors popular education programs that support grassroots activists and community leaders in the South. Many materials are available online through the links and resources section of their website. Publications can also be accessed through their library collection, or ordered from the bookstore.

Postal address: 1959 Highlander Way, New Market, Tennessee, United States of America

URL/Website: www.highlandercenter.org

Bay of Fundy Marine Resource Centre (MRC)

The MRC is a community-based institution established in 1997 that is offering services, facilities and technical support to all aspects of the Bay of Fundy marine economy and ecosystem in Atlantic Canada. The MRC was established by the Fundy Fixed Gear Council and the Western Valley Development Agency, local community economic development agency, and other community interests to provide support services to all marine industries. Once initiated, the fishing organization handed over responsibility for the centre to a board of directors comprised of community members. Over the years, the MRC has provided support to a range of fisher organizations, fish processors, the aquaculture industry, marine ecotourism operators, First Nations, environmental groups, researchers, and governments. The main focus has been on fishery themes. The MRC has also worked at the scale of the entire Bay of Fundy. The MRC often describes itself as providing a "tool box" for local groups interested in local management. Emerging community fishery groups can draw on institutional capacity building support (organizational, technical or research-based) locally from an organization which does not have interests or an agenda of its own - it is purely an enabling agency. The MRC's work focuses on six broad areas: (1) community-based resource management, (2) aquaculture, (3) marine tourism promotion and marketing, (4) digital data storage and retrieval, (5)

training for aquaculture and fisheries, and (6) ecological, market, legal, technological and social research relating to marine resources.

Postal address: Cornwallis, Nova Scotia, Canada

URL/Website: <http://www.bfmrc.ns.ca/>

Coastal Livelihoods Trust / Clarke House (CLT)

CLT is a very recently established organization located in St. Andrews, New Brunswick, Canada. Its mission statement is to engage people of coastal communities in the stewardship of their resource based livelihoods, through education, networking and capacity building. It envisions healthy coastal communities in South West New Brunswick where social economic and environmental justice is the basis of development. CLT is different from the other resource centers of the GOM in that there is one resource centre (Clark House), with 5 non-profits acting as a cooperative and sharing resources and office space. Until recently, CLT was a part of the Centre for Community-based management at St. Francis Xavier University in Antigonish. The CLT is currently working on the following projects: capacity building and organizational development with Fundy North Fishermen's Association, a campaign for recognition of the Passamaquoddy First Nation in Canada, linking fishermen and tourist operators working in Passamaquoddy Bay, and development and coordination of the new resource centre. It has yet to define its program areas, but they will fall broadly under supporting community-based management, support for aboriginal communities, peace and social justice. The CLT also supports local initiatives through offering support for action and then a gradual phase out, for example building non-native support for recognition of the Passamaquoddy.

Postal address: Clark House, St. Andrews, New Brunswick, Canada

URL/Website: [in development](#)

Cobscook Bay Marine Resource Center

The Cobscook Bay Marine Resource Center in Northern Maine emerged out of the Cobscook Bay Clam Restoration project which in turn came from the Sustainable Cobscook Project. The initial projects created a better understanding of the importance, of and threats to the marine environment in the Cobscook Bay area. The projects created the knowledge, partnerships, and constituencies for a more permanent resource center. Their current mission is to encourage and strengthen community-based approaches to resource management and sustainable economic development in the Cobscook Bay region, the Bay of Fundy, and the Gulf of Maine. Cobscook Bay Resource Centre has a strong reputation amongst the other Gulf of Maine resource centre for their GIS mapping work, research, and community monitoring projects. They have developed collaborative data sharing agreements around GIS data and maps that have served as a model for other organizations in negotiating data sharing agreements. They are also known for long

running water quality monitoring and marine education as well as innovative research partnerships. Much of Cobscook Bay Marine Resource Center's networking activities stem from the dialogue and relationship building that the Centre can offer in its role as a "safe space" for people to meet. It has been supportive in conflict resolution for organizations, community, and municipal government, and between communities in the area. They connect people working on CBCRM to other organizations and potential supporters.

Postal address: Eastport, Maine, United States of America

URL/Website: <http://www.cobscook.org/index.htm>

Penobscot East Resource Center

Penobscot East Resource Center is a community-based organization located in Stonington, Maine that provides support to local groups engaged in community-based marine management and fishermen-based stewardship.

PERC was incorporated in July 2003. It evolved out of the work of the Stonington Fisheries Alliance, a local fishing organization. PERC differs from SFA in that it is a capacity building/supporting institution for SFA and other community-based organizations.

PERC's vision and mission are to energize and facilitate responsible community-based fishery management, collaborative marine science, and sustainable economic development to benefit the fishermen and communities of Penobscot Bay and the Eastern Gulf of Maine.

The primary constituencies for the resource centre are those involved in the marine industries in the Eastern Gulf of Maine. Directly supporting fishers and those earning a living from the water is large part of PERC's vision. Their approach stems from a belief that those earning a living from the fishery must have a direct role in fisheries management.

PERC's main programs and functions:

- A meeting place: A safe and familiar place for fishermen, scientists, and diverse community members. Its planned location in an old warehouse on the waterfront will be highly visible and physically accessible to fishermen and other community members.
- Information: Science about the local area including both fishermen driven research and collaborative work with scientists and research institutions. The site will also eventually host a fisheries museum
- Support services: This can include general access to office and meeting space including fax, copier, and computer, as well as support for organizational development for other organizations, such as capacity building, leadership development and organizational support.

- **Local Science:** Local science will bridge the divide between scientists and communities, by providing access and facilities for visiting scientists and arranging collaborative research with fishermen. It is not only a way to collect information, but to change attitudes and build new relationships.

Postal address: Penobscot East Resource Center
 PO Box 27
 Stonington, ME 04681
 (207) 367-2708

URL/website: <http://www.salwaternetwork.org> or <http://www.penobscoteast.org/>

A longer description of each of the centers can be found in Appendix 2: Individual Narratives.

9. Findings and Analysis

9.1 Organizational Motivation

Local vs. geographically distributed environment

There are some interesting aspects to how various resource centres see the scope of their work and the relationships and partners with whom they are involved. For example, being grounded and having legitimacy are real issues for many North American resource centres who are working with communities that are sensitive to being told what to do by outsiders. There is also a fear of stretching resources and commitments too thin and no longer serving the needs of their local area. For Cobscook Bay Resource Center, being grounded and staying true requires “nesting” partnerships in order of priority from “those who are earning their living on the water in the Cobscook region up to “communities of the Gulf of Maine.” PERC has also attempted to clearly define its constituents and partnerships and prioritize these relationships. In contrast, RECOFTC has been envisioned as a regional centre from inception stage and similarly, CBNRM Net’s scope has always been the “global CBNRM community of practice.”

Resource centres feel that their local work is enriched by contact with more national and even international organizations but the degree of forethought or planning around national and international networks vary. Some resource centres link with either similar types of resource centers or capacity building institutions or by helping their constituencies connect with other grassroots organizations in other parts of the world. For example, MRC has been involved in exchanges between local fishing organizations and fishermen in Sri Lanka. The MRC and CLT have been more ad hoc or opportunistic in their international and even national work, with connections from the Coady International Institute or the West Coast leading to participation in study tours or training opportunities. Internationally, they are linked with the World Federation of Fish Harvesters, which is a global alliance that gets local fishing organizations engaged in global fisheries policy issues. Other resource centres are more connected either by being

representatives of regional organizations or implementing programs especially devoted to international linkages. For example, CBNRM LI has links with several regional organizations and networks in Asia and sits in the Board of Directors of RECOFTC and the Regional Coordinating Committee of the LeaRN Network. Similarly, the LRC-KsK became the official Philippine affiliate of the FoEI in 1992 and has since been active in its global trade campaigns. The Highlander Center, while clearly rooted in their local context and communities, has program areas for international linkages such as popular education around globalization and advocacy around toxic waste disposal and mining and as such, has long standing partnerships with organizations in Mexico, India and Africa. RECOFTC also has programs that would make them an information hub on community-based forest management in the Asia Pacific. CBCRM Net located neither in the North or the South, it has a global membership coordinated from a home base in Norway.

Except for the North American resource centres that have a very local focus, the rest of the cases included in this study presently have a more geographically distributed scope or are intending to widen its networking and constituency building efforts. The lack of funds for ongoing programs or staff make the North American resource centers cautious about taking on relationships or work that they cannot continue to carry. As Will Hopkins from Cobscook Bay Resource Center explains: it is difficult enough to shift from local to regional work, being effective beyond that level is simply too great a commitment of time and resources for understaffed resource centers. Is this also because the North American centres in this study are all based in rural areas, in small communities not in large capitals or urban settings?

Linking and Networking with Individuals and Institutions

The resource centers place different levels of importance on defining their partners as well as in how they “enlarge” or “deepen” their networks. This has something to do with how narrowly the resource centres see their mandate, as well as how they interpret words like networking. The MRC is involved with a wide array of projects related to the marine industry in the Bay of Fundy and their work has ranged widely from biological research to housing projects. They are involved in a number of networks from national community economic development collaboration, to regional health boards, international fish workers unions and social justice groups. They seek mainly to find common ground or general agreement on a few key goals or activities. However, they do not necessarily intend to commit more than their name and indirect support to the network.

Other resource centres are either well-placed in larger networks or moving along this direction such as the cases of RECOFTC, CBNRM LI and LRC-KsK. It is particularly instructive to point out the unique experience of the LRC-KsK, which is involved in a number of Philippine networks, task forces and working groups from environment, budget advocacy and gender. The LRC-KsK is the only resource centre in our study that is doing networking and advocacy on budget. Their budget advocacy program was conceptualized with a realization that without dedicating financial resources, the government cannot carry out their commitments or pronouncements to any developmental initiatives. Presently, this program has evolved into a tool to analyze and

critique the direction and the policies that the Philippine government has been pursuing, and to ascertain if its allocation of public resources is in line with the declarations and commitments it has made.

The Cobscook Bay Resource Center, on the other hand, is far narrower in its focus and more selective in its networking efforts. For example, they are not a member of the Northwest Atlantic Marine Alliance (NAMA) which is also based in Maine, as their own focus is state managed rather than federally managed fisheries. They are active participants in any network they are involved with but, often they prefer to first build relationships with individuals that may lead to more formal partnerships in the future.

This idea on building relationships with individuals appears to be a common entry point for networking for most resource centres. This is understandable if one considers networks for CBNRM as communities of practice in any real sense of having shared values and a shared culture of learning. This is perhaps why so many resource centers have long term partnerships that are starting with individuals who have been involved somehow in their programs. The North American resource centres for example all seem to have Board Members selected as individuals but who are already part of their community, frequently as constituents. This also holds true for the Board Members of RECOFTC and CBNRM LI. The lines are blurred, but it seems to start with people not institutions. In contrast, PERC seeks to have a Board that can provide expertise in particular topics in which the staff wants extra support.

Another common thread among resource centres is networking among like-minded individuals and groups. From local to country to international, resource centres naturally seek individuals and institutions who share their interests and commitments. The CBNRM LI's network in Cambodia cuts across government, non-governmental and academic institutions but it begins with those who have roles and concerns in CBNRM. The Cobscook Bay Resource Centre has a more pronounced stance on who to network with as explained above. A different approach to networking is taken by RECOFTC with its "categories of partners" where distinctions are made on resources and time involved, and the nature of work involved in partnership. Calling clients (i.e. the users of RECOFTC's facilities, services and products) as "partners" create a mindset of inclusiveness without necessarily being swayed away from who could be the priority partners.

Some would be more inclusive by nature like CBNRM Net which aims for a broader, more inclusive and interactive model that contributes in providing the tools and opportunities for the global CBNRM stakeholders. Others strive to balance inclusiveness and exclusiveness. RECOFTC is already well-placed in Asia Pacific and CBNRM LI is slowly creating its niche in Southeast Asia. The LRC-KsK and the North American resource centres have all gained a good reputation in their respective geographic areas and even beyond them. The question of how much to focus and how to expand sustainably would always be crucial to resource centres. Sustainability is not only about funding, it is also about having a vision and a clearly defined (and fundable) mandate. Even if resource centres could be excellent models of re-inventing themselves, the

question on “enlarging” or “deepening” networks would ultimately depend on their vision and mandate and the resources available on hand to pursue such efforts.

Vision and Agenda of Networks and Resource Centres

Should the networks supported by resource centres have a separate vision and agenda? This is a complex question and gets to the heart of “what is the actual resource centre?” For many, it is the physical space itself and the organization that creates and maintains it. However, in some cases such as CLT, the resource centre exists as a space, and the organization has a mandate far beyond providing capacity building and information exchange. Resource centres are generally well equipped to coordinate networks as they have computer space, office support and staff. However, there might be challenges in doing so. For example, MRC coordinated CEDTAP, a national community economic development training assistance program’s local portal, which is not directly related to any of their own projects because it offered them an opportunity to connect their members with a wider community of national community economic development practitioners. This relationship was challenging because MRC lacked the internal resources and context to serve as a community economic development hub. In other instances, a resource centre facilitates the creation of networks. A case in point is the LRC-KSK, which helped form the Alternative Law Group (ALG), a network of 24 institutions geared towards providing alternative or developmental legal service addressing the needs of the marginalized sectors of society. It is likely that the LRC-KsK sees the formation of ALG as a means to spread out the responsibility and commitment in providing alternative legal service to communities. Despite varying intentions and ways of working with networks, and difficulties in having clear cut roles and interests between resource centres and its networks, the question remains: are resource centers really institutions with no agenda?

The CBCRM Net provided an interest to distinguish between its function as a network for a particular community of practice (the global community of CBNRM practitioners), and at the same time, as a large-scale experiment in understanding how to optimize use of ICTs for purposes of networking on a global scale.

9.2 Organizational Function

Striving for neutrality

The discussions about what it means to be neutral and whether this is a desirable quality in a resource centre are relevant to any institution trying to balance inclusiveness with their own aims and goals. The North American resource centres in this study clearly define themselves as safe spaces - they seek to restore and strengthen civic processes by providing a space for dialogue. They also allow people to sit at the same table across the many divides within communities, and between communities and government, or scientists.

Does providing a safe space mean remaining neutral? Is neutral the same as not having an agenda or an opinion? Throughout its long history, the Highlander Center has provided a space for people to talk and learn from each other, this was vital to the civil rights movement. However, being safe did not mean neutral; in the 1950s by stating they were a space where blacks and whites lived and learned together, they were taking a clear stand on issues of integration in the American South. This was not popular with all their potential constituents in the rural South, but they remained firm in their position. In the same way, the LRC-KsK has always taken a clear stance on issues – it is against large-scale commercial mining corporations, opposes the present Philippine government's proposal on constitutional changes and takes part in advocating the restructuring of Philippine debts. In contrast, CBNRM LI describes itself as a neutral forum for analyzing and improving CBNRM practices. This stance is expected in a context like Cambodia where direct opposition to government and authority is not yet widely accepted by the citizenry.

Is there a distinction between making information available to everyone, yet not hesitating to take a stand for and against local issues such as oil and gas exploration, quarries or other controversial developments? Can a resource centre coordinate opposition to a controversial development project and still remain a place where business, fishing and environmental interests can sit at the same table? PERC resolves this by striving to provide reliable information to those who approach them regardless of their agenda, while making clear their own stance or view on fisheries and development issues.

Grounding of Work and Questions on Relevance

A learning organization is one where action leads to learning and learning can lead to change. It is easy to respond to many demands for services, and far harder to take the time to reflect on and redefine organizational mission, goals and priorities. Resource centres, like any organizations, need to constantly re-think their organizational relevance and continue finding its niche. A way to do is through regular strategic visioning and planning exercises. RECOFTC has changed from being the Asian network facilitator for the Forest, Trees and People Program of FAO to expanding its work in China and Viet Nam and eventually being an independent organization in 2000. A recent strategic planning engendered the present programs designed to facilitate learning processes and systems to support community forestry and natural resource management. Defining the change in CBNRM LI from being a program to an institution similarly made use of strategic visioning and planning tools. The Highlander Center also has a long history of re-inventing itself based on emerging needs of its constituency. If an issue is no longer relevant or their partner communities have changed, they do not want to be doing the same types of activities just because they always have done so. A good example is their current programs focused on Spanish speakers and new immigrants from Latin America. Cobscook is also strong at regularly (annually) looking at what they have done in the context of their overall program areas, emerging needs, local support and making a list of priorities based on this assessment. In contrast, MRC has not been as consistent at planning and reviewing activities which has caused it to leap back and forth between a

variety of different projects. Currently, the Board of Directors are working with SWN to support a revitalization strategy that will help to redefine its vision, mission, and goals.

The question on relevance (i.e. are we making a difference?) will always be a concern of resource centres. One resource centre in our study seemed to address this question by intentionally grounding its work on its community constituents. Despite its diverse areas of work and the different sectors it serves, LRC-KsK provides direct and consistent legal research and advocacy support to different indigenous groups in 4 areas in the Philippines. The operative words are *direct* and *consistent*; hence, communities are not only sources of grounding programs and projects, but act as partners of the resource centres, and community level projects and programs are the ground, the constant and the reason for the resource centres. The resource centres develop an area of expertise by doing it, with and for, local partners. This leads to a demand for the service and continued development of skills. They build their own tool boxes of services by actually providing these services.

Resource Centres as Switchboards and Connectors

Acting like switchboards, resource centers know what is going on and can provide one-stop-shopping experience for the public. For example, the CLT/Clark House is the place to go to find out what is happening in fishing, community development, social justice and environment in the Passamaquoddy region. In Cambodia, one would likely go to the CBNRM LI to find local groups involved in CBNRM LI. There is extensive information and links to websites on CBNRM available to anyone in the CBNRM Net website and contributing members can avail of other information such as available case studies, announcements, archived materials, job vacancies, etc.

More than connectors, however, resource centres initiate processes of learning by experimenting on various ways to engage people. Most resource centres have some attributes of communities of practice. They are not places where one passively goes to receive information. Even those that offer “trainings” are as much about bringing people together for collective learning and sharing. They are trying to create a community that can support each other over the long term. They do not emphasize static information, though many provide resource libraries, but instead try to generate knowledge through action, reflection, and narration. Highlander’s Grassroots Think Tank is an excellent example. It brings together progressive southerners to discuss issues of relevance and concern and develop positions, strategies, programs and activities. It is at the same time a grounding process for Highlander, a capacity building activity for planning and community building and a way to generate new knowledge.

Connecting peoples and groups is only a part of a resource centre’s potential in creating and nurturing relationships. An example would be the community fisheries management project that is jointly implemented by CBNRM LI and the Community Fisheries Development Office of the Department of Fisheries. With this project, CBNRM LI has the opportunity to strengthen and expand its partnership with CFDO and its partners. It is able to experiment on ways to mentor and guide a partner, eventually giving birth to more

intense learning experiences and engagements. This shows how resource centres could facilitate learning that is borne out of social relationships and engagements.

As such, there are limitations in being a virtual resource center alone. While membership to the CBNRM Net is free and open to all, it has observed a geographic imbalance in the use of its website. Around 1/3 of the visitors are located in North America, 1/3 in Western Europe and 1/3 in the rest of the world. This is perhaps because it is difficult for this resource center to become a shared space for narration, relationship building and developing a collective identity. It does however see itself as a large scale experiment in how electronic communities can learn together. It does not create curriculum or training but by providing these materials and allowing members to react to them it does function as a switchboard and does generate and circulate knowledge.

9.3 Organizational Structure

Resource Centre Staff, Leaders and Institutional Memory

Some of the resource centres in this study have consistent and smaller number of staff who might carry with them the centre's institutional memory. For example, the first Executive Director and founder of the LRC-KsK still sit in its Board of Directors. The originators of CBNRM LI are presently staff members. The same is true for Cobscook Bay Resource Center, MRC and Highlander Center. Consistency seems to be the key for carrying institutional memory and vision. It helps to have the original visionary or founder still closely associated with the resource center. Investing in people, not just hiring them, by helping them develop capacity to take on their job and take ownership over it, is an important consideration in sustaining a resource center.

From the data, it is difficult to say exactly what would be the incentives for longevity of people in the resource centres. However, the leaders of the resource centres mentioned here are dedicated and respected people who have devoted much of their lives in working on CBNRM and related issues. It could be that they are visionaries in their own rights, guiding their resource centres. It is likely that these leaders are trusted individuals that do not only carry with them the institutional memory but move the organization forward through coaching and directing.

For many of the GOM resource centres, there are so few staff that it is difficult to distinguish between founder/leaders and program staff. They usually operate with one key leader taking on many roles from fundraising, to research, to direct community support. As funding is available, students or interns do specific projects. This raises questions about the long term sustainability of these centres as the range of leadership and management tasks rest with one individual who may have some but not all of the necessary skills. Charismatic leadership needs to be matched with appropriate checks and balances for good management and through to the development of new leaders. PERC with three well-known, experienced leaders closely associated with the center and a Board of Directors that has extensive fundraising, legal and management experience seems to be actively balancing leadership and management functions.

CBNRM-LI provides an interesting model of how to develop leadership within staff. Their centre has core staff who are guided by a management team, including a Director. However, there is a team of local and international resource persons and advisors who help in strategizing, mentoring, guiding, and implementing activities. They also have a number of interns and trainees who are mostly young university-based Cambodians. What is innovative is how carefully they construct these relationships so as to build local capacity for CBNRM and not create dependency on paid consultants either local or international.

Concerns with Equity in Sharing the Benefits of Partnerships

Because it strives for creating partnerships and widening networks, there will always be concerns about equity in sharing the benefits among partners. An effort to address this is seen in CBNRM LI's case. The CBNRM LI makes a distinction among its "implementation partners," categorizing them as Focal Point Partners, Advisory Group and Resource People and Research and Training Associates. Focal Point Partners are institutions that may jointly implement activities or projects with CBNRM LI, on shared funding schemes. The Advisory Group and Resource People are formal and informal advisors from Cambodia and overseas, with experience, time available and a willingness to support the Institute's activities. They are paid for the time they provide the Institute. And then there are Research and Training Associates who could become a very large group of people (i.e. a social movement) who benefits from receiving information, resources, etc. Another case in point in establishing equal footing in partnerships is LRC-KsK's annual Partners Forum, which gathers different community representatives from across the country to hold collaborative assessments and planning of the center's strategies.

It is worth mentioning at this point that gender did not come out clearly as a concern of most resource centers, except in the case of LRC-KsK. Perhaps it is something that is considered in program implementation or even planning as in the case of the Highlander Center and CBNRM LI, but gender is certainly not made explicit in the centers' vision and programs.

Civil Institutions or Citizen-Run Resource Centres

The resource centres in this study are all non-governmental organizations but a striking characteristic of the North American centres is that they are all civil institutions. That is they are not associated with a university, government agency or even an NGO. Instead they are proudly citizen based and independent. This idea of having citizen-run resource centres is particularly relevant in looking at issues of sustainability. In the literature, citizenship pertains to the capacity of citizens to self-organize in a multiplicity of forms, for the mobilization of resources and the exercise of powers in public spheres for the protection of rights, to achieve the end of caring for and developing common goods (Moro, 1999). The work of Naila Kabeer (2003) is also informative of the challenge among citizens to claim-making and to overcome exclusion and powerlessness.

9.4 Resources, Infrastructure and Sustainability

Defined Physical Space

The space for resource centres has a number of purposes, often presented as safe spaces for conversation and dialogues. In rural communities, often the only meeting place available, MRC and CLT offer very practical services such as the use of its meeting room. It can also be offices for locally important services, like fisheries officers and small craft and harbours. Space can generate revenue from rent or use fees. It can also provide services for the organizations itself, for example CLT is part of a cooperative that shares resources to reduce costs of running their own organizations. Similarly, the Highlander Center has training space, workshop space, library, and bookstore. The CBNRM LI also has ample space for meetings and trainings, and a library. It also has a few rooms for visiting guests from overseas. Inside the Kasetsart University campus, RECOFTC has a building and a dormitory where it could house its participants to the training courses, and other guests. These are tangible signs of the community they are part of and its strength.

For both Cobscook Bay and PERC, their new, visible, accessible buildings will be important for outreach and education purposes. They will also make a strong political and cultural statement about the importance of fisheries to the local economy and society. The new buildings whether the hatchery co-sponsored by PERC, or the community kitchen initiated by Cobscook are also steps towards greater economic autonomy for the organizations and the communities they work with.

Struggling for Funding and Mechanisms for Sustainability

Financial matters are a valid concern among organizations. To address financial sustainability, some mechanisms are noted among the resource centres in this study. For instance, developing fee-for-service for an area of expertise is found in the Cobscook Bay example on GIS or the study tours facilitated by MRC. The RECOFTC also offers both open subscription and customized training and study tours. Selling its own publication, direct mail campaigns and sponsorship of special events like concerts and movie premiers are also some efforts extended to source out funds. Finally, LRC-KsK hinges sustainability by investing in training its staff and putting a premium in maintaining committed, skilled and diverse individuals able to perform quality work in line with the center's program of action.

Many centres struggle to find a balance between operational funds and funds to support activities and projects. The mix and match of project funding makes it difficult to keep core staff in place and maintain consistent services to constituents. There are great examples of creativity and resourcefulness in how many resource centres keep their centres afloat.

A physical resource centre is a great asset for an organization; however, with insufficient funds for maintenance, it can become a source of stress and a liability. Many resource

centres try to generate funds to maintain their buildings by renting office space or workshop facilities. Others, such as RECOFT enjoy subsidized or free space within existing institutions.

Long term sustainability is not only a function of funds, though this is clearly an important consideration. Long term sustainability also involves an ability to reflect, re-assess, refine programs and activities and re-engage in new directions. It also requires building trust and goodwill within their larger community to ensure real support for the centre to exist. Relationships, consistency, and providing valuable services, as well as investing in staff and maintaining and expanding institutional learning also contribute to long term sustainability.

10. Competencies of Resource Centres

Based on our research, we suggest the following as competencies of the resource centres in this study:

- Linking and networking skills
- Skills in developing leaders among its constituencies (idea of resource centres becoming leaderfull)
- Conflict resolution and management (idea of RC as a space for dialogue)
- Strategic visioning and planning skills (as a way of re-inventing RCs)
- Knowledge and skills in ICT or information and communication technology since a function of the RC is to broadcast information and link people

11. Supporting Resource Centres: Emerging Questions

This study is primarily intended for IDRC partners, especially existing RCs or those who are thinking of evolving into a resource center. As such, the researchers tried to consider what kind of support these institutions need to develop into sustainable, long lasting, civil institutions. We also identified emerging questions for further research on resource centers and their potential contributions to building CBNRM capacity.

Resource centres do need support for physical space, either as direct support from funding partners, or other types of assistance to achieve this. This is especially important since the space itself becomes a powerful symbol of the community and its values. PERC, MRC, and CLT are all examples of spaces that have been donated, sold or rented to resource centres at far below their commercial values as an indication of local support for the endeavour. To be a safe space, to provide direct and consistent services, to store resources and documents, and to welcome the community, a resource center needs suitable buildings and infrastructure. Funders should not support innovative programs at the expense of helping an emerging centre secure and develop suitable space.

Resource Centres exist to connect people. Since this activity is such an integral part of what they do, it is not always specifically funded as a program area. This can be challenging since so many resource centres struggle to carry out their program activities and build and support networks. Core funding for programs on linking and networking is needed for resource centres to achieve their full potential.

And as a last point, a plan for sustaining the resource center should be something to be thought of right at the beginning in order to not fall into the trap of chasing projects in order to survive. The data show us that to be sustainable, RCs should have a plan on how to develop core staff and perhaps offer incentives for their longevity. Long term financial sustainability requires diversifying funding partners, forming networks that could take on some of the tasks and responsibilities, accessing government funds (with varied success in our cases), incorporating fee-for-service strategies, and having "knowledge products" that they can sell for a fee e.g., publications of LI, books of LRC, trainings of RECOFTC.

Most of the emerging questions in this study stem from the main messages summarized in Section 6:

- a) How can resources centers become genuinely safe spaces for meaningful dialogue?
- b) What is the relationship between a RC's primary constituents and its wider networks? Who is a RC really accountable to?
- c) What kinds of RC activities build the social relationships that lead to learning? What kinds of learning lead to action?
- d) What is the role and responsibility of funders in developing the capacity and sustainability of the RCs?
- e) What are the challenges and opportunities for RCs to influence policies?
- f) How do resource centres ground themselves in real and meaningful practice? What are the types of direct and consistent service they should be providing to their constituents?

References

Bessette, Guy & Ronnie Vernooy. 2005. "Strengthening Individual and Organizational Capacities for CBNRM: Towards CBNRM Centers of Excellence: A Concept Paper."

Charles, A.T. A. Bull, J. Kearney and C. Milley, "Community-Based Fisheries in the Canadian Maritimes" in *Fisheries Management: Progress towards Sustainability* (T. McClanahan and J.C. Castilla, editors). Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, UK (to appear 2006).

Hildreth, Paul & Chris Kimble. 2005. "Knowledge Network: Innovation through Communities of Practice."

<http://www.cs.york.ac.uk/mis/KNICOP/Chapters/Introduction.html>

Kabeer, Naila. 2003. *Gender Mainstreaming in Poverty Eradication and the Millenium Development Goals: A Handbook for Policymakers and Other Stakeholders*. Commonwealth Secretariat.

Lave, Jean & Wenger Etienne. 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge University Press.

www.infed.org/biblio/communitiees_of_practice.htm

Murphy, P. (ed.) (1999) *Learners, Learning and Assessment*, London: Paul Chapman. See, also, Leach, J. and Moon, B. (eds.) (1999) *Learners and Pedagogy*, London: Paul Chapman. 280 + viii pages; and McCormick, R. and Paetcher, C. (eds.) (1999) *Learning and Knowledge*, London: Paul Chapman. 254 + xiv pages,

<http://www.cs.york.ac.uk/mis/KNICOP/Chapters/Introduction.html>

Salvador, Alma Maria. 2005. "Networking: Illuminating Concepts and Practices." In *Learning CBCRM Newsletter*, First Issue, 2005

Smith, M. K. 2003. "Communities of practice". *The Encyclopedia of Informal Education*. www.infed.org/biblio/communitiees_of_practice.htm

<http://www.lrcksk.org/index.htm>

<http://www.cbnrmli.org>

<http://www.recoftc.org>

<http://www.cbnrm.net>

www.highlandercenter.org

<http://www.bfmrc.ns.ca>

<http://www.cobscook.org/index.htm>

<http://saltwaternetwork.org>

<http://www.Tamarackinstitute.org>

Appendix 1: Preliminary Research Questions

Organizational Motivation

1. Brief history of the establishment of the organization.
2. What is the organization's vision, mission, goal (VMG). What is their relationship to CBNRM?
3. Describe any relevant changes in VMG over time and explain these changes.
4. Who are the constituencies of the organization?
5. Who are its networks and partners?
6. Overall, what would be the niche of the organization?

Organizational Functions

1. What are the main functions of the organization?
2. How does the organization facilitate sharing of CBNRM (or other relevant) experiences?
3. How does the organization support networking of CBNRM practitioners or its constituents??
4. How does the organization develop curricula and o
5. What other related materials does it produce?
6. At what levels (local, regional, global) does the organization influence policy? What kinds of policies is it trying to impact?
7. How does the organization support community initiatives?
8. Does the organization play a role in national and/or sector development?
9. What is the strategic leadership role of the organization in CBNRM?

Organizational Structure

1. What is the structure of the organization? Describe who are involved and their roles and functions.
2. Describe the decision-making process in the organization.
3. Who are primarily the leaders in the organization?
4. What are the roles of these leaders?
5. In what way is the structure supportive of collaborative arrangements with partners and other stakeholders?
6. In what way is the structure supportive of demanding advice from partners and stakeholders?
7. Does the structure allow for flexibility to adapt to changing needs?

Organizational Resources, Infrastructure and Sustainability

1. Who are the funders of the organization? Describe the organization's access to government, international and other funding sources.
2. What physical infrastructures are in place to support the organization's work?
3. Who are the sources of non-financial support for the organization?
4. What are the indicators of sustainability for the organization?

Appendix 2: Individual Narratives

The Legal Rights and Natural Resources Center-Kasama sa Kalikasan (LRC-KSK/Friends of the Earth Philippines)

Organizational Motivation

The Legal Rights and Natural Resources Center-Kasama sa Kalikasan (LRC-KsK) is a policy and legal research and advocacy institution that started its operations in February 1988. It is organized as a non-stock, non-profit, non-partisan, cultural, scientific and research foundation duly registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission. The organization is the official Philippine affiliate of Friends of the Earth International (FoEI).

The goal of LRC-KsK is to empower marginalized and disenfranchised peoples directly dependent on our natural resources so as to be able to affect ecologically sustainable, culturally appropriate, economically viable, gender sensitive, equitable uses, management, conservation and development of our natural resources.

Being a legal research organization, the LRC-KsK is motivated by certain truisms about the law. First, that laws may be invoked by the community as well as those who wish to encroach on to their territory; secondly, laws are normative; third, laws are not above and beyond human beings; fourth, laws change as society changes; and lastly, most legal forums favor elites. These truisms have led LRC-KsK towards a more pragmatic view of using the law to effect real and substantial changes at the societal and community level. It believes that knowledge and understanding about the laws, no matter how detestable they may be, is a key element in effecting people and community empowerment in the form of tenurial victories over well entrenched economic and political elites.

Since its formation, the LRC-KsK is involved in a number of networks in the Philippines. It is an active member of Bantay DENR, a nationwide task force of non-government and peoples organizations that would like to ensure a truly pro-people and pro-environment Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR). The task force monitors and reviews policies, programs and issuances of the government, specifically the DENR, related to the protection of the environment and the utilization of natural resources. LRC-KsK is also involved in Forestry Working Group, organized to convene advocacy groups working on forestry issues. Activities include legislative lobbying, and participation in technical working groups in both Houses of the Congress.

LRC-KsK is also part of a task force of different interest groups working against large-scale commercial mining corporations. Specifically, the task force is campaigning against Climax-Arimco Mining Corporation, an Australian mining company that operates in Didipio in Nueva Vizcaya province.

A significant contribution of LRC-KsK is its active role in the formation of the Alternative Law Group (ALG), a network of 24 progressive institutions geared towards providing alternative or developmental legal service addressing the needs of the marginalized sectors of society. Formed in 1990, ALG continues to support various efforts at law reform, community organizing, paralegal development, litigation and media work.

Aside from the above networks, LRC-KsK is also involved in politically-oriented formations such as the group of NGOs that opposes the present Philippine government's proposal on constitutional changes, or the Freedom from Debt Coalition, an NGO formation advocating for the restructuring of Philippine debts.

Internationally, LRC-KsK became the official Philippine member of the FoEI in 1992. In the same year, it was elected to the FoEI Executive Committee and has since been active in FoEI campaigns. LRC-KsK realizes the wisdom of joining the Friends of the Earth network because it sees the relevance of linking grassroots community issues with international work. Understanding the global/international context enriches the direction and orientation of local community struggles.

Despite the diverse areas of work of LRC-KsK and the different sectors it serves, its main constituencies would still be the indigenous peoples in the Philippines. The center provides direct legal research and advocacy support to different indigenous groups in 4 areas in the Philippines. This includes the Ifugao and Ibaloi in Barangay Didipio, Nueva Vizcaya province, the Subanen community in Midsalip municipality of Zamboanga peninsula, the Bong banwu (large village) Salnaong, of Barangay Datal Blao, Sultan Kudarat province, and the Subanen people in Siocon town, Zamboanga del Norte.

Since its inception in 1987, LRC-KsK has developed expertise on the issues of indigenous peoples' rights, resource tenure, natural resource management, forestry, mining, energy and local community initiatives. Central to the activities of LRC-KsK is the critiquing of policies and laws affecting indigenous peoples and natural resources. Paralegal trainings are conducted with partner communities. Cases are filed in the courts as deemed fit by the communities in the context of their own campaigns and struggles.

Organizational Functions

LRC-KsK has been organizing activities that inform its partner communities and the public in general of laws and government policies, and their implications on the poor and marginalized groups. These initiatives started as "Law Lecture Series" in 1992, and later evolved into "Policy Discussion Series" in 1999. The change in title was a result of a conscious effort of LRC-KsK to organize a "friendlier" venue for information exchange and update sharing. The change in title from "Law" to "Policy" reflected a change in the substance and content of the forum: from normative discussions and legal analysis of the law to a presentation of existing and proposed laws, orders and jurisprudence in the context of a society composed of marginalized communities dependent on natural resources. The shift in title from "Lecture" to "Discussion" signified a change in the

modality and procedure of such information exchange: from more formal presentations to creative and participatory discussions where LRC-KsK's partner communities not only are updated about recent developments in policy, but are themselves instrumental in sharing information not readily discernible from a review of said laws and policies.

Another program function is on gender integration. It was in 1993 that LRC-KsK first collectively endeavored to look into the reality of women's distinct oppression as well as women's distinct struggle inside a local community and within its bigger society. To fulfill this function, the staff members had gender sensitivity trainings and subsequently formed a Gender Committee in 1995 to act as a recommendatory body for mechanisms and processes of gender integration, both within the Center and with its advocacy. The focus of the committee was to generate individual appreciation and internalization of gender issues that would steer actions and services toward a gender-responsive legal and policy research and advocacy work. At the center, the library was developed with books and other relevant materials on gender and natural resources. Workshops and trainings on gender, indigenous peoples and natural resource management were regularly held. To integrate gender work in its community services, the staff took note of the representation of women and men in community meetings and paralegal trainings. Research information were also collected and analyzed by disaggregating by sex, taking particular interest in how sex and class affect and interplay with the power structure in the community. Network linkages also played a significant role in the institutional effort of gender mainstreaming. LRC-KsK has linked up with women organizations in various formations in the national and international arena.

In 1995, LRC-KsK started its Budget Advocacy Project with a realization that in all governments and legal systems, policy declarations without the corresponding dedication of financial resources to carry out the objectives would be rendered meaningless. This project aims to scrutinize budgetary activities of relevant national government agencies and departments and advocate for the allocations of appropriate amounts for the implementation of the relevant laws. This evolved into a tool to analyze and critique the direction and the policies that the government has been pursuing, and to ascertain if its allocation of public resources is in line with the declarations and commitments it has made. In essence, LRC-KsK's budget initiatives ultimately endeavor to prioritize public expenditures in ways that would empower the marginalized and disenfranchised peoples directly dependent on our country's natural resources.

To facilitate sharing of their experience, LRC-KsK publishes books and other materials. These are circulated in local bookstores and libraries in Metro Manila, Cagayan de Oro and Davao. It also participates in annual book fairs and in an alternative book fair organized by a local NGO at the University of the Philippines in 1999. The center also regularly publishes the "Budget Alert" that summarizes the basic analysis and monitoring of proposed budgets in popular form.

LRC-KsK engages the media, and forms networks with organizations from local, national and international spheres in support of local campaigns. LRC-KsK sits in national working groups working groups such as those mentioned above related to its budget

advocacy and policy discussions. Internationally, the center was designated as the Asian regional coordinator for FoEI's Trade, Environment and Sustainability Program in 1996. It aims to address the impact of international trade and investment patterns and regulations on environmental protection and the development of equitable and sustainable societies. LRC-KsK is also an active member of the Mining Working Group led by FoEI.

LRC-KsK also appears in 2 websites to link with like-minded organizations. This is the world directory of environmental organizations (www.interenvironment.org) and "global rising," a website listing organizations working towards global justice in at least one of the following areas: global democracy, global finance, trade and general global coordination (www.globalrising.org).

To strengthen its relationship with its partner communities, LRC-KsK holds an annual Partner's Forum. In 2003 for example, the center gathered different community representatives from across the country to hold a collaborative assessment of the center's strategies in advocating for the causes of marginalized sectors on issues of mining, ancestral domains, dams, privatization and human rights violations. It was dubbed as "LRC and Communities: Deepening Partnerships, Sharing Visions."

The main focus of LRC-KsK's work, particularly its advocacy campaign, is on influencing policies at the national (i.e. Philippines) level but it is working on global issues such as the effects of trade and the World Trade Organization (WTO) on local communities. It also campaigns overseas to popularize the effects of large-scale mining on local communities. A case in point was the center's joint work with Friends of the Earth Canada to persuade the Canadian government to take up concrete regulatory measures against human rights and environmental abuses of Canadian mining companies overseas. This case was about the Toronto Ventures Inc. which started mining operations in Siocon town, Zamboanga del Norte, without the appropriate permits. There were alleged human rights abuses when the company hired a para-military group to protect its mining operations. LRC-KsK staff, together with Subanen leaders, went to Canada to testify before the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

In the 4 communities where LRC-KsK works, it provides legal representation, developing legal theories and inputs through researches, paralegal services and local campaign support. The center links with the Social Action Center of the Catholic Church and other local NGOs such as the Task Force Detainees of the Philippines and Tri-Peace Dev for their work in these communities.

Since its inception, LRC-KsK has always advocated for the recognition and the empowerment of indigenous peoples. All Center activities aim to assist communities in their struggle against large commercial extractive resources and their government patrons. Strategically, the center continues to be a respected institution that unites with the indigenous peoples in their struggle for genuine recognition, and full and authentic participation in national processes.

Organizational Structure

LRC-KsK works through its national teams, namely, the Direct Legal Services, Research and Policy Development, Campaigns and Support Linkages, Administrative Support and Financial Resource Management teams and the Project Development Section. It has regional offices in Luzon, Cagayan de Oro and Davao. Its Executive Director is Atty. Marvic Leonen, a respected public interest lawyer and a professor at the College of Law of the University of the Philippines.

Organizational Resources, Infrastructure and Sustainability

LRC-KsK is supported by various funding agencies such as the Asia Foundation, Biodiversity Support Program, Ford Foundation, Foundation for the Philippine Environment, Friends of the Earth-International, Friends of the Earth-United States, Helvetas, Novib, The Hague and Oxfam-Great Britain.

It maintains an office in Quezon City, Philippines with 3 other regional offices in the country.

Like many NGOs in the Philippines, LRC-KsK faces the challenge of financial sustainability. The center believes that its sustainability is hinged primarily on the capability of the center to continue and improve its service and expand it to meet the needs of its partners. Thus, a premium continues to be placed on the maintenance of committed, skilled and diverse individuals able to perform quality work in line with the center's program of action. At the same time, it seeks out diversification of both funding and donor sources. The Center's core operations remain to be funded by donor institutions. Multi-year grants exist with the Center's main funding partners and efforts are underway to expand the Center's funding partners. There are also efforts to source out funds by direct mail campaigns and sponsorship of special events like concerts and movie premiers.

Source: <http://www.lrcksk.org/index.htm>

Community-Based Natural Resource Management Learning Institute (CBNRM LI)

Organizational Motivation

The CBNRM LI describes itself as an “innovative place for reflective learning, a creative and technical training and resource centre, a nurturing point for building partnerships for mutual learning and sharing of experiences, and a neutral forum for analyzing and improving CBNRM practices.” Its precursor is the CBNRM Case Study and Networking Initiative which started in June 2001 as a response to the growing need on building knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are crucial to participatory and community-based approaches.

In recent years, the legislative and regulatory framework for natural resource management (NRM) has been quickly taking place in Cambodia e.g. new land and forest laws took effect and sub-decrees on community forest, forest concessions and community fisheries have been issued. It became critical for the different NRM practices in the country to be mainstreamed, developed and considered in this emerging NRM framework.

Since it started, the CBNRM LI has been supporting the building and strengthening of linkages to locally based approaches that empower local communities to participate actively in the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources through Community Forestry (CFo), Community Fisheries (CFi), Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP) and Participatory Protected Areas Management (PA). In 2003, CBNRM LI started transforming itself from a project into an institute with a long-term vision of not only supporting the development of a Cambodian perspective on CBNRM but also a regional one by linking and building on partnerships with regional offices and networks doing CBNRM. Its key partners in the inception stage are World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Cambodia, the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Oxfam America (OA) and the Regional Training Center for Forestry in Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC).

CBNRM LI now works as a non-profit NGO with a mission to analyze and improve the CBNRM approach as an integral component of poverty alleviation, sustainable livelihoods and resource management, conservation, and decentralization policies and strategies of the Royal Government of Cambodia. It also implements and evaluates the impact of CBNRM at various levels, facilitates opportunities for people working on CBNRM in Cambodia and in the region to learn and share their experiences.

The CBNRM LI have 4 main objectives:

- Human Resources Development: to build conceptual, analytical, research, and documentation skills of facilitators, researchers within relevant Government partners at provincial and local levels.
- Knowledge Building and Sharing: to identify, analyze, and share lessons and experiences of various approaches to community based natural resource management across the country.
- Partnership Building: to build networking linkages among institutions supporting resource management strategies at local, levels.
- Institutional Arrangements and Policy Support: to improve institutional capacity and understanding of the policy context which influences community based natural resource management practices at the field level.

The Learning Institute has formed partnerships with relevant research and training institutes in Cambodia like the Cambodia Development Resource Institute, Centre d'Étude et de Développement Agricole Cambodgien, Forestry Training Centre, Inland Fisheries Research and Development Institute and the Mekong Learning Initiative (MLI).

It also has extensive links to local and international NGOs in Cambodia and relevant government agencies such as Community Fisheries Development Office (CFDO) of the Department of Fisheries, Community Forestry Office (CFO) of the Forestry Administration, Community Protected Area Development (CPADO) of the Department of Nature Conservation and Protection under the Ministry of Environment, the PLUP Focal Point of the Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction and Seila Program. It likewise connects with academic institutions such as the Royal University of Agriculture and the Departments of Environmental Science and Tourism at the Royal University of Phnom Penh.

Regionally, it has linkages with World Agroforestry Centre and the International Institute for Rural Reconstruction based in the Philippines, the Center for Biodiversity and Indigenous Knowledge in Southwest China, RECOFTC in Thailand and the Centre for International Forestry Research in Indonesia.

The CBNRM LI fills in an important niche for capacity building, networking, lessons learning and policy support in Cambodia. Strategically, it also strives to become the “Cambodian node” of regional networks such as the Learning and Research Network (LeaRN) and RECOFTC.

Organizational Functions

The key program functions of CBNRM LI are:

- Training and learning forums for strengthening the capacities in designing, implementing and evaluating CBNRM as a sustainable approach to development. This function includes supporting, organizing and/or facilitating capacity building events and providing small grants for short-term and long-term training in-country, overseas and university programs.
- Participatory action research and its link to policy processes for synthesizing and analyzing field data on CBNRM, extending and building concepts on CBNRM and Sustainable Livelihoods to improve frameworks, tools and influence policy processes, and link traditional ecological knowledge with other forms of knowledge.
- Documentation and information dissemination that aim for synthesizing lessons across field sites and adaptation of these lessons from one site to others, adapting international scientific and technical resource materials to fit into the Cambodian context, and facilitate improved information access among partners.
- Networking and partnership building aim to connect institutions and partners and support initiatives and institutions towards enabling legal and policy frameworks.

To facilitate sharing of CBNRM experiences, CBNRM LI’ supports Training of Trainers, student internships, study tours, workshop and on-the-job trainings. LI also has a small library and an electronic newsletter.

To support networking, the Institute actively participates in county working groups such as Community Forestry, Fisheries Law, Community Fisheries and NGO Forum on the

Environment. For example, the Institute is part of the Community Forestry Network in Cambodia which aims to share information and experiences among community forestry NGOs, relevant government units and community groups. This network was established in 1993 by the Cambodia Environment Management Project and later on continued by the Department of Forestry and Wildlife, the Ministry of Environment and CONCERN Worldwide, an international NGO working in Cambodia. In the region, CBNRM LI sits on the Regional Coordinating Committee of LeaRN and its Executive Director is a member of the Board of Trustees of RECOFTC.

The CBNRM LI also supports the development and dissemination of curricula on CBNRM through its publication of research reports, preparation and consultation on practical field manuals, and development of extension materials and multi-media productions. It has produced several case studies on CBNRM experience in Cambodia and a book on CBNRM that was endorsed by the Prime Minister. In 2005, the Institute started its Skills and Awareness Building (SAB) program that aims to strengthen the managerial and leadership capacity of core groups of motivated and competent change agents associated with the Tonle Sap Initiative of the Asian Development Bank. These would include developing training curriculum for the junior and middle government officers, community leaders and representatives around the Tonle Sap.

Presently, CBNRM LI is mainly focused on influencing Cambodian policies related to CBNRM by training CBNRM partners and subsequently publishing joint case studies with them. Two sets of case studies on Cambodia have been published by the Institute in 2002 and 2004. It also supports peer review of research results, small grants for field research of graduate students, and project monitoring and evaluation.

The Institute supports community initiatives mainly through trainings and publications. For example, the on-going training activities in the Tonle Sap include commune council members and those part of the community fisheries committees. The case studies published by CBNRM LI were written in Khmer and English and distributed to different community groups in the country.

CBNRM LI is slowly building up its reputation of being a center for networking and capacity building in Cambodia. It has become a respected institution that links CBNRM groups and practitioners in the country.

Organizational Structure

CBNRM LI has a Program Management Team composed of an Executive Director, Program Coordinators and Support staffs on finance, administration and communications. These core staff members work full-time for the Institute. The Program Director is responsible for the overall operations and the main contact person of the Institute. The Director works with the Program Coordinators to design and implement the programs. He is also responsible for regularly reporting the progress of the programs to the Board of Directors, Advisory Group and the donor partners.

The Program Coordinators serve as the core team of the program and include coordinators for education/research, local planning processes, institutional linkages and networking. There are Consultant Advisors hired to assist in the overall program implementation. Presently, there is only one Program Coordinator, a Deputy Program Coordinator, 2 Technical Advisors, and a Program Advisor.

CBNRM LI includes a group of individuals called “implementation partners” consisting of Focal Point Partners, Advisory Group and Resource People and Research and Training Associates. Focal Point Partners are institutions that determine the nature of linkages, partnerships and collaborative activities. A key partner designates someone as the Focal Point Person.

The Advisory Group and Resource People is a group of formal and informal advisors from Cambodia and overseas, with experience, time available and a willingness to support the Institute’s activities. The Advisory Group lends technical expertise on a wide range of issues related to CBNRM. There are presently 5 Program Advisors who are Cambodians working on other CBNRM programs in the country and provide part time work support to CBNRM LI. Resource persons are those asked by the Institute for short-term, task-based needs.

Research and Training Associates are students, trainers, researchers and other individuals associated with the CBNRM LI through collaborative activities e.g., participants in workshops, training, networking events, research grants, etc. This group is divided into two types: Active Associates and Alumni Associates. All active associates will become alumni associates once their collaborative activity is completed. Thus, this could become a very large group of people (i.e. a social movement) with more and more influence on the eventual direction of the Learning Institute. Some of the people may also become Resource People or Advisors.

The Institute is governed by a Board of Directors consists of 7 people from various sectors in Cambodia. Its Secretary General is H.E. Dr. Chuon Naron from the Ministry of Economy and Finance. The members come from international NGOs like Oxfam America and WWF Cambodia, from projects funded by Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) and UNDP/GEF, the Director of the Nature Conservation and Protection under the Ministry of Environment, and the Managing Director of Amarita Tours.

Organizational Resources, Infrastructure and Sustainability

The CBNRM LI is supported by IDRC, Oxfam America, WWF Cambodia, RECOFTC, and of late, the Department for International Development (DFID) and DANIDA. The government of Cambodia does not provide any direct funding support to CBNRM LI but presently, the CFDO of the Department of Fisheries is co-implementing a research and capacity building project on community fisheries with the Institute supported by IDRC.

The Institute rents a house in Phnom Penh for its office. It has ample space for meetings and trainings. It also has a few rooms for visiting guests from overseas.

Source: <http://www.cbnrmli.org>

The Regional Community Forestry Training Center For Asia And The Pacific (RECOFTC)

Organizational Motivation

The discussions in Jakarta, Indonesia of the 8th World Forestry Congress in 1978 laid down the initial idea of having a regional institution on community forestry training and research to facilitate the exchange of information and implementation of activities. This idea was consolidated during the seminar on forestry extension, organized by the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) and Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) in 1982 and subsequently presented to several countries in the region. Thailand submitted a proposal for the center to be based at the Faculty of Forestry in Kasetsart University highlighting the advantages of its central location within the region, easy access to existing community forestry practices and the proximity to a variety of ecological zones. At the same time, the Faculty of Forestry started implementing a course on social forestry. Thus, the Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC) was established in March 1987 fulfilling an idea conceived and pursued by many practitioners in the region.

The original objective of RECOFTC was to organize and provide training support for community forestry throughout the Asia-Pacific region. It was also the Asian network facilitator for the Forest, Trees and People Program (FTTP) of FAO. It later on expanded its operation to include the Thailand Outreach Program supported by Ford Foundation and subsequently expanded again in China and Viet Nam. RECOFTC became an independent organization in 2000.

Today, RECOFTC is a known autonomous, not-for-profit international organization that works closely with partners to design and facilitate learning processes and systems to support community forestry and natural resource management (NRM). It operates through strategic partnerships and collaboration with government and NGOs, programs, projects and networks.

RECOFTC's vision is for "local communities in the Asia-Pacific region to be actively involved in the equitable and ecologically sustainable management of forest landscapes." Its mission is to "enhance capacities at all levels to assist people of the Asia-Pacific region to develop community forestry and manage forest resources for optimum social, economic and environmental benefits."

The community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) work of RECOFTC is focused on community forestry and NRM that involve the governance and management of forest and natural resources by communities. RECOFTC has identified 3 key issues to address: (1) insufficient recognition that local communities can manage forest and natural resources sustainably; (2) lack of appropriate policies and legislative frameworks to support community management of forest and natural resources; and (3) inadequate funds and resources to increase the capacities of all stakeholders in optimizing environmental, socio-economic and cultural benefits of community forestry.

The primary geographical focus of RECOFTC's program is the Asia-Pacific region (extending from Central Asia in the west to the International Dateline in the east, and from China, Mongolia and Japan in the north to Australia and New Zealand in the south), and covering 47 countries. It is also open to collaboration with organizations from other regions when the opportunity arises. RECOFTC categorize partners as:

- Institutional partners are organizations that support or contribute resources to RECOFTC as a corporate body either on a long-term basis or for an indefinite period of time.
- Strategic or program partners are organizations that contribute resources to the identification, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of RECOFTC's programs and activities.
- Project partners contribute resources to a specific set of activities for a specified period of time; a process that also helps establishes linkages and working relationships with other organizations.
- Network partners periodically exchange information, knowledge and advice.
- Collaborating organizations work together with RECOFTC without any expectation of a longer term relationship.
- Clients are users of RECOFTC's facilities, services and products.

RECOFTC continues to fill in the niche for capacity building, networking and policy support in the Asia and the Pacific region.

Organizational Functions

The functions of the organization are gleaned from its three-interlinked programs:

- Regional Analysis and Representation (RAR) identifies important themes in community-based forest management, analyzes issues and presents position statements at regional and international forums, and acts as an information hub in the region.
- The Capacity Building Services (CABS) program is designed to enhance the formation and implementation of community-based natural resource policies, and to strengthen institutions and processes by developing cost-effective and quality capacity-building products and services for stakeholders at all levels. CABS also works to enhance existing partnerships with key individuals and organizations to further develop and deliver targeted capacity-building services and products.
- The Country Program Support (COPS) identifies and validates best practices and documents lessons learned in community-based forest management systems in a number of countries selected according to clearly identified criteria and indicators. Its

site-based activities illustrate the potential for community-based forest management to contribute to environmental sustainability, social empowerment and economical benefit of local people dependent on forest resources.

To facilitate sharing of CBNRM and other relevant practitioners, RECOFTC facilitates impartial platforms and multi-stakeholder dialogues that promote the discussion and validation of community-based forest management approaches in the Asia-Pacific region. For example, RECOFTC is part of the Civil Society Advisory Group of the ITTO and represents community-level issues in markets and trade of forest products. Forums and discussions on poverty reduction and livelihoods, management systems for sustainable forest use and governance are organized.

In addition, RECOFTC maintains a website and produces regular publications, newsletters, and community forestry e-news to support sharing of experiences. It also has a library on community forestry and related topics where the data are available through their database online.

Networks in the region are also supported by RECOFTC so that coherent messages on community-based forest management learning are expressed and shared among practitioners, governments and decision makers. For example, RECOFTC is supporting the ASEAN Senior Officers on Forestry (ASOF) to develop a Social Forestry Network that will provide a forum for ASEAN government partners to discuss and review progress in community forestry through sharing experiences and information across national programs.

To contribute to curriculum development and dissemination in the region, RECOFTC offers a range of integrated training courses and study tours on CBNRM topics using participatory learning methods. Case study explorations and analysis, field visits and discussions with experts are incorporated in these courses and tours. RECOFTC offers both open subscription and customized training and study tours. In 2005 for example, RECOFTC offered training courses on managing conflicts for NRM, good governance and decentralization, community enterprise development and rural livelihoods, participatory action research for CBNRM, and participatory management of protected areas. It also provides technical assistance on training and evaluation, and collaborates with tertiary education institutions to enhance CBNRM curricula.

Global issues relevant to community forestry at the national and local levels are also the concerns of RECOFTC. For example, it co-hosted with Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) and International Center for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) a regional consultation in Nepal to understand the influence of community forestry policy on land use patterns in Asia.

To support community initiatives, strengthen existing structures and capacities, the COPS program is implemented with a range of stakeholders based in Thailand. The size, scope of work, level of intervention, entry points and partnership arrangements vary according

to mutually defined mandates. However, activities might include multi-stakeholder platforms, policy dialogues, documentation of best practices and the development, testing and adoption of indicators to measure local level impacts of CBNRM. Some themes emerging from these initiatives include decentralization and devolution, pro-poor enterprise development, and good forest governance.

Aside from a wide range of international and regional partners (e.g. GTZ, FAO SDC, ICIMOD, etc.), RECOFTC also has direct partnerships with countries like Bhutan, Philippines, Cambodia, India, Lao PDR, Nepal, Thailand and Viet Nam. It has country offices in Nepal, Indonesia and Thailand

Despite being already an established training center in community forestry in the region, RECOFTC strategically seeks new and exciting opportunities, partnerships and alliances to further build its reputation as a leading and innovative organization in the field of capacity building in community forestry and CBNRM. It also aims to build its library to be a regional resource reference center for people working on community forestry, rural development, natural resource management and other related topics.

Organizational Structure

RECOFTC is headed by the Executive Office (EXO) and supported by the Finance, Administration and Human Resources (FAHR) and Information Management and Communication (IMAC). The EXO provides leadership in seeking strategic alliances with donors, partners and collaborators. It is responsible for the overall coordination of RECOFTC. The EXO is supported by the Executive Committee in formulating policies and procedures, preparing annual work plans and budgets. The EXO is composed of the Executive Director and Executive Secretary. A Monitoring and Evaluation Officer works with the EXO to develop and implement a system to monitor and assess the outputs and impacts of RECOFTC's work.

The FAHR takes charge of the financial, administrative and human resource management. It is headed by a Manager, supported by an accountant and 3 accountant assistants, a Human Resource Administration Manager with several staff who are responsible for the organizational facilities and dormitory services.

The IMAC coordinates the management and communication of all information and outputs. It has a Manager and 3 other staff who are responsible for the organization's management information system, publications and documentation center.

The Board of Trustees of RECOFTC are program managers, researchers and practitioners from different countries like Nepal, Cambodia, Switzerland, India, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Viet Nam and Thailand.

Organizational Resources, Infrastructure and Sustainability

RECOFTC is funded by a wide array of donor agencies that include Australian Government Overseas Aid, the Canadian International Development Agency, Danish International Development Agency, the Department for International Development (United Kingdom), Ford Foundation, International Development Research Centre, Swedish International Development Cooperation, and Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. Other donor partners are the European Union, Forest Trend, IUCN-World Conservation Union, Kenan Institute Asia and Toyota Foundation. RECOFTC also has the support of Petroleum Authority of Thailand and the Royal Thai Government.

Inside the Kasetsart University campus, RECOFTC has a building and a dormitory where it could house its participants to the training courses, and other guests.

Source: <http://www.recoftc.org>

Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM Net)

Organizational Motivation

Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) takes places in a context that includes increased emphasis on culture, local institutions, traditional knowledge, participation and participatory approaches, and NGOs and civil society. It also takes place within an overall nation-state framework with an increasing interest in decentralization, governance and transparency. With such changes, people involved in CBNRM as practitioners, managers and researchers around the world share an urgent need for establishing networking capabilities that would make it possible for people to exchange experiences, manage relevant knowledge, and support learning across countries, sectors, cultures, and languages.

CBNRM Net addresses this need by setting up the global portal website that provides useful networking tools aimed at linking stakeholders. It is presented as a service to the global CBNRM community of practice. The World Bank's Common Property Resource Management Network (CPRNet) and a 1998 international CBNRM workshop provided the initial inspiration and motivation to CBNRM Net. The CPRNet founded in 1995, is an international network open to practitioners, policy makers/managers, researchers and others interested in issues related to property rights and sustainable natural resource management. Information about CPRNet is now available on CBNRM Net under a web-hosting agreement. The international CBNRM workshop was held in Washington D.C., United States in May 1998 organized jointly by World Bank Institute, International Development Research Centre and Ford Foundation

The experiences from these initiatives were used in a needs assessment and subsequently became the basis for setting up CBNRM Net. This was later informed and complemented

by experiences and results from other events, notably a regional CBNRM workshop for West Africa held in Niamey, Niger on October 1998. The regular and extensive contacts between a large number of CBNRM practitioners and other stakeholders worldwide are also key elements in this process. CBNRM Net was conceptualized as an electronic network so it is using internet and email as the main means of communication. As it has become apparent that not all partners have the necessary access to the internet to make electronic information sharing possible, the CBNRM Net newsletter has become increasingly important.

The CBNRM Net's mission statement:

- Play a key role in implementing the recommendations in recent CBNRM workshops and conferences, including the May 1998 international CBNRM workshop,
- Contribute to realize the potential inherent in civil society, participatory approaches, local social organization, culture and traditional knowledge in connection with managing local natural resources (this potential can be understood also as a means),
- Provide a broad and unified network interface for the use of the global CBNRM community of practice,
- Function as a gateway to, and clearinghouse for, all manner of CBNRM knowledge,
- Be a virtual meeting place for the growing CBNRM community of practice, thus making possible easy exchange of CBNRM knowledge, and through this support the increasing amount of practical work,
- Produce new CBNRM knowledge, and thus move the CBNRM agenda and community of practice forward, and
- Advocate the importance of training and capacity building in CBNRM. Specifically, contribute to determining the role of Internet in training and capacity building in CBNRM, in combination with select CBNRM Net networking tools.

The main constituency of CBNRM Net is the “global CBNRM community of practice” composed broadly of politicians, public sector officials, project managers, funders, field level implementers, researchers and local people. CBNRM Net is not really situated in the north, and neither in the south. The essence is not the physical address/location of the website and newsletter, but the relationships and paired /multiple communications channels and links that are established through and via the network. These are located anywhere and everywhere.

Presently, there are more than 500 members registered with CBNRM Net and there are a higher number of general users of the website, as well as people that receive the Newsletter indirectly, either by members or as posted on various listserves. However CBNRM Net notes a geographic imbalance in the use of the website. In 2005 around 1/3 of the visitors are located in North America, 1/3 in Western Europe and 1/3 in the rest of the world.

CBNRM Net has a specific focus on Africa. The reasons for this are connected with needs, in relation to other continents, specifically Latin America and Asia. Also, CBNRM actually originated in southern Africa.

The unique characteristic of CBNRM Net is its global website service that addresses CBNRM broadly in terms of overall knowledge management and knowledge sharing. Knowledge Management (KM) is an approach, a tool, and a way of relating to and managing information that is actually independent of the recent occurrence of ICTs but becoming all the more important because of them. CBNRM Net is aiming for a broader, more inclusive and interactive model that would eventually contribute in providing the tools and opportunities for CBNRM stakeholders globally to exchange views and experiences and avail of information and resources on CBNRM that are practice-oriented.

Knowledge management is an area where lots can be done, but within the limits imposed by the fact that the key stakeholders have limited access. These ideas and tools, which are advanced KM techniques, include: complexity, value networks, semantic webs, information markets, and social media. However, a lack of resources (human and financial) limits the effort to what can be done exclusively through web-based means.

Organizational Functions

The CBNRM Net's main services and activities are:

- **Webhosting.** Materials and knowledge that are hosted broadly include web sites and documents. The documents include literature that is hard to come by, either because it was never published (e.g., proceedings of conferences and seminars), because it is difficult to locate (e.g., on-line newsletters), or because it is out-of-print (e.g., books). Local groups, NGOs and networks that focus on CBNRM-related activities and that wish to use webhosting would receive technical advice and server space for free.
- **Services for Members.** Contributing members of the CBNRM Net can log on to the Members Section and avail of other information such as available case studies, announcements, archived materials, job vacancies, etc. Membership to the network is open to development practitioners, researchers, policy makers/managers and others that are interested in CBNRM as well as related approaches. Individual and organizations/institutions can become members. Members also receive the CBNRM Net newsletter.
- **Links to CBNRM Organizations.** The website contains a select list of web sites that cover a broad range of subjects, including advocacy, development/aid, knowledge management, natural resource management, research, training and capacity building, and strategic communication. Some are focused on specific sectors or subsistence practices. Others cover a specific country or present an NGO. Member organizations of CBNRM Net are included in this list. The links include general references to CBNRM Net website as well as to specific pages and documents.
- **Resources.** The section on "Resources" is the main place for locating CBNRM knowledge (aside from the section on members). The website offers different types of CBNRM and CBNRM resource materials including reports, evaluations, papers and project documents, articles in periodicals, articles in books, and books. Other types of literature covered include bulletins, articles in newspapers, pamphlets and reviews. The emphasis is on literature on CBNRM and related areas of focus and investigation, including literature authored by CBNRM Net members. The information on this section is organized by (a) country and region, (b) activities and interventions i.e.

knowledge on the bureaucratic, judicial, policy, and political levels and projects/programs, (c) analytical and practical tools. There is also a library section that contains issues of CBNRM Net newsletters, CBNRM Net papers and a literature database. Another section is on research that contains, among others, dictionaries and terminology. Finally, there is a section training and capacity building that provides one copies of conference and seminar proceedings.

CBNRM Net was set up precisely to facilitate sharing of CBNRM experiences and support networking. It does so by the services offered by its website. An interesting feature in the Resource Section is information about activities and interventions on the bureaucratic, judicial, policy, and political levels. These activities are often taking place on a macro-level, be it the regional, national or international level. Past, ongoing and planned activities are covered. For example, there was information about the “game ranching policy” adopted by the Botswanian Parliament, which is expected to give far-reaching proprietorship over wildlife to the landholder. The game farmer will own his game just as a cattle rancher owns his stock and he will be able to sell (crop or hunt) his game without asking permission from anyone.

The Training and Capacity Building Section offers information about trainings and seminars including both informal and formal activities, and as taking place throughout the world. The training providers are found in public sector, in the private sector and in civil society. The CBNRM Net does not develop CBNRM curriculum but disseminates information about available training resources.

CBNRM Net does develop two-way dictionaries of key CBNRM terms from one language to another in which relevant, sources and/or names of persons providing information are given. New terms and words are added to existing dictionaries continually, and new dictionaries are constantly being created. Existing translations are revised based on user feedback. Presently, there are 11 dictionaries that include English-French, English-Spanish, Arabic-French, Aksopo-English, etc.

CBNRM Net, including the website, is a network serving a Community of Practice (COP). At the same time it is a large-scale experiment in understanding how to optimize use of ICTs for purposes of networking a COP living and working in more than 100 countries. The various papers and articles on CBNRM located on the site can be understood as a continual analysis of, as well as a process of documentation of, this learning process.

To the extent that CBNRM Net does influence policy, this would take place at a macro-level (specifically the level of the nation-state). As for policies, these would primarily deal with land management and property rights, specifically those dealing with communal or common property rights. In this connection CBNRM (and CBNRM Net) focus on the modern legal code and how it reflects traditional/indigenous codes (and the connection with traditional/indigenous knowledge less and less).

Otherwise, CBNRM Net tries to influence “activities” and ways of managing natural resource, and this is properly located at the local (and to some extent the “regional” - as in the sub-region of a country) level

CBNRM Net cannot do much more than make knowledge and information available. It is up to the users of this information (whether members of CBNRM or not), to operationalize and apply this information to a concrete situation. If requested, CBNRM Net would take up a particular issue and present it in the Newsletter, and if other, macro-level stakeholders (say, working in a relevant ministry) would read this, this support for a community initiative might make a difference. In other words, CBNRM Net provides relevant knowledge to members and others; the rest is up to them. CBNRM Net can give support, but not much more than that. This follows from the basic principle that any developmental activities, at whatever level, are owned by as well as the responsibility of the people concerned,

CBNRM Net does not aspire to have a leadership role. Leadership implies some type of responsibility, and the only responsibility that CBNRM Net would recognize is connected with the essence of KM, namely locating, storing, managing, disseminating, packaging and producing relevant knowledge. The rest is up to the users (which here means specifically the local-level / grassroots users. Their leadership stems from using the most useful, adaptable and efficient knowledge management (KM) approaches and techniques in delivering the knowledge that this COP needs

Organizational Structure

The CBNRM Net is managed by an NGO based in Norway and led by Lars T. Soeftestad. The organizational structure it is very flat. There is the Coordinator, and an ever changing group of people that submits information and knowledge, and that sometimes get together (virtually) for purposes of writing and research.

Membership is open to development practitioners, researchers, policy makers/managers and others that are interested in CBNRM - as well as related approaches - and its importance for sustainable management of natural resources.. Individual and organizations/institutions can become members. Membership is free and members receive free copies of CBNRM Net Newsletters. However, members are obliged to: (1) support CBNRM Net actively, (2) promote CBNRM Net actively, and (3) inform in a timely way of changes in email address and other contact information. Members can be subscribers, regular members, or contributing members.

The agenda and direction of CBNRM Net is really decided on by the collectivity of its members, as their preferences and views are being presented, heard, listened and read by other members.

CBNRM Net considers itself a “distributed network” (this term is a CBNRM Net invention to try and convey and grasp the essence of CBNRM Net’s rationale). And this essence is that it exists less in relation to a physical location somewhere (as it happens, in

Kristiansand, Norway), and more in the relations and relationships between its members, be the permanent or fluid, and located throughout the world. It is eminently suited to respond to and adapt to changing needs, exactly because it is a “distributed network”

The coordinator is clearly a key leader, and some members, in addition, located in particular countries/regions with many members, have taken on some kind of responsibility for reporting on activities in these countries/regions.

Organizational Resources, Infrastructure and Sustainability

“CBNRM Networking” is a Norwegian non-profit, whose sole purpose is to support CBNRM Net. Funding so far has come from local (meaning Norway) private sector and civil society sources. The management model and rationale for CBNRM Net also follows from the fact that there are little resources at disposal. And conversely, CBNRM Net is a prime example of how to be effective in knowledge management using ICTs without a large budget and a fancy website

Sources:

<http://www.cbnrm.net>

Written comments from Lars T. Soeftestad provided April 5th, 2006

Heijden, A., T. Pryor and L. Soeftestad. 2006. “Knowledge Management and Natural Resources in Africa: Perspectives from Two

The Highlander Center for Research and Education

Organizational Motivation

The mission of the Highlander Center is to work with people struggling against oppression, supporting their effort to take collective action to shape their own destiny. It creates educational experiences that empower people to take democratic leadership towards fundamental change.

It is difficult to summarize over 70 years of fascinating Highlander history. Highlander was founded in 1932 by Willy Horton. Gillian Johnson, a Tennessee educator and suffragist, donated her farm outside of the town of Monteagle where the founders established the Highlander Folk School. Highlander's original mission, which has since been adapted and expanded, was to educate "rural and industrial leaders for a new social order."

From 1932 until the mid-1940s, Highlander worked towards a progressive labor movement in the South among woodcutters, coal miners, government relief workers, textile workers, and farmers in the region. During this period, Highlander developed a

residential educational program designed to help build a broad-based, racially integrated, and politically active labor movement in the South. The integrated workshops defied the conventions of Southern society and labor unions of the time and caused great controversy among segregationists and union leaders. In 1953, Highlander changed its focus from labor to the Civil Rights Movement. Highlander's long tradition of working with African Americans in the labor movement put the school in a strong position to support the movement to end segregation, focusing mainly on school desegregation and voter education/voting rights. Highlander also served a role as a key gathering place for civil rights activists.

Highlander also played a vital role helping to spread freedom songs throughout the Civil Rights Movement, including "We Shall Overcome," "Keep Your Eyes on the Prize," and others. Cultural workshops at Highlander brought together activists and song leaders to share songs and create new ones. These freedom songs -- sung at marches, rallies, and in jails across the South -- became one of the hallmarks of the movement, providing inspiration, hope, and solidarity for all those fighting racism and segregation.

The Citizenship Schools represented Highlander's most successful voter education strategy. The purpose of the Citizenship School program was to help African Americans learn to read so that they could pass the literacy tests required to become eligible voters in the South at the time. Eventually, the Citizenship Schools led to a region-wide citizenship education program under the management of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The Citizenship Schools played a critical role in building the base for the Civil Rights Movement by helping those African Americans participate in politics.

Highlander's civil rights work provoked a vicious backlash among southern segregationists. In 1957, the Georgia Commission on Education published a sensational piece of propaganda called *Highlander Folk School; Communist Training School, Monteagle, Tennessee*. The publication proved to be an effective tool for organizing white supremacists against Highlander. The campaign against Highlander culminated in 1961 in a move by the State of Tennessee to revoke the Folk School's charter and confiscate its land, buildings, and other property. Anticipating the inevitability of defeat, leaders of the Folk School took action to preserve the idea and work of Highlander by securing a charter for the Highlander Research and Education Center. The new Highlander relocated to Knoxville, Tennessee in 1961.

In 1971, Highlander opened a new center on a farm near New Market, Tennessee, and turned once again to organizing in the Appalachian communities where it began. Highlander's primary focus was encouraging local leadership to build community organizations that could break the hold of undemocratic governments and companies in the region. Through fieldwork and workshops, Highlander reached out to groups organizing around issues such as banning strip mining, improving healthcare in the coalfields, and eliminating toxic pollution in their communities.

Highlander also helped to develop the Southern Appalachian Leadership Training program (SALT), which provided training and support to emerging local leaders. Additionally, the staff organized cultural workshops throughout the region to highlight the strength of Appalachian cultures and the need for cultural workers to engage in social-change efforts.

In the late 1970s, Highlander joined with the Appalachian Alliance in a participatory research study of land ownership in Appalachia. Highlander provided research assistance to this effort and helped train local activists to do their own research to strengthen their voices on issues affecting their communities.

Following Highlander's 50th Anniversary in 1982, the staff and Board decided to keep working in Appalachia but also to rebuild the Center's connections with local organizers and activists in the Deep South. Recognizing that many local problems are the result of global economic forces, they decided to forge new connections with activists and organizers beyond the borders of the United States as well.

In the late 1990s, the Highlander staff and Board undertook a major strategic planning process to analyze current conditions and provide an overall focus for Highlander's work. This process identified economic justice and democratic participation as common themes that connected groups working on many different issues. It also affirmed Highlander's commitment to Appalachia and the South, the continuing need for Highlander to serve as a democratic gathering space for local organizations, and the importance of keeping alive a sense of regional, national, and international struggles.

The staff and Board identified young people, poor and working class people, people of color, and lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender people as marginalized populations and important targets for organizing. As a result, a newly formed education team decided to focus on groups working with these constituencies and to encourage them to join forces to build a multi-racial, multi-generational movement for social and economic change. The growing population of immigrants to the southern United States, largely from Mexico and Central America, provided a new constituency. Highlander helped groups organizing among this population to create a loose educational-support network that functions in Spanish.

Currently, Highlander works with community groups primarily in Appalachia and the Deep South. They actively promote equity in our society for those suffering from discrimination based on gender, class, sexual orientation, age, and physical abilities.. They also maintain exchanges and linkages with national and international groups.

Highlander's approach is relevant to CBNRM practitioners in the following ways. Firstly, through working to support marginalized communities in harnessing their own capacity to bring about change. This requires building on a base of local resources, skills and values – in short the same community-based orientation as CBNRM and the same emphasis on organizing, capacity building and empowerment. Secondly, for the last few decades Highlander has devoted considerable resources to environmental issues

facing Appalachia and the Southern US, including the impacts of strip mining and health and environment. The recognition that resource dependent communities should be able to manage and benefit from and not be harmed by effects of resource extraction activities in their communities has parallels with the CBNRM approach. Lastly, the Highlander Center is rooted in a sense of place, of connectedness to certain geographic communities, and their people and resources. Again, this connection with a particular place is fundamental to the ethos of community-based natural resource management.

The Highlander Center works through partnership, collaboration and networking. It also has direct research partners with institutions including the Center for Research on Women at the University of Memphis and the Southern Regional Congress. Many of its long time partners are organizations or networks representing Highlander's constituents, many of whom send representatives to workshops and training courses.

Long term partnerships exist with civil rights and civil liberty organizations such as: Centre for Democratic Renewal, Greater Knoxville Civil Liberties Alliance; Leadership Conference on Civil Rights; Southern Regional Council (SRC)

Cultural Work: Alternate ROOTS; Appalshop; Bread and Roses Cultural Project - the cultural arm of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Local 1199; The Labor Heritage Foundation, Regional Economic and Social Justice Organizations, Democracy North Carolina Democracy South; Early Childhood Equity Alliance ; Grassroots Leadership; Greater Birmingham Ministries (GBM) ; Jobs with Justice of East Tennessee; Regional Economic Justice Network (REJN); Solutions of Concern to Knoxvilleans; South Carolina United Action (SCUA); Tennessee Economic Renewal Network (TERN)

National Economic and Social Justice Organizations: Center for Community Change; United for a Fair Economy (UFE).

Environmental Justice Organizations: Narrow Ridge Earth Literacy Center and Save Our Cumberland Mountains

Foundations: Appalachian Community Fund (ACF) and Southern Rural Development Initiative (SRDI)

Immigrant/Farmworker Rights: Coalition of Immokalee Workers; National Community for Latino Leadership (NCLL); National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition

International partnerships: Instituto Mexicano para el Desarrollo (IMDEC); TransAfrica Forum

Labor Organizations: AFL-CIO; George Meany Center for Labor Studies - National Labor College; The Labor Heritage Foundation ; United Association for Labor Education

Media organizations: Institute for Southern Studies

Popular Education Organizations; Institute for People's Education and Action (IPEA) - a grass-roots association of North American folk schools, popular education centers, community and academic institutions, resource organizations, and individuals; Project South - a community-based membership institute that develops and conducts popular political and economic education and action research for organizing and liberation; Youth Action - provides trainings, events, technical assistance and networking opportunities to strengthen youth organizing and create change for local communities.

Organizational Functions

The Highlander Center works with grassroots leaders on a wide variety of social concerns, including

- Civil and Human Rights
- Humane Immigration Policy
- Criminal Justice Reform
- Economic Justice and Workers' Rights
- International Peace and Solidarity
- Environmental Justice
- Youth Leadership
- Racial, Gender, and Sexual Discrimination

In support of their vision, Highlander conducts research, develops organizing and educational strategies, collects and produces resource materials for popular educators and organizers. These materials include research reports, fact sheets on immigration issues and law, community organizing and voting rights. They also compile information on many topics related to economic justice, civil rights and globalization from Appalachia, the American South and around the world. Many materials are available online through the links and resources section of their website. Publications can also be accessed through their library collection, or ordered from the bookstore. Materials such as the book *Grassroots Action for Global Change: A resource for Community-based Organizers in Appalachia and Elsewhere* can be downloaded from the website or purchased from the bookstore.

Highlander also sponsors popular education programs that support grassroots activists and community leaders in the South. Upcoming workshops include: *Interpreting for Social Justice* which is designed to build a cadre of skilled social justice interpreters in the Southeast and Appalachia, to encourage local leadership in immigrant communities, and to create multilingual spaces where language is used democratically as a movement-building tool, and the *Highlander Social Change Workshops* to enable participants and Highlander staff to learn from each other about strategies for social change, and to share information about Highlander's current programs and core strategies of popular education, cultural work, and participatory research.

Highlander's programs are unified by the common theme of "Constructing Democracy," building a society in which all people can participate equally in the decisions that affect their lives. Tactics for achieving this goal include

- Creating democratic space: providing an environment within which individuals can bring their whole selves and build authentic relationships with other people across race, class, gender, sexual orientation, age, etc. so that they can participate meaningfully in efforts to achieve social and economic justice.
- Base-building: helping to create and support democratically governed grassroots organizations capable of addressing the problems facing their communities and of joining with other groups in a broad-based collaborative movement for social and economic change.

Current programs include:

- Across Races and Nations - Across Races and Nations is a collaboration between Highlander, the Center for Research on Women at the University of Memphis, and the Southern Regional Council. Through this project, they are conducting research into community change in the South due to immigration from Latin America.
- Cultural Program - Highlander's Cultural Program encourages and supports cultural work that enhances social change organizing in the region.
- Grassroots Think Tank - The Grassroots Think Tank brings together progressive Southerners and others to discuss critical movement issues and develop new strategies for change.
- Multilingual Capacity Building – The Multilingual Capacity Building (MLCB) program provides interpretation, translation, and training services to help Highlander and other social justice organizations work across language to support and build coalitions with immigrant activists and organizations
- Pueblos de Latinoamérica - Pueblos de Latinoamérica works with new Latino immigrants throughout the Southeast
- We Shall Overcome Fund - "We Shall Overcome" served as the theme song of the Civil Rights Movement and is now a worldwide anthem for freedom and justice. Since 1966, Highlander has administered the We Shall Overcome Fund, which is generated by royalties from the commercial use of "We Shall Overcome."
- Workshop Center - The Workshop Center is a vital part of efforts to construct democracy, create democratic space, and build a broad base for social and economic change. It is also available for rent, for a modest fee, to other organizations who work for social and economic justice

- The Young and the Restless - The Young and the Restless works with youth activists and organizers ranging in age from 15 - 21.
- Internship Program - Part of the Young and the Restless, the Internship Program brings up to two interns at a time to Highlander for six-month internships designed to help them learn the nuts and bolts of popular education and social justice work.
- Children's Justice Camp - Also part of The Young and the Restless, the Children's Justice Camp is a week-long summer camp for young people 6-12 years of age whose families are interested in social democracy, justice, and environmental awareness.

Organizational Structure

Highlander Centre is supported by a number of staff including a Director, Administrative support team, Building and Grounds team, Development Team, Education Team, Workshop Centre team. It also relies on a number of consultants for designing and delivering programs. The organization is governed by a volunteer Board of Directors.

Organizational Resources, Infrastructure and Sustainability

Highlander Center is a registered non-profit. It survives through charitable donations, foundation support and program delivery partnerships with other institutions. Royalties from commercial use of “We shall overcome” support scholarships and cultural workshops.

The organization also solicits donations from supporters for ongoing operational costs as well as for specific projects such as the 75th Anniversary Capital Campaign.

Highlander offers two facilities for workshops, meetings and retreats.

- The Horton House, former home of Highlander's founder Myles Horton, is available for rent by individuals, small groups, and organizations as a site for meetings, writing projects, and individual or group retreats. The house can accommodate up to 8 people for multi-day meetings and retreats, and up to 15 people for one-day meetings.
- The Workshop Center is available for rent as a site for meetings, workshops, and retreats by groups of 15-35 people. Workshop Center accommodations include meeting space, lodging in a dormitory, and meals in a dining room.

The Harry Lasker Memorial Library contains over 6,000 books and hundreds of videotapes, audiotapes, periodicals, and research from universities, government agencies, and other mainstream institutions; primary source material on historical social movements in the South; and field research developed by or in collaboration with literally hundreds of grassroots organizations. The Highlander archives can also be accessed at

either the Wisconsin State Historical Archives or the Tennessee State Library and Archives.

The Bookstore offers educational books especially about popular education and community organizing, pamphlets, music, and videos, as well as caps, t-shirts, book bags, mugs, posters, and other novelty items

Gulf of Maine Resource Centres

The Gulf of Maine is the large body of water that borders the eastern seaboard of the United States and culminates in the Bay of Fundy between the Canadian provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The Gulf of Maine extends from Cape Cod Massachusetts to Cape Sable Island in Nova Scotia.



Figure 1: Gulf of Maine. Source. www.saltwaternetwork.org

The marine resource centres of the Gulf of Maine are an interesting case study of networking and linking between resource centres with similar mandates and projects. This narrative refers primarily to the six resource centres that receive networking support from the Saltwater Network. These include:

- Cobscook Bay Resource Center, Eastport Maine
- Community Livelihoods Trust, St. Andrews, NB
- Bay of Fundy Marine Resource Centre, Cornwallis, NS
- Penobscot East Resource Center, Stonington, Maine
- Upper Bay Resource Centre, Canning, NS
- Centre de la Baie Resource Centre, Meteghan

Four of the individual resource centres (Centre for Community Livelihoods/Clark House), BFMRC, Penobscot East and Cobscook) will be explored in more detail in separate narratives.

The Saltwater Network (www.saltwaternetwork.org) is a coalition of community-based organizations around the Gulf of Maine that works to support community based management and conservation in the Gulf of Maine. The Saltwater Network's geography includes the Canadian and Eastern portions of the Gulf of Maine. Their primary constituents are resource centres involved with community-based fisheries management. Other networks such as the Northwest Atlantic Marine Alliance (NAMA) or resources centres like the Shanty in Cape Cod do frequently connect with the GOM resource centers but do not receive direct support from SWN.

There are some similarities amongst the GOM resource centres.

1. They are all civil institutions. That is they are not part of a government department or agency, an academic institution, or even a non-government agency. .
2. They are genuinely cross-cutting in their approach. Though each has considerable expertise or specialization in certain areas, none can clearly be defined as having a solely resource management or economic development or social change mandate. They are always situated at the place where these issues intersect.
3. GOM resource centres define themselves as safe space, one where different interests can meet, build relationships and perhaps learn to collaborate. They serve the needs of the entire community by bringing people together who might not otherwise sit at the same table. This is particularly evident for MRC, Cobscook and CLT/Clark House who help First Nations and fishing communities find ways to build relationships.
4. Place-based. The GOM centres are very connected to a sense of place. They feel a great attachment to the land and seascape of their communities, as well as to the people who live there. They have a fierce sense of being rooted. GOM organizations have often emerged from a single project or organization and remain rooted in this original connection to a certain community, sector or region. Networking and partnering start in a sense of place and work outwards.
5. Working outward means inclusiveness. The RCs all make it explicit that their tools and skills are not only for one group, for example inshore fishermen, but to be shared with other sectors and communities.
6. They function as switchboards, gathering information and resources and passing it on to individuals and groups.
7. Areas of expertise: Each GOM has developed some expertise in particular aspects of CBM, like GIS at Cobscook so that people can be referred there as needed. They can also support the others in these aspects.

There are some differences in how the resource centres operate

1. For some, such as the Centre de la Baie in Meteghan, community-based fisheries management is only one small part of a much broader mandate which includes all resource dependent sectors in the community, economic development, and cultural

and heritage activities. Neither Cobscook nor CLT like to define themselves as being exclusively a CBM or fisheries organization preferring to refer to themselves as community-based institutions or community economic development organizations.

2. **Striving for neutrality:** Most GOM resource centers define themselves as “safe institutions”, and put a premium on bridging differences within their community and between their community and government or science. Some of the resources centers such as Cobscook Bay RC, explicitly say that they try to remain neutral on highly polarized local issues in order to better facilitate civil discussions in a “safe place.” Others, such as CLT feel it is essential to take a strong and clear stance on controversial local issues. Consequently, the role and approach of each RC in local debates can be quite different.
3. **What is the actual resource centre?** For most of the GOM resource centres, the organization is the physical space of the RC. Even the BFMRC which rents offices to many other groups is clearly the organization that “is” the resource centre. The exception is CLT which has received funding from SWN to set up a marine resource centre. They are a community-based organization, but the physical space of the RC is Clark House, a cooperative venture between 5 local non-profits. Their RC is for the wider community in the sense of easier access and meeting space, however, the RC is also for the cooperative members who benefit from increased synergy and shared resources.
4. **Fee for service and community enterprise.** Some of the resource centres such BFMRC are trying to implement fee-for-service arrangements as part of their financial sustainability efforts. Others, such as Cobscook would like to become incubators for economic development projects that would generate revenue for the resource centres and individuals and small businesses in the community. Most of the other RCs are not in a position to consider such revenue generation strategies. Some also worry about the potential of competing with other organizations or their constituents.

Common Challenges

1. **Finding a good model for sustainability.** What is the right mix of project and operational funding? Of fee for service and providing services? Who should be expected to pay the costs of providing service?
2. **Leadership and staffing:** How to invest in leaders and staff who can develop expertise in certain areas and support them to keep working in these areas over the long term? How to build the capacity of the RCs so they can then support capacity building of other organizations? What are the areas of expertise that need to be developed? What is the right mix of associate and permanent staff?
3. **Mandate drift.** The quest for funding can lead to a project based approach to fundraising that may lead to projects that are not clearly linked to the original mandate. This means staff are constantly pulled in different directions and the actual CBM work of the organization does not get done.
4. **Lack of programming.** RCs need to carefully develop programs linked to their mandates and build on these. For example, Cobscook has monitoring as a core

activity that is part of who they are. Lack of programming leads to bad project choices and will eventually affect funding and staffing.

Cobscook Bay Resource Center

Organizational Motivation

The Cobscook Bay Resource Center offers an interesting example of how a RC can evolved based on local research. In 1993, the Maine Community Foundation, in partnership with the Nature Conservancy and Ford Foundation, initiated the Sustainable Cobscook Project to undertake environmentally sound economic development in the Cobscook Bay area of Washington County. The purpose of the Sustainable Cobscook Project was to help local people plan their own futures so as to enjoy greater economic growth and stability while protecting and sustaining the area's natural resources... During this project, local values and indicators of sustainability were identified: natural resources, economy, strong education system and sense of community.

The Cobscook Bay Clam Restoration Project was selected as a pilot project that would make an impact in all of the selected indicator areas. It combined an innovative community-based approach to conservation, management, and restoration of the Bay's soft-shell clam resource founded on the inextricable link between the health of the environment and the health of the local economy. In 1996, the Clam Restoration Project contributed to the opening to harvest of over 2,000 acres of flats previously closed due to fecal coliform pollution by identifying and helping residents to upgrade faulty septic systems. In 1998, the Cobscook Bay Resource Center was created to expand the work of the Clam Restoration Project.

From the beginning of the Sustainable Cobscook project, the need for a Cobscook regional resource center was apparent. There was so much information about the area that was missing, or scattered. The researchers felt that better decisions could only come when better information was available. At this point, a RC that could create, share, and build new information was envisioned. The emphasis on making information available to Cobscook residents has remained strong since the early phases of the project. The Cobscook Bay Clam Restoration project was a first step to figure how this might work, to develop specific indicators, and relationships. It also was integral in building regional awareness, in developing a Cobscook identity for a region that had previously not identified as a distinct region.

Cobscook Bay Resource Center's mission is: to encourage and strengthen community-based approaches to resource management and sustainable economic development in the Cobscook Bay region, the Bay of Fundy, and the Gulf of Maine.

Cobscook Bay Resource Center sees its relationships as nested from the very local out to the entire Gulf of Maine. The constituencies of the organization are firstly people who make their living on the water, such as clambers and local fishing organizations such as the Cobscook Bay Fishermen's Association, and other community groups and networks in the Cobscook Bay region; secondly, residents of the Cobscook region; followed by

Maine coastal communities, Bay of Fundy residents and those living along the Gulf of Maine.

Like most GOM resource centers, Cobscook has partnerships at many levels. Its local networks include fishing organizations around Cobscook Bay, Down East Maine, and the Bay of Fundy including Campobello Fishermen's Association and Fundy North Fishermen's Association and the Passamaquoddy community at Pleasant Point. It also works closely with Maine Department of Marine Resources, Maine Department of Environmental Protection and the University of Maine at Machias and Orono.

Regionally, Cobscook Bay Resource Centre collaborates with the Downeast Institute, and with the Biological Station in St. Andrews, New Brunswick. It is a member of Saltwater Network and works with other Gulf of Maine resource centers.

They are not presently part of any national or international networks. This is deliberate as they feel that would lose credibility locally if they tried to shift their focus. In their experience, it has been hard enough to move between local and regional work due to lack of resources and time; any further scaling up would be too much.

Over the years, Cobscook has sought to answer questions about how to become a fully mature community development organization and stay true to its original purpose. Cobscook Bay Resource Center has a strong reputation amongst the other Gulf of Maine resource centre for their GIS mapping work, research, and community monitoring projects. They have developed collaborative data sharing agreements around GIS data and maps that have served as a model for other organizations in negotiating data-sharing agreements. They are also a secure organization for sharing maps and other information. They are also known for long running water quality monitoring and marine resource education programs, as well as innovative research partnerships.

Organizational Functions

Cobscook's main activities are:

Cobscook Monitoring Network: This works through community partnerships to collect water quality samples to assure safe shellfish consumption; analyze water samples for the presence of toxic phytoplankton that cause harmful algal blooms; conduct septic system inspections to determine sources of pollution, and facilitate replacement of failed systems. They recently completed a study with the Passamaquoddy Tribe of 13 heavy metals and dioxin in samples of four marine species frequently consumed by tribal members.

Technical Assistance: They provide technical assistance to resource users, municipal officials and others in developing the capabilities needed for effective local participation in conservation and management planning, research, and conflict reduction and resolution. An example is the creation of the Cobscook Bay Fisherman's Association and development of a daily catch limit on scallops.

Marine Resources Education: Cobscook provides assistance to teachers in engaging students in the marine environment, including using computer mapping and GPS tools, participating in water quality and biotoxin monitoring, and providing opportunities for students to participate in research and stock enhancement projects. They have developed marine education curriculum for primary and secondary schools and have a long term relations with local schools.

Community-Based Research: Cobscook's research helps give voice to local research priorities. They arrange logistical support for scientific studies in the Bay, provide a link between researchers and local people, and conduct their own research projects. An example is the Cobscook Drift Study, a field study of circulation patterns in the combined Passamaquoddy/Cobscook ecosystem.

Information Exchange: Cobscook hosts the annual Cobscook Fishermen's Forum which is an important event for information sharing, capacity building and networking between fishing organizations, researchers, legislators, resource managers, and law enforcement. In recent years, this has been an important venue to share information and resources related to community-based fisheries management.

Partnerships and Alliances: Cobscook leverages its own resources through partnerships and alliances with individuals, agencies, universities or community organizations including University of Maine scientists on drift studies, the Centre for Community-based Management and Stonington Fisheries Alliance on local stock work, Quebec Labrador Foundation on marine education, and Island Institute on mapping projects.

Much of Cobscook's networking activities stem from the dialogue and relationship building that the Centre can offer in its role as a "safe space" for people to meet. Cobscook has been active in supporting conflict resolution for organizations, community, and municipal government and between communities in the area... They connect people working on CBCRM to other organizations and potential supporters.

The resource library and website are the main avenues for disseminating materials based on their research and activities. The website also provides summaries of the annual Cobscook Fisheries Forum, mapping and research studies, and information about clam closures, as well as marine education curricula.

The resource center has had some success at helping fishermen influence fishing policy at Cobscook regional level by working through the Maine State Legislature. They have also influenced municipal and tribal policies around clam licensing and restoration. The resource center supports the Cobscook Bay Fishermen's Association as they participate in the Department of Marine Resources Advisory Council. The Resource Center is currently working with marine users and Cobscook residents to encourage civil processes, conversations, and exchange of information around liquefied natural gas issues.

Organizational Structure

Cobscook Bay Resource Center is an incorporated not-for-profit organization in the State of Maine and has 501(c) (3) IRS nonprofit status. Their Board of Directors consists of experienced individuals working with organizations supporting community-based management, marine and coastal issues and community development, as well as fishermen, researchers and scientists. They meet 4 times a year. Board members are chosen as individuals, but through their institutional affiliations they help the Center connect to a wide range of local and regional institutions.

The Executive Director of the organization, Will Hopkins, has been with the organization since its inception, providing continuity and vision. He also sits on the Board. He provides key programmatic leadership for the organization, solicits funds, facilitates organizational development and networking activities and leads most policy work., The other permanent staff, Heidi Leighton, was born and raised in the area. She specializes in GIS, provides technical assistance and financial management, and works with community partners and schools. They bring in researchers or consultants as needed. The Resource Center often has students or interns working on projects.

Most Board members are involved in some way in the Center's program areas. . They become part of the conversations that determine the resource center's direction over the short and long term. Annually, they review their program activities over the past year and determine which activities to add or drop, and consider the financial implications of these decisions. They try to look where the real demand is and whether there has been a shift in where the greatest interest is shown, at what they might drop or change. They have to have a clearly identified community interest in a project or activity even if it is an informal commitment from a fisherman or teacher.

Once program goals are identified they then raise the funds. They try to support their entire program, and to minimize project funding, to avoid lurching from thing to thing. They want to be able to stay with their programs and not have to stop conducting activities because of lack of funding. This approach helps build credibility for the Resource Center in the community.

Organizational Resources, Infrastructure and Sustainability

Cobscook Bay Resource Center has received funding from foundations including: the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, the Jessie B. Cox Charitable Trust, Quebec Labrador Foundation, Henry P. Kendall Foundation, the Island Institute, Sudbury Foundation, Davis Conservation Foundation, Jane's Trust, and Saltwater Network. They also work collaboratively with partners such as the Passamaquoddy Tribe to raise funds for specific research projects. The Cobscook Drift Study Project, for example, was funded by the Maine Oil Spill Advisory Committee and Maine Sea Grant.

The organization has had a small office, with a library, meeting room and mapping center for a number of years. It has recently received funds from the Congressional

Appropriation budget to establish a marketing co-op in Eastport, along with a community kitchen. They were also able to get full funding from a local bank to allow the purchase of a property on the waterfront. The loan is for 100% of the cost of the lot, while the Congressional funds will allow the construction of a new building. They still have to raise \$200,000 to renovate the existing building on the property to house the resource center itself.

As a result of this, resource center development has been added as a program area to Cobscook Bay Resource Center's ongoing program areas.

The renovated building will house a community meeting room, a library, a small retail area, research space, and offices. The new building will house the marketing co-op and community kitchen in an attached extension to the office building. The co-op and community kitchen will share heating, plumbing, electrical systems, and office equipment with the Resource Center. The new facility will act as an incubator for the efforts of local people engaged in production of both seafood and agricultural food products. Like many GOM resource centers, Cobscook struggles with questions about what percentage of their operating budget should eventually come from grants versus, earned income. Currently, they receive roughly 15 to 20% from fee for services. .

The marketing co-op will market Cobscook scallops and other local food items, including seafood and agricultural products. The community kitchen will allow local small producers to better retail and wholesale and market their value-added products. The community kitchen will be a fully certified commercial kitchen that meets health standards and can be rented out on an hourly or daily basis for those who want to process or package seafood or jams and jellies... The facility will have all permits and licenses, so goods can be produced without carrying capital overhead. The community kitchen will likely be a subsidiary wholly owned for profit, and support the operating costs of the resource center. These projects are baby steps towards making Cobscook Bay Resource Centre self-sufficient.

Community Livelihoods Trust/ Clark House

CLT is a very recently established organization located in St. Andrews, New Brunswick. Its mission statement is to engage people of coastal communities in the stewardship of their resource based livelihoods, through education, networking and capacity building. It envisions healthy coastal communities in SWNB where social economic and environmental justice is the basis of development.

CLT is different from the other RCs of the GOM in that there is one resource centre (Clark House), with 5 non-profits acting as a cooperative and sharing resources and office space. The other resource centres are one organization AND a physical space. Clark House is a physical space shared by 5 organizations. CLT is the only organization that works specifically on community-based marine resource management.

Until recently, CLT was a part of the Centre for Community-Based Management at St. Francis Xavier University in Antigonish. The Centre for Community-Based Resource Management (CCBRM) was established at St. Francis Xavier University in 1998, partly as a response to the emerging efforts at community-based fisheries management in the ground fisheries. . The CCBRM drew on the university's strong history (since the 1920s) of supporting the development of adult education, cooperatives and credit unions in the Maritimes, through the "Antigonish Movement".

One of the first initiatives of the CCBM in the 1990s was a needs assessment with the groundfish management boards in order to evaluate the ways to advance their capacity for community-based management. The Centre also supported in various ways the formation and operations of the Bay of Fundy Marine Resource Centre, as with other marine resource centres, the CCBRM played a linking and support role for community groups, as an independent third-party organization that is able to facilitate multi-stakeholder meetings and act as a mediator in conflict resolutions. It also provided training and capacity-building resources, a training programme in community-based resource management, and support for community-based research.

Local staff based in New Brunswick worked on CCBM's Bay of Fundy Project, which focused on capacity building, knowledge management and participatory research with local fishing organizations. The Bay of Fundy project coordinated participatory research to build upon the ecological knowledge of fish harvesters by engaging them in participatory research, strengthening local capacity for community-based research, and establishing nodes to house and access data and knowledge of the Bay of Fundy. The 3 main projects were the Local Knowledge and Local Stocks project, the Cooperative Cod Tagging Project and the Gaspereau Migration Project. .

The establishment of CLT as an independent organization came about for a number of reasons. Extension workers found that community organizations, like fishermen's associations and citizens groups, often lacked the capacity to use their research results to make policy change. Consequently, their efforts shifted, although they still work on participatory research, they find themselves engaged in capacity building initiatives: training courses; organizational development work; and linking groups and individuals with others confronting similar issues in the Gulf of Maine and internationally.

Secondly, it became clearer that a real resource centre is a physical place that brings people together. There was a real lack of such an institution on the NB side of the Bay of Fundy. CCBM along with organizations such as New Brunswick Nature Trust and Conservation Council of NB started to look for a suitable location for a building that would provide office space for community organizations as well as a meeting place for the constituencies they serve. This would create more local momentum for social change and opportunities for collaboration between organizations.

Lastly, as St. FX University's Extension Department sought to redefine its own focus and geographic scope, it presented a perfect opportunity for CLT to continue capacity

building and organizational work with local fishing organizations, while at the same time expanding its base to connect with First Nations and peace communities.

CLT is now one of the partner organizations in the establishment of “Clark House: Our Natural, Social and Cultural Heritage”. Clark House is a heritage building located in St. Andrews and owned by the Civic Trust. It is leased to CLT, NB Nature Trust, Conservation Council of NB, St. Andrews Art Council, and the Passamaquoddy Tribe. They will soon incorporate a cooperative to operate Clark House as a resource centre. Sharing the building allows more collaboration; it also keeps costs down as they can share office costs. It also will allow “one stop shopping” for the public wanting to connect with a number of different local organizations. .

As a individual organization, CLT continues to be part of many networks of CBCRM practitioners in the Atlantic region including Fundy North Fishermen’s Association, Campobello Fishermen’s Association, Deer Island Fishermen’s Association, gaspereau harvesters association, clammers, weir fishermen, Saltwater Network, Bay of Fundy Fisheries Council, and the other Gulf of Maine resource centres. It is also has connections to the many environmental groups opposing LNG expansion in the Bay of Fundy.

Because it shares office with CCBN and NBNT, there is a closer working relationship with key environmental groups in the area. CLT works closely with the local Passamaquoddy Tribe and other First Nations associations, as well as the Tatamagouche Centre, Cobscook Bay Resource Centre and the BFMRC. There remains a close and supportive connection with the Extension Department at St. FX.

Clark House is the Resource centre and because most of tenants are focused on marine and coastal issues, it serves as a marine resource centre; CLT is the only marine resource centre on the New Brunswick side of the Bay of Fundy and as such will play an important role in providing support for local CBM initiatives. A valuable role will be providing the space and opportunity for groups to connect in new ways (aboriginal and fishing communities, marine industry and environmentalists) and collaborate on various projects.

Organizational Functions

CLT is currently working on the following projects: capacity building and organizational development with Fundy North Fishermen’s Association, a campaign for recognition of the Passamaquoddy First Nation in Canada, linking fishermen and tourist operators working in Passamaquoddy Bay, and development and coordination of the new resource centre. It has yet to define its program areas, but they will fall broadly under supporting CBM, support for aboriginal communities, peace and social justice...

To date, most of the sharing of CBNRM experiences has involved bringing groups together around specific issues such as the opposition to LNG terminals in

Passamaquoddy Bay, for example informally connecting people working on the same issues or helping the southwestern NB fishing groups develop a fisheries position on LNG and the formation of a fisheries committee within the Save the Passamaquoddy Bay organization.

Most of their policy work has to do with small-scale fisheries, such as writing letters around the location of aquaculture sites or opposition to trust agreements in the fisheries. This has mainly been done through or with Fundy North Fishermen's Association. They have also done some First Nations policy work at local or regional level.

They support local initiatives through offering support for action and then a gradual phase out, for example building non-native support for recognition of the Passamaquoddy.

Organizational Structure

The organization is registered non profit. It has a Board of Directors with representatives from the fishing industry and local community and environmental organizations, First Nations, social justice and tourism... When Clark House incorporates as a coop, they will also establish a Board.

There are two staff. Maria Recchia, the founder of the organization is the Executive Director. She leads the proposal development, fundraising efforts, networking, collaboration and project work. She brings almost a decade of experience working in this field and is well respected locally and in the region. The office manager does some project work, but mainly handles logistics, and organizational tasks.

The Board has two co-chairs, and they make overall policy decisions. The ED is a voting member of the Board. Since the Board represents stakeholders, they can shape the direction of the organization. If CLT moves in new directions, they will be able to add new Board representatives from these constituencies.

Organizational Resources, Infrastructure and Sustainability

Presently, the establishment of the organization has been supported by a grant from Salt Water Network. Some projects funds come from Kendall Foundation and Gulf of Maine Council. CLT also has a contract with Fundy North Fishermen's Organization to support organizational development work. Long term funding remains uncertain. They have not yet set up indicators of sustainability.

Bay of Fundy Marine Resource Centre

Organizational Motivation

The Bay of Fundy Marine Resource Centre (MRC) is a community-based institution, offering services, facilities and technical support to all aspects of the Bay of Fundy marine economy and eco-system. The Bay of Fundy Marine Resource Centre was established in 1997 during a period of great activity and optimism about the potential of community-based fisheries management in the region. The Fundy Fixed Gear Council (a community-based fisheries management board) realized that long term success of community-based approaches would require support and services beyond the range of a fishing organization to catalyze on its own...

The MRC was established by the Fundy Fixed Gear Council and the Western Valley Development Agency, a local community economic development agency, and a number of marine related community groups, harvesters' organizations, First Nations, and others, to provide facilitation, research, and support services to all marine industries. Once initiated, the fishing organization handed over responsibility for the establishment of this centre to a board of directors comprised of community members. The original building for the Centre was purchased for \$1 as part of the process of dismantling a former naval base in Cornwallis, Nova Scotia.

According to Charles et al (2005), the MRC (1) helps local marine-oriented groups develop the skills needed for defining problems, establishing goals and working cooperatively, and (2) provides support services for these groups in conflict resolution, organizational development, facilitation, technical support, Geographic Information Systems, and research. The MRC's work focuses on six broad areas: (1) community-based resource management, (2) aquaculture, (3) marine tourism promotion and marketing, (4) digital data storage and retrieval, (5) training for aquaculture and fisheries, and (6) ecological, market, legal, technological and social research relating to marine resources.

Over the years, the MRC has provided support to a range of fisher organizations, fish processors, the aquaculture industry, marine ecotourism operators, First Nations, environmental groups, researchers, and governments. The main focus has been on fishery themes, to organizations such as the Fundy Fixed Gear Council, the Digby-Annapolis Clam Management Board, and the new Management Board in Lobster Fishing Area 34 of southwest Nova Scotia, as well as providing assistance to Bear River First Nation in planning its fishery.

The MRC has also worked at the scale of the entire Bay of Fundy in (a) developing a Community Learning Network to provide technical, research, educational and informational resources, and (b) supporting the Writing the Rules project to develop ecosystem-based management principles for the Bay of Fundy fisheries, based on input from fishers and their organizations...

Although still oriented toward marine industries, the MRC plays a leading role in many community-based development projects in the Nova Scotia coastal region of the Bay of Fundy. For a few years, it hosted the local portal for a national community economic development website and discussion board (CEDTAP). It also carried out a Community Learning Network Project through the Office of New Technologies, which focused on the use of web and video based technologies to encourage dialogue by community groups around the Bay of Fundy. For two years, the MRC partnered with Women's Space (a women's resource centre in Digby) on an HRDC funded study of homelessness in Digby County.

The MRC often describes itself as providing a "tool box" for local groups interested in local management. Emerging community fishery groups can draw on institutional capacity building support (organizational, technical or research-based) locally from an organization which does not have interests or an agenda of its own - it is purely an enabling agency.

Organizational Functions

Services offered at the MRC include:

- Information and Referral
- Conflict Resolution
- Facilitation
- Organizational Development Support
- Technical Support
- GIS Consultation
- Project Initiatives
- Volunteering Opportunities

The MRC has also helped link local fishers to universities, networks, First Nations groups and other fisheries organizations as needed. It has also supported the development of organizations that address wider regional and bioregional issues, such as the Saltwater Network and the Bay of Fundy Fisheries Council, which involved more than a dozen fisheries groups, and which was able to create a plan for ecosystem-based fisheries in the Bay of Fundy

The physical reality of the MRC being able to provide a safe space for meetings and discussions has been key in bringing different stakeholders together to build support and capacity for CBCRM. Other avenues for sharing between communities and organizations include study tours organized by, or in which the MRC participated, including Turning the Tide tours to the Canadian West and the Gulf of Maine. The study tours helped strengthen relationships between the fishing organization and First Nations participants from the East Coast of Canada who participated in the exchange as well as with similar organizations in other parts of the country or in the US.

The MRC has also participated in collaborative research projects with university and government scientists, as well as academics, students, and other NGOs. These projects

have included biological studies of fish and lobster stock status, social science research, market studies, local knowledge studies, oral histories, and eco-tourism. These collaborations have led to the creation and dissemination of new research, as well as better relationships between fishing organizations and researchers. A few federal and provincial government offices rent space in the MRC which also helps build a relationship between fishing associations and government, particularly since the Fundy Fixed Gear Council and the Bay of Fundy Inshore Fishermen's Association rent office space for their office manager in the MRC building.

The MRC also helps the fishing industry with local schools, community economic development initiatives, women's organizations, environmental groups, and tourism operators.

At one time, St. Francis Xavier University Extension Department rented office space in the MRC and offered training and skills development around CBCRM at the resource centre. The MRC has facilitated other learning opportunities such as arranging for some required navigational training courses to be offered at Bear River First Nation.

The MRC does not offer much information on its website. It has produced maps and other material which are available on site. It developed a pamphlet and posters explaining CBCRM and many local and regional resource materials on CBCRM and fisheries are available on site.

Most of the MRC's policy work has focused on supporting fisheries management around the Bay of Fundy. It has worked with regional and national groups on campaigns such as owner-operator provisions in fisheries licensing policy. MRC was the inspiration for many of the other RCs emerging in the Bay of Fundy and works closely with the Upper Bay Resource Centre and the Centre de la Baie in Meteghan. It is a part of Saltwater networked and closely connected to other RCs in the Gulf of Maine and into New England. There is a history of international connection to CBCRM groups in Asia through LEARN and the World Federation of Fish Harvesters.

Organizational Structure

The MRC has a Board of directors composed of community leaders active in fisheries, community economic development, education and First Nations. Each director sits on the Board based on their capacity as an individual not because of their institutional affiliation.

The MRC usually has only two full time staff: the Building Manager who oversees the operation of the facilities including finding tenants, and who also develops proposals and manages funds, and the office manager. When funding permits there is a Research Coordinator. Interns and students often base themselves at the MRC during the summer months.

The MRC also has a number of associates. Well known CBCRM practitioners such as Arthur Bull, Allison Evans or Sherri Pictou who help raise funds, develop proposals and are sometimes hired on contract for certain activities.

As the MRC is undergoing a renewal strategy, its structure may change. Currently the Board is very active as funding is limited and there are few staff. They may decide to move towards having an Executive Director to provide leadership and a connection between Board and staff and to oversee all projects and financial matters. They would retain the associate staff model with a “stable” of potential experts and resource people to draw on. They may also solicit proposals and initiate new projects

Having a clearly designated leader and contact person will facilitate collaboration as it will be clear where lines of communication and accountability lie.

The revitalization process the MRC is undergoing will re-affirm or more clearly define the MRC’s mandate within its existing mission and goals. This should make project selection and partnership building clearer as some baseline criteria will be defined.

Organizational Resources, Infrastructure and Sustainability

The MRC's facilities, located in Cornwallis Park, Annapolis County, include training facilities, a walk-in information and referral centre with on-line access to information on a wide range of marine related topics, training classroom, GIS mapping centre, meeting rooms, and other facilities.

However, due to a financial shortfall, they are currently renting space in a nearby building and trying to sell the building as a cornerstone for a sustainability plan.

Funding for MRC remains an ongoing challenge. Local organizations do not always have the financial capability to pay for the services provided by the MRC. The MRC has relied on a range of funding sources, including rental income (from offices rented to community groups and government agencies), ‘fee for service’ income (providing GIS mapping, technical support, facilitation, etc.), funding from Canadian and US foundations, and funding from government grants provided for specific project activities.

Financial support has come from funders such as: Kendall Foundation, McConnell Foundation, Turning the Tides, Saltwater Network, Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment, World Wildlife Federation, an Office of Learning Technologies, Human Resources Development Canada.

Funding limitations lie in part behind why the MRC was unable achieve some of the goals it had identified at the outset – such as setting up a research facility with a wet lab, and a fully staffed marine information and referral centre.

The new strategy will focus on obtaining operational funds (for the building and core staff), project funds (from funders to implement certain projects), fee-for-service (cost

recovery on a range of services from organizing study tours, organizational development to GIS), and social businesses (marketing or other profit-based community enterprises). Both Kendall and SWN are committing financial support to this planning and revitalizing but requiring the MRC to develop indicators of sustainability including financial indicators.

A key form of non financial support comes from the wider community, who have rallied round to work in the office when staff are sick or have no funding, or to sit on the Board or to try to help in fundraising and strategic visioning. There has been an outpouring of support from community organizations, communities, local government, and allies like other GOM resource centers.

Penobscot East Resource Center

Organizational Motivation

Penobscot East Resource Center is a community-based organization located in Stonington, Maine working to make a future for fishing communities from the Penobscot Bay islands to Jonesport. It provides support to local groups engaged in community-based marine management and fishermen-based stewardship.

The founders of PERC are all volunteers with Stonington Fisheries Alliance (SFA). This fishing association has been influential in policy advocacy at the local level, however, they realized an organization was needed that could support/catalyze purely volunteer efforts. For example, starting a lobster hatchery would require raising money, hiring staff. All this could be difficult for a purely volunteer organization, so SFA decided to split into another kind of organization that could provide organizational development, capitalization and other support for SFA and other local organizations.

PERC was incorporated in July 2003, and regard themselves as still in the building stage – building capacity, building trust and building a hatchery!

PERC aims to expand the community served by SFA. Penobscot East Resource Center will be a place where all sectors of the fishing communities can meet, work, plan, and learn together. It will link the communities to schools, universities, research organizations, funders and others so that together they can meet the challenges of access, productivity, and sustainability of marine resources.

PERC's mission is to make a future for fishing communities in its area. It does this by energizing and facilitating responsible community-based fishery management, collaborative marine science, and sustainable economic development.

The primary constituencies for the resource centre are those involved in the marine industries in the Eastern Gulf of Maine. PERC works directly with organizations such as SFA, the Deer Isle Stonington Clam Committee, Stonington Lobster Co-op, and the Zone

C Lobster Management Council. Through SFA, PERC has membership on the board of the Northwest Atlantic Marine Alliance (NAMA).

PERC believes that fishermen are a key constituency for marine conservation. They possess important knowledge that is needed for effective, local, ecologically sound management. PERC seeks to work with small groups of fishermen and fishing community members on projects that work constructively for the future of the resource and the ability to fish. This, over time, will start the transformation of the fisherman's role so that they are stewards as well as fishermen. It will also stimulate community science that will provide tools for better management. All community based management requires the involvement not only of fishermen but also other community members.

PERC is quite deliberate in their approach to constituency building. They frequently ask themselves "what is local?" They are well known on the island and are thus approached by potential partners. However how far down the coast they can effectively work or represent is an ongoing discussion.

Beyond their extensive local collaborations, they collaborate with Maine Department of Marine Resources, Down East Groundfish initiative, university researchers and Bigelow Laboratory for Ocean Sciences. They stay in touch and have collegial relationship with SWN partners, but have limited time for networking beyond the local level.

Organizational Functions

PERC divides its operations into the following categories: community science, community leadership, public policy advocacy, education, and their building project working on developing a permanent home for its offices.

Specific programs include:

Local Science

The Zone C Lobster Hatchery is located at the Stonington Lobster Co-op. The hatchery was initiated by fishermen and will serve fishermen. Penobscot East is providing the organizational infrastructure to raise funds, operate the highly technical facility, and solicit collaborative research to evaluate the hatchery's effectiveness. The hatchery is an ambitious and visible project that represents exactly the type of collaboration that Penobscot East seeks to create – a true partnership between fishermen, scientists, and the community, doing something constructive for the fishery.

The hatchery fundraising illustrates this partnership. In the end, construction of the hatchery cost around \$80,000, with over \$27,000 donated by Zone C lobstermen and their communities. Many lobstermen sent in individual donations; the most common amount received was \$100. The towns of Isle au Haut and Stonington also supported the hatchery, donating money at their annual town meetings. Other local organizations

helped as well – including area banks, businesses, and the Downeast Lobstermen’s Association. The remainder of the money necessary to build the hatchery was raised or secured by Penobscot East.

This summer, it is projected that the hatchery will produce three batches of 50,000 juvenile lobsters. These tiny – less than one inch long – lobsters will be released in each of Zone C’s nine districts, encompassing 400,000 fishing acres and the towns of Stonington, Deer Isle, North Haven, Vinalhaven, Isle au Haut, Matinicus, Brooklin, Sedgwick, Brooksville and Blue Hill.

Ted Ames is holding a series of meetings with lobstermen from each Zone C district to determine where the lobsters will be released. At the meetings, Ted updates the lobstermen about the hatchery, discusses the strategy of seeding areas that have been depleted in recent years, and discusses juvenile habitat. The lobstermen in attendance talk things over and draw pertinent areas on photocopied charts. These meetings constitute a critical part of the community-building part of this project. It is significant for fishermen from a district to have a concrete, non-regulatory reason to come together to talk about the condition of the fishery in their area.

PERC is also working with a group of mussel draggers from Taunton Bay to write another collaborative research proposal to the Northeast Consortium. The mussel draggers approached PERC, interested in responsible bay management and eager to conduct a project, but lacking the capacity to design and write a viable proposal.

Capacity Building and Community Leadership

PERC is creating a mechanism for testing community science, which will build fishermen and scientists ability to talk, to listen, for example, the project Ted Ames is doing around location for juvenile lobster release. This reaches out to many people sharing their knowledge of lobster habitat and habitat changes. It does not only change habitat, it changes the habits of community members.

Community leadership is capacity building for local leaders. Ultimately, their goal is to help the communities develop the skills needed to effectively participate in governance of resource management. A key element of this will be a community outreach coordinator position for two years. This person will work “in the field” to build capacity and networks among local groups. The coordinator will travel extensively in the communities, organize internships and outreach events, and in many ways become the public face of the Penobscot East Resource Center.

Other community leadership activities include:

- An upcoming Clam Summit. Penobscot East is providing facilitation support for a summit to be sponsored by the Deer Isle-Stonington Clam Committee and the town of Stonington. The summit will address shore access and environmental issues.

- A Saltwater Network-sponsored clam tour that brought diggers from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to Stonington to meet briefly with the island clam committee in November.
- A Stonington Waterfront Project. President, Ted Hoskins is working for Penobscot East talking with people who use the Stonington waterfront about what makes it a good place from which to fish, and what features should be considered important as the town changes and gentrifies.

Public Policy Advocacy

Penobscot East Resource Center is becoming established as a trusted source of information and perspective on community-based resource management, through outreach, forums and lectures.

Executive Director Robin Alden and Vice-President Ted Ames team-taught a local Colloquy, conducting four two-hour classes in January and February 2006. Coursework covered fishery history and the basics of community-based resource management.

In 2005, Penobscot East hosted two community forums, in an attempt to sate the public's hunger for knowledge about marine resource issues. The forums took place in late spring and again in late summer, featuring speakers from the island's diverse fisheries. They held the forums in the community church, and served the famous clam chowder of a local fisherman.

Ted Ames' MacArthur fellowship has presented tremendous opportunities for public advocacy. Ted has been featured in newspapers ranging from the local weekly to the *New York Times*, and in magazines from the *University of Maine Alumni Magazine* to *Wired Magazine*. The fellowship has also led to many speaking engagements.

Participation in the Downeast Groundfish Initiative is another avenue to influence public policy. The initiative would result in an area management and community-based approach to groundfish regulation in the eastern Gulf of Maine.

Education

PERC's website is still under development. Most of its training work is done through facilitation support for other organizations and towns rather than through producing materials.

PERC plans to make hatchery internships available to college or graduate school students once production begins this summer. The hatchery will also provide educational opportunities to local high school students.

PERC has also arranged to have a small exhibit space in the Heritage House, a building next to the Deer Isle Historical Society that has recently been purchased privately for use as adjunct exhibit space.

Organizational Structure

The organization is led by three very well known, well-respected community-based management proponents. Executive Director, Robin Alden, is a former Maine Fisheries Commissioner and a respected fisheries organizer. Ted Ames, the recipient of the 2005 MacArthur Fellowship in recognition of his work combining fishery science and fishermen's knowledge to protect essential groundfish habitat, is the Vice President of the organization. Ted Hoskins, the President, has worked with, and inspired fishermen along the Maine coast for many years.

PERC staff includes the Executive Director, an administrative assistant, and an executive assistant to the director. The hatchery will provide three additional, seasonal, jobs: a hatchery manager, assistant manager and technician. They also will be hiring a Community Coordinator to do the primary work of the center: working with fishermen and community groups.

There is an 8 member Board of Directors which includes well-respected individuals who bring needed skills to the organization.

PERC has a small strong Board. They help with the budget and public policy advocacy to support the work. The Board meets four times a year. The ED tries to give them policy issues, so that they can add value through their expertise. They are the principal decision makers. The ED does not sit on the Board. This structure allows PERC to have access to expertise as needed. Everyone can weigh in with their different skills and styles.

PERC believes that the most productive way to help fishermen find and use their voice for working for the future of their communities is to start by working on problems that fishermen want to address, learn through those, and follow the path that establishes. They do support community initiatives and are public advocates for community-based management. They are a supportive institution, but they are not invisible.

Organizational Resources, Infrastructure and Sustainability

PERC receives grant funds from a wide variety of sources including foundations such as Sudbury, Tides and Jesse B. Cox Charitable Foundation. Grant funding will be essential to the organization's operations for the foreseeable future. They also receive some funding from research grants.

PERC has received a Community Development Block Grant through the towns of Stonington and Isle au Haut. The grant provides Penobscot East with \$140,000, which they can draw anytime during a two and one half-year period. The deliverable is that they must create seven jobs, more than half of which go to low or middle-income people.

Other recent grants include:

- Project development funds from the Northeast Consortium, to fund the scientific hatchery workshop in Stonington.
- Support from Saltwater Network for support of Community Leadership activities, particularly supporting the readiness of communities Downeast to be involved with the Downeast Initiative.
- Funding for two years for a Community Coordinator position.
- Funds from the Rural Community Development Initiative to fund skill building at Penobscot East Resource Center and in nearby communities.

PERC currently has space in a former school building. Continuing work on the Colwell Building plans for a permanent home for the center is a priority. During 2007 PERC will start a capital campaign for the building and an endowment to run it.

Sources:

www.saltwaternetwork.org

Interview with Robin Alden, March 24th, 2006