

LESSONS LEARNED ON GOVERNANCE FROM A GAP ANALYSIS ASSESSMENT IN NAM ET-PHOU LOUEY NATIONAL PARK, NORTHERN LAO PDR

John W. K. Parr^{1*}, Teaunchay Phongkhamphanh², Vilasack Southammakoth² and Latsamay Sylavong³

*Corresponding author: jwkparr103@gmail.com

1 Protected Area Management Specialist, 40/24 Mooban Chaiyapuk, Tanon Semafarklam, Tambon Kooklod, Lam Lukka, Pathum Thani, 12130, Thailand.

2 Protected Area Management Division, Department of Forestry, That Dam, Vientiane, Lao PDR.

3 Conservation Standards Adviser, GIZ Lao Program, Vientiane, Lao PDR.

ABSTRACT

In Southeast Asia, the collaborative management system within government managed protected areas is one of the least well understood fields of protected area management. The large scale of these natural landscapes, the diversity of management issues found within them, and the diversity of actors to be engaged at the different administrative levels make the mechanisms for implementing effective collaborative management unclear. In December 2022, the authors used the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas Standard (IUCN Green List Standard), which comprises a set of 17 'Criteria' categorised under four 'Components', accompanied by 50 'Indicators', to conduct a gap analysis assessment in Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park, northern Lao PDR. This paper reviews the findings generated, focusing on 'Good Governance' under Component 1, which comprises three criteria and 16 indicators, focusing on how these actors are mobilised to assist the management of the national park. The application of the 16 indicators broke down the multi-tiered institutional arrangements within Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park into the 'bite-sized' institutional bodies with management mandates within the different administrative levels, and then requested verification documentation to show that these institutional bodies were functional. The paper describes these institutional bodies identified within the multi-tiered collaborative management system of the national park, as well as the importance of the verification documents exchanged between them.

Key words: gap analysis assessment, governance, Green List, multi-tiered collaborative management, Lao PDR, national park, protected area, verification documents

INTRODUCTION

In December 2023, the national protected area system in Lao PDR comprised six national parks, a single species and habitat management area and 18 national protected areas. These protected areas are managed through a collaborative management model. Under these arrangements, the protected area management body manages the reserves in collaboration with the local communities as well as the local administrations; it may be termed 'shared governance' (Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2013). Within all the protected area categories, the villagers maintain their lands for agriculture, use water for irrigation and drinking, and collect forest products as wild food and pharmacopeia. These traditional rights of the villagers to use their natural resources are prescribed

through the Forestry Law (Government of Lao, 2019b). The Decree on Protected Areas (Government of Lao, 2023) also endorses improving the livelihoods of the peoples of various ethnicities, as well as contributing to national socio-economic development. The local communities are prescribed as 'guardian villages' in the Decree. Hence, the better funded national parks are particularly interesting from a collaborative management perspective.

Sustainable financing for the protected area system within the country has been lacking in the last three decades. In 2016, government funding streams to individual national protected areas varied from zero funding to a maximum of US \$5,000 per annum (Parr et al., 2019); this predicament has not altered significantly in the last eight years. Understandably, this low level of

funding has immense negative impacts on the number of staff employed within the protected areas, the field activities undertaken, as well as the levels of collaboration and working relations with partners. Only two protected areas have received sustained funding streams over the past 15 years, namely Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park and Nakai-Nam Theun National Park. Both reserves have benefitted from technical assistance, and hence the two reserves are the best managed protected areas in Lao PDR.

The IUCN Green List Standard

The IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas Standard (IUCN & WCPA, 2017) provides a global benchmark for protected and conserved areas, to assess whether they are achieving successful conservation outcomes through effective and equitable governance and management. The Standard includes globally consistent Components and Criteria, which are supported by Indicators, to measure site performance. It describes a set of 17 ‘Criteria’ categorised under four ‘Components’, accompanied by 50 ‘Indicators’, for successful conservation in protected and conserved areas. It provides an international benchmark for quality that motivates improved performance and helps achieve conservation objectives. By committing to meet this global standard, site managers seek to demonstrate and maintain performance and deliver real nature conservation results. The global IUCN Green List Standard remains unchanged, until it is reviewed at least every five years, in accordance with the ISEAL Code (ISEAL Alliance, 2014), to ensure that the Standard is continuously improving and consistently providing an international benchmark for quality.

The IUCN Green List Standard is organised into four components of successful nature conservation in protected and conserved areas. The baseline components concern:

- Good governance
- Sound design and planning; and
- Effective management

The Standard is one of the first assessment methodologies that places emphasis on good governance. The three criteria on good governance in the IUCN Green List Standard are described below:

IUCN and the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) (2017). IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas, Standard Version 1.1., Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Under the three above-mentioned criteria, a total of 14 generic indicators are prescribed to assess good governance (see Supplementary Online Material). These indicators are intended to guide evaluating good governance within a protected area.

Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park

Nam Et-Phou Louey was designated as the nation’s first national park through Prime Ministerial Decree 35 dated 15 February 2019 (Government of Lao, 2019a). The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (2022) issued Agreement No. 4756/DOF on the organisation and activities of the Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Management Office, dated 18 November 2022. The Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Management Office (2019) issued Agreement No. 265/NE-PL on the appointment and division of responsibilities of the technical staff in the Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Management Office, dated 7 October 2019.

The national park protects montane forest and mixed deciduous dry forests. The reserve remains an important area for species of conservation concern, especially its carnivore and primate species, including the endangered or vulnerable White-cheeked Gibbon, Clouded Leopard and Dhole. The national park provides direct ecosystem services to 91 guardian villages (approximately 44,500 individuals) who share land or are contiguous to the national park. To these communities, the park provides land for agriculture, delivers water for irrigation and drinking, wild food and pharmacopeia. The increasing park-based economy provides some employment and source of income to residents.

Criterion 1.1 Guarantee Legitimacy and Voice	There are clearly defined, legitimate, equitable and functional governance arrangements, in which the interests of civil society, rights-holders and stakeholders are fairly represented and addressed, including those relating to the establishment or designation of the site.
Criterion 1.2 Achieve Transparency and Accountability	Governance arrangements and decision-making processes are transparent and appropriately communicated, and responsibilities for implementation are clear, including a readily accessible process to identify, hear and resolve complaints, disputes or grievances.
Criterion 1.3 Enable Governance Vitality and Capacity to Respond Adaptively	Planning and management draw on the best available knowledge of the social and ecological context of the site, using an adaptive management framework that anticipates, learns from and responds to change in its decision-making.



Phathi road encroachment © Ben Swanepoel, WCS

A large number of baseline assessments had been conducted regarding the biodiversity values and socio-economic values within the national park such as Wildlife Conservation Society (2016 and 2018), Eshoo (2019), and Foppes and Xayalath (2022). Secondly, the comparatively regular funding streams permitted the recruitment of numerous researchers at various times during the last 15 years on different specialist topics. Thirdly, the ongoing financial and technical support by the Wildlife Conservation Society has permitted a large programme of field activities to be undertaken over the last 15 years, more or less continuously. The Gap Analysis Assessment team had access to many of the existing conservation-related reports and assessments.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology below outlines the various activities undertaken during the gap analysis assessment in Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park.

Interviews with the Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Management Office, as well as Provincial and District partners

A collection of relevant reports and scientific papers were collected prior to the field work being conducted. A field assessment was conducted from 14–23 December 2022. The Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Management Office constitutes a professional hub of protected area excellence within the national park management system. Hence, this institutional body was prioritised for

collecting data about the status of management within the national park. Interviews were conducted with the staff from each of the five protected area Technical Sub-units; interview duration varied according to the size of their respective field programmes. The staff from the Administration and Finance Unit were also interviewed. The senior management team, comprising the Director and the Deputy Director of the National Park, were interviewed during the last few days of the field assessment, in order for them to receive management feedback from the Technical Sub-units. Interviews lasted 3–7 hours. Key representatives from the Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Supervisory Committee were also interviewed, including staff from the Houaphanh and Luang Prabang Provincial Agriculture and Forestry Offices as well as the Hiem District Governor's Office. Most of the gaps identified during the assessment were not described in the recently approved Five-Year National Park Collaborative Management Plan (2022–2026) (Department of Forestry, 2021a), or the 10-Year Strategy (2022–2031) (Department of Forestry, 2021b).

Interviews were convened as follows:

- (i) the Biodiversity Research and Monitoring Sub-unit (3 hours)
- (ii) the Law Enforcement Sub-unit (7 hours)
- (iii) the Livelihood Development for Conservation Sub-unit (6 hours)
- (iv) the Outreach Sub-unit (2.5 hours)
- (v) the Tourism Sub-unit (3 hours)

- (vi) the Administration Unit – administration, human resources and planning (3 hours)
- (vii) the Administration Unit – finance (1 hour)
- (viii) the Senior directors (3 hours)
- (ix) Houaphanh Provincial Agriculture and Forestry Office (3 hours)
- (x) Luang Prabang Provincial Agriculture and Forestry Office (3 hours)
- (xi) Hiem District Office (3 hours).

Questions were chosen, based upon the indicators from the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas: Standard Version 1.1 (IUCN & WCPA, 2017), which were the most appropriate for the targeted technical unit staff to answer. The park staff were asked about the current status for a particular management issue and then requested to provide a random sample of a document or agreement, or Minutes, which provided the best verification to the consultant team. WhatsApp groups were formed between the consultants and each of the technical sub-units so that documents could be shared, either immediately or on subsequent requests. In this manner, comprehensive sets of documents were obtained from each unit.

RESULTS

Five of the 16 indicators under the Good Governance component targeted different institutional bodies within different administrative levels within the multi-tiered institutional arrangements found within Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park. The assessment also required verification to show that these institutional bodies were functional. The most significant issues identified on the ‘good governance’ component were as follows:

(i) Village rights-holders’ involvement in park management

The Village Administration is the main institutional body at the village level, as prescribed in the Law on Local Administration (Government of Lao, 2016), and are important partners within the collaborative management system. Within each village, this body formally had 11 members, including two women and three Village Elders, who met monthly. If there were important village issues, they called all the head of households in the village. Greater female participation was promoted in village meetings. It was noted that important technical village documents were endorsed at the district level, reinforcing the working relationship between the villages and the relevant districts (see Supplementary Online Material).

(ii) District working groups in different technical fields

Technical teams were established involving the national park staff from the five individual technical sub-units, together with the relevant district counterparts in all the 10 overlapping districts within the national park. Agreements of co-operation were signed between the National Park Management Office and concerned district agencies – as verification documents. These district technical teams were the key implementing bodies for virtually all the technical field programmes within the national park and the 92 guardian villages (see Supplementary Online Material). Of relevance, these district technical teams have been captured and prescribed in all relevant national protected area regulations, including forest and land use planning, outreach, livelihood development for conservation, and tourism. Of note, there was no district working group established to work on biological research and monitoring; this field of park management functions through a more fluid biodiversity research network, linked to NGOs and academic institutions.

The importance of mobilising district technical teams was overlooked in both the Five-Year Collaborative Management Plan (2022–2026) (Department of Forestry, 2021a) and the 10-Year Strategy (2022–2031) (Department of Forestry, 2021b).

(iii) Provincial Protected Area Committees

Each of the three concerned provinces appointed their own respective National Park sub-committee in mid-2019, through Agreements No. 675/G.KX (Governor Decision of Xieng Khouang Province, 2019), No. 802.G.HP (Governor Decision of Houaphanh Province, 2019) and No. 511.G.LP (Governor Decision of Luang Prabang Province, 2019). However, there was no evidence to suggest that the three provincial protected area committees were meeting regularly, or that they were using the senior management team monthly reports or the district working group technical reports. Their working relationship with the National Protected Area Steering Committee still seemed to be embryonic. Hence there were no operating institutional platforms bringing together key provincial and district representatives to supervise the implementation of the Annual Work Plan and Budget on a regular basis. Ideally, a provincial and district management body designated in each province could (i) supervise the national park human resource issues; (ii) supervise and strengthen the collaborative management partnerships between stakeholders; (iii) provide regular financial oversight over annual work plans and budgets, and (iv) respond to emerging issues, among others.



Monthly meeting chaired by the Director of the National Park © Ben Swanepoel, WCS

(iv) Nam Et-Phou Louey National Protected Area Steering Committee

The current Nam Et-Phou Louey National Protected Area Steering Committee was established in December 2017 (Department of Forestry, 2017) for supervising the management of the entire protected area. The Steering Committee met only once a year, having responsibilities to respond to numerous ongoing management issues occurring over the 400,000-ha protected area landscape. The effectiveness of this Steering Committee was dependent upon the succinct information sets that it received from the field level. Hence, its effectiveness will be strengthened through delegating management responsibilities to the field-based forums operating at the provincial and district level. Of relevance, the three provinces individually formulated agreements on the appointment of the supervisory committee and sub-committee for the management of Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park in 2019 (see No. 802/G.HP. dated 7 July 2019, Governor Decision of Houaphanh Province, 2019), but it was unclear what role these institutional bodies would play, when they meet and whether they institutionally support the Management Office or the Supervisory Committee.

(v) Issue-specific task forces or working groups

An Advisory Committee was established for supervising the management of the Phati Road immigration and settlement problem in 2020. This was a specific working group established to deal with an emerging issue and prominent threat to the national park. The Governor of

Houaphanh Province (2020b) approved an Agreement No. 411/G.HP. for establishing an “Advisory Committee and Secretariat for the resolution of land speculation linked to cattle raising and livestock within Nam Et-Phou Louey Total Protection Zone (Phati Road), dated 7th May 2020”. The committee “was directed to monitor the Phati Road settlement involving four villages”. From field surveys conducted in 2018 and village interviews in 2019, the Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Management Office recorded 172 families from the villages of Ban Xone Neua, Ban Najak, and Ban Huay Muey in Xone District and Ban Huay Ma in Xam Neua District to be raising livestock inside the Total Protection Zone. These families were reported to be raising 1,194 cattle, 577 buffalos, 225 goats and 16 horses in the Total Protection Zone along the road. From field surveys employing a quadcopter drone and unannounced ‘field-house’ visits in 2018, 30 livestock field-houses were recorded. A field-house was counted as a single structure or a cluster of structures for part-time human habitation for the sake of looking after livestock.

Monthly management team meetings and reporting, including financial matters

The Senior Management Team of the national park constituted one of the most important institutional bodies within the collaborative management system of the national park. It comprised the Director, the two Deputy Directors, the Head of Administration, the Heads of the five Technical Sub-units and a representative from the Hiem District Administration. This team of expert

Table 1: Some indicative relationships between the multi-tiered technical and administrative institutional bodies, some key verification documents and the indicative hierarchy of timing of meetings and reports

Technical groups	Blended technical and administrative working groups	Some indicative verification reports	Indicative hierarchy on timing of meetings and reports
-	Interprovincial Protected Area Committee	Annual reports	Annually
-	Provincial Protected Area Committee	Quarterly protected area reports	Quarterly
-	Issue-specific Working Group	Special issue reports	Quarterly or monthly
Senior park management team	-	Park management monthly report	Monthly
-	District Working Groups	SMART field reports Village land use plans Conservation agreements	Monthly
-	Village Administrations	Village meetings and reports	Monthly or more frequently

protected area practitioners convened monthly staff meetings on a regular basis to guide adaptive management of the site. For example, four meetings were convened between September 2022 and December 2022. The Minutes of Meetings of these monthly meetings summarised the activities undertaken as well as the emerging management issues, and could be considered verification documents for park management. The monthly reports did not mention ‘Action Points’. Furthermore, the financial staff were segregated from these monthly staff meetings. Separate meetings were convened between the Park Director and the financial sub-unit personnel on monetary matters.

DISCUSSION

The significance of generating verification documents to ensure collaborative management and facilitate effective decision-making

The use of the 16 indicators on ‘Good Governance’ within the IUCN Green List Standard broke down the multi-tiered institutional arrangements within Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park into the ‘bite-sized’ institutional bodies found within the different administrative levels and with management mandates (Parr et al., 2023). Equally significantly, the IUCN Green List methodology then required verification that these institutional bodies were functional. The gap analysis assessment methodology revealed that the multi-tiered collaborative management system was dependent upon key datasets – in the form of verification documents – to become functional and effective. Foremost amongst these key verification documents was the national park monthly report, generated from the monthly meetings of the

senior park management team. Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park generated a reasonable monthly report. It may be fair to say that the ‘monthly report’ carries as much weight in directing management in developing countries as the five-year management plan.

Other key verification documents which assisted management decision-making comprised the reports generated by the district working groups. These technical verification documents comprised camera trapping reports, monthly enforcement summaries, village land use plans, village conservation agreements, among others. These key verification documents needed to be distributed to representatives within higher administrative levels within the multi-tiered collaborative management system. However, the assessment found no evidence that this structured distribution was taking place, or being monitored. Undoubtedly, these documents could strengthen district, provincial, interprovincial and national support for the national park and the resolution of management issues, and for financial sustainability. Borrini-Feyerabend and Hill (2015) stated that governance analysis should deal with who makes decisions and how, but also with how actors and decisions connect and relate with other actors and decisions in society.

Salafsky et al. (2019) refer to the growing interest in evidence-based conservation, with a slant towards project application. Evidence-based conservation should also be promoted in the good governance of national parks and the management of natural resources, by the concerned civil society, rights-holders and stakeholders themselves. The good governance stakeholders need to introduce evaluation methodologies to confirm, or dispute, the validity of the content of these verification

documents. Ultimately, if conservation as a discipline is going to become more evidence-based, then we collectively need to improve how evidence is generated, accessed and ultimately used by practitioners along a shared theory of change. Within the Green List Standard indicators, these key verification documents are often referred to as ‘mechanisms’.

Village level organisations

The Village Administrations held regular meetings on natural resource issues. However, these issues were rarely reported to the National Protected Area Management Office. Most village representatives prepare notes of village meetings in their personal notebooks. Most frequently, important village issues relating to national park management were captured in documents and reports prepared by the district working groups.

District working groups as work-horses for implementing field-based collaborative management

In Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park, the gap analysis assessment revealed that district working groups were significant ‘work-horses’ in delivering the field programmes. These district working groups comprised the national park staff from the different technical sub-units from the National Park Management Office formally teaming up with district counterparts who shared overlapping professional mandates. These working groups had all been provided with technical assistance to strengthen their respective capacities. Moreover, virtually all these working groups were formally designated through local administration legislation. Within Nakai-Nam Theun National Park, district ‘technical teams’ were also identified as the work-horses for the delivery of the field programmes (Parr & Sylvong, 2022). District agreements have been formulated between the Nakai-Nam Theun National Park Office and the concerned districts on village land use planning, outreach, and livelihood development for conservation and tourism. There were also district agreements for some aspects of interagency law enforcement, including the District-Wildlife Enforcement Networks.

The establishment and functioning of district technical teams in other protected areas within Lao PDR are scarce. One major constraining factor is the absence of established Management Offices. For example, Hin Nam No National Park only established a Management Office in 2021; prior to this they only had a few permanent staff (Department of Forestry, 2022). The park established three technical teams/technical working groups on tourism, biodiversity/law enforcement, and outreach and awareness raising in 2019. Consequently, the chairs of

these district working groups comprised the Head of the District Information and Culture and Tourism (office) for the tourism programme, the Head of the District Agriculture and Forestry Office for law enforcement and the Head of the Lao National Front for Construction for the outreach programme. This suggests that the district counterparts may have received higher levels of training and work experience, and thus had higher capacities compared to the national park staff, who are supposed to be the leading expertise for implementing the national park field programmes.

The creation of district working groups has several critical benefits. These working bodies increase the number of personnel, permit capacity building and mentoring by skilled national park staff. More pertinently, it permits budget sharing by engaged district administrations, and increases conservation impacts in the respective field programmes. The mechanism goes a long way towards socialising protected areas within the broader protected area landscape. Some examples of protected area management working groups operating in mainland Southeast Asia were described by Parr et al. (2013). However, the groups described were from different administrative levels.

Empowering (provincial and interprovincial) protected area committees

The assessment found inconclusive evidence that the three provincial protected area committees were functioning effectively, or even convening regular meetings. This could have been a consequence of requiring instructions from higher authorities as to when to convene meetings, capacity limitations, funding limitations, among others. Many protected area committees have been established within the protected area system within Lao PDR, as well as more broadly within Southeast Asia. While there seems to be a focus on the membership of these committees, and the number of meetings to be convened by a committee during the course of a year, there appears to be little consideration on the volume of information to be deliberated over. These datasets may also guide which government agencies are best placed to implement the follow-up actions.

Merits of establishing dedicated task forces to tackle serious emerging management issues

The concept of establishing dedicated working committees within a national park to tackle specific emerging major threats to the integrity of the reserve, seems a highly efficient form of delegating responsibilities and workloads amongst the stakeholders.



Village engagement © Ben Swanepoel, WCS

The Governor of Houaphanh Province established an Advisory Committee to resolve land speculation linked to cattle and livestock raising along the Phati Road in May 2020. (involving some 400 households) (Governor of Houaphanh Province, 2020). During the discussions with the national park director, the merits of establishing a district level law enforcement working group and district-level socio-economic working group under this task force were being debated. These dedicated task forces were established elsewhere in the protected area system within Lao PDR. In Nakai-Nam Theun National Park a dedicated committee was established to monitor gold-mining activities in four villages in Khamkeut District, Bolikhamxay Province in May 2021 (Governor Decision of Bolikhamxay Province, (2021).

The working committees should be established to respond to particular issues that require dedicated management attention. These working committees should be established, organise meetings and be dismantled, according to management demands. In the Philippines, a Cultural and Tribal Affairs Committee was established in Mount Kitanglad Range Natural Park to evaluate and review (i) ancestral domain and land claims within the reserve; (ii) tenurial instrument issues related to the members of the Indigenous Cultural Communities and the tenured migrants; (iii) cultural and tribal conflicts settlements; and (iv) the tribal cultural values

programme (Parr, 2017). The committee then made recommendations for Protected Area Management Board (PAMB) Executive Committee action. A Tenured Migrant Committee was established to address management issues and concerns of the duly registered tenured migrants within the protected area. The committee also endorsed/recommended whether a tenured migrant community will be issued with a tenurial instrument, depending on the validity and qualifications.

Technical assistance on strengthening governance mechanisms

The tiered management arrangements within Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park constitute a highly complicated collaborative management system comprising the senior park management team, several tiers of blended technical and administrative stakeholders, as well as issue-specific working groups. The capacity of the members of the collaborative management system would benefit from dedicated technical support and monitoring to attain good governance. Currently, this is one of the most poorly understood aspects of collaborative management in Lao PDR, and one of the most important components in the Green List methodology.

CONCLUSIONS

Component 1 on ‘Good Governance’ in the IUCN Green List, comprising the three Criteria and 16 Indicators, was particularly valuable. The indicators assisted in identifying the institutional bodies within the multi-tiered collaborative management system within Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park as well as the verification documents required for information exchange to render the system more effective.

The importance of the verification documents was identified as critical for information exchange between the different institutional bodies within the multi-tiered collaborative management arrangements. Notable documents comprised the monthly reports prepared by the senior park management team, as well as the technical reports prepared by the district working groups (e.g. law enforcement reports, village land use plans, and conservation agreements). Without these reports, the higher-level institutional bodies had no information sets from which to make informed management decisions. Often, conservationists refer to natural resource management committees as dysfunctional; the need for analysing the use of critical verification documents may be part of the answer.

District working groups seemed particularly valuable institutional bodies for delivering the field programmes. They have the advantage of being a strong body of personnel with capacity for delivering sustainable field programmes.

The mandates of the Provincial Protected Area Committees established in Lao PDR should be reviewed in relation to the monthly report, and anticipated verification documents. These responsibilities might include supervision of: (i) the national park human resources issues; (ii) strengthening the collaborative management partnerships between stakeholders; (iii) providing regular financial oversight of the annual work plans and budgets, and (iv) respond to emerging issues, among others.

The merits of establishing issue-specific working groups for tackling emerging threats was also recognised. These ad-hoc working groups should be mobilised for tackling serious management issues and major threat issues like population growth, uncontrolled encroachment or tackling influential persons.

There appeared to be a hierarchy in the general timing of meetings, corresponding to the pyramid of management responsibilities, and information needs.

The hierarchy of institutional bodies – from village level up to national level – should be expected to be present in most other areas of natural resource management,



School outreach conducted by district working group
© Ben Swanepoel, WCS

including community forestry, community wetland management, coastal resources management as well as other conservation topics such as illegal wildlife trade. The identification of the verification documents should be identified for these natural resource management issues which feed the respective multi-tiered management systems (if appropriate). Clearly further research on good governance is required.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Gap Analysis Assessments conducted for all Green List sites should be reviewed within the region, in order to compare the multi-tiered institutional arrangements prescribed in a selection of protected areas. It would be further beneficial to identify the highest priority verification documents which would assist protected area management in developing countries.

The format for the national park monthly reports within the region/developing countries should be reviewed, strengthened and then formally endorsed.

The functioning of protected area committees within the region/developing countries should be monitored in relation to priority verification documents, and particularly the monthly reports for the protected areas.

The merits of establishing and maintaining district technical working groups and issue based working groups to tackle serious emerging threats should be encouraged and evaluated.

Technical support on strengthening good governance in the national parks and other reserves would consolidate understanding on the institutional bodies and the information exchanged between them. This topic is one of the most poorly understood aspects of collaborative management in Southeast Asia.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank Mr. Bounpheng Phoomsavath, the Director of Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park and Mr. Vilakhone Phengdong, the Deputy Director of Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park, for providing their dedicated support during the undertaking of this Gap Analysis Assessment throughout the field visit. The authors particularly thank the senior staff from the Administration Unit and the five technical Sub-units, who gave freely of their time to be interviewed. The assessment team thanks: Ms. Naly Thavongkham, Mr. Bounsou Sipaserth, Mr. Ael Thanouxay, Mr. Tock Khampanya, Mr. Dao Keoduangdy and Mr. Phonesuk Inthavong. The authors thank the field staff from the Wildlife Conservation Society for their back-up support to the gap analysis assessment. Thanks are extended to Mr. Khamgel Thor (general management), Mr. Khamphui Invixay (law enforcement) and Mr. Souvit Chueukongya (tourism) for sharing their information and ideas about the park management. This assessment was funded by the World Bank Office in Vientiane.

SUPPLEMENTARY ONLINE MATERIAL

Supplementary Online Material 1. 14 generic indicators prescribed to assess good governance.

Supplementary Online Material 2. Important technical village documents at the district level.

Supplementary Online Material 3. Indicators on governance.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

John W. K. Parr is a protected area management specialist residing and working in Southeast Asia for 35 years. He bases much of his approach to conservation on studying natural resource legislation. He promotes the establishment of nature education centres in urban areas to promote support for wildlife conservation. He also promotes conservation through producing local language field guides on higher vertebrates.

Dr. Teuanchay Phongkhamphanh is the Deputy Head of Protected Area Management, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. He studied ecology and soil science for his PhD at Chiang Mai University, Thailand.

Vilasack Southammakoth is a technical assistant on livelihood development at the Protected Area Management Division, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.

Latsamay Sylavong has worked on environment, forestry and natural resources management involving social sciences for more than 30 years. She has a long

association with the IUCN Lao office, including 12 years as the Country Representative. She currently provides technical support to the GIZ Lao Programme as the Conservation Standards Adviser.

REFERENCES

- Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Dudley, N., Jaeger, T., Lassen, B., Pathak Broome, N., Phillips, A. & Sandwith, T. (2013). *Governance of protected areas: From understanding to action*. Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 20, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. xvi + 124 pp.
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G. & Hill, R. (2015). 'Governance for the conservation of nature'. In G. L. Worboys, M. Lockwood, A. Kothari, S. Feary and I. Pulsford (Eds), *Protected area governance and management* (pp. 169–206). Canberra: ANU Press.
- Department of Forestry. (2017). Agreement on the appointment of a committee responsible for the management of National Protected Area. No. 4622/DOF dated 13 December 2017.
- Department of Forestry (2021a). *Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Collaborative Management Plan*. Volume 2: 5-Year Collaborative Management Plan (2022–2026) prepared by the Protected Area Management Division, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.
- Department of Forestry (2021b). *Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Collaborative Management Plan*. Volume 1: 10-Year Strategy (2022–2031) prepared by the Protected Area Management Division Department of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.
- Department of Forestry. (2022). *Hin Nam No National Park Collaborative Management Plan 2021–2025*. Prepared by the Protected Area Management Division, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.
- Eshoo, P. (2019). *Tourism Profile (Full Version) Nam Et & Phou Louey National Protected Areas*. Report prepared for the Protected Area Management Division, Department of Forestry Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.
- Foppes, J. & Xayalath S. (2022). *Study on the value of Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs) for livelihoods of communities living in and around two National Parks in Lao PDR*. Targeted Technical Assistance on Landscape Valuation. World Bank Lao Country Office. May 2022.
- Government of Lao PDR. (2016). Law on Local Administration No. 022/NA dated 28 January 2016.
- Government of Lao PDR. (2019a). Prime Minister Decision No. 35/PM on the establishment of Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park dated 15 February 2019.
- Government of Lao PDR. (2019b). Forestry Law No. 64/NA dated 13 June 2019.
- Government of Lao PDR. (2023). Decree on Protected Areas. No. 219/GOV dated 20 June 2023.
- Governor Decision of Bolikhamxay Province (2021) on the appointment of the overall committee, cooperation committee and field technical team to be responsible for the relevant information on mining in Ban Nakadok, Ban Vangpha, Ban Vangko and Ban Nathone of Khamkeut District, No. 261/BKX dated 4 May 2021.
- Governor Decision of Houaphanh Province. (2019). Agreement on the appointment of the Supervisory Committee and the sub-committee for the management of Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park. No. 802/G.HP. dated 7 July 2019.
- Governor of Houaphanh Province. (2020a). Minutes of Meeting No. 56/G.HP on resolutions for mitigating the biodiversity threats and land speculation along the Phati Road, dated 11 February 2020.

- Governor of Houaphanh Province. (2020b). Agreement No. 411/G. HP for establishing an Advisory Committee and Secretariat for the resolution of land speculation linked to cattle raising and livestock in Nam Et-Phou Louey Total Protection Zone (Phati Road), dated 7 May 2020.
- Governor of Houaphanh Province. (2020c). Minutes of Meeting for resolution of land speculation linked to cattle raising and livestock (Phati Road) in Xone and Sam Neua Districts, dated 12 June 2020.
- Governor of Houaphanh Province. (2021). Agreement No. 646/G. HP for establishing an Advisory Committee and Secretariat for resolution of land speculation linked to cattle raising and livestock in Nam Et-Phou Louey Total Protection Zone (Phati Road), dated 10 May 2021.
- Governor Decision of Luang Prabang. (2019). Agreement on the appointment of the Supervisory Committee and the sub-committee for the management of Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park. No. 511/G.LP dated 1 October 2019.
- Governor Decision of Xieng Khouang Province. (2019). Agreement on the appointment of the Supervisory Committee and the sub-committee for the management of Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park. No. 675/G.XK dated 6 August 2019.
- Hiem District Agriculture and Forestry Office. (2020). *Report on the allocation and planning for management, use of agricultural and forest land in a participatory manner at the village level, in Ban Namsart village, Hiem District, Houaphan Province*, dated 20 February 2020.
- Hiem District Office. (2019). District Agreement No.673/D.HM on the appointment of the Steering Committee and the technical staff of the District to implement Livelihood Development for Conservation and Land Use Planning in Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park, dated 19 September 2019.
- ISEAL Alliance. (2014). *Setting Social and Environmental Standards ISEAL Code of Good Practice Version 6.0 – December 2014*
- IUCN and the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) (2017). *IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas*, Standard, Version 1.1. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
- Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. (2022). Agreement No. 4756/DOF on the Organization and Activities of Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Management Office, dated 18 November 2022.
- Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Management Office. (2009). Memorandum of Understanding No. 243/NPA between Nam Et-Phou Louey National Protected Area and Houa Mouang District Office and Son Khoua Village in the development of tourism in the Nem River area, dated 20 December 2009.
- Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Management Office. (2019). Agreement on the appointment and division of responsibilities of the technical staff of Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Management Office. No. 265/NE-PL dated 7 October 2019.
- Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Management Office. (2020a). Minutes of the 2020 Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Meeting and 2021 Allocation Plan.
- Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Management Office. (2020b). Community Conservation Agreement (CCA) No. 4/HV between Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park and Ban Namsart Village Administration, Ban Namsart Village, Hiem District, Houaphan Province, dated 15 May 2020.
- Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Management Office. (2020c). Minutes of Meeting for the resolution of land speculation linked to cattle raising and livestock inside the Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Total Protection Zone with Houy-Ma village, dated 16 December 2020.
- Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park Management Office. (2022). Contract No. 435/NE-LP with Ban Son Khoua Village for work in the ecotourism services in Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park, 13 November 2022.
- Parr, J. W. K. (2017). Analysis of the multi-level collaborative management system in Mount Kitanglad Range Natural Park, Mindanao, Philippines. *Ecosystems & Development Journal*, 7(1), 33–44.
- Parr, J. W. K., Insua-Cao, P., Lam, H. V., Tue H. V., Ha, N. B., Lam, N. V., Quang N. N., The Cuong, N. & Crudge, B. (2013). Multi-level co-management in government-designated areas. Opportunities to learn from models in Southeast Asia. *PARKS*, 19(2): 59–64. <https://doi.org/10.2305/iucn.ch.2013.parks-19-2.en>. DOI: 10.2305/IUCN.CH.2013.PARKS-19-2.JWKP.en
- Parr, J. W. K., Phiapalath, P., Latsavong, L., Inthapatha, I., Chanthakoummane, S. & Southammakoth, S. (2019). *The National Protected Areas Status Report of Lao P.D.R.: 2019*. Department of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, March 2019. This Report was prepared under the LENS 2 Sub-Project: Institutional Capacity Building in Protected Area and Protection Forest Management, and Wildlife Conservation. 210 pp.
- Parr, J. W. K. & Sylavong, L. (2022). *Nakai-Nam Theun National Park: Phase 1 of the IUCN Green List Certification Process. Gap Analysis of the National Park*. Prepared for the IUCN Lao Programme, Vientiane. 16 August 2022. 99 pp.
- Parr, J. W. K., Phongkhamphanh, T. & Southammakoth, V. (2023). *Gap Analysis Assessment of Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park*. Report prepared for the Lao Landscapes and Livelihoods Project. 82 pp.
- Phoukhoun District Administration. (2021). Agreement No. 79/D. PK on the appointment of a team to carry out publicity and awareness raising activities for the management of Nam Et-Phou Louey National Park, dated 12 February 2021.
- Salafsky, N., Boshoven, J., Burivalova, Z., Dubois, N. S., Gomez, A., Johnson, A. Lee, A., Margoluis, R., Morrison, J., and Wordley, C. F. R. (2019). Defining and using evidence in conservation practice. *Conservation Science and Practice*, 1, e27.
- Wildlife Conservation Society. (2016). *Large carnivore monitoring in Nam Et-Phou Louey: Camera trapping in Phoupha-Siphou Area*.
- Wildlife Conservation Society. (2018). *Monitoring Biodiversity and Forest Cover in Nam Et-Phou Louey National Protected Area, Lao PDR*. Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry/ Department of Forestry.

RESUMEN

En el Sudeste Asiático, el sistema de gestión colaborativa dentro de las áreas protegidas gestionadas por los gobiernos es uno de los campos de la gestión de áreas protegidas que menos se conocen. La gran escala de estos paisajes naturales, la diversidad de cuestiones de gestión que se encuentran en ellos y la diversidad de actores que deben participar en los diferentes niveles administrativos hacen que los mecanismos para aplicar una gestión colaborativa eficaz sean poco claros. En diciembre de 2022, los autores utilizaron el Estándar de la Lista Verde de Áreas Protegidas y Conservadas de la UICN (Estándar de la Lista Verde de la UICN), que comprende un conjunto de 17 «Criterios» clasificados en cuatro «Componentes», acompañados de 50 «Indicadores», para llevar a cabo una evaluación de análisis de deficiencias en el Parque Nacional de Nam Et-Phou Louey, al norte de la RDP Lao. El presente documento examina las conclusiones generadas, centrándose en la «Buena Gobernanza» dentro del Componente 1, que comprende tres criterios y 16 indicadores, centrados en cómo se movilizan estos actores para ayudar a la gestión del parque nacional. La aplicación de los 16 indicadores desglosó las múltiples estructuras institucionales del Parque Nacional de Nam Et-Phou Louey en órganos institucionales con mandatos de gestión en los distintos niveles administrativos y, a continuación, solicitó documentación de verificación para demostrar que estos órganos institucionales funcionaban. El documento describe estos organismos institucionales identificados dentro del sistema de gestión colaborativa a varios niveles del parque nacional, así como la importancia de los documentos de verificación intercambiados entre ellos.

RÉSUMÉ

En Asie du Sud-Est, le système de gestion collaborative au sein des zones protégées gérées par le gouvernement est l'un des domaines les moins bien compris de la gestion des zones protégées. La grande échelle de ces paysages naturels, la diversité des questions de gestion qui s'y posent et la diversité des acteurs à impliquer aux différents niveaux administratifs rendent les mécanismes de mise en œuvre d'une gestion collaborative efficace peu clairs. En décembre 2022, les auteurs ont utilisé la Norme de la Liste verte des aires protégées et conservées de l'UICN (Norme de la Liste verte de l'UICN), qui comprend un ensemble de 17 « Critères » classés en quatre « Composantes », accompagnés de 50 « Indicateurs », pour mener une analyse des lacunes dans le Parc national de Nam Et-Phou Louey, dans le nord de la RDP Lao. Ce document passe en revue les résultats obtenus, en se concentrant sur la « bonne gouvernance » dans le cadre de la composante 1, qui comprend trois critères et 16 indicateurs, en se concentrant sur la façon dont ces acteurs sont mobilisés pour aider à la gestion du parc national. L'application des 16 indicateurs a permis de décomposer les dispositions institutionnelles à plusieurs niveaux au sein du parc national de Nam Et-Phou Louey en organes institutionnels de taille réduite ayant des mandats de gestion aux différents niveaux administratifs, puis de demander des documents de vérification pour montrer que ces organes institutionnels étaient fonctionnels. Le document décrit ces organismes institutionnels identifiés dans le système de gestion collaborative à plusieurs niveaux du parc national, ainsi que l'importance des documents de vérification échangés entre eux.