JUDGE INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES

CMS

Title: An organizational approach for the biodiversity management by local communities in developing countries.

Author: Paula Moreno
Associate Researcher Centre of Latin American Studies
Supervisor: Professor Francoise Barbira -Freeman

Contact details:
Av.Cll 46 No 18-59 Apto 511
Bogotá-Colombia
Phone number: 57 3 3108836705 or 57 1 3200146

Cambridge, 2005

1

An organizational approach for the biodiversity management by local communities in developing countries.

by Paula Moreno[1]

Introduction

Some of the top national development experts and agencies in Colombia discussed what was the key success factor in development projects. All the participants agreed in defining sustainability as the main criterion in evaluating success and organizations as the entities that could create this condition. Organizations at different levels, but especially local grassroots organizations accomplish and sustain the so-called "development goals", not just as a temporarily action but as support frame for long-term changes.

Development projects supported by international aid have emerged as one of the many multidimensional manifestations of globalisation. After the second world war, the interdependency among nations became more evident, not only because we share a common earth, but above all, because individual and national actions may threat the human species as a whole. International cooperation has generated a network of micro and macro-organizations that are the recipients or donors of this aid, which aims to make changes or support national and local initiatives.

Nowadays, development projects are increasingly addressing an environmental concern. Most developing countries with major social problems make an important contribution to the global environment. For instance, the environmental threat to be put under the spotlight in this analysis is the loss of biodiversity, given that most of the world's biodiversity is located in developing countries. This threat was globally assumed in the Rio conference in 1992 through the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Rio conference was an historical moment in which development and environmental goals came together to define a new "sustainable development" concept. Recently, the World Summit on Sustainable Development (2002) reinforced this biodiversity concern by establishing that biodiversity represents "the very basis of sustainable development" and can be seen as a "life insurance for life itself."

There exist few authors that have analysed the make up of local communities managing biodiversity resources (Sponsel, 2001;Escobar,1998). The leading sources of information in terms of management and the participation of local communities are the international bodies (World Bank, WRI, UNDP, FAO and

IADB)[2]. This paper is based on an exhaustive literature review and a series of interviews with development and environmental practitioners and four different communities from the Pacific coast of Colombia. The analysis and comparison of all the primary and secondary sources of information structures the key statements in summarizing the organizational analysis of the biodiversity management by local communities.

The purpose of this paper is twofold. First, it will address the environmental angle of the international cooperation, which attempts to make a synergy encompassing the development process of low-income countries and the growing global concern about the environment. Second, to analyse the interaction between micro and macro-organizations involved in a specific environmental issue. In doing so, First, it will study the global environmental scenario where the biodiversity network works. Second, it will make an organizational analysis based on the management of biodiversity by local communities. The last section will be devoted to draw the conclusions.

THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL SCENARIO

Although the global dimension of the environmental concern is not a new phenomenon, there are three main causes of its widening and acceleration in the last decades after the second world war (Agarwal et al., 2001; Held et. at,1999).[3] One cause is the recognition of the "global commons", the environment assumed as a public good with rights of sovereignty, but of which protection is a matter of global survival. A second cause refers to the strengthening of the environmentalist movement mainly in Europe. Finally, the third cause entails the considerable degradation of the environment mainly produced by the impact of the increasing levels of consumption by an ever increasing global population.

The environmental globalisation has generated a global environmental system of governance. This system constitutes the macro organizational level where global parameters of environmental protection are set, based on continuous flows of information, financial resources and actors. The global environmental governance works as a system of multilateral environmental agreements that seek to generate dynamics between the local and the global scenario in order to tackle the main environmental threats[4].

The global environmental governance depends on a network of organizations that interact at the global and local level. These organizations may vary according to the environmental threat in question. In general terms, the main actors are: the Western research institutes, developed and developing countries, the global civil

---

[2] WRI (World Resources Institute), UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), FAO (Food Agricultural Organisation) and IADB (Inter-American Development Bank).
[3] Before the second world war, 5 international environmental treaties were subscribed. Nowadays, the totality of global environmental treaties is up to 170.
[4] The main environmental threats are: biodiversity loss, the hole in the ozone layer, climate change produced by global warming, POPS (persistent organic pollutants) among others.

society (mainly, represented by international environmental NGOs (Non-Governmental Organisations) e.g. Green Peace, Friends Of the Earth) and transnational corporations. In this paper, the set of actors will be referred to as the biodiversity network.

The biodiversity network

In this section, the main actors of the global biodiversity system of governance will be defined and examined based on their role and their direct or indirect interaction with other actors of this network. The biodiversity network is composed - in the macro level - by research institutes, global development agencies, global civil s ociety, the regional organizations and the national government. In the micro level, there is a group of local organizations (e.g. local communities and illegal groups).

The global environmental threats have been mostly detected in the Western society or as Agarwal (1999) refers as North, where research institutes have provided evidence to establish the dimensions of the environmental problems. In particular, the term "biodiversity" was first mentioned in 1986 by Walter Rosen and Edward Wilson (Wilson, 1986), both members of the National Research Council of the United States. Despite the fact that the term biodiversity was first used in a Western institute, it condensed what local communities have conceived from ancient times as "nature".

The World Bank, IADB, WWF and national cooperation agencies have been the main global development agencies in providing funds to support the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. For instance, the Global Environmental Facility[5] has assigned up to USD $3,135, 469, 000 ; having biodiversity as the main recipe of resources allocation approximately USD$ 1,400.000.000.

In the biodiversity network, the global civil society is made up of a group of environmental NGOs that have gradually gained importance in the protection of the environment and the respect for the rights of its inhabitants. There are two main types of environmental NGOs. The first actively involved in denouncing environmental depletion or misuse of natural resources such as Green Peace or Friends Of the Earth; these NGOs have a major influence on the public opinion of developed countries and can affect the image of business organizations. The second type refers to NGOs which implement ecological projects e.g. the Nature Conservancy and Conservation International; these organizations design and implement projects which communities or national organizations.

The acceleration of the global environmental concern was caused by the growing ecological degradation in developed countries and its consequenc es on their inhabitants[6]. Developed countries have taken the initiative for environmental protection and have integrated developing countries mainly for their influence on ecological conservation. Governments of developed countries provide resources

---

[5] The global environmental facility created by UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank (www.gefweb.org)

[6] The Montreal Protoc ol arose as an action against the increasing number of skin cancer

through the financial bodies of the different environmental treaties or environmental NGOs, partly because these nations recognize their historical responsibility of the current ecological crisis. Likewise, environmentalists, mainly from developed countries, have conformed a global network that provides annual funds in order to protect the environment. On the other hand, developing countries define their position in the global environmental governance through their participation in the negotiation of the different environmental treaties and the creation of environmental legislation.

Businesses have became important actors in the biodiversity network due to two major reasons. The first one is their corporate image, in which they want to appear to their costumers as an environmental friendly enterprise in line with the green thinking (green markets, green and organic products). The second reason is some businesses' interests in biodiversity resources for genetic resources (e.g. pharmaceutical companies), offset of emissions (e.g. carbon sequestration).

Finally, at the micro level, two groups are: local communities and illegal groups. In a basic definition, the term local communities refers to a group of individuals who share a confined location. However, it could also allude to a group of persons who share the same race, religion, occupation or even interests. In the biodiversity context, the definition could be different for each particular case. For example, local communities from the Pacific coast of Colombia may refer to indigenous communities, peasant communities among others. On the other hand, illegal groups may denote guerrilla groups, illegal drugs or species traffickers, biopirates etc. These groups normally are concentrated in high biodiverse areas due to the usual difficult access and lack of control from the state in those places e.g. Choco.

The organizational analysis will focus on how these different actors interact with a micro and macro perspective and how they influence or change the position of others. This will be discussed in the following section.

ORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE BIODIVERSITY NETWORK: LOCAL COMMUNITIES, GLOBALIZATION AND VIOLENCE.

In order to explore and try to define what the analysis of organizations is, it would be useful to define the two words in general terms. Organizations refer to the groups of human beings that are together in order to achieve a goal or in other words, that have gathered together with a purpose. On the other hand, the Oxford Dictionary defines analysis as "the resolution or breaking up of something complex into its various simple elements". From these two basic definitions, it may be concluded that the analysis of organizations is a practice in which people who interact from inside and outside an organization try to break up its complexity in various simple elements in order to understand it.

After exploring the meaning of the analysis of organizations, another essential issue is establishing the different reasons for people to analyse organizations. In the first place, it is the need of **understanding** how organizations function, their

environment, the uncertainty, the management of the scarce resources, conflict or consensus between different groups and how they should be managed (Thompson & McHugh, 2002; Dawson, 1996). Knights & Willmott (1999) emphasizes the relevance of understanding highlighting; that understanding requires placing the information collected in a framework that gives meaning to it and enable knowledge generation. This knowledge generation is required to establish what it is appropriate in a particular context.

Several authors have defined organizational analysis. Reed (1985) defines organizational analysis as a conscious self-reflection on the part of both, the "organizers" and the "organized". Chia (1996) emphasizes: *"Instead of thinking about organizational analysis as concerning the analysis of organizations or the analyses of theories of organizations, it should be conceived as a critical intellectual practice of deconstructing or dismantling the logical and network structures".* In biodiversity management, taking the "organizers and the organized" perspective, local communities have traditionally represented the "organized", and development agencies the "organizers" within the dynamics of the global environmental scenario. For this paper, the process of self-reflection have been developed through a group of interviews. The results of this exercise have been summarized in general statements, in which different people interviewed from different standpoints coincided and evidence patterns of difference and similarity within the relationship between these two organizations: local communities and development agencies, in the management of biodiversity.

Organisational analysis is a subject that academics, managers and the general public are concerned about, either in a direct or in an indirect way. As mentioned in the introduction, during any kind of project, organizations are those which allow continuity to any particular process. It is at most importance that environmental and development projects receive the understanding of organizations as the cornerstone in order to achieve their goals. Development agencies require organizational analysis when they are trying to design and implement a project in a particular context, because it can not be taken for granted the nature of the social entities that live of and manage a group of natural resources. Organizational analysis responds to the necessity of trying to deal with changes and the complexity of these kinds of dynamic realities that organizations (e.g. local communities) are.

The following 5 key points which summarize the organizational analysis refer to the internal dynamics of local communities and its interaction with the outside world, especially with development agencies.

Biodiversity: A matter of meaning

Biodiversity: a matter of meaning is a semantic issue. When two social entities are interacting, it tends to be an assumption to believe that they are talking about the same thing. However, this is not always the case. In some scenarios, the semantic differentiation may seem slight or the meaning could be assumed on the basis of power relations e.g. the meaning assumed corresponds to the group that has the major control and power. There must exist an consensus which agrees on the

6

definition of biodiversity in order to develop a successful environmental project accepted by both parties. The key questions are: How has the meaning of biodiversity been formed? Why is important to analyse the meaning of biodiversity? what does biodiversity mean? Is biodiversity an exclusive biological term? Does biodiversity have a particular meaning considering the different actors involved in its management?

It is necessary to define whether biodiversity only represents some particular physical natural resources important for humanity or the historical construction and modification made by local communities of these natural resources. From the organizers point of view, the conservation of biodiversity refers to a major physical and biological concern. Instead, for some local communities the use and conservation of biodiversity corresponds to an integral element of their cosmogony that it is manifested in their natural environment.

Culture in organizational analysis refers, in Hofstede´s words to the "collective programming of the mind" or the "software of the mind". Hofstede states: *"Every person carries within him or herself patterns of thinking, feeling and potential acting which were learned throughout their lifetime".* From this perspective, the meaning given by communities to biodiversity corresponds to a cultural expression that has driven their organization and its use. Culture constitutes a dynamic and fluid system of values, beliefs, assumptions, rituals, stories, jargons, mental and physical arrangements. Hence, culture determines the organizational interpretative schemes and organizational life that need to be considered while planning an intervention.

Some of the Colombian experts who have worked with the IADB and the World Bank projects addressing the environmental protection and social development of the Pacific coast of Colombia[7] (e.g. "Plan Pacifico") agreed in stating that their main weakness in these programmes was their lack of understanding of the Afrocolombian culture. Most of the population living on the Colombian Pacific coast is Afrocolombian. The experts said that the cultural issue became more complex when they discovered that there was not one unified Afrocolombian culture, there are many subcultures that need to be understood at the moment of establishing any intervention.

For instance, the Afrocolombian culture in the Pacific coast corresponds to an ancient process in which Black slaves tried to escape from the colonialist power. Black slaves dreamt about freedom in the heart of the forest. A forest so abundant and rich as difficult for human beings to adapt to. The Pacific forest was not their natural habitat and they penetrated its inhospitability without anything more than the fear of being captured again by the colonialist power.

---

[7] The Colombian Pacific coast makes part of the group of biodiversity hotspots, 14 places in the world where more than 70% of the world's biodiversity is concentrated . According to the IIAP (Instituto de Investigaciones Ambientales del Pacífico) This region represents 7.17% of the Colombian territory and 3% of the national population. This is one of the richest regions of Colombia in terms of natural resources, but the poorest in terms of the quality of life of the population, 82 % of the total population in the Pacific coast lives below the poverty line and with a life expectancy of 55 years old.

Additionally, one of these experts said : "…*this is not just a matter of money*", referring to the fact that failure in achieving the expected results was not the lack of financial resources, but the lack of understanding between those who were supposed to be the organizers and those who were classified as the organized. At the end of the day, when culture became a primary concern, causing the re-evaluation of the whole project, both parties recognized that they are organisers and organised during different stages of the process. This fact entails that which according to the development agencies "needs" to be organised by them, it is actually organised by the local community in their own way. The development agency then enters to determine its role not only based on its "expertise" but also on the will of the local community to be advised or assisted. One of the main discordances of the development-environmental initiatives is that development agencies feel to recognise that local communities not always respond to the attitude that whoever has the money can set the rules. In most cases, it has been demonstrated that despite the fact that money is important, it is just one of the elements that determines success. Several ambitious development projects have not achieved the expected results due to the need of understanding of historical processes and cultural parameters. In this regard, the meaning is crucial, because there is a difference between what the organizers think have to be protected and the view of the organized.

As a consequence, it is important to consider the dynamic nature of biodiversity in terms of biological visible interactions and the invisible links associated with interaction with human beings (Vermeulen, 2004; Sponsel, 2003, Escobar, 1997). As summarised by Zweilfel (1997) : "....the diversity in nature corresponds to, and results from, a diversity of cultures". In such case, the definition of biodiversity combines the historical process of building diversity from a original given natural resources that have evolved and been transformed, not exclusively, but through the interaction with human beings.

The meaning also depends on two perspectives. First, actors involved in the biodiversity network. Actors pursue or construct a meaning frequently related to their organisational orientation and background (biology, anthropology, economics, management or illegal activities). Second, the relationship between global and local forces that determine the management of biodiversity. Initially, it could be considered that the global consensus about what biodiversity means should prevail over the local concepts of biodiversity. In this regard, Correa (1998) discussing the meaning of biodiversity for Colombia states: "*They tell us that we are megadiverse ...being megadiverse is in dispute with having biodiversity*". From this statement made by a Colombian politician, academic and member of a leading agricultural movement, it can be seen how the global "consensus" may not be really understood by megadiverse countries. That is the reason why, Escobar dares to say that biodiversity in some contexts does not even exist. This fact overpasses the mere semantic or philosophical discussion, because when projects and policies posit goals, they do not achieve the targets due to the existing dichotomy between global premises and local conceptions.

On balance, biodiversity is framed within a group of actors, concepts and dimensions that make impossible to reduce it to a single definition. To some extent

the strict biological definition of biodiversity provides a basic understanding of the term and could respond to giving priority to physical human survival that is threatened by biodiversity loss. However, people involved in the management of biodiversity need to have a wider picture of the complexity of this term so that the different proposals made for its use and conservation can be embedded in a more holistic approach that could imply major possibilities of success.

The management of biodiversity by local communities

The management of biodiversity refers to the organization of a group of individuals who live in a given geographic area in order to protect and, at the same time, utilize biodiversity to sustain their livelihoods. The concept of management of biodiversity by local communities makes part of the range of approaches to Community-Based Natural Resource Management (Wellford, 2002).

The use of biodiversity is framed within the multidimensional nature of biodiversity. For instance, the social dimension emphasises the contribution of biodiversity to human development (culture creation, social interactions) and welfare through food security, livelihoods, health care and income generation (Greenough & Lowenhaupt, 2003; WSSB, 2002; Escobar, 1997). The political dimension focuses on the establishment of rules, norms, and policies that determine the access to the resources and develop the sense of "property" in using the resources, which determines who and how one can benefit from them (Vira, 2003; Igliori & Goesch, 2003). The economic dimension has been particularly focused on determining the values of biodiversity and how these values are traded in the marketplace (Pearce, 2004;Heal, 2000). The religious dimension has been mainly associated to the contemplative value of biodiversity and the cosmogony associated to its existence (Greenough & Lowenhaupt, 2003; Ramakrishnan, 1998). These multiple dimensions could address the management of biodiversity from different angles and within different contexts.

There are two foremost approaches towards the management of biodiversity by local communities: the self-sufficiency approach and the local and international supply of biodiversity products. The self-sufficiency approach posits how local communities use or could use biodiversity resources in order to get a better standard of living. Although many communities have traditionally used biodiversity for food and housing, a more integral approach could be used with the purpose of generating more resources, to make a better use of the resources or produce them in higher amounts that could satisfy most of the people. The self-sufficiency approach corresponds to the development approach called: "help for self-help", what is described by Gronemeyer as follows: "the capacity of a community to shape and maintain its way of life by its own forces". Naturally, in this case a way of life denotes a standard of living that allows individuals to cover their basic needs and to make choices (Sen, 1999).

In the Colombian case, some of the experts argued that people have been satisfied with too little, just something that can fill their basic needs day to day. The self-sufficiency approach responds basically to a survival necessity. As a result, it evidences frequently a short-term vision of the communities, in which communities

want to have things for today and are not always interested in building a long-term process. In Colombia, this situation does not only correspond to the poverty fight but also to violence. Violence substantially reduces communities' capacity to think about the future, because life and stability can be lost in either moment. For some members of the community, long-term results are so uncertain that there is not point in people to raise their expectation for them.

The second approach refers to the sustainable use of biodiversity in order to produce goods or services that could generate an income. These goods or services could be produced to supply local or/and international markets. In this respect, it is argued that the highest biodiversity concentration is located in developing countries (e.g. Brasil, Colombia) and given that the developing countries with notorious declines in poverty (e.g. China) are those that have integrated faster into the economic world (UNDP, 2003), this market approach could be an opportunity to generate higher incomes.

These two approaches determine the need for communities and development agencies to find a trade off between the global and local levels, in which both levels could preserve what they consider important. Either approach implies some tensions. For instance, the market approach is under the demands and uncertainty of the business environment (e.g. high volumes and quality) .On the other hand, the self-sufficiency model could integrate community's history without substantially altering their traditional management, but in some of these communities the income generation becomes an issue due to the high levels of poverty and even misery, as mentioned above in the case of the Pacific region in Colombia.

In the management of biodiversity, local communities are seen as stakeholders [8], which implies that biodiversity conservation and development depends on their action (Vira, 2003). The question under these assumptions is to what extent the so-called management of biodiversity by local communities responds to the decision of local communities or to the Western "wisdom", in which almost everything is marketable.

The contradiction of the market approach in the sustainability warranty

The previous section briefly mentioned a market contradiction, which represents some of the arguments of the "post-development" or "alternative development" approach(Escobar, 1995: Sachs, 1996). The "post-development" approach stems from the conception of development as a westernisation of the world in which the so-called developing countries are trying to advance attaining western ways of living.

In the biodiversity context, some authors (Vallejo, 2000; Richards, 1997) argue that local communities have a different point of view regarding the perceived

---

[8] As mentioned by Vira (2003), Freeman defined stakeholders as those grouped without whose support the organization would cease to exist.

undeniable benefits of the management of biodiversity. Vallejo defines this side as "the contradictory character of sustainable development", in which to some extent communities will never be adequately rewarded for their protection of the environment and this development-environmental initiatives could become a way to generate new needs and to modify communities' own way of living. Furthermore, Richards points to the use of community names as an advertisement strategy used by many businesses and organizations to promote corporate philanthropy while hiding their profit-centred motivation and superficial social concerns. Richards claims that this community management is regarded as the "great white hope" and calls for a careful analysis and evaluation of institutional basis and livelihood systems required to deal with outside pressures.

Antonio Hill[9], one of the experts interviewed, pointed out that communities' definition of what they want it is even more important than market analysis in community development. In Hill's words:

> *"The best starting point is an "appreciative inquiry"[10] with that community, rather than marching in with a product / market that may make perfect sense given the state of market supply / demand but which makes no sense given where that community is starting from. It is crucial to ask local producers what biological resources they actually have access to, which they use already, which they think could be developed sustainably, and then figure out what related market opportunities can be developed rather than vice versa".*

In many cases, communities do not want to alter their traditional life with the design of ambitious projects. Instead, communities would like to have a modest income that could allow them to cover their basic needs and that would not imply major tensions or the transformation of their natural habitat. That is the case of the network of the Afrocolombian women of Tanando, one of the most successful biotrade experiences recognized in the world[11].

The Afrocolombian women network of Tanando is an association of a group of 80 Afrocolombian women who 8 years ago sold medicinal and aromatic plants at the marketplace "plaza de Mercado". They got together to try to deal with the problem related to the production and to organize and increase their presence in the marketplace, with a product that was not only a plant but also a transmission of their traditional knowledge. This group got the support of Canadian and Dutch cooperation for technology transfer and creation of a differentiation in the product. Nowadays, these women have the brand "Tana condiments" a brand of products that is sold in the most important supermarkets in Colombia. The director of this group and the director of the local development agency that have accompanied this process highlighted that the key factors for this successful experience were: the support to a traditional activity, the sequential penetration of the local and the national market while the strengthening of the technical and organizational capacity

---

[9] Extract from the interview with Antonio Hill on May 4 2004. Antonio Hill is a global programme adviser of OXFAM.
[10] "Appreciative inquiry" (following the "sustainable livelihoods approach -- see: www.livelihoods.org)
[11] Tanando is a village located in Choco, one of the departments of the Pacific coast in Colombia.

and a model of development that did not alert these women traditional way of living.

One additional point in which the director of the local development agency and the other experts agreed was how in this market approach a complete mistake has been trying to transform local people into entrepreneurs. When local communities were asked whether they are or would like to be entrepreneurs, they answered that this is something that is not relevant to them. For local communities, they have always managed their resources and they may require additional instructions to deal with outside pressures, but it is not their ambition to become an entrepreneur.

Another of the international experts interviewed, Walter Reid [12], referred to this market approach highlighting the modest outcomes of this approach that sometimes are perceived with excessive expectations. Reid mentioned:

 ".. the opportunities in the development of these types of novel biological products can not serve as a true engine for rural/local community economic development. Nevertheless, from a national development standpoint pursuit of these opportunities makes senses as it does provide some increased economic opportunities and because there are spin-off benefits (education, capacity building) that could prove beneficial for the society in the long-run".

To sum up, the market contradiction refers to the question whether the local view corresponds to the development agencies view or not. Both organizations are focused on a matter of survival, physically and/or culturally. The real question is whether it can be founded a balance in which both organizations achieve their goals without affecting what they are in essence. One possible answer is to find market opportunities that do not demand communities to radically change their way of living, and at generating an opportunity that can help them cover their basic needs. Once this quality of life is achieved, communities should be in the position to decide whether they want to enter into the macro market competition or try to maintain a modest local positioning.

Processes or results ?

The failure or success of any project is evaluated with the achievement of expected results, generally quantitative in nature. In development and environmental projects, this mathematical operation does not always function because the variables involved in it have a different nature. Communities plus development agencies and other actors are not just quantitative but also qualitative variables under the effect of innumerable different factors.

There are several cases in which, as the interviewed mentioned, *" the hurry for results make development agencies invest in unnecessary infrastructure and technology"*. Many environmental and development projects want to show through their design their efficiency by making high investment in things that they consider are the salvation for a given community. However, a period of time is required in

---

[12] Walter Reid was interviewed on 4 May 2004. Walter Reid is the Director of the Millennium Assessment .

order to establish what a community really needs, as mentioned by Hill. Sometimes, even if a community states clearly what they want or need it does not mean that it always corresponds to the best option. The same situation occurs when the development agency has a preconceived solution, in both cases, it is required a period of time to generate a process in which both the organizers and the organized dialogue and define what needs to be done.

In Plan Pacifico, some of the interviewed agreed that the first phase of this program was a failure. However, after asking them about the results that were achieved through the program ,they concluded that the main result was the recognition for a need of a cultural dialogue and understanding for the intervention to have any kind of positive impact. The question is: to what extent is this a failure? Who is this a failure for? With reference to the above example, this experience taught development experts that what they have considered necessary for the development of the community was not necessary the community desire. There should be no roles, the role of organiser as well as organised varies in the process of defining what both want. The result may be insignificant in numbers, however in this example, the real result was the process of understanding each other and starting to establish the desired outcome together.

Therefore, thinking of project formation as a process opens the door to a real community participation; instead of the desk top planning, in which a wise development expert plans from his or her desk in Washington, Geneva or even the capital of the country what he or she imagines or considers is what communities should do in a particular case. As an Indigenous leader of the Pacific coast pointed out: "*We want to define with our communities what resources exist in order to lay the basis for a sustainable development plan. We want to do it our way-respecting our cultures -and we have been working on this for years and years.*"

The tension of illegality on biodiversity management

Other crucial actors are illegal groups (drug and species traffickers, guerrilla, paramilitary groups among others). In the Colombian case, armed groups play a crucial role in determining the fate of Colombia's forests since they have power and are more familiar with the terrain in where Colombian biodiversity is concentrated. These groups operate in 33% of the Colombian forest and in some areas they accomplish the functions of the state (Alvarez,2003). Forests constitute a strategic location considering that they provide food, wood and natural resources, which satisfy the basic needs for combatants. The vastness of forest regions impels a lack of authority, difficult access (transport and communication), and ease in hiding (dense vegetation minimizes detection via air raids). Moreover, forests are also the places where armed groups retain kidnapped people and build laboratories where narcotics are produced. Additionally, armed groups have implemented what Alvarez mention as "gun-point conservation". The "gun-point conservation" consists of restricting the access to key war-strategically zones by means of land-mines, killing or other violent forms.

Many megadiverse regions such as the Colombian Pacific coast are not only in the middle of an armed conflict but also immersed in an intimately related phenomenon: drugs. National and international forces participate in this phenomenon e.g. drug trade and international fight against drug trafficking. On one side the drug conflict is based on the cultivation of illicit crops to produce narcotics, in which some members of local communities participate because of the higher incomes, shorter periods of harvesting and easy management. This is nurtured by a main international demand that is willing to pay a high price for drugs and at the same time promote fumigations to eliminate coca crops as well as biodiversity.

The biodiversity becomes even more complex in the light of a high-scale violent conflict. A biodiverse region under conflict loses all the stability necessary for conservation as in security and community intervention. The interrelationship between violence and biodiversity in Colombia integrates "peace" as a pre-requisite for its meaning, because without peace the pressure of war dissolves the possibilities of cultural construction by means of displacement, killing or participation in illegal activities. Furthermore, the biological wealth is subdued to the war forces that exploit and manipulate them at their own convenience.

Conclusions

Globalisation as a multidimensional phenomenon has made evident the existing relationships not only among countries but also between issues. One example of these crosscutting issues is the interrelationship between development and the environment. The current environmental crisis posits new patterns for the models of development to be addressed in crucial areas in terms of conservation or protection of the natural resources. In this regard, people at the grass roots become key players in order to achieve any advance, but this is not just people as a group of individuals, but people with common interests or aspects that gather to form organizations.

The global-local interaction creates dynamics between development agencies -as macro organizations in charge of the global environmental governance- and the local communities that manage natural resources. This interaction has been marked by assumptions in terms of what has to be done, from a mostly Western perspective of development. In many cases, this perspective corresponds to the traditional wisdom, which states: do not provide fish, but give them the means to catch the fish. As seen in the biodiversity case, this premise does not always correspond to reality because local people to some extent know how to fish and may not want fish. Several projects have shown that development agencies should consider the importance of establishing a dialogue with communities and do not take for granted what these communities want. The same projects have consequently forced communities to be able to express what they want and the way the conceived what should be done. A good example is the figure of Communitarian councils in municipalities of the Pacific Coast in Colombia, which now have constituted their life plans and any agencies that want to interact with these communities need to be framed in their principles and complement their action lines.

The main purpose of the international cooperation in these development-environmental initiatives should be to generate and strengthen the local organizational capacity. It means not to impose people what is conceived as successful patterns for development and conservation. On the contrary, to establish a dialogue in which the positions of the local communities as well as the development agencies are expressed and analysed in order to find how they can complement each other. The word dialogue involves a process in which both entities are open to listen and concert. In particular, development agencies should consider that as soon as the financial resources are depleted, local communities are those who will have to sustain the initiatives. The extent to which these communities are integral part of the design and implementation could imply a major opportunity for the initiative to survive and enhance its coverage. For instance, the most successful experiences in the Pacific coast corresponds to the initiatives that have arose from the community, they decided what to do and in which areas they needed assistance (e.g. Tanando).

Organizational analysis becomes a key practice in order to understand from past and current experiences how to deal with the process of establishing an intervention. Furthermore, it enables the capacity of the macro and micro organizations to anticipate the position of the other and establish its own position. In the biodiversity case, it has been showed how entities need to clarify their goals in order to negotiate, especially for the local communities to raise awareness on what they have and what it implies.

Bibliography

Agarwal, A.,Narain, S. , Sharma, A & Imchen A..(2001) *Poles Apart. Global Environmental Negotiations*. Centre for Science and Environment. New Delhi: Thomson Press

Agarwal, A.,Narain, S. & Sharma, A.(1999) *Green Politics. Global Environmental Negotiations* 1. Centre for Science and Environment. New Delhi: Thomson Press

Chia, R (1996) *Organizational Analysis as Deconstructive Practice*. New York: Walter de Gruyter

Dawson, S (1996) *Analyzing organizations*. 3rd ed. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Escobar, A. (1998) Whose knowledge, whose nature? Biodiversity Conservation and Social Movements' Political Ecology. *Journal of Political Ecology*, Vol 5.

Escobar, A. (1997) *Biodiversidad, Naturaleza y cultura: localidad y globalidad en las estrategias de conservación.* First edition. Mexico city: Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico. Centro de Investigaciones Interdisciplinarias en Ciencias y Humanidades

Escobar, A. (1995) *Encountering Development: The Making and the Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gardner, J. & Mitchell, P. (2003) *Integrating biodiversity into environmental management systems and community development programmes*. Geneva: IUCN

Heal, G. (2002) *Biodiversity and globalization.* Paper presented at the Kiel Week Conference on Globalization. Institute for World Economics

Held, D., McGrew A., Goldblatt D. & Perraton J. (1999) *Global transformations. Politics,*
Economics and Culture. Oxford: Polity Press

Hofstede, G (1991) *Cultures and organizations: Software of the Mind.* London: McGraw Hill

Igliori, D, Goeschl, T. (2003). *Property rights for conservation and development: An analysis of extractive reserves in the Brazilian Amazon*. Draft unpublished

IIAP (

Knights, D & Willmott, H (1999) *Management lives: power and identity in work organizations*. London: Sage publications

Lessen, R (1998) *Management development through cultural diversity*. London: Routledge

O' riordan, T. & Stooll-Kleemann (2002) *Biodiversity, Sustainability and Human Communities.Protecting Beyond the Protected.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Parker, M (2000) *Organizational Culture and Identity.* London: Sage publications
Pearce, D. (2004) Environmental market creation: saviour or oversell?. *Paper for Portuguese Economic Journal.*

Ramakrishnan, P. (1998) Ecology, economics and ethics. Some key issues relevant to natural resource management in developing countries. *International Journal of Social Economics*. Vol. 25, Issue 2/3/4, Bradford p. 207-225

Reed, M (1985) *Redirections in organizational analysis*. London: Tavistock Publications

Sachs, W (1996) *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*. London: Zed Books

Sen, A. (1999) *Development as freedom.* New York: Knopf

Sponsel. L. (1993), "The Potential Contribution of Buddhism in Developing an Environmental Ethic for the Conservation of Biodiversity" in *Ethics, Religion, and*

Biodiversity: Relations Between Conservation and Cultural Values, Lawrence S. Hamlton, ed.Cambridge, U.K.: White Horse Press, Ch. 4, pp. 75-97.

Thompson, P & McHugh, D (2002) *Work organisations*.3rd Ed. New York: PALGRAVE

Vallejo, A (2000) M*odernising Nature: Sustainable Development, Biodiversity Conservation and Indigenous Peoples : the Case of the Yasuni National Park*. Environment and Development M. Phil Dissertation Department of Geography. University of Cambridge.

Vira, B (2003) *Stakeholder interaction and collaborative forest management; theory and analysis of the Indian Experience*. PhD thesis of the department of geography. University of Cambridge

UNDP (2003). *Local Business for Global Biodiversity Conservation: Small Business   Development   Strategies   In   Biodiversity   Projects*. http://www.undp.org/gef/undp-gef_publications (accessed: 5th Nov. 2003)

UNDP (1999) *Human Development Report 1999: Globalization with a Human Face* at http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/1999 (accessed: 25th October 2003)

Vermeulen, S (2004) Biodiversity planning: Why and how should local opinions matter? *Gatekeeper series* No 115, IIED

Wilson, E. (1986) *Biodiversity*. National Forum on Biodiversity. Washington D.C:National Academy of Sciences

Zweifel, H. (1997) The gendered nature of biodiversity conservation. *Nwsa Journal* Vol.9, Issue 3. Bloomington p. 107-123