

# **Living Lakes Governance: What the Survey Shows and Next Steps**

Presentation of Andrew O. Moore aomoore@juno.com +1 215-848-6910  
8<sup>th</sup> Living Lakes Conference Norwich, England 11 September 2003

## **1. Summary**

Governance of protected areas is a topic of frequent discussion today. Governance may be understood as the way people decide to lead organisations, places or natural resources, and communities. A review of governance models and structures at Living Lakes reveals a complex governance picture involving all levels of government and international bodies, as well as emerging innovative approaches involving NGOs, corporations, partnerships, and collaborations. The results of an opinion survey of Living Lakes members suggest the need for further attention to the pursuit, adoption, and spreading of good governance practices. Conference workshops and discussions offer the first opportunity for a thorough treatment of these issues and practices. The Living Lakes network could adopt ongoing means of proclaiming and promoting good practices, and assisting individual members with governance challenges and opportunities.

## **2. Background**

Governance of protected areas, including vital resources such as the Living Lakes, is a current “hot topic” of discussion among environment, development, and funding agencies worldwide. The emphasis in the discussion often falls on topics such as decentralisation and participation. And there is a widespread recognition that discussions of governance affect or relate to other topics – as in this conference, with climate change. For instance, the ways decisions get made about climate change, and who makes the decisions, are relevant topics tomorrow.

The term “governance” itself needs explaining. In general, governance has to do with the ways people decide to lead and manage organisations, places or natural resources, and communities of any size. Often, discussions of governance hone in on the makeup, operations, responsiveness, and effectiveness of NGO boards, public commissions, and similar governing bodies. Another ongoing topic is the quality and degree of representation provided by elected and appointed bodies. A frequent viewpoint in current discussions is the notion that the group of stakeholders for a given organization, place, or community has been defined too narrowly in the past. Still another view has it that discussing governance leads to clarifying who sets the end purposes for an organisation, and who implements the means of pursuing those ends.

At least two of the Rio Treaty principles set a context for discussions of natural resource governance. As summarized by the World Resources Institute, these include principles of:

- Making decisions at appropriate level given scale of resource + Providing access to information, participation, and redress (Principle 10), and
- Integrating the environment into all decisions – “In order to achieve sustainable development, environmental protection shall constitute an integral part of the development process and cannot be considered in isolation from it.” (Principle 4)

The World Resource Institute’s most recent semiannual guide to world resources goes on to provide a lesson – if not a definition – regarding governance: “*How* we decide and *who* gets to decide often determines *what* we decide.”

## 2.1 The Ends-Means Distinction in Governance

This paper and the survey that informs it draw upon an important distinction that has led many NGOs (including BTCV, one of the partners involved with Living Lakes member The Broads) to re-consider their structures and processes for governance. That is the distinction between *means* and *ends* in governance. John Carver ([www.carvergovernance.com](http://www.carvergovernance.com)) has explored this topic in depth.

Determining, debating, and reshaping *ends*, also known as vision, goals, or objectives, are a critical function of governance. For instance, with Living Lakes and other protected areas, ends might have to do with nature conservation, science, visitor opportunities, local and indigenous needs, or even with practical economic uses such as fisheries and drinking water. Shaping the ends would be the work of the board, partnership, or other multi-sided group constituted to think strategically about a Lake. *Means*, by contrast, have to do with how the ends or vision gets pursued, and could fall under the heading of “management” rather than governance. Means may take the form of powers at a Living Lake, as in powers to plan, regulate, spend, generate revenue, and enter into agreements. Decisions about means might be left to professional leaders and staff of the various organisations involved.

Employing the ends-means distinction could be useful for Living Lakes, as it may clarify the need for each Lake to have a vision developed by a vision-setting body in consultation with stakeholders -- and to have a management structure for making and carrying out day-to-day decisions. Putting the distinction into practice for a Lake is a complex task due to the multiple overlapping jurisdictions and interests involved. Putting the distinction into practice for a Living Lakes member organisation would also require some work but would pay benefits in effectiveness.

## 2.2 Elements and levels of governance

Recent publications on governance of areas of environmental value offer two lists of the “elements” of governance -- the relevant systems, structures, and considerations. The World Resources Institute describes seven elements (see Resources section for more detail):

- Institutions, laws
- Participation rights, representation
- Authority level
- Accountability, transparency
- Property rights, tenure
- Markets, financing
- Science and risk

Also building in a sense of what is important in governance, Canada's Institute on Governance identifies five "good governance principles:" (details in Resources section)

- Legitimacy and voice – participation, decentralisation
- Direction – plans, consistent with international conventions
- Performance – efficiency, capacity
- Accountability
- Fairness

In addition to principles or elements, it is worthwhile to consider the overlapping levels at which governance may occur. Governance can be global, national, community-level, or organization-level (the last level is the immediate concern of the many NGOs taking a closer look at the way they govern themselves). We also must not forget, especially with reference to magnificent natural bodies such as the Living Lakes, that governance can occur at the level of a specific natural resource – with input nearly certain from the four other levels.

### **3. The Living Lakes Governance Survey 2003**

With the importance of governance in mind – and a sense that governance makes a difference in progress toward protecting lakes – most members of the Living Lakes network responded to a survey in August 2003. The survey contained a number of questions seeking descriptions of the governance structures and processes at a Lake, as well as some questions seeking opinions about how well Lake governance is working.

I received a total of 20 survey responses representing 18 of 23 Living Lakes members or candidates. Most survey respondents worked for NGOs; one each represented a national government body, a university, a partnership, and a corporation. Five of the responses had to do with transboundary lakes, 15 with lakes contained within one country. As with many surveys, not all respondents answered every question – and in two cases, I received more than one survey per Lake. And I learned that the situation at some Lakes did not lend itself to description by the clear-cut answers I provided. For instance, more than one governance model may be in use at a Living Lake. Lastly, because English was a second language for many respondents, and because use of language is debatable, different people may have meant differently by their answers. For instance, some considered designation as a Ramsar site to constitute full protection for the lake, others did not.

The survey helped identify the variety of governance models in use at Living Lakes. For example:

- At The Broads, legal governing authority is vested in national government, local authorities, and international designations. Other structures are also important, such as: 1) Collaborative management of the Trinity Broads between the Broads Authority, English Nature, and the Essex & Suffolk Water Company; 2) Management by community liaison groups developing site-specific plans; and 3) Delegated management by NGO Wildlife Trusts of Sites of Special Scientific Interest in agreement with English Nature.
- At Lake Constance, at least four transnational commissions help govern aspects of the lake.
- At Lake Uluabat and Milicz Ponds, models such as collaborative management and management by local communities are in use.

### **3.1 Lake Protection Status**

On the issue of lake protection status, the survey was revealing. Six respondents consider their lake fully protected via national, provincial, or international designations. Eleven consider their lake partly protected, either because only certain geographic features or areas are included in protected zones or only certain resource aspects receive protection. Three lakes, Vortsjarv in Estonia, Chapala in Mexico, and Victoria in Kenya/Uganda/Tanzania, described themselves as “not protected.” The needs suggested by partial or non-protection lead directly to some of the recommendations that appear below.

### **3.2 Involvement in governance, and trends toward new governance structures**

National governments are involved in most aspects of governance (holding regulatory, planning, spending, revenue-generating powers) at most Living Lakes. Regional or provincial governments are involved in some way in about half the responding lakes, as are local authorities. Other bodies involved in some aspect of governance include national or regional commissions, transnational commissions, or special authorities.

As expected, Living Lakes report that new participatory governance structures are taking shape. Collaborative management of some sort is in effect at most responding lakes. Members of local communities or indigenous people have input into governance in some cases. At a few lakes, management functions have been delegated to NGOs. In at least one case, management has been delegated to a private sector company.

The types of collaborative management in use at Living Lakes most usually involve a partnership of some sort between a public agency and an NGO (the Living Lakes network member). At several lakes, a multi-sided public/private/NGO partnership collaborates on management. At still other lakes, multiple public agencies collaborate. In a smaller number of cases, partnerships exist between NGOs, or between public agencies and private companies.

### **3.3 Vision, direction, ends – and means – at the Living Lakes**

At most responding Living Lakes, some sort of vision, direction, or ends statement has been created, often through a formal process. Development of such a statement is reported in process at four of the responding lakes. At least one lake's respondent noted that whereas a vision has been established, this has not led to the creation of concrete goals. One lake lacks a vision altogether.

As noted above, determining who is responsible for establishing the ends -- and for implementing the means to reach those ends -- is an important exercise in understanding how governance really works in an organisation or in this case with respect to a lake. Respondents to the survey tell us that in most cases, government agencies hold principal responsibility for setting ends or vision for a Living Lake, often with formal or informal input from Living Lakes member organizations. Responsibility for means or programmes, by contrast, is split just about evenly between two categories: government, and partnerships.

In most cases, Living Lakes members report receiving some funding for establishing ends and pursuing means. The most frequent source of these funds is the respective national government. Funds also come from individual donations, foundation grants, and international donors. Unilever helps support a number of the Living Lakes members, and other corporate sponsors provide support elsewhere. At least four lakes, though, report receiving no funding whatsoever for their involvement in governance.

### **3.4 Opinions regarding Living Lake governance**

The opinion-seeking portion of the survey asked respondents to rate governance of their lake Strong, Average, or Weak against the Institute on Governance's "good governance principles." As reflected in Table 1, below, ratings on most principles tended toward Average or Weak, with the exception of Direction. This appears to be consistent with other survey answers showing that direction has been established for most Living Lakes. Ratings on the other good governance criteria also appear consistent with other survey answers, and suggest areas for improvement or discussion regarding how Living Lakes are governed.

Table 1: Living Lake Ratings on IOG Good Governance Principles

	<u>Weak</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Strong</u>
Legitimacy and voice	7	7	4
Direction	4	7	7
Performance	8	9	1
Accountability	5	9	4
Fairness	5	8	4

When asked about their degree of satisfaction with their current role in lake governance, five respondents responded they were satisfied, five responded they were not satisfied, and ten responded that they were partly satisfied. Those who were not satisfied made telling explanatory remarks, such as “We do most of the work but have little power” and “[Our involvement] could be more strategic” as well as “We have not achieved having the input to the whole process that we consider important for the lake’s survival.” The numerous “partly satisfied” respondents also offered telling commentary:

- “[We are] Supporting a lot of work without financing...”
- “Could have closer working partnership...”
- “Participation of different stakeholders could be higher...”
- “With some agencies our input is disregarded...” and
- “Would like to make the decisions more democratic...”
- “...The process and the application of the decisions are very slow.”

Respondents also provided constructive input regarding which groups they consider under-represented in governance. Groups cited by many as currently under-represented included the general public / local residents, visitors, and conservation volunteers. Groups mentioned by several respondents included indigenous peoples, nontraditional users from minority or ethnic communities, and NGOs. A few more respondents described communication between groups seeking involvement in governance as sufficient, than did those who said it was not sufficient.

#### 4. Potential next steps

By launching the survey and devoting time at its 8<sup>th</sup> Conference to the subject of governance, Living Lakes has taken a bold step to engage with an important set of issues which it has in common with other areas currently protected or seeking protection around the world. At workshops during the conference, Living Lakes members would do well to continue clarifying and noting:

- Which governance practices are working well, and which need improvement – with regard to governing structures, engaging with broader groups of stakeholders, and partnership in particular;
- Areas in which sharing of best practices would be most helpful to other Living Lakes members;
- Critical gaps in information or knowledge; and
- Groundbreaking efforts to involve previously under-represented groups in lake governance.

To the degree the network of lakes wishes to remain closely engaged in governance issues, it may want to consider taking the following steps (and seeking funding to support them):

- Elaborate a set of “good governance” principles specific to the circumstances of Living Lakes, and provide members a continuous means to rate governance at their lake with respect to those principles;
- Publicize best practices in governance, where certain or innovative modes of partnership or collaboration are working for the benefit of one or more values;
- Launch a targeted effort to develop and spread good practices for involving under-represented groups in governance;
- Continue research efforts to understand the variety and nuances of different approaches to governance.

As a matter of priority, the Living Lakes network will also likely want to explore and pursue ways of assisting member lakes lacking sufficient strategic vision or direction, those with inadequate means or powers of implementing a vision, and those in need of means to gauge performance against concrete objectives. Similarly important would be providing assistance so that currently unprotected Lakes achieve some degree of protection. Furthermore, the network may wish to carve out a niche for itself as a specialist in developing and using more inclusive means of setting and implementing strategic vision, and in making goals more concrete.

# APPENDIX I: Resources for Further Information

## Living Lake Governance September 2003

### Seven Elements of Environmental Governance

*Excerpted from:*

**A Guide to World Resources 2002-2004: Decisions for the Earth – Balance, Voice and Power**, United Nations Development Program, United Nations Environment Program, World Bank, World Resources Institute, 2002 [www.wri.org](http://www.wri.org)

**Institutions and Laws:** *Who makes and enforces the rules for using natural resources? What are the rules and the penalties for breaking them? Who resolves disputes?*

- Government ministries; regional water or pollution control boards; local zoning departments and governing councils; international bodies like the United Nations or World Trade Organization; industry trade organizations.
- Environmental and economic laws, policies, rules, treaties, and enforcement regimes; corporate codes of conduct.
- Courts and administrative review panels.

**Participation Rights and Representation:** *How can the public influence or contest the rules over natural resources? Who represents those who use or depend on natural resources when decisions on these resources are made?*

- Freedom of Information laws; public hearings, reviews, and comment periods on environmental plans and actions; ability to sue in court, lodge a complaint, or demand an administrative review of a rule or decision.
- Elected legislators, appointed representatives, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) representing local people or other environmental stakeholders.

**Authority Level:** *At what level or scale—local, regional, national, international—does the authority over resources reside?*

- Distribution of official rulemaking, budgeting, and investment power at different levels of government (e.g., district forest office, regional air pollution control board, national agriculture ministry, international river basin authority).

**Accountability and Transparency:** *How do those who control and manage natural resources answer for their decisions, and to whom? How open to scrutiny is the decision-making process?*

- Elections; public oversight bodies; performance reviews; opinion polls; financial audits; corporate boards of directors; stockholder meetings.
- Availability of public records of rules, decisions, and complaints; corporate financial statements; public inventories of pollutant releases from industrial facilities, power plants, and water treatment facilities.

**Property Rights and Tenure:** *Who owns a natural resource or has the legal right to control it?*

- Land titles; water, mineral, fishing, or other use rights; tribal or traditional community-based property rights; logging, mining, and park recreation concessions.

**Markets and Financial Flows:** *How do financial practices, economic policies, and market behavior influence authority over natural resources?*

- Private sector investment patterns and lending practices; government aid and lending by multilateral development banks; trade policies and tariffs; corporate business strategies; organized consumer activities such as product boycotts or preferences; stockholder initiatives related to company environmental behavior.

**Science and Risk:** *How are ecological and social science incorporated into decisions on natural resource use to reduce risks to people and ecosystems and identify new opportunities?*

- Science advisory panels (e.g., Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC]); natural resource inventories (e.g., Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations biennial State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture report); ground- and satellite-based ecosystem monitoring programs (e.g., Millennium Ecosystem Assessment); national censuses and economic tracking; company health, safety, and environment reports.

## **Good Governance Principles and Criteria**

*Excerpted from:*

**GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLES FOR PROTECTED AREAS IN THE 21ST CENTURY**, Prepared for The Fifth World Parks Congress Durban, South Africa by John Graham, Bruce Amos, Tim Plumptre in collaboration with Parks Canada and Canadian International Development Agency, June 30, 2003 [www.iog.ca](http://www.iog.ca)

### **The Five Good**

#### **Governance Principles**

1. Legitimacy and Voice
2. Direction
3. Performance
4. Accountability
5. Fairness

#### **The UNDP Principles on which they are based**

Participation  
Consensus orientation  
Strategic vision, including human development and historical, cultural and social complexities  
Responsiveness of institutions and processes to stakeholders  
Effectiveness and efficiency  
Accountability to the public and to institutional stakeholders  
Transparency  
Equity  
Rule of Law

Suggested specific criteria for each good governance principle:  
(PA = protected area)

## **LEGITIMACY AND VOICE**

- **Existence of a supportive democratic and human rights context** through
  - democratic institutions based on free elections, ‘one person one vote’, and a viable multi-party system
  - respect for human rights such as freedom of speech, association, religion
  - no discrimination based on gender, race, colour, religion
  - promotion of tolerance and social harmony
  - respect for rights of indigenous peoples
- **Appropriate degree of decentralization in decision-making for PAs;** any devolution or divestment is through local bodies that
  - are accountable to local people
  - have the requisite powers and capacity to perform their functions
  - have some constraints, such as minimum environmental standards, to act in the broader national and international interest
- **Collaborative management in decision-making for PAs** involving representatives of all affected parties, particularly local and indigenous people
- **Citizen participation occurring at all levels of decision-making** related to PAs (legislation, system planning, PA establishment, management planning, operations) with special emphasis at the local level and the equal participation of men and women
- **Existence of civil society groups and an independent media** to act as a check and balance on the exercise of the powers granted to PA political leaders and managers
- **High levels of trust** among the various actors, governmental and non-governmental, national, state and local, involved in the management of PAs

## **DIRECTION**

- **Consistency with international direction relevant to PAs (as appropriate):**
  - international conventions e.g. World Heritage Convention; Convention on Biological Diversity, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Significance
  - intergovernmental programs e.g. UNESCO Man and the Biosphere
  - regional agreements e.g. European Union’s Natura 2000, North American Migratory Birds Convention
  - other guidance documents e.g. IUCN/WCPA best practice guidelines

- **Existence of legislative direction (formal or traditional law) that:**
  - sets out clear purpose and objectives for the PAs
  - establishes clear authorities relating to means (governance instruments)
  - provides for viable organizations to administer the PAs
  - includes requirements for citizen participation in decision-making
  - is elaborated in written policy statements
  
- **For national PA systems, existence of system-wide plans that**
  - have quantified objectives for the full range of PA management categories
  - establish priorities for the planning period
  - include provision for citizen participation, particularly local and indigenous people, in their implementation
  
- **Existence of management plans for individual PAs that:**
  - reflect citizen participation, particularly local and indigenous people
  - have formal approval of the appropriate authorities
  - set out clear objectives consistent with legislation
  - set out measurable results to be achieved within specific timeframes
  - are reviewed and updated on a regular cycle (e.g. every five years)
  - are implemented through annual work plans
  
- **Demonstration of effective leadership** – including political leaders and managers responsible for systems as well as individual PAs that:
  - provides an inspiring and consistent vision for the long term development of the PA system or individual PA
  - mobilizes support for this vision
  - garners the necessary resources to implement the various plans for the system or individual PA

## **PERFORMANCE**

- **Cost Effectiveness** – Efficiency in achieving objectives: conservation, science, visitor opportunities, local and indigenous communities
  
- **Capacity** – Capacity to undertake required functions, particularly in regard to its mandate (i.e. conservation, science, visitor opportunities, local needs) and authorities (i.e. regulation and planning, spending, revenue-generation, agreements); its policy capacity and the adequacy and security of its funding
  
- **Co-ordination** – Ability and capacity to co-ordinate efforts with the principal affected ‘players’ both within and outside government
  
- **Performance Information to the Public** – Provision of sufficient information to facilitate the assessments of performance by governments and the public

- **Responsiveness** – Responsiveness in dealing with complaints and public criticism
- **Monitoring and Evaluation** – Capacity to undertake regular and comprehensive monitoring and evaluation, including long term monitoring of key ecological and cultural values, and to respond to findings
- **Adaptive Management** – the ability to provide for policy learning and adjustment of management actions on the basis of operational experience as part of an adaptive management strategy
- **Risk Management** – Capacity to identify key risks and manage them

## ACCOUNTABILITY

- **Clarity** – Clarity in the assignment of responsibilities and the authority to act is critical in being able to answer the question "who is accountable to whom for what?"
- **Coherence and Breadth** – the degree to which broader concepts of accountability to the global community, future generations and nature are integrated with more traditional concepts of political accountability
- **Role of Political leaders** – Appropriateness of responsibilities assigned to political leaders as opposed to non-elected officials or semi-independent bodies and the absence of corruption
- **Public Institutions of Accountability** – Effective public institutions of accountability, including access to information, capacity to analyze and report, ability to get action, comprehensiveness of mandates
- **Civil Society and the Media** – Effectiveness of civil society and the media in mobilizing demand for accountability
- **Transparency** – The capacity of citizens, civil society and the media to access information relevant to the performance of PA management and to its use of regulatory, spending and other powers

## **FAIRNESS**

- **Existence of a supportive judicial context** characterized by respect for the rule of law including
  - an independent judiciary
  - equality before the law
  - the requirement for government and its officials to base their actions on well defined legal authorities
  - citizens having the right to seek legal remedies against the government and against their fellow citizens
- **Fair, impartial and effective enforcement of any PA rules** including
  - the transparency of the rules themselves (their existence is known and accessible)
  - the absence of corruption among public officials
  - the right of appeal for those charged with transgressions
- **Fairness in the process for establishing new PAs** including
  - respect for the rights, uses and traditional knowledge of local and indigenous peoples related to the area
  - an assessment of other options for the use of the area
  - public participation in the process of establishing the PA, particularly including local and indigenous peoples
  - the appropriate balancing among PA objectives (local use, science, conservation and visitors' use)
- **Fairness in the management of PAs** including
  - practices that achieve a favourable balance of costs and benefits to local and indigenous peoples (e.g. traditional uses, revenue-sharing, preferential employment and contracting procedures)
  - mechanisms for sharing or devolving the management decision-making of the PA with local and indigenous peoples
  - use of traditional knowledge and resource management methods of indigenous and local people
  - equitable human resource management practices for the staff of the PA
  - processes for recognizing and dealing with past injustices resulting from the establishment of PAs

## **APPENDIX II: COMPILED SURVEY RESULTS**

### **Pre-Conference Governance Questionnaire-8<sup>th</sup> Living Lakes Conference**

#### **A. Basic Information on you and your organisation**

**1. Name** **E-mail**

**2. Living Lake**

**3. Organisation**

#### **4. Type of organisation**

**1** National government agency or authority

Regional government agency or authority

Local government agency or authority

Quasi-governmental organization

**16** NGO / nonprofit organization

Division of one of the above (which? \_\_\_\_\_)

**1** Corporation or business (for-profit)

**1** Partnership

International body

**1** Other - University

#### **5. Type of lake**

**5** Falls within or crosses the boundaries of more than one nation (transboundary lake)

**15** Falls within the boundaries of one nation (national lake)

#### **6. Protection status of lake**

**6** Fully protected (please indicate means of protection: )

**11** Partly protected (means: )

**3** Not protected

## **B. Governance and management of your Living Lake**

### **1. Tick all legal governing authority(ies) and list their main powers if known (e.g., regulatory, planning, spending, revenue-generating etc.)**

18\_ National government

11\_ Regional government

11\_ Local authority

1\_ International body

5\_ National or regional Commission

3\_ Transnational Commission

2\_ Other (please name and list powers)

### **2. Tick all other governance models or structures in use at your Living Lake, and list their powers (if any and if known) from the choices above:**

12\_ Collaborative management / partnership

6\_ Management by local communities or indigenous people

7\_ Delegated management by NGO(s)

1\_ Delegated management by the private sector

3\_ Other

### **3. If collaborative management is in use, please tick best description of partnership**

3\_ Public / private (i.e., between a public agency and a private company)

5\_ Public / public (i.e., between one or more public agencies)

10\_ Public / NGO (i.e., between government and at least one NGO)

3\_ NGO / NGO

6\_ Multi-sided partnership (government-NGO-corporate)

Other / does not apply

### **C. Direction, vision, and inclusivity**

#### **1. Have a strategic direction, vision, or concrete goals been set for your Living Lake?**

**15** Yes

**2** No / Don't know

**4** In process

#### **2. Who holds principal responsibility for setting strategic direction, vision, or goals?**

**16** Primarily held by government agency or authority

Primarily held by other stakeholder e.g., private sector company

**3** Shared among multiple partners

**1** Other / Don't know

#### **3. Does your organization have input into strategic direction or vision?**

**17** Yes

**1** No

**3** Sometimes - how?

#### **4. Who holds principal responsibility for implementing programs to fulfill vision?**

**11** Primarily held by government agency or authority

Primarily held by other stakeholders

**8** Shared among partners e.g., NGO, government, other stakeholders

**3** Other / Don't know

**5. Is your organisation responsible for fulfilling or helpful fulfill direction or vision?**

11 Yes

1 No

8 Sometimes – when?

- When decision regards private reserves
- Via partnership
- Participate as members of a consultatory group
- As agreed in service level agreement, or as a consultee
- Education, visitor services and information, research

**6. Does your organisation receive financing for your involvement in setting or fulfilling strategic direction for the lake?**

16 Yes (If yes, sources):

- Unilever, DaimlerChrysler, CSR budget of company
- Partnership
- International donors or development agencies
- Membership fees, donations, foundations, corporate sponsorship
- Global Environment Facility, UNDP, EU / EC
- National government authority

4 No

**D. Your opinions regarding governance of your Living Lake**

**1. Rate the governance of your lake Strong, Average, or Weak in connection with the following five “good governance principles” (drawn from Graham, et al, 2003):**

**W7 A7 S4** *Legitimacy and voice*, as shown by broad participation and consensus orientation

**W4 A7 S7** *Direction*, as shown by strategic vision that takes into account human development and historical, cultural, and social complexities

**W8 A9 S1** *Performance*, as shown by responsiveness of institutions and process to stakeholders, as well as effectiveness and efficiency

**W5 A9 S4** *Accountability*, as shown by accountability to the public and to institutional stakeholders, as well as transparency

**W5 A9 S4** *Fairness*, as shown by equal treatment and attention to the rule of law

**2. Are you satisfied with your current role or input in lake governance and management?**

\_5\_ Yes

\_5\_ No – explain (See representative quotes in paper)

\_10\_ Partly – explain (See representative quotes in paper)

**3. Tick any of the following groups you see as under-represented in lake governance.**

\_7\_ Indigenous peoples

\_7\_ Nontraditional users e.g. local minority ethnic/immigrant populations

\_10\_ NGOs / voluntary sector

\_12\_ General public / local residents

\_10\_ Visitors

\_3\_ Staff / workers

\_10\_ Conservation volunteers

**4. Is communication between your organisation and others involved in lake governance sufficient?**

\_9\_ Yes

\_6\_ No

\_5\_ Other / comment

- Introduction of multi-agency/advisory forum helping
- Communication between NGOs and government/commissions is not sufficient
- Basically yes, but our capacity is insufficient in comparison to the tasks

**E. Conference Planning: What topic related to governance would you like to discuss in a conference workshop? Or, what governance issue would you like to deal with in a workshop, or what problem would you like to try to solve?**

\_\_10\_ Governing structures

\_\_2\_\_ Relating to traditional/new constituencies

\_\_11\_ Partnerships

\_\_13\_ Engaging with stakeholders, including local communities

\_\_3\_ Broadening / diversifying the stakeholder groups for Living Lakes

\_\_3\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_