

**The Peer Review Report for the Liguang Community
Conserved Area (CCA)**

Lijiang Institute of Health and Environment

May, 2018

Table of Contents

Overview	1
Phase I: Discussion and Application for the Registration of ICCA	3
Phase II: Preparation for the Peer Review of ICCA	5
Phase III: Peer Review for the ICCA.....	8
Conclusion	20

Overview

The Liguang Community CCA has gone through a three-month period of registration and review, and experienced three following phases:

Phase I: Discussion and Application for the Registration of ICCA

- Liguang Community requested the assistance from Lijiang Institute of Health and Environment (Here after refer to the NGO) for their the registration of the ICCA
- The NGO went through the ICCA system and learned the registration procedures
- The NGO explained the registration procedures and materials required for the application to the Liguang Community
- The Liguang Community assembled a meeting to arrange detailed community-based discussions for the registration of the ICCA
- Village groups within the Community discussed whether to register ICCA, and elected village representatives
- Representatives from village groups met and filled the FPIC and the Registration Form for ICCA; and formally authorized the NGO to assist with the registration
- The NGO submitted the registration materials

Phase II: Preparation for the Peer Review of ICCA

- The Liguang Community and the NGO jointly researched and formulated the draft for peer reviewing
- The Liguang Community, the NGO and the ICCA China Working Group discussed the outline and specified the peer review modality
- Liguang Community prepared the peer review according to the modality discussed before with the assist of the NGO.

Phase III: Peer Review for the ICCA

- General Introduction of the Liguang Community
- The peer reviewers paid field-visit to the Liguang Community
- The ICCA Peer Review Modality Discussion

The ICCA are defined and claimed by the communities themselves, rather than the definition and interpretation given by the outside parties. The existence and claim of ICCAs reflect local communities' appeals, desires, and actions for self-governance. Such desires,

appeals and actions might be regarded by the outside parties as “Cultural Shocks.” The ICCAs play a prominent and irreplaceable role in biodiversity conservation and the inheritance of cultural diversity. Nevertheless, these biodiversity conservation may not be the direct motivations for communities to initiate applications for ICCAs. Instead, communities may emphasize the role that ICCAs play in production and living of the communities. There are various types of ICCAs in the world. This leads to the expansion of individuals understanding of ICCAs. Therefore, there is no universal standard or model for the definition of the ICCA, nor the modality for peer reviews of ICCAs, and the best interpretation of the ICCA goes to communities.

Phase I: Discussion and Application for the Registration of ICCA

Villagers from the Liguang Community went to the White-Headed Langur Community Conserved Area in Qu'nan, Fusui, Guangxi for exchange study from December 25th to 27th on 2017. After coming back from Qu'nan, Feng Jinlong, the head of Liguang Community, spoke to the Lijiang Institute of Health and Environment (The NGO) about the registration of the ICCA and proposed a verbal application.

The Staff of the NGO studied the procedures and the required documents for the ICCA registration and take the following actions: 1. Contacted with the person in charge of the ICCA website to get a preliminary understanding of the general procedure, knowing that the necessity of Peer Review before the application is formally included into the ICCA system; 2. Read required documents for ICCA registration from GEF Small Grant Programme; 3. Collected information and materials including, the FPIC and Registration Form for ICCA etc.

Since 12 villager groups within the Liguang Communities dispersedly located, to announce the registration of ICCA, the meetings were assembled at 12 village groups separately. Then villagers decided whether to register for the ICCA or not. If they decide to register, village groups would elect village representatives. After the election, these representatives would meet to discuss issues including the necessary information required for registering the ICCA and the category of information disclosure.

And after two weeks of debate, villager groups elected representatives and decided to concentrate their discussion on the ICCA registration and the preparation for required documents.

A meeting of community representative was held on February 5th at Liguang, and the contents included: 1. decided whether each group of the community agreed on the registration of ICCA; 2. each villager group elected one village representative; 3. determined whether the community agreed to entrust the NGO to handle the registration procedure.

First of all, the meeting collected the notes from village groups' discussion (see Annex 1). After the on-site inspection, most of the villagers in each village group agreed to register the conserved areas within its village into the ICCA system. Each group elected one community representative, responsible for the works related to the registration; all villager groups agreed to authorize the NGO to handle the registration procedure.

Then, community representatives reviewed and confirmed the information for the ICCA

Registration Form. After the confirmation of the contents of the form, village representatives reached consensus on the usage, sharing and the category of information disclosure, choosing “UNEP-WCMC” (the highest degree of information disclosure). The meeting tentatively determined the name of the conserved area as the “Liguang Nature Reserved Area.” In the FPIC (see Annex 2), the community representatives formally signed and authorized the NGO to assist the registration of their ICCA.

On February 7th, staffs from the NGO submitted the materials of the registration of the Liguang Community Conserved Area to the ICCA system through email. On February 22nd, staffs received the response from the UNEP-WCMC, reminding the peer review procedure. At the same time, since the Liguang Community has set its level of information disclosure as the highest, it needed to supplement the geographic information data and maps. However, after speaking to the community, they don’t have its geographic information data or map; and since it involved regional confidentiality issues, the local government could not provide the relevant data and map. According to policies from the UNEP-WCMC, if there is no geographic information data or map of the protected area, then it would still register into the ICCA system, but not the database of the UNEP-WCMC.

Phase II: Preparation for the Peer Review of ICCA

From February 10th to March 7th, requested by Liguang Community, the NGO and the community representatives reviewed the actions to be taken for natural conservation and the development needs of this area. Each villager group introduced the situation of conservation in the past three years. The staff from the NGO and the community representatives jointly discussed the standards and modality of the ICCA peer review.

First of all, the meeting discussed the method of peer review. The NGO supported projects in the communities were implemented through a modality of village group's mutual assessment and scoring, the community recognized such approach is fair and transparent from their previous experience. After discussion, the community decided that peer review should be done through scoring, which can indicate the process of community's conservation. For instance, how to reflect the subject position of communities' participation in the process of conservation? It does not depend on the negotiation between few people; instead, it is through continuous meetings, constant discussions, and delivering from debates among all community members. On one hand, the scoring system can help the community elaborate on the whole circumstances of their conserved area. On the other hand, the scoring system can help the community understand what is needed to improve their ICCA. Besides, the community representatives believe that the external experts and representatives from other ICCAs joining the scoring and reviewing process is more objective and fair. However, since the conservation area is community driven, it was recommended to put different weight on the scores of community representatives and external experts. Community representatives account for 70% of the total score, whereas the external experts account for 30% of the entire score. The review will pass if the total score exceeds 60 percent.

Next, specific content and criteria for scoring were discussed and articulated at the meeting. It is divided into five aspects: 1. The motivation of the conservation: mainly observing if the conservation is sustainable; 2. The conservation target: conservation for a single species or for the ecosystem and all natural resources; conservation based on community traditional wisdom or pursuit of economic gains; 3. Who is the subject of conservation: conservation activities conducted by the community itself or the outside organizations; 4. The method of the conservation: conservation through community leading process or supervision by a few individuals; 5. The effectiveness and impact of the

conservation (see Annex 4): Scoring table for the community conserved area.

After the community representatives reach a consensus of scoring criteria and methods, on March 8th, staffs from the NGO prepared the ICCA registry materials and peer review modality and submitted to the ICCA China Working Group through email for feedback.

The ICCA China Working Group suggested including the community's self-assessment into the peer review: "The community should conduct the self-assessment, and then report the result of the assessment during the peer review. Through such approach, the entire community could participate in the registration process, while raising the awareness of ICCA and enhance the solidarity of the community." Besides, the working group also put forward specific suggestions on the setting of the review process and the criteria of the scoring system.

On March 11th, the Liguang Community conducted the self-assessment on their conserved area. The participants included village committee leaders and community representatives. Each villager group representative reported the community's compliance with the ICCA system, the improvement of their environmental condition, and the insufficiency associated with the current system.

The Hendu Village Group: More than 90% of the villagers have joined the community mutual fund and also complied with the village rules and regulations. Community members stopped illegal logging in their community forest. Instead, many of them decided cutting woods in the national-owned forest due to proximity in the distance. In the past, many villagers fished in rivers, and such situation no longer exists since they decided to conserve this area. Even if there are small fishes in the river, villagers will neither catch fish. Since there is no garbage pool in the village, villagers collected unrecyclable waste and burn it at a centralized place. However, under-forest resources are not managed and need to establish a system to manage and sustainable use it in the future.

The Hexia Village Group: Our village has relatively few forest lands. However, it is well-managed by us. Our focus is on the protection of rivers, and the native fish is effectively protected. Nobody fish in the river now; plus, we have set aside one day each year to clean up the garbage in the village. We feel like we have done very well and therefore we do not need more conservation measures.

The Sechongluo Village Group: There have been several incidents that violated the village rules. However, community members can still handle affairs in accordance with the regulations. We have punished few people for now. A community member has stopped illegal

logging; and our village also built several waste pools, leading to less rubbish in the river. Before, the sound of cutting trees with saw were heard everywhere in the forest; now it's replaced by the sound of bird singing. We feel great. Next, we need to discuss the management of the under-forest resources.

The Bieyiding Village Group: The group leader was too shy to express his opinion.

The Wujihou Village Group: After the establishment of the village rules, the situation of illegal logging is no longer existing, and nobody fish in the river anymore. The village cleared up garbage several times, but found that more and more garbage was found. This is because the garbage is hidden in the river and underground before. We have burned unrecyclable waste by ourselves. However, there are still many glass bottles that cannot be burned. Therefore, we piled up these glasses in several places. We have done an excellent job in ecological conservation, and we hope to maintain such trend.

The Daibuqi Village Group: The forest in our village is vast. In the past, individuals came up and asked for timbers, and we cannot say no due to acquaintance' network. After the establishment of the mutual fund, we have set up rules that only lend to people who don't cut trees. Lending to whom is decided by group discussion so that the group can say no to logging request. Also, residents from other village used to came to our village and cut trees down in our forests. They often came together and it's hard for us to control. Now, if they come again, the entire village would stop them collectively. This method so far has been advantageous, and we would report these cases to the Forest Bureau if the community cannot control the illegal logging. We have been taken good care of the trees in the forest and stop selling them. Through community meetings, we also set up rules for the garbage disposal. However, there are still many glass bottles that we cannot deal with. Our village also has many wild fungus and medicinal herbs such as *Paris polyphylla* var. *yunnanensis*. Many people come to our town to collect them. In the future, we need to discuss the management of the under-forest resources.

The Laoshang Village Group: Our village launched the community mutual fund only last year; it has not yet had any significant effect. We have assembled eight meetings and founded the conserved area. However, we haven't included the protection of the water conservation forest. We need to include such protection into the village rules later. After the spring festival, the entire village cleaned up the garbage collectively. Lots of residents drink beer in our village. Therefore there are many beer bottles which are hard to deal with. We once again discussed the management of the under-forest resource a few days ago. As we

talked, if any outsider came to our village and harvested medicinal herbs, we could confiscate these herbs and sell them. The remaining money would be used as the public fund in the village.

The Nianzipaluo Village Group: Our village also launched the project last year. The regulation for the conserved area has been set cautiously. Everyone followed the rules; and so far, there has not been any incidents violating these rules. There used to be some young men in the village cutting trees down, and the elderly cannot stop them. However, after the establishment of the village rules, the situation of over deforestation does no longer exist. Houses in the village were built on the hillside, and the protection of forest can prevent catastrophic events like the landslide, which benefits all the residents in the village.

The Nupaluo Village Group: They did not participate the meeting.

The Qizuoluo Village Group: Our village has more than 20,000 mu (1 ha. = 15 mu) forest land. Despite the vast area, the protection has been advantageous. In particular, there used to be many people from the neighbor village came and excessively cut trees down, and since our village is not well-united, we cannot control such incidents very well. It is much better now with the establishment of the conservation area. And the entire village would stop such activities if any outsiders came again. Our village also built one waster pool last year and prearranged regular cleaning and burning of garbage. There is less waste in the village now. We need to learn how to manage resources such as under-forest resources in the future.

The Heshang Village Group: The conservation project has been launched for almost three years, and the result has been effective. It can unify the villagers, and every individual can manage the village affairs together. Many people used the money from the community mutual fund to do business to make money. Everyone seems very satisfying. The best thing we had done so far is the protection of fishes. Despite there has been outsider came and fished illegally, community dealt such incidents together, and we need to manage them well afterward. There used to be villagers cutting trees for selling and did illegal land reclamation, however, they are now constrained through the village regulation. We also start to manage the garbage, and there is one day set aside for garbage collection annually.

The Laoxia Village Group: Our village was the last one that carried out the project. The project only took effective for few months; therefore, we have not yet found many positive results. We cleaned up garbage once at the beginning of the year. The problem of glass bottles was also severe, and villagers do not know how to deal with them. We have assembled many meetings. The villages did not like to hold meetings because such meetings

are very inconvenient for them. However, as individuals realized the benefit of the meetings now, we started to schedule meetings whenever we encountered problems. And we would take actions once villagers agreed on any issue.

Phase III: Peer Review for the ICCA

On March 27th, external assessment experts, community representatives from other ICCAs, media, and researchers arrived in Lijiang and went to the Liguang Community on the same day. The final participants are:

Name	Gender	Organization/ Community	Role of the Meeting
Liu Yi	Female	ICCA China Working Group /UNDP GEF SGP	External assessment Expert
Sutej Hugu	Male	ICCA Consortium, East Asia Coordinator	External assessment Expert
Luo Jing	Female	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences	External assessment Expert
Song Peijun	Male	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences	External Assessment Expert
Han Shasha	Female	Nature Conservation and Community Development Research Center at Guizhou Normal University	External Assessment Expert
Eridengwula	Male	Haloxylon Forest ICCA at Alashan, Inner Mongolia (Established in 2005)	Community Representative for Peer Review, Mongolian People
Yang Dailu	Male	Laozhai Village Liriodendron Chinese ICCA at Jianhe, Guizhou (Registered at the ICCA Registry System)	Community Representative for Peer Review, Dong People

Name	Gender	Organization/ Community	Identity Attending the Meeting
-------------	---------------	--------------------------------	---

Li Yukun	Male	Mt. Laojun Xinfang ICCA at Lijiang, Yunnan (Established in 2010)	Community Representative for Peer Review, Bai People
Li Jingbao	Male	Mt. Laojun Fengping ICCA at Lijiang, Yunnan (Established in 2010)	Community Representative for Peer Review, Bai People
Yang Zhishan	Male	Jinhe ICCA at Lijiang, Yunnan (Established in 2016)	Community Representative for Peer Review, Han People
Wang Linlin	Female	China Environment News	Journalist
Shi Yuqing	Female	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences	Observer
Wandegongba	Male	Shangri-La Sustainable Community Society	Observer, Tibetan People
Yu Jianping	Male	Shangri-La Sustainable Community Society	Observer, Tibetan People
Gongqiu	Male	Yunnan Weixi County Bazhu Village Community Learning Center	Observer, Tibetan People

March 28th, the Liguang Village Committee, The general information about the Liguang Village and a basic understanding about the Liguang ICCA

The community representative, Feng Jinlong, introduced the necessary information of the community to participants, including population, ethnic groups, history, geographical locations, landforms, vegetation, agricultural sector development, infrastructure, etc., giving participants a general understanding of the Liguang Community.

Afterward, Liu Yi and Hugu introduced the background of the registry of the community conserved area and the peer review. The community conserved area is a governance type of protected area that combines both the ancient and modern characteristics. In the past, there was no government-managed conserved area; it is the community who protected natural

resources and ecosystem through village regulations, traditional custom and religious traditions. In fact, the conserved area is not determined by outsiders such as the United Nations, ICCA consortium, experts; it is rather defined by the community and recognized by the community itself. Peer review is a mechanism that has been added by the ICCA registry system in recent years to complete the pre-registration process of the ICCA. This is the mechanism that allows others, other conservation areas, stakeholders associated with ICCAs, and counterparts related to the conservation areas witness the process of registering the ICCAs. In China, the peer review mechanism is still in its initial stage. Therefore, the self-assessment plan (the scoring sheets) is historically significant, and it is the process to discover the future of such ICCA peer review mechanism in China.

Then, the Director General from the Lijiang Institute of Health and Environment, Deng Yi, explained the scoring criteria for the assessment sheets (see Annex 4) so that the reviewers can score the ICCA during the meeting on March 29th. As Deng Yi stressed, “this assessment is quantifying things which community usually do and speaking about, and demonstrate it through scoring; therefore it is not simply about the application of the Liguang ICCA or the witness from outsiders. This testimony also provides a basis for the peer review mechanism for the entire ICCA in the future.”

In the afternoon of March 28th, participants visited the Liguang Community Conserved Area, and exchange and shared the experiences among different conservation areas

In the afternoon, the participants were divided into three groups and visited three village groups including the Liguang village, the Wujihou village, and the Sechongluo village. They conducted on-the-spot investigations and learned about community’s traditions, cultures, histories, as well as current status of conservation.

After on-the-spot investigations, each community representative shared stories about their conserved area.

In the morning of March 29th, the Liguang Village Committee, Liguang ICCA Peer Review meeting

Representatives from Liguang ICCA as below:

Name	Gender	Identity/Function	Ethnicity
Feng Jinlong	Male	The Party Branch at Liguang, Lijiang	Lisu People
Huang Qingzhong	Male	The Village Committee at Liguang, Lijiang	Lisu People
Li Haiyun	Male	Lijiang Liguang ICCA (Heshang Village Group)	Lisu People
Li Cui	Female	Lijiang Liguang ICCA (Heshang Village Group)	Lisu People
Zhao Hongli	Male	Lijiang Liguang ICCA (Hendu Village Group)	Lisu People
Feng Liguang	Male	Lijiang Liguang Community ICCA (Laoshang Village Group)	Lisu People

First of all, as the representative of the Liguang Community, Feng Jinlong introduced the Liguang community based on the content of scoring sheets.

I. The motivation of conservation

“We have lived in this place for dozens of generations. Our affections are attached to the mountains and rivers of this place. In particular, most of our Lisu People directly enter the socialist society from the primitive society, called 'direct-transformed ethnic group'. The majority of us believe in primitive religion, some of whom believe in Christianity (one-fifth). We very admire nature and do not need to use legal provisions and governmental enforcement to protect the environment. However, with the recent development, some of our customs and practices have been assimilated and broken. 40 years ago, we have no protected areas here, and there is no Mt. Laojunshan Administration. The government does not need to advocate for ecological conservation because the environmental condition was good. The fish in the river were also countless and there was no garbage. The destruction of natural forests, rivers, the environment, etc., which occurred only in the past 40 years, is more serious now.”

“With the current use of firewood for flue-cured tobacco and construction, construction materials, production materials (beans, etc.), unrestricted logging including water-conservation forests, water resources in several village groups start to deplete. Locals and animals have to move 4-5 kilometers away for the drinking water. Facing such situation, our survival is threatened, so we have to carry out ecological conservation.”

In response to the above statement, Liu Yi, Song Peijun, and Hugu asked whether there was a system for community to manage natural resources in the early days, whether there were written records in traditional culture, and how to pass on tradition. Liu Yi and Hugu also suggested that the Liguang community should document the traditional cultural knowledge and use text, pictures and images to record.

II. The conservation target

“There are currently 12 community conservation areas in the administrative village. Each conservation area has a group of villagers, and different conservation targets. How to protect is depends on the geographical conditions and characteristics of each group. Some people live on the mountain, some people live in the valley, and the vegetation distribution is different among groups as well. Therefore, we will develop different plans of 12 villager groups’ conservation area according to the distribution of plants and animals, and the opinions of the villagers. The villagers will discuss and make decisions together. And the common ground among different conservation area is the implementation of comprehensive protection, which is in accordance with the rules we have remained in the past.”

Liu Yi suggested that the villagers should document animals and plants within the conservation area, improve the effective management of the conserved area. Hugu suggested that the community should use its traditional knowledge and language to document it.

III. The process of establishing CCA

The community representative Feng Liguang introduced the establishment of community conservation area in Laoshang Village. Liu Yi asked about the number of village meetings and the ultimate reason why the conserved areas were established. Feng Liguang said that he had assembled eight villager meetings; and after a process of one or two years, the villagers eventually reached an agreement to protect the water conservation forest.

Hugu asked the villagers about the democratic forms and decision-making models during meetings. Feng Jinlong said that the community first elected the prestigious villagers, and later consulted with the villagers whether they agree the decision through voting. The minority is subordinate to the majority. Liu Yi asked "the majority of people" specifically how much of the ratio. Feng Jinlong said that most people refer to more than 70%.

Feng Jinlong said that, “we have 366 households in the village, 351 households have signed the agreement. Others who did not participate are either childless and poor family or those who are out of village for a long term. Those who have signed FPIC are willing to participate in the community conserved area registration; and the establishment of the

mechanism of CCA, the composition of management group and the divisions of responsibilities are determined through discussion and election among the villager.”

Hugu asked, "whether projects and activities are supporting the operation of conservation areas?" Feng Jinlong explained that “conservation areas were supported and promoted by the “community mutual fund” founded by the Lijiang Institute of Health and Environment. Until now, each group has been able to carry out protection actions independently and autonomously. If things have gone wrong inside the community itself, it can also be dealt with within the community. And since the conservation systems are built based on the community’s actual needs, each villager would protect the effectiveness of the system. In community protection task, everyone is responsible for the management, and everyone is involved. Responsibility, rights, obligations, rewards and punishments are all visible.”

Subsequently, Li Haiyun, a village representative from Heshang Village Group, and Zhao Hongli, a representative from Hendu Village Group, introduced their conservation area and conservation systems within the community, including the stories about punishing violators. The villagers from Heshang group effectively prevented outsiders from fishing indiscriminately in the rivers in the conservation areas through collective action and fined 500 CNY from outside violators. The villagers from Sechongluo Group fined villagers who had cut trees in the conservation area during the villagers’ meeting. The villagers participated in the meeting, including the families of the fined villagers, believed that the signed village rules and regulations should be resolutely implemented. Nevertheless, the group meeting villagers in the Hendu group discussed the treatment of the villagers who cut trees in state-owned forests. Because the village rules and regulations did not include the protection of state-owned forest, the villagers unanimously believed that village rules and regulations did not bind such behaviors; but the meeting made adjustments to the original rules at the same time. It was agreed that “if anyone cuts trees outside the designated community conserved areas, they will be handed over to the local forestry station for punishment.”

Hugu and Liu Yi asked if it is possible to introduce the revision and adjustment on the management system or the terms and conditions and whether the meeting is held regularly. Feng Jinlong said that if there is exceptional circumstance, village groups will immediately assemble meetings to discuss the amendments of regulations. For example, the Heshang Group met after dealing with the outsider fishing violation case and set up a warning sign on the roadside. Also, the community would meet once a year and would revise the regulations

when necessary.

Song Peijun asked the proportion of women attending villagers' meetings. Feng Jinlong replied that it was about 10%, but there were no statistics.

Liu Yi asked the villagers' groups how many meetings they hold during the process of the registration of the conservation areas. Feng Jinlong said that they generally hold meetings no less than four times. Li Yukun said that the villagers “discussed through the meeting to seek a rule and system to regulate the public behavior in the village. No matter whether such regulations are traditional, ethnic, or cultural, community internal affairs should be resolved through this institutionalization, which has been very effective.”

Hugu inquired about the governance mechanism of Liguang Community Conserved Area: 12 village groups organize meetings separately, and these meetings are subjects to formulate their own norms and regulations, whether the future goal is for Liguang to link these 12 groups into one, whether there will be a conference held at Liguang-level with 12 representatives, and whether all villagers agree. Feng Jinlong introduced the process of discussing the registration of CCAs. It was based on the discussions and election representatives of the 12 communities. 12 community representatives would discuss the decision before applying for registration; if there is no community representative, they cannot register their CCA.

IV. The Effect of the Conservation and the CCA Management

Feng Jinlong introduced, “from the perspective of management and conservation, there have been no incidents of deforestation and destruction of the vegetation that punished by the local authorities in the past three years in this area. Even during the process of developing the conservation areas, there was no impact on the income of our local villagers, mainly because our village did not get wealthy through cutting trees and selling them. At the same time, our villagers have huge expectation for the advancement of conserved areas, and they hope to benefit from such conservations. How to make conservation benefit villagers remain very challenging things to us. We also feel that the pressure on us is enormous. We have not yet found a good solution. For now, we tried to establish a farmers’ cooperative, and hope to sell and promote our agricultural ecological products collectively. There are currently 289 villagers participating in the cooperative, but there are no visible economic returns yet. Moreover, the villagers have set up a Sanitation Day in response to the growing number of garbage in the community, combined with the Lisu People’s ethnic tradition, conducting cleaning works from January 16th to the 18th of each year based on the lunar calendar”.

Liu Yi suggested that “when assessing the effect of conservation in the future, we must comprehensively consider social, economic and environmental benefits, not merely emphasize the economic benefits. This is because the sustainable development refers to the balance among the society, economy and the environment. As Mr. Feng said, such protection does not mean banning fishing completely; rather, we cannot let the fish die out through fishing. We must also consider the survival of fish. This is the consideration of environmental benefits. Then, when to fish is determined by everyone in the village, and all residents need to participate equitably. This is the consideration of the social equality. Therefore, when we consider the benefits, we need to find the balance of governance among social, economic, and environmental factors.

The Bazhu community representative Gong Qiu asked why the community stipulated regulation that banned grazing freely in conserved areas, and would there be conflicts between villagers in the community. Feng Jinlong said that such control was mainly formulated to prevent bamboo shoots from being over-eating by cattle and sheep, and was also a system developed by the villagers themselves.

Wang Linlin asked whether the villager meeting would punish some villagers lightly, giving favors to them and making the implementation of regulations less effective. Feng Jinlong said “the community never encountered any situation like this because the villagers themselves develop the rules. Therefore, they will not fool themselves”. Feng Liguang mentioned, “I’m an acquaintance with you, and I would keep half an eye out for you. But such phenomenon would not exist during the village meeting. And you must pay the price if everyone in the village knows what you did”.

Hugu asked that since there are only 12 independent management regulations for each respective communities, and there is not a unified, more massive, more macro overall operation, so the first issue is the mediation of disputes among village groups, and the second is the cooperation projects among village groups. How can villagers all cooperate with each other? Is there overall management of the Liguang Village? Are there relevant mechanisms for the mediation of disputes among village groups now or in the future? Are there detailed plans for cooperation? Feng Jinlong said that mediation work would be done according to the national system. At present, there is no specific cooperation mechanisms and projects for the overall ICCA.

The external experts and community representatives then scored the evaluation form, and the staffs counted the final scores. The total score of the five community representatives

was 437 points with an average rating of 87.4 points; the five experts had an overall score of 455 points, with an average rating of 91 points. According to the mechanism, the score of the community representative accounted for 70% of the total score, the score of the expert representative accounted for 30% of the total score, and therefore the final score was 88.48 points. Finally, ten peer reviewers signed and witnessed the registration of the Liguang CCA.

In the afternoon of March 29, the Liguang Village Committee, CCA and CCA registry Peer Review Discussion, Summary

In the afternoon, Liu Yi facilitated a discussion with community representatives, external experts, researchers, NGOs, media representatives on how to define CCA in China; and, the peer review mechanism in the situation to support community to register their CCAs. For the definition of the ICCA, participants mostly mentioned: the places where production and living are closely related to the community, the local people as the subjects of natural conservation, the long-term conservation mechanism for the community, respecting community's culture, environment, economy and education, the co-existence of cultural diversity and biodiversity, human-centered settlement communities, common resources, culture, and joint management. This is in line with IUCN's definition: Community Conserved Areas are "natural and modified ecosystems including significant biodiversity, ecological services and cultural values voluntarily conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities through customary laws or other effective means". Hugu emphasized that although the ICCA Consortium used such a definition, it was abstract and written language, and it was basically similar to the relationship between the people and the land just mentioned by the villagers, encouraging the indigenous people to use their own methods to define the CCA.

With regard to how to conduct peer review mechanism for CCA registry in China, the participants think that Liguang's scoring sheet was very applicable. It measures whether or not community fully participate, how the community become the main body of the CCA, how resources are allocated, and whether there are specific indicators or standards and etc. The peer review process for Liguang CCA can later be used as a reference to other CCAs' assessment. However, China has a vast territory; each locality should conduct peer review according to local conditions. Under this macro framework, each community may set the content to be assessed according to its own circumstances. This macro framework includes whether or not the community is the subjects, whether or not there is governance mechanism

in place, and whether it protects cultural diversity and biodiversity. The specific content of the assessment requires the community to summarize and demonstrate by itself. This is the consensus of this meeting.

Conclusion

The registration and the peer review of the Liguang CCA spent around three months in total. The participants included the community representatives, NGOs, researchers, and the media. In summary, there are mainly the following aspects:

Community conserved areas are self-claimed by the communities. Their registration is based on the community's own needs and determined through the community's collective discussions and decisions, making sure it is publicized, informed, and voluntary. NGOs provide necessary assistance. This specific procedures and materials in this area are relatively complete and mature.

The peer review is the key part, and it is due to the fact that the peer review work is still in its infancy and exploration status in China. Different parties have different understandings of the purpose of peer review, which also leads to differences in the review process and content. Combining the actual situation, ICCA's "Peer Review Mechanism" focuses on the peer's testimony of the community's conserved areas, aiming to verify truth and false, not to judge whether it is good or not. The Assessment Scoring Sheet used in the peer review of Liguang CCA played a role in the community self-governance assessment programme. It fully demonstrated the motivation, conservation targets, establishment process, and protection effect of the CCA to its peers, making peer review process more applicable.

Peer review mechanism of CCAs should not be unified and there is no standard. The final discussion reached a preliminary consensus on the basic forms of peer review. Peer review includes the following frameworks: whether it is a community-centered, whether community governance mechanism is in place, whether it protects cultural diversity and biodiversity. Based on this macro-framework, the community decides to share and display the contents of the community.

自由、事先和知情同意书

为加强社区保护地（ICCA）了解的全球注册系统

我们代表 曙光村 【填写社区名称】（以下简称“我们的社区保护地社区”）传统社区或土著居民，作为 曙光自然保护地 【填写社区保护地名称】（以下简称“我们的社区保护地”）传统权利的所有者，签署本知情同意书，确认知晓以下事项：

- ◆ 我们的社区保护地社区愿意向由UNEP-WCMA管理的ICCA注册系统提供信息；
- ◆ 这一决定是建立在：
 - (a) 根据我们已经阅读并理解的由ICCA注册系统说明（可登录www.iccaregistry.org获取）提供的信息，以及
 - (b) 遵循我们日常的商议机制，展开了适当的讨论和咨询。
- ◆ 丽江健康研究中心 【填写信息提供者姓名】依据本知情书被授权向ICCA注册系统提供信息数据和信息，但我们也可随时指派其他个人或机构向ICCA注册系统提供数据和信息；
- ◆ 我们知道参加ICCA注册系统是完全自愿的；
- ◆ 我们知道我们可以随时撤销我们对ICCA注册系统提供的任何信息，且无需做任何解释和承担任何后果；一旦我们申请撤销，我们的信息也将从ICCA注册系统记录中被撤销，并且不会被用于今后的任何分析中；
- ◆ 我们向ICCA注册系统提供数据和信息是基于我们能继续持有被法律认可的知识产权。上述知识产权不会因我们向ICCA注册系统提供数据和信息，而被UNEP-WCMA或其他ICCA伙伴占有的前提；
- ◆ 我们向ICCA注册系统提供数据和信息是基于UNEP-WCMA、其他ICCA伙伴或其他第三方不会把这些数据和信息用作商业用途的前提；我们向ICCA注册系统提供数据和信息是基于有关个人的敏感信息和保密信息不会被公开、发表或提供给任何其他机构，除非事先经过我们的书面许可的前提；
- ◆ 我们知道如果我们对ICCA注册系统的运作、关于我们提供的数据和信息的使用或对ICCA注册系统有任何意见或问题，我们可以联系注册系统经理，他将会本着寻求双方认可的恰当解决方案的宗旨，来讨论我们的问题或意见；
- ◆ 我们知道ICCA注册系统的目标及信息如何被使用。我们知道ICCA注册系统对于数据和信息的使用有不同等级。数据和信息有可能通过世界保护区数据库向公众公开提供（遵守相关条款<http://www.protectedplanet.net/termsandconditions>）；或通过加密保护；或仅向ICCA注册系统经理提供。我们向ICCA注册系统提供信息是基于我们可以根据信息类型，设置不同的开放等级。

ICCA信息的使用

同意以何种方式分享您所提供的信息，请在相应的□内打勾。

信息的类型	可从世界保护区数据库获取	可从ICCA注册系统获取	仅向ICCA注册系统经理或经过事先批准的人提供	仅向ICCA注册系统经理提供
关于社区保护地的总体或描述信息 (特别是关于社区保护地的面积、社区、特殊物种、生境和/或基因资源【动/植物】及其利用)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
位置数据 (社区保护地中心点的经度和纬度)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
社区保护地的范围 (可提供地理信息系统图层或纸质地图、出版物或网站上的地图)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
照片、视频或其他多媒体资料	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
补充说明				

*使用世界保护区数据库中的信息需遵守相关条款(<http://www.protectedplanet.net/termsandconditions>)



聚光村

社区名称 (和签字代表姓名)

签名

2018年2月5日

日期

此同意书的副本将在社区和UNEP-WCMC社区保护地系统经理处各存一份。本表也可在线填写

<http://www.iccaregistry.org/en/contribute>.

Annex 3: Liguang CCA Peer Review Programme and Process

A. Peer Review Programme

1. Form of Assessment

The peer review combines site visit and review meeting. Community takes the lead of the peer review and external experts participate as well.

Site visit: Representatives from Liguang Community assisted the assessment group in the investigation of the CCA, and the assessment group scored according to the actual circumstances.

Review meeting: The representative from the Liguang Community introduced the specific conditions of the CCA. The reviewers asked question and score one by one according to the review content.

The final score is synthesized based on the two scores from CCA representative and outside experts. A recommendation to ICCA registry will be made if the final score is 60 points or above.

2. Personnel Composition and Responsibilities

a) The review panel and members

The peers are people related to CCAs (both the villagers and the experts) across the country, who served as peer reviewers, and they formed the review panel to elect one member as the chairperson.

The chairperson of the panel will coordinate and synthesize the opinions and suggestions of the panel, announce the final scores, and propose corresponding improvements.

The peer reviewers are responsible for verifying the current conditions of the Liguang CCA, asking for specific details, visiting the Liguang CCA, and scoring according to the scoring sheet.

The number and selection of reviewers: 8-10 people, depending on the circumstances. The ratio of villagers and experts should keep the same, depending on the situation. In conjunction with the assessment of the social and regional conditions of the conserved areas, an appropriate proportion of villagers are from local or neighboring areas. Among these reviewers, experts' scores weight 30%, and villagers' scores weight 70%.

b) Observation teams and members

The observation team is made up of members, watching the review process and understanding the actual situation of the Liguang CCA; or make assessment or suggestions on the Liguang CCA.

c) Representative from the Liguang CCA

In particular, these representative from the conserved areas, responsible for introducing to the specific circumstances of their CCA, the effect of conservation, and management methods of the Liguang CCA. At the same time, these representatives need to answer the questions from the panel truthfully, providing the necessary supporting materials to assist both the reviewers and the observers to understand the community.

d) Assistant staff

Moderator: elected from the observation team or the panel, responsible for facilitating the meeting according to the schedule.

Score statisticians: two members familiar with the scoring rules are elected within the observation team to review and calculate scores.

3. Assessment Content

The content of the assessment includes four major items: the motivation of conservation, the conservation target, the process of developing a CCA, and the effect of conservation and management of the CCA. These contents should be determined by the representatives of the local villagers in this area. The relevant indicators are as follows:

1. Motivation of Conservation
2. Conservation Targets
 - 2.1 Comprehensive Conservation
 - 2.2 Specific Species Conservation
3. The Process of Developing a CCA
 - 3.1 Public Discussion
 - 3.1.1 Meeting Participation Rate
 - 3.1.2 Meeting Type
 - 3.1.3 Whether the Discussion is Sufficient
 - 3.2 Organization Mechanism of a CCA
 - 3.2.1 Whether there is a Community-centered Management Organization
 - 3.2.2 Whether there is a Clear Division of Tasks and Responsibilities
 - 3.2.3 How Management Mechanism are Generated
 - 3.2.4 Whether there is Projects and Activities that Support Their Operation

3.3 Management System of CCA

3.3.1 Whether there is a Clear Conservation System

3.3.2 Whether the System Meet Community Reality

3.3.3 Ratio of Community Households Participating in the Maintenance System.

3.3.4 Whether the System Have Continuous Improvement and Discussion Mechanism

3.4 Implementation of CCA System

3.4.1 Proportion of Responsible Individuals for CCA in the entire Community

3.4.2 Whether there is a Mechanism to Ensure that Community Members Perform their Duties

3.4.3 Whether there are Clear Incentives and Penalties Mechanisms

4. Effectiveness of Conservation and Management

4.1 Environmental Benefits

4.1.1 Violation Incidence Rate

4.1.2 Field Research

4.2 Economic Benefits

4.2.1 Whether the CCA Affect Villagers' Income

4.2.2 Whether there are Effective Mechanisms to Ensure Villagers' Benefits from Conservation

4.2.3 Benefit Ratio

4.3 Cultural Conservation

4. The Scoring Rules

Out of 100 points, the final score of 60 points and above is recommended to register for the ICCA registry system.

Ratings are taken in an anonymous manner.

The reviewers scores according to the scoring rules or notes, and shall not exceed the rules or score limits. Otherwise, the score of the reviewers is considered to be abandoned and points are not counted.

The Review and Calculation of Scores: two people outside of the panel and the Liguang community. One person is responsible for verifying that the score is valid and the other one is responsible for calculating the score. When the score violation found, it need to be reported to

the chairperson of the panel, and the chairperson of the panel would deem it as obsolete upon confirmation. The final score would be handed over to the chairperson of the panel for publication.

The Final Score is calculated in the following ways: the average score of the villagers' effective score *70% + the average of the experts' effective score*30%.

Score calculations are rounded to the nearest 0.1.

B the Peer review Process of the Liguang CCA

1. The Review Time: Wednesday, March 28, and Thursday, March 29, 2018

2. The Review Venue: Liguang CCA, Liguang Village, Liming Township, Yulong County, Lijiang City, Yunnan Province, China

3. Participants: Community Representatives, Peer Reviewers, Observers, and etc.

4. Review Process:

4.1 Process Introduction

Time: Morning, March 28th

Content: Introduction of the background, purpose, participants, and matters that need to be completed, rules, etc.

4.2 Site Visits

Time: Afternoon, March 28th

Form of Visit: The group of peer reviewer and observers visited the conserved areas of 3-5 different communities to investigate and talk to community members in different communities to obtain an initial understanding of the situation and prepare for the review meeting.

Choosing Communities: Random selection can be made by drawing lots; taking into account local traffic problems, the community can also be selected by reviewers and observers.

After completed the site visits, both reviewers and observers returned to the meeting point.

4.3 Peer Review Meeting

Time: Morning, March 29th

Form: Meeting. The specific process is as following:

- Meeting preparation, introduction of participants;
- The facilitator introduces the background and process of the review;

- The Liguang community representatives introduce the current situation of the conservation areas and displays the results of self-assessment;
- The peer reviewers and observers ask questions about the CCA based on the site visit and information obtained at the meeting, and scored;
- Scores statistician review and calculate the scores;
- Chairperson of the panel announces scores and decisions, analyze the strengths and weakness of Liguang CCA, or makes recommendations
- Reviewers, observers, and community representatives shared their thoughts and discusses
- The facilitator announces the end of the peer review meeting and group photo taking;

5. Review Summary

Time: Afternoon, March 29th

The Main Content: The reviewers and observation team members combined the review process, discussed and analyzed the issues, and further improve and supplement of the peer review mechanism for later review of other conserved areas.

Annex 4: Liguang ICCA Review Criteria and Score Sheet

Assessment Indicator	Assessment Standard	Score	Remarks
<p>I. Motivation of Conservation (10 Points)</p>	<p>Subjective Judgment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conserved areas formed by local beliefs and traditions; 2. To satisfy community residents' living, producing and sustainable development; 3. In response to government policies or laws and regulations, spontaneously formed by the villagers; 4. Due to the intervention and leading formation of external forces; 		<p>The first part examines the direct cause of the conservation, and whether the necessity is sufficient, subjective assessment by way of question and answers, with scores between 0 and 10 Points.</p>
<p>II. Conservation Targets (15 Points)</p>			
<p>2.1 Comprehensive Conservation</p>	<p>Subjective Judgment: Plants, Animals, Water Resources, and etc. in the Conserved Area;</p>		<p>Scoring based on the comprehensiveness of the conservation, with scores between 9 and 15 Points.</p>

2.2 Conservation of Specific Species	Subjective Judgment: The value of Specific Protected Species;		Scoring based on the importance of specific species, with scores between 4 and 10 Points.
III. The Process of Developing a Conserved Area (45 Points)			
3.1 Public Discussion			
3.1.1 Meeting Participation Rate	Participation Rate 0-49%, 0 Point; Participation Rate 50%-66%, 1 Point; Participation Rate 67%-99%, 2 Points; Participation Rate 100%, 3 Points;		Percentage of households participated in conservation based on the number of household signed the final village regulation agreement.
3.1.2 Meeting Type	Meetings organized for administrative order, 1 Point; Meetings organized by outside parties, 2 Points; Meetings organized by community itself, 3 Points;		
3.1.3 Whether the Discussion is Sufficient	Hold Villager Meeting once, 1 Points; Hold Villager Meetings 2-3 times, 2 Points; Hold Villager Meetings 4-5 times, 3 Points; Hold Villager Meetings more than 5 times, 4 Points;		Number of meetings organized by community members themselves
3.2 Organization Mechanism of CCA			
3.2.1 Whether there is a	No, 0 Point;		

Community-centered Management Organization	Yes, 3 Points;		
3.2.2 Whether there is a Clear Division of Tasks and Responsibility	No, 0 Point; Yes, 3 Points;		
3.2.3 How Management Organizations are Generated	Appointed by Outside Partiers or Leaders, 0 Point; Community Autonomous Democratic Election, 3 Points;		
3.2.4 Whether there is Projects and Activities that Support their Operation	None, 0 Point; Formed by External Input, 1 Point; Formed by the Community itself, 3 Points;		
3.3 Management System of CCA			
3.3.1 Whether There is a Clear Conservation System	No, 0 Point; Yes, 3 Points;		
3.3.2 Whether the System Meet Community's Reality	No, 0 Points; Yes, 3 Points;		
3.3.3 Ratio of Community Households Participating in the Management System	Participation Rate 0-49%, 0 Point; Participation Rate 50%-66%, 1 Point; Participation Rate 67%-99%, 2 Points;		Ratio of household participating in conservation

	Participation Rate 100%, 3 Points;		
3.3.4 Whether the System Have Continuous Improvement and Discussion Mechanism	No, 0 Point; Yes, 3 Points;		
3.4 Implementation of CCA system			
3.4.1 Proportion of Responsible Individuals for CCA in the entire Community	Participation Rate 0-49%, 0 Point; Participation Rate 50%-66%, 1 Point; Participation Rate 67%-99%, 2 Points; Participation Rate 100%, 3 Points;		The percentage of households participated in conservation; refer to the village regulations or other relevant decision making resolution.
3.4.2 Whether there is a Mechanism to Ensure Community Members Perform their Duties	No, 0 Point; Yes, 4 Points;		
3.4.3 Whether there are Clear Incentives and Penalties Mechanisms	No, 0 Point; Yes, 3 Points;		
IV. Effectiveness of Conservation and Management (30 Points)			
4.1 Environmental Benefits			

<p>4.1.1 Violation Incidence Rate</p> <p>4.1.2 Site Visit</p>	<p>Decrease By 49% or Less, 0 Point; Decrease By 50%-59%, 1 Point; Decrease By 60%-69%, 2 Points; Decrease By 70%-79%, 3 Points; Decrease By 80%-89%, 4 Points; Decrease By 90%-99%, 5 Points; Decrease By 100%, 6 Points;</p> <p>Subjective Judgment: Forest Vegetation, Rivers, Community Waste management, Species, etc.</p>		<p>Using the data provided by relevant government departments, including the number of violation incidents before the establishment of conserved areas and after, calculating the reduction rate.</p> <p>Materials are prepared by the community.</p> <p>Scoring based on the actual investigation and inquiries from local residents, with scores from 0 to 6 Points.</p>
<p>4.2 Economic Benefits</p>			
<p>4.2.1 Whether the CCA Affects Community's Income</p>	<p>Conservation reduces economic income, 0 Point; Conservation has not brought economic gains or losses, 3 Points; Conservation increases community's income, 6 Points;</p>		
<p>4.2.2 Whether there are Effective Mechanisms to Ensure Community Benefits from Conservation</p>	<p>No, 0 Point; Yes, 3 Points;</p>		

<p>4.2.3 Benefit Ratio of Community Member</p> <p>4.3 Cultural Conservation</p>	<p>Benefit Ratio 0-29%, 1 Point; Benefit Ratio 30%-59%, 2 Points; Benefit Ratio 60%-89%, 3 Points; Benefit Ratio 90% and above, 4 Points;</p> <p>Whether it is conducive to promoting the community's self-confidence, identity and self-governance, and to what degree the benefit would be, 0-5 Points;</p>		<p>Number of beneficiary households of total community households</p> <p>Reviewer's subjective judgment</p>
--	--	--	---