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Currently, collaborative and community-based approaches to natural resources management are being widely promoted in the United States. They are manifested in the increasing numbers of partnerships, consensus groups, community-based collaboratives, watershed councils, and similar groups that are involved in natural resources management. In this report, the movement is referred to as collaborative conservation, but it goes by many different names, including community-based ecosystem management, grassroots ecosystem management, community forestry, community-based conservation, and coordinated resources management.

As the collaborative conservation movement has grown, a broad body of literature has both informed and commented upon its expansion. The literature is diverse, coming from many different disciplines, each with its own publications, theoretical constructs, and jargon. This makes for stimulating interactions between different perspectives but also creates some degree of confusion. There is no one database or set of keywords to search, and even the literature that focuses specifically on collaborative conservation uses a bewildering range of terms and approaches.

The aim of this document is to bring together a selected, representative sampling of the literature to give the interested reader a beginning on which to base further investigations.

This collection began as a briefing paper for a workshop of the Consortium for Research and Assessment of Community-based Collaboratives, held in Tucson, Arizona, in October 1999. The workshop was organized and hosted by the Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy at The University of Arizona and the Institute for Environmental Negotiation at the University of Virginia. Members of the consortium were asked to identify the works they felt were most relevant to discussions of collaborative and community-based conservation. Thus, the initial version of this review was built from their lists of recommended sources.

A second, much abbreviated version of this report has been published as an appendix in Across the Great Divide: Explorations in Collaborative Conservation in the American West (Brick et al. 2000) and incorporates the suggestions of several of the book’s authors. This final, expanded version brings together both of these earlier efforts and supplements them with additional works chosen by the authors. As such, this review represents a synthesis of the recommendations of people with a wide range of personal, professional, and academic backgrounds.

The review is presented in two sections. The first section looks at the different theories that have informed the development of collaborative conservation. While the works cited in this section may not directly mention collaborative conservation, they all present ideas that have been used to develop, justify, and understand it. The second section includes literature that deals explicitly with collaborative conservation as practiced in the United States. Some citations are included several times, so that each section can stand on its own.
Collaborative Conservation In Theory

Collaborative conservation draws upon theories of democracy, international development, and alternative dispute resolution. It can be associated with critical theorists who have developed models of ideal communication, wildlife managers looking for ways to give local communities incentives to stop poaching, essayists exploring how we are shaped by the landscapes we live in, and economic developers searching for sustainable livelihoods for rural communities. The following sections introduce some of the principal lines of thought that relate to collaborative conservation and list sources that the interested reader can refer to to learn more about each area.

International Experiences

Collaborative conservation in the United States has been referred to as an idea that originated overseas and is now taking hold in North America. Both “participatory development” and “community-based conservation” are concepts that are widely used in the international development arena. Today there is considerable interest in the ways that groups manage communally held property, and comanagement—where local people and government agencies share management responsibilities—is widely promoted.

Participatory Development and Community-based Resource Management

Over the last few decades, development theorists have come to emphasize that local participation in project development is a key element of any successful community development project (e.g. Chambers 1997; Korten and Klauss 1994; Uphoff, Esman, and Krishna 1998).

Specific interest in community-based natural resources management has grown out of increased recognition of: 1) local peoples’ direct dependence on surrounding natural resources, 2) the relevance of indigenous knowledge of natural resources management, and 3) the frequent inability of resource-poor and/or corrupt national and state governments to effectively manage natural resources.

Since the mid-1980s, there have been many efforts to implement projects that help local communities manage and benefit from nearby natural resources. Recent publications provide critical analyses of the international efforts (Agarwal and Gibson, 1999, Brosius et. al. 1998).

Common Property Management

Recent research into common property management systems emphasizes the often effective role local institutions have played in sustainable natural resources management in virtually all parts of the world. This research has led to a reassessment of the way “the tragedy of the commons” has been used to justify state control of natural resources and to support assertions that community involvement can improve the management of natural resources.

Researchers are striving to understand why some management systems, whether formal or informal, work well while others do not. This has led to the development of new methods for analyzing management systems to identify the rules, institutions, and incentives associated with successful management systems (Kenney and Lord 1999; Ostrom, Gardner, and Walker 1994).

Comanagement

All of these factors have come together in the widespread promotion of comanagement—the sharing of decisionmaking authority by local resource users and state and national governments—as a way to manage resources.

While much of the common property literature focuses on indigenous management systems that are often not recognized by the state, comanagement focuses on establishing productive partnerships between resource users, local communities, and government bodies. The current interest in collaborative approaches to managing public lands in the United States can be seen as a domestic effort at comanagement (e.g. Paulson 1998).

Democratic Theory

Participatory, or direct, democracy has also gained in popularity in recent decades. Collaborative conservation efforts are frequently used as examples of this form of governance, which is based on the ideal that all citizens actively participate in government processes through active debate. Procedural justice is the idea that people who participate in rulemaking are more likely to accept unfavorable outcomes based on those rules. Social capital—the capacity for citizens...
to work together for the common good—is often identified as both a prerequisite for and a product of collaborative efforts.

**Participatory Democracy**

Participatory democracy proponents (Barber 1984; Morone 1990; Pateman 1970; Press 1994) draw from aspects of both critical theory and pluralism in their calls to better involve citizens in policymaking. Moote, Mcclaran, and Chickering (1997) identified some of the basic tenets of participatory democracy theory as applied to planning efforts: 1) that everyone who might be affected by or have an interest in the plan be involved; 2) that all interests be encouraged to discuss their needs, concerns, and values; 3) that the public be involved continuously through all stages of planning and decisionmaking; and 4) that decisionmaking authority be shared among all participants.

Both pluralism and critical theory state that classic rational decisionmaking processes cannot produce effective solutions in situations where conflicting goals and values predominate. But where pluralists rely on competition between different interests to produce the optimal compromise (e.g. Rescher 1993), critical theorists call for improved communication among conflicting interests.

Critical theory argues that the ideal of communicative rationality—where people attempt to come to an understanding among themselves “free from deception, self-deception, strategic behavior and domination through the exercise of power” (Dryzek 1990 p. 14; see also Habermas 1984)—needs to be a part of the decisionmaking process.

Collaborative groups frequently represent efforts to incorporate elements of this “ideal speech” into the policy process. In addition to the claims that effective public participation is necessary to create more effective public policy, some policy analysts assert that one of the criteria on which all forms of public policy should be judged is the degree to which their implementation promotes democratic ideals (Schneider and Ingram 1997).

Collaborative efforts, though often focused on narrow topics, have been promoted as ways to teach broader democratic ideals. Some authors have made the link between democratic theory and environmental management explicit (e.g. John 1994; Mathews 1996; Shannon 1993; Weber 1998, 1999; Williams and Matheny 1995).

**Procedural Justice**

The concept of procedural justice—the idea that people who participate in rulemaking are more likely to accept unfavorable outcomes based on those rules—has also been influential as a rationale for increased community involvement in decision making.


**Social Capital**

The concept of social capital has been rapidly adopted by many disciplines. Putnam (1995) defines it as “features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit” (p. 67). Social capital is featured in discussions of collaborative conservation as both a prerequisite for effective collaborative processes and a potential product of collaborating.


**Public Participation in Planning**

Another body of literature looks more closely at how existing mechanisms of public participation have functioned in environmental and natural resources planning efforts. Since the 1970s, federal law has mandated the inclusion of the public in environmental and federal lands planning, and there have been several efforts to assess such participatory processes.

Critics of the planning processes typically used by land-management agencies have promoted collaborative processes as alternatives or supplements to hearings, public comment periods, and other existing means of incorporating the public in planning efforts (Cortner and Shannon 1993; Richard and Burns 1998a; Shands 1991; Sirmon et al. 1993; Wellman and Tipple 1990).


Mattessich and Monsey (1992) and London (1995) both provide succinct introductions to this literature. Chrislip and Larson (1994) present a model of collaboration that is frequently cited by advocates of collaborative conservation. Selin and Chavez (1995) use these general theories to explain the stages in the development of collaborative groups addressing natural resource issues.


Theories of Collaboration

Collaborative conservation draws on theories of collaboration that have been developed both in the fields of organizational behavior, public administration, and community psychology, and through practical experiences with collaborative processes in business, government, and nonprofit sectors.

The works of Barbara Gray, which outline a model to explain when and how collaborative efforts develop, are perhaps the best known. She defines collaboration as “a process through which parties who see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible” (Gray 1989: 5).

Community Dynamics and Development

In recent decades, the fields of economic and community development and planning have increasingly focused on fostering the basic conditions of successful communities. Collaborative community-based visioning and strategic planning are being widely applied in efforts to increase social capital, build community capacity, and improve the quality of life in communities of all sizes.
A number of collaborative efforts dealing with natural resources issues have grown out of community-based strategic planning efforts, and organizations like The Sonoran Institute and The Nature Conservancy’s Center for Compatible Economic Development promote this approach. Authors make the link between practical community development efforts and the pursuit of environmental sustainability explicit (e.g. Ford Foundation 1999; Frentz et al. 1999; Howe et al. 1997; Johnson 1993; Schweke and Weinreb 1997).

On a more theoretical level, rural sociologists have helped redefine how community well-being is assessed (Kusel 1996) and increase understanding of the dynamics of poverty, exploitation, and internal colonialism that many collaborative efforts strive to redress (Freudenburg and Gramling 1994; Peluso et al. 1994a; Rural Sociological Society Task Force on Persistent Rural Poverty 1993). The volume edited by Lee (1990) specifically addresses the connections between communities and forest resources.


Sense of Place and Community

A number of scholars have looked at both the role of community in shaping our sense of social responsibility and interdependence, and the way “sense of place” informs our relationship to the landscapes in which we live. Their work has been broadly influenced by theories of democracy and social capital, literary ideas about how our sense of community and place shape us, and populist interest in neighborhood and small-town self-governance. Collaborative conservation is often seen as a natural extension of this community-based vision.
Critiques of Federal Land Management Agencies

Federal agencies are often portrayed as inefficient bureaucracies, and many authors promote devolving federal power to more local levels or using alternate management strategies, several of them based in free market approaches (Fretwell 1999; Hirt 1994; Nelson 1995, 1999; O’Toole 1988, 1999). Some have used criticisms of the agencies as justification for the use of alternative collaborative approaches (e.g. Forest Options Group 1998; Harrington and Hartwell 1999).

Devolution of Federal Powers

Recent American politics have included efforts to devolve federal powers to state and local governments and to private entities. Devolution of federal government’s responsibilities to the states has led to increasing interest in promoting collaboration among federal, state, and local governments; nongovernmental organizations; and communities (Kingsley 1996), though this concept has not been without controversy (eg. Coggins 1998b).


Sagebrush Rebellion & Wise Use Movement

A number of collaborative efforts exist in political climates where the sentiments that led to the Sagebrush Rebellion remain strong, and these have been presented as compromise solutions that recognize a critical role for local voices without granting absolute local control. At the same time, some of the strongest criticisms of collaboration come

from environmental interests who see collaborative and community-based efforts as generally co-opted by local interests. Understanding the Wise Use, county supremacy, and property rights movements helps make sense of the political scene in which collaborative conservation exists today.


**Alternative Dispute Resolution**

Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) has its roots in international peacemaking and labor negotiations but is now commonly used in efforts to resolve environmental and natural resource policy disputes.

Many collaborative efforts started as attempts to resolve specific conflicts and move beyond the polarized interest politics so prevalent in the natural resources arena. ADR practitioners often emphasize the role of consensus-based decisionmaking (Jones 1994; Ozawa 1991), a key feature of many collaborative groups.

Proponents of collaboration sometimes draw on the ideas of transformative mediators, who see the dispute resolution process as an opportunity to build community capacity and remake the relationships between stakeholders (e.g. Burgess and Burgess 1996; Dukes 1993). There is now a broad literature focusing on ADR.


**Environmental Conflict Resolution**

Today environmental conflict resolution (ECR) - alternative dispute resolution focused on environmental issues - is a field unto itself, with a substantial literature (see Scharf's 1997 annotated bibliography). The nascent efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of ECR efforts offer models for those interested in evaluating other forms of collaborative conservation (d'Estree and Colby 2000; Innes and Booher 1999; Sipe 1998). Critics of environmental mediation strive to understand how it fits into the broader political land-
scape and what the implications are for different interest groups (Amy 1987). Buckles’ edited volume questions whether conflict interventions undermine local strategies for conflict management. Some argue that the very nature of environmental mediation works in favor of state and industry interests (Modavi 1996).


Ecosystem Management

Early conceptions of ecosystem management emphasized the need to coordinate natural resources decisionmaking across different land ownerships and administrative boundaries. However, they often did not specify how such coordination was to occur (Grumbine 1994) or focused specifically on the legal mandates for coordination (Keiter 1994).

Others have responded by including collaborative approaches as an essential feature of ecosystem management (Cortner and Moote 1999; Gunderson, Holling, and Light 1995; Keystone Center 1996; Sample et al. 1995). The connection to ecosystem management is explicit in two recently coined names for collaborative conservation: “community-based ecosystem management” (Gray, Enzer, and Kusel 2000) and “grass-roots ecosystem management” (Weber 2000).

Adaptive Management

Adaptive management—which emphasizes an experimental, iterative approach to decisionmaking—is closely linked to the idea of ecosystem management. The public is considered to have an essential role to play in adaptive management, and collaborative groups have been promoted as a forum through which the public can participate in adaptive management (Kusel et al. 1996a; McLain and Lee 1996).

Watershed Management

While the principles of watershed management are quite similar to those of ecosystem management, watershed management has retained its own identity and focus on the watershed as a unifying concept in cross-jurisdictional natural resources management. While not all watershed-management groups are collaborative in nature, they constitute a large portion of the collaborative efforts in the United States. Several works related to watershed groups are cited in the second part of this document.

Collaborative Conservation in Practice

As interest in collaborative conservation grows, researchers are paying more and more attention to what many are calling a new environmental movement. “Community-based,” “consensus,” and “collaborative” all achieved buzz-word status sometime in the 1990s, and publications about these topics appear with increasing regularity.

Authors writing about collaborative conservation come from a wide range of backgrounds and have used a diverse array of research methods. Some work is grounded in extensive fieldwork, involving techniques that range from quantitative analysis of survey data to participant observation.

Other work explores ideas and issues raised by collaborative conservation. Publication venues include law reviews and journals such as Professional Geographer, Administration and Society, Environmental Management, and the Journal of Forestry. Since 1996, the Chronicle of Community has provided an excellent forum for discussions of collaborative conservation in the western United States. While a growing body of work appears in peer-reviewed journals, much of the documentation and analysis of collaborative conservation is in the gray literature. Some of it is accessible mainly through word-of-mouth.

This literature addresses a wide range of issues. Some authors look at specific questions about collaborative processes themselves, while others evaluate how collaborative efforts affect democratic governance, delve into the details of legal authorities, or assess power dynamics in collaborative groups.

In this review, the literature is divided into a number of broad categories: 1) overviews, 2) case studies, 3) classifications and catalogues, 4) criticisms, 5) evaluations, and 6) facilitating and inhibiting factors. Some works may be mentioned in multiple categories.

Overviews

Overviews of collaborative conservation are found in several different forms. Below, general overviews are divided out by type of publication. The next sections identify overviews that are specific to distinct types of collaborative conservation.

Popular Press Overviews

Public interest in collaborative conservation has grown tremendously over the last decade, and overviews of the movement can be found in the popular news media (Krist 1998) and specialized publications like High Country News (High Country News 1999; Jones 1996), in books that use a number of case studies to promote collaborative processes (Bernard and Young 1997; Dagget 1995; Montana Consensus Council 1995), in political speeches (Kitzhaber 1998), on the Web, in agency flyers (U.S. Forest Service 1998a), and in a special issue of American Forests (1998), among others.


Academic Overviews

Researchers’ interest in collaborative conservation is growing (see Moote et al. 2000). McKinney (1999) and Fairfax et al. (1999) strive to describe the historical context of the current interest in collaborative conservation in the West. Weber (2000) describes the tenets of grassroots ecosystem management, which he considers a new form of the environmental movement. Wondolleck and Yaffee (2000), Gray et al. (2001), and
Brick et al. (2000) give overviews of the movement. Duane (1997) includes a brief but thoughtful overview of the ideas behind collaborative collaboration and presents a model that identifies four distinct kinds of conflicts. Selin and Chavez (1995) apply broad-based collaborative theory to natural resources issues, identify situations that are conducive to collaboration, and present a model that identifies distinct stages in the development of collaborative efforts. Coughlin et al. (1998) provide an overview of the growth of collaborative conservation, identify the arguments for and against collaborative approaches, and then examine how these pros and cons have played out in a number of case studies.


**Coordinated Resource Management**

Coordinated resource management (CRM), with roots in work by the Soil Conservation Service (SCS, now the Natural Resources Conservation Service, NRCS) in the 1950s, was one of the first models for collaborative natural resources management. Since the 1970s, it has been applied and promoted by the SCS, the Bureau of Land Management, the Society for Range Management, and others.

CRM is a consensus process that emphasizes face-to-face interactions between stakeholders during the formulation and implementation of management plans. Anderson and Baum (1988) give an overview of the process, while Cleary and Phillippi (1993) give detailed guidance to participants and conveners. Paulson (1998) describes how CRM has been used in Wyoming and concludes that while CRM groups have often helped reduce “overlay conflict” due to misunderstandings, they generally have not helped resolve conflicts where participants’ values and interests clearly conflict.

Kruse (1995) evaluates the success of CRM processes, while Moote et al. (1997) evaluate the degree to which a CRM process actually incorporated the tenets of participatory democracy.
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Landcare

Landcare is a community-based program developed in Australia that has been held up as one of the most successful examples of collaborative conservation in the developed world. Campbell (1995) gives an overview of the Landcare movement and describes a typical Landcare group as “a voluntary group of (usually rural) people working together to develop more sustainable systems of land management.”

Ewing (1999) identifies a number of challenges that Landcare groups have faced, including the difficulty of equitably delineating membership on decisionmaking bodies, finding adequate funding, and coordinating administrative processes.


Collaborative Learning

Collaborative learning is a model for participatory planning and management processes that has been widely used in Forest Service planning activities in the Northwest. It draws from communications and systems theory, and promotes an iterative planning process that aims to facilitate learning by all participants. The emphasis is on learning and improving the situation rather than reaching consensus.

• Carr et al. (1998) report on surveys of supervisors of all the national forests and of 15 interest groups that assessed participants’ opinions of Forest Service collaborative planning efforts. Wondolleck and Yaffee (1994) also surveyed Forest Service personnel and other participants in collaborative planning processes, in addition to cataloguing 230 partnership efforts, presenting 35 case studies, and discussing factors that facilitated and/or inhibited the collaborative processes and their outcomes.

How-to Guides

Several handbooks and guides have been written to assist people facilitating or participating in collaborative processes. Some focus on specific models of the collaborative process (Cleary and Phillippi 1993) or on collaboration involving specific agencies (Ringgold 1998) or specific resources (Luscher 1996; Oregon State Extension Service 1998), while others provide more general guidance.


Case Studies

Case studies provide an excellent window onto collaborative conservation in practice on the ground, and more are being written each year. Most case studies describe the development and outcomes of one or two specific collaborative efforts, while a few describe a number of different efforts (e.g. Cestero 1999; Coughlin et al. 1999; Moseley 1999).

A few case studies are notable for the analytic frameworks that they apply (e.g. Cestero 1999; Coughlin et al. 1999; Duane 1997; Kenney and Lord 1999; Moore 1994; Moote, McClaran, and Chickering 1997). Some collaborative groups have received considerable publicity but have not been the subject of scholarly inquiry, while a few can count numerous theses and dissertations among the results of their collaboration. Those presented here are only a sampling of the many available.
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Catalogs and Classification Systems

A few research efforts have gone beyond the simple case-study approach in their attempts to catalogue numerous collaborative efforts and analyze their salient features. Coughlin et al. (1999) recently compiled a database with information on 450 collaborative partnerships, The New Watershed Source Book (Kenney et al. 2000) identifies 346 different watershed management groups; includes cases studies and a statistical analysis for 117 of these; and discusses the range of contexts, purposes, and institutional structures that exist among them.

Ecosystem Management in the United States (Yaffee et al. 1996) identifies 619 ecosystem management efforts and includes brief case studies of 105 of them. Based on this sample, the authors provide an analysis of the characteristics of the projects, the factors that have facilitated and inhibited their progress, and lessons drawn from them that can be applied to future efforts. In Building Bridges Across Agency Boundaries, Wondolleck and Yaffee (1994) take a similar approach to cataloguing Forest Service partnerships.
Beyond the Hundredth Meeting (Cestero 1999) develops a classification system that divides groups into place-based and interest-based groups, including watershed groups, dialogue groups, partnerships, mediations and negotiations, advisory councils, and collaborative advocacy groups. Selin and Chavez (1995) identify four types of collaborative designs: appreciative planning (collaboration limited to information exchanges), partnerships, dialogues, and negotiated settlements.

Coughlin et al. (1999) describe a number of different axes along which collaborative groups can be described, while Griffin (1999) identifies salient characteristics of watershed groups. Kenney and Lord (1999) apply the institutional analysis and design approach pioneered by Elinor Ostrom to distinguish between different types of conflicts and collaborative institutions.


Criticism

Collaborative efforts are regularly subject to criticism. Most critics are environmental activists who perceive collaborative efforts as inefficient and/or dangerous attempts to assert local, often industry, control over natural resources (Benson 1998; Blumberg and Knuffke 1998; Britell 1999; McCloskey 1996; Southern Utah Wilderness Association 1994). Kenney’s piece (2000) provides an excellent overview of these criticisms. Coughlin et al. (1999) identify environmentalists’ main criticisms as follows:

Collaborative efforts:
- delegitimize conflict;
- produce lowest common denominator outcomes;
- often include members with unequal resources such as time, money, information, and negotiation training;
- address issues such as national forest management and grazing on public lands through local collaboration instead of through national dialogue;
- consist of stakeholders whose roles may not be well-defined;
- exclude urban-based environmental groups;
- disempower both national and local majorities when using consensus-based approaches;
- may circumvent the authorities of the agencies whose role it is to manage resources; and
- co-opt environmental advocates.

Coggins (1998a; 1998b) is a legal scholar who has expressed similar concerns. Coglianese (1999) argues that consensus decisionmaking may not be as effective as is often claimed. Many of these criticisms were foreseen by Amy (1987) in his insightful assessment of environmental mediation. Many critics have singled out the Quincy Library Group, a collaborative group of foresters, environmentalists, and other citizens in northern California who worked through Congress to force the U.S. Forest Service to address their forest management concerns, in their criticisms (e.g. Blumberg 1997; Blumberg and Knuffke 1998; Mazza 1997).
Others have observed that typical place-based definitions of community are overly simplistic (e.g. Bates 1993; Leach et al. 1997), and critics have challenged community-based efforts on this basis. McLain and Jones (1997) suggest that the interests of migrant forest workers, transient gatherers, and others who depend on specific natural resources but do not reside in adjoining communities are often ignored by community-based groups.


Evaluating Collaborative Conservation

There is currently considerable interest in developing methods to evaluate collaborative efforts, both to guide future efforts and policies and to allow researchers to compare different processes and identify variables associated with success. The challenge facing all evaluatory efforts is in choosing appropriate criteria and transforming them into measurable variables.

Definitions of success are inherently normative, and unambiguous indicators are rare indeed. Kenney discusses the growing interest in evaluation (1999a) and then takes a closer look at the arguments for and against collaboration to assess how they might form the basis for criteria against which collaborative efforts can be evaluated (2000). Kenney and Lord (1999) developed a set of criteria that they used to evaluate a set of watershed groups. They found that collaborative efforts are most likely to succeed when fundamental value conflicts have already been resolved and adequate incentives exist to assure participation by all affected parties. This echoes Paulson’s (1998) conclusion that CRM efforts reduce misunderstandings but do not resolve fundamental value differences.
Gericke and Sullivan (1994) quantified the number of appeals to Forest Plans and found that small group work in the planning process reduced the amount of subsequent conflict. Surveys have been used to evaluate collaborative processes based on participants’ opinions of their effectiveness (Daniels and Walker 1996; Harmon 1999). Williams and Ellefson (1997) evaluated 40 partnerships based on the assumption that a successful partnership is one that is able to attract and maintain members’ active participation.

Moote et al. (1997) used criteria drawn from the participatory democracy literature to evaluate a CRM process. Blumberg (1999) identified standards that collaborative efforts would have to meet for him (a representative of the Wilderness Society) to see them in a positive light, while KenCairn (1998) looked at what organizations should consider when funding a collaborative group.


Facilitating and Inhibiting Factors

Researchers have used evaluatory methods to identify factors that either facilitate or inhibit the successful use of collaborative processes. Some focus on identifying the keys for successful collaboration in an effort to aid those involved in the design of collaborative processes (Cestero 1999; Martinson 1998; Wondolleck and Yaffee 2000).

For example, Williams and Ellefson (1996) found that shared interests among partners, efforts to involve all stakeholders, and adequate funding were all highly correlated with success. They also found that voluntary partnerships tended to be more successful than ones in which participation was mandated and that effective leaders played an important role in successful partnerships.

Other researchers have identified legal constraints on collaborative efforts (Kagan 1997; Moote and...
McClaran 1997; and the literature on the Federal Advisory Committee Act in the next section) and changes in the institutional framework that would facilitate the use of collaborative approaches in general (Cortner and Moote 1999; Firehock 1999; Wondolleck and Yaffee 2000), and in the Forest Service in particular (Carr, Selin, and Schuett 1998; Wondolleck and Yaffee 1994). Moseley (1999) looks at the role of social capital as a prerequisite for effective collaboration and discusses the ways government programs can support and/or hinder collaborative efforts.


**Federal Advisory Committee Act**

Both critics of and those involved in collaborative efforts frequently point out that many collaborative groups operate in apparent violation of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). FACA sets very specific conditions that federal agencies must meet when using an advisory committee. This has spawned a small literature investigating when FACA does or does not apply and how FACA can be accommodated in collaborative efforts.
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