

Global ICCA Database
Dongba Sacred Land, South-West China

<i>A-Basic Data</i>	
Site Name (in local language and in English)	the Dongba Sacred Land
Country (include State and Province)	The Xiangpi Township, Gongjue County, Changdu Prefecture, Tibet TAR,
Area encompassed by the CCA (specify unit of measurement).	Within the boundaries of the 11 villages centered around the Dongba village of Xiangpi Township, estimated at 300-400 km ² ,
GIS Coordinates (if available)	None
Whether it includes sea areas (Yes or no)	No
Whether it includes freshwater (Yes or no)	The Requ River, the upper stream of the Jinsha River – head water of the Yangtze
Marine (Y or N)	No
Concerned community (name and approx. number of persons)	The Dongba Village, Xionglong Village, Naire Village, Engqiong Village and etc 11 in total, total population is 1,334.
Is the community considering itself an indigenous people? (Please note Yes or No; if yes note which people)	the local community, the Tibetans, are indigenous to the region,
Is the community considering itself a minority? (Please note Yes or No, if yes on the basis of what, e.g. religion, ethnicity)	The majority of the local communities are Tibetans, one of the ethnic groups in China, with characteristic history, religion and culture.
Is the community permanently settled? (Please note Yes or No; if the community is mobile, does it have a customary transhumance territory?)	The local communities are permanent residents. Two of them are of mobile nomads but with permanent village bases and the rest of the nine villages are agro-pastoralist communities.
Is the community local per capita income inferior, basically the same or superior to national value? (please note how confident you are about the information)	There is no previous data available. The prominent cash source of the communities is from sale of caterpillar fungus; therefore it varies greatly from year to year, from household to household.
Is the CCA recognized as a protected area by governmental agencies? (Yes or no; if yes, how? If no, is it otherwise recognized?) If yes, legal document? Establishment date?	At best, the CCA in the area stands as de facto because there is yet neither legal nor local government official recognition.
Have there been any government resources on environmental protection or poverty reduction within the CCA, if yes, is there a relationship between these action and CCAs, if not, why?	No
Conflicts with tenure, natural resource use?	There are no conflicts as the result of tenure, or disputed natural resource use in the CCA area, but in terms of access to rangeland in the adjacent area of CCA, there are some disputed uses among different villages.
What is the main management objective (e.g. livelihood, cultural, spiritual...)	Replant forest that was destroyed on the sacred hills, so that vegetation can regenerate faster and wildlife have better sanctuary. Revitalize and pass on tradition and cultures to younger generation;

By definition, a CCA fulfils a management objective. To which IUCN management category[1] do you consider it would best fit (this does not imply that the management objective is consciously pursued by the concerned community, but that it is actually achieved)	VI – Managed Resource Protected Area
<i>B-Additional qualitative information</i>	
Main ecosystem type	temperate coniferous forests, alpine meadows and scree
Description of biodiversity & resources (ecosystems, species, functions) conserved by the CCA	There has not yet been a through study on the ecosystem and natural resources in the CCA area. But overall, our visit to the area seems to support the idea that the regenerated forest after massive logging in the 1960s is doing very well. There have also been continuous reforestation project with the help of the county forest bureau. According to the villagers, there is general impression that the frequency of spotting wildlife is noticeably increasing. There must be a bounce back of wildlife population, the wolf, the Przewalskium albirostris and the blue sheep, as the habituate is improving. Also as this land is at the very upstream of the Yangtze River, the contribution to the watershed conservation as an ecosystem services to the lower reaches should be better recognized.
Description of local ethnic groups and languages spoken	The 11 villages centered around Dongba used to be affiliated with the Ganrong tribe managed by Dege local chieftain before 1949. Even though with changes of government administration now, the 11 villages still attach to their own local chief. The villagers still tend to consult their village traditional chief for their advices. The majority still uses Tibetan as their primary language, and a handful of them also speak mandarine.
historical context of the CCA	Since 1988, there was a surge of awareness for environment issues. Particularly it was headed by the villager, Renqing Sangzhu who reflected amongst themselves, about the consequences of the massive logging, and legal hunting. Such activities were also spilled over to the sacred mountains. He started to write his thoughts down in Tibetan and shared with villagers who started to discuss these issues with one another. They kept their community activities to themselves until 2003 when the Tibetan conservation NGO, the Snowland Association reached them. With the external help, they established a voluntary association named: the Khampa Anqionsengenazong Environment Protection Voluntary Association. All those who chose to participate in the association gave their fingerprints as a way of giving personal promise on the written management rules. The monks and nuns who originated from the the 11 villages also participated the association. Please see the picture of their fingerprints in the photo folder.
Governance structure for the CCA (who takes management decisions, how?)	A total of 32 villagers, 2-3 selected by each one of the 11 villages sit on the association board. The board coordinates and decides on associations' activities. It includes: 1) publish one village newsletter "Self-Devotion" each year summarizing the yearly activities, and villagers' opinions and understanding about their CCA. 2) Voluntary reforestation, 3) management of trash; 4) environment awareness raising; 5) anti-poaching monitoring; 6) management of caterpillar fungus harvesting. The association was recommended by the Snow land Association to a nation-wide community environment award in 2006.
The concerned area and natural resources may or may not be physically demarcated but are perceived and treated as “different” from the surrounding landscape or seascape. Who decided that they are so?	The village association in consultation with villagers through village meeting.

The concerned area and natural resources are managed according to a set of <i>rules</i> that may or may not be immutable, exist in written form or be fully respected by all, but are broadly known at least locally. Who established those rules?	There are written rules, established by the association board but approved in the village meeting.
In fact, the concerned area and natural resources may be managed according to a main <i>objective</i> (preservation of a sacred feature, conservation of biodiversity, sustainable use of a resource, etc.) Who decided about that objective?	The association board decides the objectives: 1) publish one village newsletter "Self-Devotion" each year summarizing the yearly activities, and villagers' opinions and understanding about their CCA. 2) Voluntary reforestation, 3) management of trash in the communities; 4) environment awareness raising 5) anti-poaching monitoring; 6) management of caterpillar fungus harvesting.
The concerned area and natural resources need <i>on going</i> management decisions. Who takes those decisions?	the association board
If a given "body" takes those decisions, who decided the structure of that body?	A total of 32 villagers, 2-3 selected by each one of the 11 villages sit on the association board. The board coordinates and decides on associations' activities. And the villager, Renqing Sangzhu plays a key role.
Who decided the <i>composition</i> of that "body"?	the association board
If decisions are taken by an individual, who appointed and supports her/him?	the association board
To whom is the "body" or the person who takes management decisions directly accountable?	the association board
Who enforces management decisions regarding the area and natural resources?	the representatives of each villages, and their village heads, the village elders
Who carries out some forms of surveillance, monitors the concerned area and resources and is generally aware of their status and potential problems?	every villagers
<i>Who is crucially concerned</i> with the area and resources and demonstrates a strong will to preserve it when facing potentially destructive change?	Renqing Sangzhu and his fellow board members in the association.
Length of time the governance model has been in place	CCA without a structure since 1988, and with a structure since 2003
Characteristics of the use and management of natural resources in terms of kinds and estimated quantity and other features in the CCAs, such as fuel wood, wild mushroom, herbs, livestock ranging, etc.	primarily grazing, collection of caterpillar fungus
Land and resource ownership in the CCA, both in terms of de jure and de facto and pls specify if there is difference.	It is primarily CCA in de facto, as there is no official recognition or legal backup for CCA.
Type of land use in the CCA	grazing
Existence of written or oral management plans and specific rules for the use of natural resources in the CCA	Historically, according to the elders, there are oral rules for banning of logging and poaching wildlife at various designated places, during special seasons. But since 2003, villagers through their association has reached consensus to pass two set of rules, one on voluntary reforestation initiatives, and other on sustainable harvesting of caterpillar fugues.
Map and zoning of the CCA (please attach if available and relevant.)	there is a map in the photo folder

Relevant pictures with captions (please attach if available)	see photo folder
Major threats to biodiversity and/or the CCA governance system	<p>Policy difficulty: villagers have in the past spotted illegal hunters who challenged villagers for lack of legitimate authority to capture and punish them.</p> <p>Financial difficulty: Villagers have done very successful mobilization of continuous voluntary reforestation. They have replanted more than 20,000 trees with the help of forest bureau making use of resources from the upland conversion program. Now this program is running out of resources, there is no tree seedling support to continue reforests the remaining barren area in the CAA sites.</p> <p>Technical support: Villagers have been requesting for planting cash crop trees and better management of the area of serious soil erosion concerns, but do not have enough technical support.</p>
Local CCA-relevant features, stories, names, rules and practices	