

BOXES

| | | |
|--------|---|----|
| Box 1 | Watershed management issues in Agenda 21 | 7 |
| Box 2 | FAO-promoted watershed management field projects in the 1990s | 9 |
| Box 3 | The Inter-Regional Project for Participatory Upland Conservation and Development | 10 |
| Box 4 | Sassari Declaration | 11 |
| Box 5 | Do forests really decrease runoff and regulate dry season flows? | 16 |
| Box 6 | Forests and floods in Himalayan watersheds | 17 |
| Box 7 | Eutrophication in Ecuador | 19 |
| Box 8 | Natural and humanly modified environments | 21 |
| Box 9 | Agricultural frontier and demographic transition among the Shuar | 22 |
| Box 10 | The colonization of the Peruvian <i>montaña</i> | 23 |
| Box 11 | Local livelihoods in watershed ecosystems: examples from Nepal, the African lake region and central Italy | 24 |
| Box 12 | Livelihoods and environmental degradation in eastern Guatemala | 25 |
| Box 13 | Misreading an African landscape | 26 |
| Box 14 | Customary and statutory land rights in Kenya | 27 |
| Box 15 | Transboundary watershed management and regional integration in West Africa | 28 |
| Box 16 | Freshwater in the Mediterranean basin | 29 |
| Box 17 | A private agreement on compensatory payment for watershed management services in Costa Rica | 33 |
| Box 18 | A public–private PES scheme in rural Ecuador | 34 |
| Box 19 | Transfer of hydropower revenue to watershed management institutions in Colombia | 34 |
| Box 20 | Costa Rica’s National Forestry Financing Fund | 35 |
| Box 21 | Integrated watershed management and sustainable rural development in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic | 43 |
| Box 22 | Fallacies of integrated watershed development in India | 44 |
| Box 23 | Enhanced water availability and the livelihoods of poor households in South Africa | 45 |
| Box 24 | Embedded integration of environmental and socio-economic issues in France | 46 |
| Box 25 | Embedded integration of environmental and socio-economic issues in Italy | 47 |
| Box 26 | Embedding watershed management in sustainable development in Cuba | 48 |
| Box 27 | Participation, collaboration and decentralization in watershed management | 50 |
| Box 28 | Collaborative management of natural resources: a definition | 51 |
| Box 29 | Towards collaborative watershed management in India | 52 |
| Box 30 | Flaws in participatory appraisal and planning methods in Nepal | 53 |
| Box 31 | Interactive research and action learning for watershed management: the CAMP project | 54 |
| Box 32 | Collaborative watershed management and action research in the United States | 55 |
| Box 33 | “Heavy” and “light” watershed management institutions in Indonesia | 58 |
| Box 34 | Indigenous water management institutions in Zimbabwe | 59 |
| Box 35 | Compartmentalization of watershed management in India | 64 |

| | | |
|--------|--|----|
| Box 36 | Mountain forests and watershed management in Europe | 65 |
| Box 37 | Water sector reforms in sub-Saharan Africa | 66 |
| Box 38 | Why water sector reform has not performed as expected in Zimbabwe | 67 |
| Box 39 | Assessing multiple property right systems in watersheds: the CAPRI framework | 68 |
| Box 40 | Collaborative watershed management's contribution to a sustainable future | 70 |
| Box 41 | The impact of misconceptions on watershed management policies in Asia | 72 |
| Box 42 | Watershed management and population dynamics in Nepal | 73 |
| Box 43 | Mountain universities in Cuba | 74 |
| Box 44 | A virtual learning community to support the European Water Framework Directive | 76 |
| Box 45 | Collaborative agreements between farmers and a water supply company in Germany | 77 |
| Box 46 | A watershed protection fund in Ecuador | 78 |
| Box 47 | Environmental trust funds and watershed management in Bhutan and Viet Nam | 79 |
| Box 48 | A conservation trust fund in the United States | 80 |

TABLES

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| Table 1 | Potential impacts of land use on aspects of river regime | 18 |
| Table 2 | Characteristics of watershed goods and services | 30 |
| Table 3 | Watershed environmental services and their users | 31 |
| Table 4 | Old and new generation paradigm shifts | 41 |
| Table 5 | Comparison between (programme-led) integrated and embedded watershed management | 46 |
| Table 6 | Comparison between participatory and collaborative watershed management | 51 |
| Table 7 | Watershed management delivered under a project format and as a subsidiary service | 57 |
| Table A1 | Conflict analysis tools from the FAO/DFID guide | 00 |
| Table A2 | Stakeholders involved in the conflict | 00 |
| Table A3 | Effects of the river diversion on stakeholders | 00 |
| Table A4 | Watershed services, beneficiaries and users | |

FIGURES

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----|
| Figure 1 | The human ecology of watersheds | 21 |
| Figure 2 | Total economic value framework as applied to watershed water resource | 32 |
| Figure 3 | Outline of PES scheme for watershed management | 32 |
| Figure 4 | The four Millennium Ecosystem Assessment scenarios | 69 |
| Figure A1 | Services delivered by WOCAT | 89 |
| Figure A2 | Sustainable livelihood analytical framework | 98 |
| Figure A3 | The capital (or livelihood) assets pentagon | 98 |
| Figure A4 | Collective action and tenure security in watershed management | 104 |