

Audrey Denizot

**Summary of Maganda & Petit and Medina & Petit articles:
Strategic natural resource governance**

Medina & Petit's article illustrates the complexity of property rights and interests regarding lands, territories and resources. It emphasizes the complexity for identifying the compromises and the indemnification or compensation needed for the indigenous people when a land becomes a protected area or is exploited. The international human rights regime (ONIC, 2003) recognizes a group of rights to indigenous people as a collectivity and as a political subject: cultural and ethnic integrity, the right to preserve their habitat, the right to collective forms of property. Those rights are in tension with international law, notably with the territorial sovereignty of States. For example, the State has a sovereignty towards indigenous rights so that if the public interest is thought to be threatened then the State can limit indigenous people rights.

The consequences of land exploitation or preservation are huge for indigenous people and are linked with a displacement of tens of millions of people. The associated transformation of indigenous people rights to land and to natural resources has a cost that must be determined. The share of the benefits of land use have also got to be fixed. Overall, a better integration of local communities in biodiversity conservation and protection programs is needed.

Maganda & Petit's article is somehow a generalization of the previously mentioned issues. It emphasizes the need for a better integration of the various actors, strategies and instruments of the environmental governance. There is a need for regulating natural resources properties in regard to economical, political and social demands as well as for regulating its international trade and its abuse by some companies.

The actors involved are various and act at different levels: the states, regional and local governments, entrepreneurs, NGOs and organized communities.

Firstly, they emphasize the need for identifying resources property rights holders. Identifying those rights raises a lot of questions: Who is participating and applying environment decision making? How can we control its sustainability and the fact that it's socially equitable? What are the different scales involved? Who are the actors? What are their rights and respective responsibilities regarding the society? Three types of resource property rights exist: private, public or common property rights. The best solution could be a compromise between those different rights, depending on the scale mentioned: local, national or global. The contradictions between the environmental right (everybody has the right to a secure, healthy and ecologically sound environment) and property rights, which are not universal by definition, are highlighted. Compromises between the different stakeholders must thus be found.

Secondly, they emphasize the fact that environmental issues should be included in civil society. Then the principles of legitimacy, accountability, equity and justice must be incorporated in the public debate. This could be done through an institutional reconfiguration. The problem is that environmental-friendly institutions have been fragmented so that it is hard to find solutions to collective problems. There is now a need for a collective action. Then the following questions should be tackled: who is responsible for solving environmental problems at the different scales? And on different territories?