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| Summary: | Conservation areas (CAs) and community forests (CFs) are generally considered to be two successful community-based conservation (CBC) models in Nepal. Nepal’s two CAs are administered by a nongovernmental organization (NGO), and all of its CFs are administered by a government agency (GA). The goal of this research is to compare and contrast these two models using quantitative and qualitative data collected through field research in the Annapurna Conservation Area in the summer of 2007 and adjacent CFs in the fall of 2008. The Conservation Area Management Committee (CAMC) and the Community Forest User Committee (CFUC) are the functional decision-making entities at the local level in CAs and CFs, respectively. We conducted one-on-one semi-structured interviews with 66 executive members of 10 CAMCs and 67 members of 9 CFUCs. While both models appear to have performed well overall, the CA under the direction of the NGO appears to have fared better with regard to (i) developing trust of local constituencies, (ii) garnering favorable attitudes among villagers, (iii) building capacity of executive members, and (iv) improving standards of living. We suggest that the particular accountabilities associated with NGOs may situate them in a better position to cultivate local governance than state entities on their own. |