



Développement durable et territoires

Économie, géographie, politique, droit, sociologie

Vol. 8, n°1 | Avril 2017

Modalités de qualification et de gestion des
ressources naturelles (2/2)

How do transnational grassroots networks reframe the global norms of water and forests governance?

Réseaux transnationaux communautaires et stratégies de requalification des normes globales de gouvernance de l'eau et des forêts

Émilie Dupuits and Géraldine Pflieger



Electronic version

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/developpementdurable/11636>

DOI: 10.4000/developpementdurable.11636

ISSN: 1772-9971

Publisher

Association DD&T

Electronic reference

Émilie Dupuits and Géraldine Pflieger, "How do transnational grassroots networks reframe the global norms of water and forests governance?", *Développement durable et territoires* [Online], Vol. 8, n°1 | Avril 2017, Online since 30 April 2017, connection on 29 January 2024. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/developpementdurable/11636> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/developpementdurable.11636>

This text was automatically generated on January 29, 2024.



The text only may be used under licence CC BY-NC 4.0. All other elements (illustrations, imported files) are "All rights reserved", unless otherwise stated.

How do transnational grassroots networks reframe the global norms of water and forests governance?

Réseaux transnationaux communautaires et stratégies de requalification des normes globales de gouvernance de l'eau et des forêts

Émilie Dupuits and Géraldine Pflieger

- 1 Since the 1970s, environmental challenges have been increasingly governed at the global scale. Despite this fact, the global governance of common-pool resources such as water or forests remains limited. Indeed, these resources are traditionally managed at either the local or national scale. Consequently, there is no structured international regime that can be called on to regulate critical transboundary issues such as deforestation, water depletion and pollution. This situation evolved in the 1990s. As part of rising efforts to fight climate change, water and forest resources became the focus of various attempts to address these issues at the international scale. As a result, these resources are now governed by multiple global norms, mainly focused on a market-based approach of natural resources. This is observed with the Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD+) program that was created in 2007 to fight climate change (McDermott *et al.*, 2012). Likewise, it is reflected in the human right to water that was officially recognized in 2010 by the United Nations (UN) and defined as compatible with private and market mechanisms (Conca, 2005).
- 2 Disagreements remain on the best way to represent water and forest resources (between public, private or common goods) and on the appropriate scales for their governance. Traditionally, global norms or paradigms have been produced by international technical experts producing resistance. Concerns have been raised over the absence of local communities in the norm-building process. Indeed, often the only way that local communities are represented in global arenas is through intermediaries

such as international non-governmental organizations (INGO) (McMichael, 2004; Vielajus, 2009).

- 3 In response, local communities started to establish their own transnational grassroots networks. This was in an effort to defend their own rights to these resources and to be better positioned to express their concerns without an intermediary. Transnational grassroots networks reflect how local actors who are affected by specific global issues can reclaim their power through the building of common claims and solidarities (Batliwala, 2002). Some of the first attempts to create grassroots networks at the transnational scale originated from indigenous communities in the 1980s. This was especially the case in the Latin-American region. More recently, transnational networks have emerged which promote the specific model of community-based governance. Two emblematic cases are to be considered here. The first one is the Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests (AMPB), founded in 2010 following the 16th Conference of the Parties (COP16) in Mexico under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The second one is the Latin-American Confederation of Community Organizations for Water Services and Sanitation (CLOCSAS), created in 2011 during the second Latin-American Conference of Community Water Management in Peru.
- 4 To what extent does the reframing of common-pool resources impact the scales of water and forests governance? This paper examines how CLOCSAS and AMPB reframe the global norms on water and forest resources with alternative representations in order to legitimate specific scales of community-based governance. To do this, a contextual and theoretical framework will first be presented. The emergence of global norms around common-pool resources and the strategies used by transnational grassroots networks to influence these norms will be reviewed. Secondly, an analysis will be undertaken to show how CLOCSAS and AMPB reframe global norms – respectively the human right to water and REDD+ – according to their specific claims to the resources. Thirdly, the way in which these strategies lead to distinct claims on the legitimate scales of community-based governance will be reviewed.

1. Transnational grassroots networks in global water and forests governance

- 5 In this section, we analyse the background against which transnational grassroots networks emerged. This context is characterized by the multiple global norms that exist within the field of water and forests governance. It is important to note that these norms are mainly produced by international experts. Next, we detail the theoretical framework used to analyse the strategies mobilized by transnational grassroots networks to promote their model of community-based governance.

1.1. A general trend towards the globalization and commodification of common-pool resources

- 6 Community systems for the management of common-pool resources are challenged by two general trends: the rescaling of their management in a context of globalization and potential changes to the way they are represented as a result of commodification.

- 7 Since the end of the Second World War, INGOs and International Organizations (IOs) worked to strengthen global environmental governance considering that global commons, such as the atmosphere, oceans and seabed, polar regions or biodiversity, should be governed through multilateral environmental agreements and international regimes¹ (Pflieger, 2014). This focus on global environmental problems, governance and politics partly relies on the distinction between village commons (water, forests or fisheries) at the local or national scale and global commons, extending beyond State sovereignty and transboundary by nature (Young et al., 2006).
- 8 However, the theoretical distinction between village and global commons is increasingly blurred. Some authors have tried to transfer the conclusions made on the conditions for the sustainability of community management at the local scale to the analysis of international regimes (Keohane and Ostrom, 1995; McGinnis and Ostrom, 2008). Global commons governance and international regimes often require regional, national or even local procedures to be effectively implemented. Moreover, village commons can be considered as globally cumulative environmental issues, requiring international collective action.
- 9 Whether these are typical global environmental problems or local but cumulative environmental issues, the new forms of “glocal” environmental governance (Swyngedouw, 2004; Gupta *et al.*, 2013) involve an increasing number of actors participating in international decision-making processes. These actors range from national governmental authorities and IOs through to INGOs, experts and civil society organizations. This fragmentation can be viewed in two ways. It can be seen as an opportunity for grassroots organizations to play a role in global arenas deemed accessible to civil society. It can also be viewed as a constraint as grassroots organizations find themselves having to compete with the powerful international actors who dominate norm-building processes, especially INGOs and experts (Andonova and Mitchell, 2010).
- 10 Aside from the rescaling of water and forests governance, community-based organizations are also facing changes regarding property rights. Historically, the diffusion of three main modes of common-pool resources management can be observed (Ostrom, 1990): private management of private property which transforms resources into a commodity, public management by a national or local governmental authority, and community management by end-users, also called common-pool resources institutions (CPRIs). Ostrom (1990) identified key principles for the sustainability of CPRIs, such as reciprocity between users, horizontality in decision-making, and autonomy regarding external authorities. Common-pool resources are often referred to as common goods. They are non-excludable, meaning that it is difficult to exclude people from their access and use, and rivalrous, meaning that there is a risk of depletion. Conversely, a commodity is characterized by private property and the possibility to attribute a price to natural resources.
- 11 However, in the real world, local or national actors may experience several crossovers between these models. This means that common-pool resources can be governed through private, public and/or community governance (Armitage, 2008; Brondizio *et al.*, 2009; Ostrom, 2010). These mixes tend to produce an ambiguity among actors’ representations on common-pool resources (Bakker, 2007). Common-pool resources may be therefore alternatively framed as common, public or private goods, but also framed as commodities, services, or human and territorial rights. This approach

responds to the need to consider power relations and social representations in the study of common-pool resources, beyond their biophysical characteristics (Calvo-Mendieta *et al.*, 2014).

- 12 More broadly, common-pool resources are inserted into a dynamic of commodification (Conca, 2005). States are not excluded from this trend and sometimes reproduce private mechanisms to govern common-pool resources transforming them into commodities (Bakker, 2007). This dynamic is particularly relevant in the Latin-American continent where States justify the extraction of natural resources on the social development imperative (Svampa, 2015). Most of these trends are defined by international technical experts², imposing their own representations on common-pool resources.
- 13 Regarding forest resources, Giessen (2013) uses the concept of regime-complex³ to highlight both the lack of centralized international forest regimes and the overlaps that exist between various agreements. This is demonstrated in the trade of tropical timber (International Tropical Timber Agreement) to climate change mitigation and the fight against deforestation (REDD+). As an international expert, UN-REDD tends to turn forests into a commodity, giving value to the ecosystem services provided by forests to the global atmosphere in terms of carbon storage. INGOs, such as the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) or the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) also tend to prioritize an ecosystem services approach on forests and biodiversity, giving an economic value to the resource at the cost of more social and cultural values (Nasi and Frost, 2009). This market-based approach is contested by local communities who historically manage forest territories and struggle for their rights and autonomy vis-à-vis governmental authorities (Schroeder and McDermott, 2014).
- 14 Regarding global water governance, authors have analysed its high institutional fragmentation in the absence of an international regime (Gupta and Pahl-Wostl, 2013). Global water governance is dominated by expert networks, such as the World Water Council (WWC), the Global Water Partnership (GWP) or the International Water Association (IWA), gathering NGOs, IOs, governments, private companies and academic institutions. Despite the absence of a global water regime (as called for by WWC during the second World Water Forum organized in The Hague in 2000), formal norms have nevertheless emerged at the global scale. These norms are associated with a technical approach to water resources, such as Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) linked to an economic representation of water resources since the adoption of the Dublin Principles in 1992 (Conca, 2005). Finally, in 2010, water was recognized as a human right by the UN⁴, and considered as a major objective in the 2015 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). However, the human right to water doesn't specify the type of actors preferred to govern water and is the object of criticism from local communities (Sultana and Loftus, 2015).
- 15 These global dynamics have prompted transnational grassroots networks to promote alternative discourses. They aim to challenge global norms on water and forests governance. AMPB promotes the discourse of "territoriality" in order to secure territorial rights, autonomy and cultural practices related to forests. The territorial authorities integrated into AMPB are community forestry organizations and indigenous organizations of the Mesoamerican region⁵ and are structured into 10 national or sub-national networks. Regarding CLOCSAS, its leaders created the term of "associativity" in order to bring coherence to water community networks in the Latin-American continent and to promote alliances with public and private actors. The network is

composed of 15 national or sub-national networks representing water community organizations providing drinking water and sanitation services⁶.

- 16 Finally, community leaders are facing the challenge to legitimise their international involvement vis-à-vis their local and national members. Both networks are attempting to redefine the scale of community-based governance in order to adapt to the effects of globalization and commodification on common-pool resources. However, they approach representations on common-pool resources very differently. This contrast is partly due to the differences in the fragmentation of global water and forests governance systems (decision-making arenas, international actors), the global norms governing these resources (the human right to water, REDD+), and the technical experts producing them (expert networks, UN agencies). These differences warrant a transnational comparison between AMPB and CLOCSAS.

1.2. Transnational grassroots networks, reframing strategies and scales

- 17 The recent creation of transnational grassroots networks by CPRIs challenges the existing transnational approaches. Several concepts have been defined to capture this transnational phenomenon. These range from transnational collective action⁷ (Della Porta and Tarrow, 2005) to transnational advocacy networks⁸ (Keck and Sikkink, 1999). Authors have highlighted the important role of these networks to regulate or provide alternatives to globalization, seeking primarily to influence States and IOs. INGOs are a key player in the process to redefine global norms. They play a significant role as intermediary between local actors and their global claims.
- 18 However, these concepts fail to adequately capture the complexity of transnational grassroots networks especially when considering the active role played by local communities to regain ownership of global issues directly affecting them. Indeed, the concepts do not take into account the diversity of civil society actors, beyond the dominant category of INGOs, to assess their role in global governance processes (McMichael, 2004; Vielajus, 2009). Neither do they take into account the existence of more institutionalized networks, beyond protest actions carried out at the international scale (Siméant, 2010; Caouette, 2010). The category of transnational grassroots network is useful to link these different approaches (Guarnizo and Smith, 1998; Escobar, 2008). The particularity of these networks lies in their self-management and membership. They are exclusively composed of grassroots organizations⁹, both providers and recipients of a collective service, and therefore directly involved in the issue they defend.
- 19 This conceptual approach considers transnational grassroots networks as full-fledged actors in global water and forests norm-building processes. Norms have been defined as a “standard of appropriate behaviour for actors with a given identity” (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998: 891). Transnational grassroots networks can influence the norm-building processes (emergence, diffusion, internalization) by reframing global norms through actors’ representations and claiming certain procedures or scales for their implementation. By means of example, Finnemore and Sikkink (1998) argue that universalistic norms are more likely to be effective, or that new institutional procedures can transform actors’ representations. In this paper, we maintain that transnational grassroots networks are reframing global representation norms for

forests and water resources in order to justify specific scales of community-based governance.

- 20 Framing has been defined as the “strategic efforts by groups of people to fashion shared understandings of the world and of themselves that legitimate and motivate collective action” (Khagram *et al.*, 2002: 12). Benford and Snow (2000) define the process of alternative norm-building as “counter-framing” or “resisting-framing”. From this perspective, grassroots organizations not only use global norms as tools for their mobilization but also contribute to creating alternative global norms from their local beliefs (Siméant, 2010). Moreover, the objective is to understand the link or rupture with “meta-frames”¹⁰ existing in global environmental governance (Dryzek, 2013), such as climate justice or human rights. In our study, the reframing of global norms is witnessed through the transformation of actors’ representations on the type of goods, the type of rights and the modes of governance.
- 21 The way in which global norms are reframed can have an impact on the procedures and scales used in their implementation. The concept of scale has been defined in the field of critical geography as an interactional process of power relations between actors (Swyngedouw, 1997). Grassroots networks are engaged in the creation of new scales of identification, beyond the political boundaries or scales defined by international actors (Dufour and Goyer, 2009). Actors can shift decision-making authority away from local organizations towards the transnational network. Actors can also defend local autonomy and decision-making, maintaining a flexible transnational structure. In this paper, the analysis will be orientated towards reaching an understanding of the strategies mobilized by transnational community leaders to legitimise certain scales of community-based governance, forms of representativeness and alliances between actors.

1.3. Discourse analysis from a critical perspective

- 22 Discourses are at the centre of the strategies that transnational grassroots networks employ to reframe and rescale norms. Appadurai (2000: 2) highlights the power of discourses in global governance in a context where “discourses of expertise that are setting the rules for global transactions, even in the progressive parts of the international system, have left ordinary people outside and behind”. A critical approach to discourses suggests that they are the result of interpretation and bargaining processes between actors. A specific focus is shed on actors playing the role of intermediary between different discursive spheres (Arts *et al.*, 2010). According to Adger *et al.* (2001), three elements have to be considered to conduct a discourse analysis: the recurrence and concordances of key expressions used in the discourses, the construction of identities taking into consideration both negative identity (us versus them), or positive identity (us with them), and the context in which the discourse has been produced.
- 23 The analysis is based on a series of qualitative fieldworks which occurred between 2013 and 2016 as part of a doctoral thesis. It includes 80 semi-direct interviews with national and transnational community leaders and external partners, various direct observations of CLOCSAS and AMPB leaders’ participation into international events (World Water Week Stockholm 2013, first Inter-American Congress of Rural Water Ecuador 2014, COP20 Lima 2014, COP21 Paris 2015) and written documents co-produced

by these actors (international declarations, web articles and social media campaigns). During the analysis of this material, particular attention has been paid to the distinct representations on common-pool resources and the scales that are claimed by transnational grassroots networks.

2. Reframing water and forests as local or global commons

24 In this section, we analyse how CLOCSAS and AMPB reframe global norms on the governance of water and forests. While CLOCSAS' leaders are aligned on the global norm of the human right to water, they seek to highlight the collective responsibility approach that is compatible with their community-based model. AMPB's leaders promote an approach of territorial rights which goes against the global market-based approach to forest governance linked to REDD+ programs. In both cases, we analyse the position of the transnational discourses of associativity and territoriality regarding global norms.

2.1. From the human right to water to global associativity

25 The discursive strategy adopted by CLOCSAS' leaders at the international scale is orientated towards the reframing of the human right to water into a global common good. The human right to water refers to five central elements: availability, quality, acceptability, physical accessibility and affordability¹¹. The requirements needed to attain the human right to water are primarily the responsibility of States. These include providing financial resources, capacity-building and technology transfers, the prioritisation of domestic uses and human consumption over agricultural or energy uses, and the inclusion and participation of users in decision-making.

26 The human right to water can be considered as a central norm in the Latin American continent. It is a right that is officially institutionalized in several countries such as Ecuador or Bolivia¹². CLOCSAS' leaders mention the human right to water in their discourses where it is cited as a key objective to be reached¹³. As an example, community leaders from the Bolivian network (FENCOPAS) mention their decisive role in the recognition of the human right to water by the UN. Moreover, leaders from the Ecuadorian network (ROSCGAE) and the Peruvian network (FENOCSAS) highlight their advocacy role in the establishment of new water laws and its diffusion to local communities and governments.

27 However, despite the fact that the norm has been institutionalized in some countries, there is still a lack of concrete implementation in national contexts where water uses are in competition (agriculture, human consumption, development projects). Indeed, few details are provided at the international scale on the specific actors and scales that implement the human right to water (Sultana and Loftus, 2015). Referring to the Ecuadorian case, the coordinator of water programs at the Avina Foundation, a regional environmental NGO supporting CLOCSAS, explains that "in the practice, there are strong interests around water. Water is demanded for various uses and it is more and more scarce. Therefore, we know there are conflictive interests. But it is clear that water access is a priority as a fundamental human right"¹⁴.

- 28 Moreover, the global definition of the human right to water by the UN considers more than just access to the resource. It also considers how rights are exercised and how actors become involved in the decision-making process. This tension is captured in the interviews of two actors involved in water governance in Ecuador. The director of the public water firm of Cuenca (ETAPA) explains that, “to fulfil human right to water, the objective is to provide the same service conditions for urban and rural sectors, referring to good quality, efficiency, fair tariffs and accessibility”¹⁵. Conversely, the coordinator of water programs in Avina mentions the “monitoring role exercised by community organizations to ensure that human right to water is a priority”¹⁶. Moreover, during the first Inter-American Congress of Rural Water in Ecuador in 2014, CLOCSAS’ president mentioned the need to go beyond the indicator of access to include additional indicators on water rights, responsibility and governmental incentives.
- 29 To address the shortcomings of the human right to water, CLOCSAS’ leaders are promoting the alternative frame of associativity. This framing opposes the collective approach of water as a global common and considers the individualistic dimension of universal human rights. CLOCSAS defines associativity as: “an institutional process of articulation, sharing, communication and coordination between the OCSAS of a locality, region, country or continent, as to learn and strengthen their capacities (management, advocacy on public policies, innovation) in a durable way, and oriented towards the common goal of access to water and sanitation to all Latin-Americans”¹⁷.
- 30 The associativity frame has been created by CLOCSAS as a means to differentiate between the social character of water community organizations and external technical experts. CLOCSAS’ secretary explains that “associativity emerged in Cuenca three years ago, during an expert meeting of Avina. They spoke of this concept that was already used without being recognized by the Academia, so it gives the opportunity of a change to escape from international external concepts”¹⁸. Avina actively spread awareness of the idea of associativity across the continent through the coordination of a first regional meeting in Ecuador in 2010 which aimed to bring water community organizations together.
- 31 A first objective of the associativity frame is to increase the visibility of community organizations in key international arenas, such as the World Water Week or the World Water Forum. CLOCSAS’ leaders use these arenas as opportunities to promote water community organizations as best positioned to achieve universal access to drinking water and sanitation. The provision of water to the most marginalized populations of Latin America is highlighted as an example. CLOCSAS frames the collective water management model as better suited to the needs of local populations, both in terms of prices and level of services. The coordinator of indigenous programs in the Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI) explains her perception of community organizations as fulfilling the fundamental responsibility of “serving the unserved”¹⁹.
- 32 A second objective is linked to the perception of shared water problems at the global scale, converting water resources into a global common good. In this perspective, CLOCSAS aims to incentive the convergence of local practices towards excellence and productive management. As an example, CLOCSAS’ secretary explains that “we have to learn how to shift paradigms using technological progresses, as a multiplying factor of productivity. If we succeed in decreasing costs and making a better use in every aspect, by some way we are useful to humanity. Climate change is affecting us unexpectedly, so we have to adopt a more universal vision of what is happening”²⁰.

- 33 Third, the associativity frame is linked to the representation of water as a service to be collectively managed by a group of actors beyond its biophysical character. CLOCSAS' vice-president explains that "the fact that water is a human right doesn't mean it is free or we should waste it. If we suppose that tomorrow there is a lack of water due to a wrong management or use and there is no water, so where is the human right if we were not able to take care of it?²¹". Therefore, the implementation of the human right to water is not only linked to the integrated management of the resource but also to the social management of a service linked to monitoring, participation and dialogue with governments. With this approach, governments assume an important responsibility in coordination with the community sector, converting water into a public good.
- 34 Through the associativity frame, CLOCSAS' leaders reframe the human right to water from an individual right to a collective responsibility that should be assumed by both community organizations and the public sector. Moreover, CLOCSAS is aligned with international experts and the UN, recognizing the economic value of water as a service compatible with human rights. Finally, CLOCSAS is converting the universal human right to water into a global common good.

2.2. From the REDD+ market-based approach to territoriality

- 35 The strategy mobilized by AMPB's leaders is distinct from the one adopted by CLOCSAS. It is oriented towards the promotion of territorial and indigenous rights, in response to the limitations of REDD+ programs. Indeed, REDD+ is facing multiple legitimacy and scalar issues. These are linked to the ownership of carbon contained in forests, the role of States in guaranteeing local rights, and participation in decision-making processes (Schroeder and McDermott, 2014). The political advisor of the Mexican network (Red MOCAF) explains his perception of REDD+ as "a risk related to resources distribution and carbon property. In Mexico, the government says that if money comes from the government, it owns the avoided emissions and not the communities who own forest resources"²².
- 36 The Mesoamerican region has been the theatre of various protests against REDD+ pilot projects. One of the most emblematic protests occurred in Panama. REDD+ negotiations were halted in 2013 due to the lack of local consultation and internal conflicts among indigenous communities. The negotiations progressively started again between UN-REDD, the government and the National Coordinating Body of the Indigenous Peoples of Panama (COONAPIP), demanding the inclusion of 19 key points into the negotiations. A key demand was the inclusion of REDD+ programs in a wider environmental national public policy including the participation of indigenous peoples.
- 37 To respond to these criticisms, UN-REDD progressively evolved and moved towards a rights-based approach including safeguards to avoid the negative effects of climate mitigation programs on local rights or biodiversity (Claeys and Delgado, 2016). Following this change, indigenous organizations have also moved towards a more open position and REDD+ is viewed as an opportunity to influence national governments for the securitization of territorial rights. The main example of this is the creation by the Coordinator of Indigenous Organizations of the Amazonian Basin (COICA) of the Indigenous Amazonian REDD+ (RIA) in 2011. COICA aims to support the demands of indigenous people across 100 million hectares of forests in the Amazon. The first

objective is to include climate mitigation mechanisms into national public policies to guarantee State control and to ensure that indigenous peoples can participate effectively. A second objective is to use climate mitigation funds to finance the titling and delimitation of indigenous territories. A third objective is to promote a holistic view of territories through the design of ecosystem services indicators beyond carbon sequestration and market-based mechanisms.

- 38 AMPB promotes the discourse of “territoriality”, which is defined as the struggle for “the recognition of territorial rights and the capacity of local and indigenous communities to defend these rights against external pressures”²³. During the 2010 COP16 in Cancun, AMPB created its own alternative to REDD+ for the Mesoamerican region called *Mesocarbon*. The aim of this initiative is to increase the visibility of territorial and indigenous issues into international climate arenas. AMPB’s secretary explains that the “REDD issue is not important for the Alliance per se, but it is important because REDD allows you to sit at the dialogue roundtables with governments and to access international negotiations to position your own issues”²⁴.
- 39 Therefore, it could be argued that AMPB’s involvement in REDD+ debates is a vehicle to position indigenous rights in international decision-making arenas rather than as an indicator of genuine commitment to the program’s values. Indeed, throughout their discourses, several AMPB members oppose the market-based and redistributive equity conception of REDD+ to their more social and procedural vision. A specialist of the IUCN’s Mesoamerican office mentions this duality: “if REDD gives them the opportunity to consolidate their territorial rights, then they are going to opt for REDD. They will accept anything oriented to the recognition of the territorial rights they have demanded for such a time”²⁵.
- 40 Through *Mesocarbon*, AMPB seeks to reframe forests away from a market-based value linked to REDD+ and into a territorial right and a local common good. Beyond territorial titling, AMPB claims that territorial delimitation and securitization from external users is the main priority for indigenous territories. A special agenda on territorial and indigenous rights was launched at the New York Climate Summit in September 2014, in parallel with the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples. These two key global events were the opportunity for AMPB to prioritize three main demands from the international community: respect and reconstitution of ancestral territoriality; territorial climate funding; auto-determination and free, prior and informed consent (FPIC).
- 41 During the climate change conference (COP20) in Lima, Peru, AMPB leaders created an international mobile cinema campaign entitled “If not us then who?”²⁶. Its aim was to raise global awareness on indigenous rights violations and their vital role in forest conservation worldwide. One of the videos showed indigenous peoples of the Awas-Tingi territory in Nicaragua defending their rights against “speculators” and “colonist invading territories”. The idea was to frame indigenous peoples as local “heroes” in the defence of forests, reflected by the emblematic death of the Asheninka native Edwin Chota in September 2014 for his environmental activism in the Peruvian amazon forest²⁷.
- 42 AMPB believes in improved collective property rights and autonomy. Its leaders frame forests as a local common good rather than a public good that would entail the reinforcement of the State’s power on forest management. The territoriality frame

clearly represents a break away from the market-based approach promoted by REDD+ programs.

- 43 This comparative analysis reveals the different ways that common-pool resources can be framed. CLOCSAS frames water as a global common, through the norm of associativity aligned with the universal human right to water. Conversely, AMPB frames forests as a local common through the defence of collective territorial rights and in opposition to REDD+.

3. Governing common-pool resources at local or global scales

- 44 In this section, we analyse how CLOCSAS and AMPB reframe global norms in order to legitimise specific scales of community-based governance. On one hand, CLOCSAS uses the alternative frame of associativity to legitimise its representativeness at the international scale and build partnerships with international experts and public actors. On the other hand, through its frame of territoriality, AMPB positions itself as a platform to decentralize international opportunities and funds and to build alliances with other transnational grassroots networks in tropical forests.

3.1. CLOCSAS as an alternative international expert representing community organizations

- 45 We first analyse how the associativity frame serves to consolidate CLOCSAS as an alternative international expert. Next, we analyse CLOCSAS' strategy to develop multi-stakeholder partnerships with international experts and public actors in order to be differentiated from more radical anti-privatization movements. Finally, we illustrate our argument with the local case study of the Ecuadorian Network of Social and Community Water Organizations (ROSCGAE).
- 46 CLOCSAS' leaders aim to transform the network as an alternative international actor. In so doing, they assert their community-based representativeness and legitimacy. CLOCSAS' secretary mentions the imperative to act globally, "if so many directives impact local policies, supranational organizations are necessary to establish a direct contact with those actors who take the decisions and impose their view of the world politics"²⁸. On the contrary, CLOCSAS' leaders are seeking to promote a more holistic representation of global water governance, through the idea of associativity, meaning the collective governance of water resources by local users instead of delegating this governance to technical experts. The coordinator of water programs in Avina defines CLOCSAS as a "regional discussion partner able to increase the visibility of the community-based model in a historical context of water governance dominated by engineers, experts in sanitation, authorities, but characterized by the absence or weak representativeness of the community sector"²⁹.
- 47 Framing water as a universal right and a global common ensures that CLOCSAS' objective to represent the community water organizations of the Latin-American continent in international arenas is facilitated. As a specialist of SIWI mentions, "CLOCSAS is mainly seen like a *portavoz*, someone who speaks for OCSAS"³⁰. Several national leaders express their positive perception of CLOCSAS and their confidence in

its ability to represent internationally. This is clearly demonstrated when the chair of the national association of Panama (OPARSA) mentions how “we have now representativeness in presidential or other summits. We have to strengthen the international space because it plays a fundamental role for the development of the poorest people of Latin-America who don’t have any voice or vote”³¹.

- 48 One of CLOCSAS’ main objectives is to build a social expertise to complement the international technical experts in global water governance. As such, CLOCSAS has built official alliances with the Global Water Partnership (GWP) to coordinate its participation in the next World Water Forum to be held in Brazil in 2018, and with the Inter-American Association of Sanitary and Environmental Engineering (AIDIS), a specialized association member of the World Health Organization (WHO) working to improve scientific knowledge on water and sanitation. AIDIS’ director explains that “our strategic alliance with CLOCSAS exists in the sense that we can provide them opportunities to participate in technical and scientific events, access universities for what they want to learn, raise awareness, learn technical skills on some aspects and on the general system, and on how to organize the administrative system”³².
- 49 To support the objective of creating partnerships with international experts, CLOCSAS aims to remain neutral regarding anti-privatization movements. This neutrality is a clear opportunity to be differentiated from the more radical protests often associated with the networks of indigenous people which still influence water politics in Latin America. CLOCSAS’ chair explains how leaders from the directive committee “are not moved by a political discourse. They are not working on political advocacy but towards finding solutions for water systems”³³.
- 50 As an example, during CLOCSAS’ fifth General Assembly, members of the directive committee refused to inscribe anti-privatization into the network statutes. On the contrary, they consider water as a paid service and defend their openness to enter into partnerships with public and private actors of the water sector³⁴. According to them, the mention of associativity and the human right to water is sufficient to ensure the permanency of the community-based model. CLOCSAS’ secretary explains that “in international forums, one can get aware that water problems are so complex that not one organization alone, public or private, has the capacity to bring the solution without the collaboration of the whole actors involving the community sector”³⁵.
- 51 The national case study of the Ecuadorian network (ROSCGAE) reveals similar issues of representativeness, neutrality and openness to partnerships with governments. The context of the renewal of the water law in 2014 illustrates these issues. In the consultation process with local communities and with the national government, ROSCGAE played a key role representing the community-based sector. The involvement of ROSCGAE as the main national expert on community-based governance was enabled by the apolitical status of the network. Moreover, the coordinator of water programs in the NGO Protos, one national partner of ROSCGAE, explains the strategic neutrality adopted regarding indigenous peoples: “one mistake has been to link the associativity process to the defence of water from indigenous claims. ROSCGAE is perceived as a platform to manage water from community, peasant, indigenous, afro-descendants, Amazonian and peri-urban organizations. Therefore, the intercultural focus is interesting to articulate distinct visions but when it serves to legitimate indigenous rights, it may be a mistake in the case of Ecuador”³⁶.

- 52 ROSCGAE decided not to be associated with the National Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (CONAIE). CONAIE was strongly opposed to the adoption of the new water law and led many protests in the country. Therefore, the radical character of this movement means that they are often excluded from national decision-making processes. On the contrary, ROSCGAE is aligned with CLOCSAS on the objective to become an expert on water issues and tries to avoid political partiality. During the first Inter-American Congress of Rural Water in Cuenca in 2014, the sub-secretary of the National Water Secretary (SENAGUA) mentioned how “water encloses power and this has been demonstrated with the oppositions to the law which is totally democratic. The ones who say it is going to privatize water are lying”³⁷.
- 53 The coordinator of water programs in Protos explains this process of differentiation and legitimisation in the process of building the new law: “ROSCGAE succeeded in having a concrete proposal leading to the perception of an organization with a technical and political approach on water issues. This explains why they have been invited to participate into the design of a national strategy as a legitimate actor. On the contrary, other organizations as ECUARUNARI³⁸ were manifestly opposed to the government, so they have never been invited into dialogue roundtables”³⁹.
- 54 The reframing of the human right to water into associativity facilitates CLOCSAS’ objective to become an alternative international expert, to build partnership with other technical experts and to adopt an apolitical position to be able to participate in the building process of water laws at the national scale. Separately, the defence of a territorial approach on forests by AMPB contributes to a more radical and in turn, isolated position at the international scale.

3.2. AMPB as an intermediate platform for territorial authorities

- 55 First, we analyse how AMPB defines itself as a new platform to voice territorial claims in international arenas and to scale-down global funds. Second, we study how AMPB aims to be differentiated from technical experts and give priority to more radical partnerships with other transnational grassroots networks. Finally, we illustrate these issues through the case study of the Association of Forest Communities of Petén (ACOFOP) in Guatemala.
- 56 One of AMPB’s major claims is that territorial authorities should be differentiated from traditional international experts who, until recently, represented them in global arenas. Indeed, the term “territorial authorities” appears in the leaders’ discourses replacing references to “intermediaries” or “paternalism”. The objective is to regain control over decision-making processes that affect them directly. This should be done “from the territories” and not “for the territories”⁴⁰. AMPB’s coordinator explains how the global discussions on REDD+ have contributed to change the traditional intermediaries’ role: “from those who produce a policy to those who execute it, there are only two actors, the government and territories. All these intermediaries, NGOs, universities, started to feel displaced of their function and way of life, and this made universities and people from cooperation change their view”⁴¹.
- 57 Beyond the criticism of international intermediaries, AMPB also criticizes leaders who represent an “indigenous international bureaucracy”. These actors are compared to the metaphor of the “TACA group”. This is a reference to the Latin-American airline and is used to describe a leadership present in international events but without a legitimate

representation of community-based actors. However, AMPB's coordinator confesses the difficulty to effectively represent local claims: "promoting dialogue and consensus, arriving in arenas such as COP21 in Paris with a territorial agenda, following this agenda and discussing it in territorial meetings mean a high cost"⁴².

- 58 AMPB has progressively gained legitimacy from international experts facilitating the diffusion and integration of the territoriality frame. During the conflict which surrounded REDD+ negotiations in Panama, AMPB supported COONAPIP in its advocacy work with the government. In fact, they took advantage of the increased visibility of the conflict at the international level. However, while acknowledging the role of AMPB and COONAPIP in representing civil society in the consultation process, one specialist from the UN-REDD regional office in Panama also expresses her doubts on the real representativeness of these actors. Another specialist of UN-REDD mentions the need to "produce a REDD strategy taking into account all this kaleidoscope of voices with representativeness of all the actors playing an important role in forest conservation"⁴³.
- 59 AMPB's strategic action is designed to redistribute global resources towards the local communities. These are the same communities who have been identified as the most appropriate actors positioned to handle climate change and deforestation issues. Indigenous peoples and local communities are framed as the "guardians" or the "owners" of the global equatorial forests. In the academic field, some studies on the Mesoamerican region show that forests located on indigenous territories or governed by community foresters have lower rates of deforestation (Kaimowitz, 2008). This argument is highly cited in AMPB's publications and underlines the capacity of local communities to deal locally with global issues and to justify the decentralization of REDD+ programs funds and decision-making authority.
- 60 The prioritization of territorial rights results from the influence of other transnational indigenous networks. These are part of a global alliance of forest owners launched during COP20 in Lima between Mesoamerica (AMPB), the Amazon Basin (COICA), the Congo Basin (Network of Indigenous and Local Peoples for Forest Ecosystem Management (REPALEAC)), and Indonesia (Indigenous Peoples Alliance of the Archipelago (AMAN)). Red MOCAF's president explains the importance of connecting with other territorial networks of the tropical forests who share the same demands in order to raise visibility and diffuse a shared message to the international community: "we spent a lot of time building alliances and overcoming distrust between various organizations which have the same characteristics in Asia, South America and Congo. It was a process of maturity to let aside a lot of specific interests, really regional, really country-based, inclusively at a personal level"⁴⁴.
- 61 AMPB consolidated COICA's international experience and legitimacy. AMPB's proposal to create a territorial fund for Mesoamerica draws on the Amazonian Fund for Humanity (FIAVH) launched by COICA. This fund – an anticipated 210 million dollars – was created as part of the Green Climate Fund intended to be managed by indigenous communities. One of AMPB's objectives is to increase funding through the visibility gained by connecting with other legitimate networks of tropical forests. AMPB's secretary explains that "one of our objectives is to increase the region's visibility because the Congo, south-east Asia and Amazon are the ones receiving territorial climate funding. They are the ones which have a voice in forest issues into these spaces"⁴⁵.

- 62 The sub-national case study of ACOFOP in Guatemala illustrates the same focus on territorial rights and the radicalization of claims to locally manage REDD+ programs. In 2012, ACOFOP created its own REDD+ initiative for the Maya Biosphere Reserve called *Guatecarbon*. It is a shared initiative between ACOFOP and the National Council of Protected Areas (CONAP) aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions while maintaining economic incentives for local communities. It is structured with a governance component managed by CONAP (institutional presence, monitoring, funding) and a community component managed by ACOFOP (local livelihoods, consultation). The project has been well accepted by local communities thanks to ACOFOP's legitimacy and its role in diffusing information and consulting local communities as demanded in REDD+ safeguards.
- 63 Beyond its climate change reduction objective, *Guatecarbon* aims to put pressure on the national government over forest concessions renewal. Indeed, the 23 forest concessions integrated into ACOFOP have no secured rights and still depend on the government's control to renew their 25-year contracts. The majority of their forest community concessions will expire in the 2020s⁴⁶. ACOFOP's director explains his vision of *Guatecarbon* as a territorial experiment to demonstrate to international experts and governments the validity or not of REDD+ programs on the ground. He mentions the desire that even "if nothing is obtained through REDD+, to have at least our property secured which is a vital issue"⁴⁷.
- 64 By reframing the REDD+ market-based approach into territoriality, AMPB's leaders legitimise territorial authorities and the local scale as the most appropriate way to manage international climate funds.

Conclusion

- 65 The objective of this paper was to understand how transnational grassroots networks reframe global norms on water and forest resources in order to legitimise specific scales of community-based governance. The paper provides an insight into the transformations of the community-based model of water and forests governance against the backdrop of rising globalization and commodification of common-pool resources.
- 66 It has been demonstrated that both CLOCSAS and AMPB intend to reframe existing global norms by creating their own alternative discourses to qualify common-pool resources. These discourses are associativity and territoriality respectively. However, transnational leaders of each network adopt a different orientation when reframing water and forests representations. This leads to a distinct claim on the scale to which these resources should be governed. In the following paragraphs, we discuss the general results presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Common-pool resources norm-building by CLOCSAS and AMPB (personal elaboration)

	CLOCSAS (water)	AMPB (forests)
Representations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Common/public good ▪ Universal human right ▪ Service to be paid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Common good ▪ Territorial/indigenous rights ▪ Territory to be defended
Scales of governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Speaking for OCSAS as a transnational authority ▪ Complementarity with international experts ▪ Multi-stakeholder partnerships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Speaking from territorial authorities ▪ Autonomy from international experts and governments ▪ Grassroots partnerships

- 67 Regarding representations, both case studies reveal a similar collective approach to governing common-pool resources. These are framed as universal or territorial rights, rather than an individualistic or private approach. However, CLOCSAS also seeks to transform water into a public good and as such recognises the role of State authorities in the co-implementation of the human right to water. The associativity frame is aligned with the global norm of the human right to water. It highlights the fundamental role of community actors who assume co-responsibility in its implementation on behalf of the poorest people of Latin-America. On the contrary, AMPB defends a pure common good at odds with the market-based approach promoted through REDD+ and the risk of forest governance recentralization in the hands of States.
- 68 CLOCSAS defends the recognition of drinking water and sanitation services as a universal right. They are convinced that this right should be fulfilled in the framework of the new SDGs and gives priority to the efficiency of the service at the global scale. On the contrary, AMPB considers forests as a carbon reserve for humanity and therefore defends a more holistic vision of the territory linked to multiple local ecosystem services beyond carbon, such as cultural services.
- 69 Regarding the scales of governance of common-pool resources, the construction of water as a global common good tends to affirm CLOCSAS as an alternative international expert representing water community organizations in Latin-America. CLOCSAS claims that its complementarity with international experts on water issues successfully leads to the development of multi-stakeholder partnerships at the international scale. On the contrary, AMPB has no desire to become an international authority but rather wishes to take on the role of a platform to diffuse international opportunities towards territorial authorities. This position leads to the development of grassroots partnerships with likeminded territorial actors to build common claims in highly technical climate arenas.
- 70 At the national and sub-national scale, the two case studies discussed illustrate similar dynamics. ROSCGAE in Ecuador aims to be included into the building process of a new water law as an apolitical grassroots expert breaking away from more radical indigenous groups. Meanwhile, ACOFOP in Guatemala adopts a more radical position to secure its property rights and is seen to use a local REDD+ project for its political means.
- 71 This paper highlights the strategies mobilized by transnational grassroots networks to influence global norms through the construction of alternative frames. The analysis

demonstrates how these frames are either aligned with or break away from existing global norms to capture the complexity of common-pool resources representations. Indeed, CLOCSAS and AMPB do not define common-pool resources in the same way. This framing is dependent on the relationship with the public or private sector and the local or global approach of the related rights and services.

- 72 Moreover, this paper reveals the link between reframing strategies and scales of community-based governance. By framing water as a global common, CLOCSAS promotes the global scale of governance while demonstrating the possibility for community organizations to have a key role in collaboration with multiple actors. Alternatively, by framing forests as a local common and mobilizing the territoriality frame, AMPB consolidates the local scale of community-based governance while proving the compatibility with global alliances of territorial authorities sharing the same objectives.
- 73 Finally, the transnational scale is decisive in the diffusion of the community-based governance model. The case of AMPB demonstrates that community-based organizations can be strengthened through transnational action, whereas the case of CLOCSAS reveals that transnational grassroots networks can become new international experts. The scale of governance determines the sustainability of this kind of transnational grassroots networks, especially regarding legitimacy issues. Indeed, while CLOCSAS may lose its grassroots connection, AMPB suffers from a lack of official recognition from local communities.

Adger N., Benjaminsen T., Brown K., Svarstad H., 2001, "Advancing a Political Ecology of Global Environmental Discourses", *Development and Change*, vol. 32, p. 681-715.

Andonova L., Mitchell R., 2010, "The Rescaling of Global Environmental Politics", *The Annual Review on Environment and Resources*, vol. 35, p. 255-282.

Appadurai A., 2000, "Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination", *Public Culture*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 1-19.

Armitage D., 2008, "Governance and the Commons in a Multi-Level World", *International Journal of the Commons*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 7-32.

Arts B., Appelstrand M., Kleinschmit D., Pülzl H., Visseren-Hamakers I.J., Eba'a Atyi R., Enters T., McGinley K., Yasmi Y., 2010, "Discourses, actors and instruments in international forest governance", in Buck A., Katila P., Rayner J. (dir.), *Embracing Complexity: Meeting the Challenges of International Forest Governance. A Global Assessment Report*. Austria: IUFRO World Series, vol. 28.

Bakker K., 2007, "The 'Commons' versus the 'Commodity': Alter-Globalization, Anti-Privatization, and the Human Right to Water in the Global South", *Antipode*, vol. 39, no. 3, p. 430-455.

Batliwala S., 2002, "Grassroots Movements as Transnational Actors: Implications for Global Civil Society." *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, vol. 13, no. 4, p. 393-409.

Benford R., Snow D., 2000, "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment", *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 26, p. 611-639.

Brondizio E., Ostrom E., Young O., 2009, "Connectivity and the Governance of Multilevel Social-Ecological Systems: The Role of Social Capital", *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, vol. 34, p. 253-278.

- Calvo-Mendieta I., Petit O., Vivien F.D., 2014, « Patrimoine, bien commun et capital naturel : débat conceptuel et mise en perspective dans le domaine de la gestion de l'eau », *Économie appliquée*, t. LXVII, no. 4, p. 101-124.
- Caouette D., 2010, "Globalization and Alterglobalization: Global Dialectics and New Contours of Political Analysis?", *Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, vol. 25, no. 1-2, p. 49-66.
- Claeys P., Delgado D., 2016, "Peasant and Indigenous Transnational Social Movements Engaging with Climate Justice", *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, p. 1-16.
- Conca K., 2005, *Governing Water. Contentious Transnational Politics and Global Institution Building*, Cambridge: The MIT Press, 484 p.
- Della Porta D., Tarrow S., 2005, *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*, Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 304 p.
- Dryzek J., 2013, *The Politics of the Earth. Environmental Discourses*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 288 p.
- Dufour P., Goyer R., 2009, « Analyse de la transnationalisation de l'action collective : proposition pour une géographie des solidarités transnationales », *Sociologie et sociétés*, vol. 41, no. 2, p. 111-134.
- Escobar A., 2008, *Territories of Difference. Place, movements, life, redes*, Durham: Duke University Press, 435p.
- Finnemore M., Sikkink K., 1998, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change", *International Organizations*, vol. 52, no. 4, p. 887-917.
- Giessen L., 2013, "Reviewing the main characteristics of the international forest regime complex and partial explanations for its fragmentation", *International Forestry Review*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 60-70.
- Guarnizo L. E., Smith M. P., 1998, *Transnationalism from below*, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 324 p.
- Gupta J., Pahl-Wostl C., 2013, "Global Water Governance in the Context of Global and Multilevel Governance: Its Need, Form, and Challenges", *Ecology and Society*, vol. 18, no.4, art. 53.
- Gupta J., Pahl-Wostl C., Zondervan R., 2013, "'Glocal' water governance: a multi-level challenge in the Anthropocene", *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, vol. 5, no. 6, p. 573-580.
- Kaimowitz D., 2008, "The prospects for Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) in Mesoamerica", *The International Forestry Review*, vol. 10, no. 3, p. 485-495.
- Keck M., Sikkink K., 1999, "Transnational Advocacy Networks in International and Regional Politics", *International Social Science Journal*, vol. 51, no. 159, p. 89-101.
- Khagram S., Riker J., Sikkink K., 2002, *Restructuring World Politics: Transnational Social Movements, Networks and Norms*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 366 p.
- Keohane R., Ostrom E., 1995, *Local Commons and Global Interdependencies. Heterogeneity and Cooperation in Two Domains*, London: Sage Publications, 261 p.
- Krasner S., 1982, *International Regimes*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 384 p.
- McDermott M., Mahanty S., Schreckenberg K., 2012, "Examining equity: A multidimensional framework for assessing equity in payments for ecosystem services", *Environmental Science and Policy*, 12 p.

- McGinnis M., Ostrom E., 2008, "Will Lessons from Small-Scale Social Dilemmas Scale Up?", in Biel A., Eek D., Gärling T., Gustafson M. (dir.), *New Issues and Paradigms in Research on Social Dilemmas*, Gottingen: Springer, p. 189-211.
- McMichael P., 2004, *Development and Social Change. A Global Perspective*, London: Sage Publications, 300 p.
- Nasi R., Frost P., 2009, "Sustainable forest management in the tropics: is everything in order but the patient still dying?", *Ecology and Society*, vol. 14, no. 2, art. 40.
- Orsini A., Morin J.-F., Young O., 2013, "Regime Complexes: A Buzz, a Boom or a Boost for Global Governance?", *Global Governance*, vol. 19, p. 27-39.
- Ostrom E., 1990, *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*, Cambridge University Press, 298 p.
- Ostrom E., 2010, Polycentric systems for coping with collective action and global environmental change. *Global Environmental Change*, vol. 20, no 4, p. 550-557.
- Pflieger G., 2014, « Délimiter les biens communs planétaires. Une analyse historique de la spatialité et de la territorialité des océans, des fonds marins et de l'Antarctique », *CERISCOPE Environnement*, 2014, [en ligne], consulté le 05/03/2015, <http://ceriscope.sciences-po.fr/environnement/content/part2/delimiter-les-biens-communs-planetaires>.
- Schroeder H., McDermott C., 2014, "Beyond carbon: enabling justice and equity in REDD+ across levels of governance", *Ecology and Society*, vol. 19, no. 1, art. 31.
- Siméant J., 2010, « La transnationalisation de l'action collective », in Agrikoliansky E., Fillieule O., Sommier I. (dir.), *Penser les mouvements sociaux. Conflits sociaux et contestations dans les sociétés contemporaines*, Ed. La Découverte, p. 121-144.
- Sultana F., Loftus A., 2015, "The Human Right to Water: Critiques and Condition of Possibility", *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews Water*, vol. 2, no. 2, p. 97-105.
- Svampa M., 2015, "Commodities Consensus: Neoextractivism and Enclosure of the Commons in Latin America", *South Atlantic Quarterly*, vol. 114, no. 1, p. 65-82.
- Swyngedouw E., 1997, "Neither Global nor Local: 'Glocalization' and the Politics of Scale", in Cox Kevin, *Spaces of Globalization: Reasserting the Power of the Local*, Guilford/Longman, p. 137-166.
- Swyngedouw E., 2004, "Globalisation or 'Glocalisation'? Networks, Territories and Rescaling", *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 25-48.
- Vielajus M., 2009, *La société civile mondiale à l'épreuve du réel*, Paris : Éditions Charles Leopold Mayer, 343 p.
- Young O., Berkhoutb F., Gallopinc G., Janssen M., Ostrom E., van der Leeuw S., 2006, "The Globalization of Socio-Ecological Systems: An Agenda for Scientific Research", *Global Environmental Change*, vol. 16, no. 3, p. 304-316.

NOTES

1. Krasner (1982: 186) defines an international regime as “the implicit and explicit principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actors’ expectations converge in a given area of international relations”.
2. Conca (2005: 125) defines the different power held by international technical experts: “the state-herding influence exerted by ‘epistemic communities’ of technical experts, the problem-framing role of politically savvy ‘knowledge-brokers’, and the knowledge-dissemination role of transnational social-learning networks”.
3. Orsini *et al.* (2013: 29) define a regime-complex as “a network of three or more international regimes that relate to a common subject matter; exhibit overlapping membership; and generate substantive, normative, or operative interactions recognized as potentially problematic whether or not they are managed effectively”.
4. Resolution A/RES/64/292 of the UN General Assembly of 28 July 2010, and Resolution A/HRC/15/L.14 of the Human Rights Council recognize “the right to safe and clean drinking water and sanitation as a human right that is essential for the full enjoyment of life and all human rights”.
5. Community forestry organizations (Asociación de Comunidades Forestales de Peten (ACOFOP) Guatemala, Alianza Nacional de Organizaciones Forestales Comunitarias de Guatemala (Alianza OFC), Federación Hondureña de Productores Agro-Forestales (FEPROAH), Red Mexicana de Organizaciones Campesinas Forestales (Red MOCAF), and indigenous organizations (Miskitu Asla Takanka (MASTA) Honduras, Nación Mayangna, YATAMA Nicaragua, Comarca Embera-Wounaan, Congreso General Guna Panamá, Red Indígena Bribri Cabecar (RIBCA) Costa Rica).
6. Asociación Hondureña de Juntas de Agua y Saneamiento (AHJASA), Articulación de la Región Semiárida Brasileña (ASA), Asociación Salvadoreña de Sistemas de Agua (ASSA), Federación Nacional de Agua Potable Rural de Chile (FENAPRU), Federación Paraguaya de Juntas de Saneamiento (FEPAJUS), Red Dominicana de Acueductos Rurales (REDAR), Red Nacional de Comités de Agua Potable y Saneamiento de Nicaragua (REDCAPS), Federación Nacional de Cooperativas Prestadoras de Agua y Saneamiento de Bolivia (FENCOPAS), Federación Misionera de Comités de Agua Potable de Argentina (FEMICAP), Red de Organizaciones Sociales y Comunitarias de Gestión del Agua del Ecuador (ROSCGAE), Federación Nacional de las Organizaciones Comunitarias de Agua y Saneamiento del Perú (FENOCSAS), Unión Nacional de Acueductos Comunales de Costa Rica (UNAC), Confederación Nacional de organizaciones comunitarias de servicios de agua y saneamiento de Colombia (COCSASCOL), ASOVERDE Guatemala, Panamá (JAAR).
7. “The coordinated international campaigns on the part of networks of activists against international actors, other states, or international institutions” (Della Porta and Tarrow, 2005: 7).
8. “Those actors working internationally on an issue, who are bound together by shared values, a common discourse, and dense exchanges of information and services” (Keck and Sikkink, 1999: 89).
9. According to Batliwala (2002: 396) grassroots movements “always refer to those who are most severely affected in terms of the material condition of their daily lives”.
10. Dryzek (2013) identifies three meta-discourses shaping global environmental governance: economic rationalism, administrative rationalism and democratic pragmatism.
11. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Human Right to Water, 2013.
12. Art. 318 of the 2008 Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador, and Art. 373 of the 2009 Constitution of the Plurinational State of Bolivia recognize the human right to water.

13. Various interviews in La Fortuna, Costa Rica, 09/09/2014.
14. Interview with Felipe Toledo in Quito, Ecuador, 02/07/2014.
15. Interview with Vicente Gonzales in Cuenca, Ecuador, 25/07/2014.
16. Interview with Felipe Toledo in Quito, Ecuador, 02/07/2014.
17. “La Asociatividad Como Estrategia en la Gestión Comunitaria del Agua en Latinoamérica”, CLOCSAS, 2012.
18. Interview with Luis Velasco in Stockholm, Sweden, 03/09/2013.
19. Interview with Moa Cortobius in Stockholm, Sweden, 05/09/2013.
20. Interview with Luis Velasco in Stockholm, Sweden, 03/09/2013.
21. Idem.
22. Interview with Gonzalo Chapela in Santa Elena, Guatemala, 17/11/2015.
23. “Pueblos Indígenas y Comunidades Rurales Defendiendo Derechos Territoriales”, AMPB/Prisma, Abril 2014.
24. Interview with Marvin Sotelo in Mexico city, Mexico, 13/07/2014.
25. Interview with Alberto Salas in San José, Costa Rica, 01/09/2014.
26. International Mobile Cinema Campaign, “If not us then who?”, AMPB, 2014, <http://vimeo.com/106682402>.
27. Press Conference during the official launch of the International Mobile Cinema Campaign “If not us then who?” in Peru, <http://ifnotusthenwho.me/conferencia-de-prensa-por-primera-vez-la-viuda-de-edwin-chota-y-otros-asheninkas-asesinados-en-la-selva-lunes-17-de-noviembre-las1400-h-2/>.
28. Interview with Luis Velasco in Stockholm, Sweden, 03/09/2013.
29. Interview with Felipe Toledo in Quito, Ecuador, 02/07/2014.
30. Interview with Moa Cortobius in Stockholm, Sweden, 05/09/2013.
31. Interview with Bartolo Herrera in Olmué, Chile, 01/09/2015.
32. Interview with Vicente Gonzales in Cuenca, Ecuador, 25/07/2014.
33. Interview with José Miguel Orellana in Olmué, Chile, 01/09/2015.
34. Direct observation of CLOCSAS’ 5th General Assembly, Costa Rica, 08/09/2014.
35. Interview with Luis Velasco in Olmué, Chile, 03/09/2015.
36. Interview with Helder Solis in Olmué, Chile, 02/09/2015.
37. Direct observation, Cuenca, Ecuador, 06/08/2014.
38. Confederation of Peoples of Kichwa Nationality (ECUARUNARI).
39. Interview with Helder Solis in Olmué, Chile, 02/09/2015.
40. “Consulta Mesoamericana sobre enfoque común para las Salvaguardas Ambientales y Sociales del FCPF en el marco de REDD + desde los territorios”, AMPB, COONAPIP, Septiembre 2011.
41. Interview with Levi Sucre in Puebla, Mexico, 15/07/2014.
42. Idem.
43. Interview with Fernando Hiraldo in Panama city, Panama, 25/05/2015.
44. Interview with Gustavo Sanchez in Paris, France, 02/12/2015.
45. Interview with Marvin Sotelo in Mexico city, Mexico, 13/07/2014.
46. Interview with Marvin Sotelo in Mexico city, Mexico, 13/07/2014.
47. Interview with Marcedonio Cortave in Santa Elena, Guatemala, 29/08/2014.

ABSTRACTS

The current era of globalization and commodification has had a substantial impact on common-pool resources governance. In direct response to this, community-based organizations managing water and forests at the local level began to create their own transnational networks. Primarily, these organizations aim to achieve direct representation in international decision-making arenas in order to promote their model of collective governance. By reframing the representations of common-pool resources (from commodities to human rights or collective goods), they seek to influence norm-building processes and establish specific scales of community-based governance (local, regional or global).

To what extent does the reframing of common-pool resources impact the scales of water and forests governance? This paper addresses the question by adopting a geographical approach of transnational social movements and undertaking a discourse analysis. The study focuses on two case studies: the Latin-American Confederation of Community Organizations for Water Services and Sanitation (CLOCSAS), and the Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests (AMPB). On one hand, CLOCSAS frames water as a global common good and a universal human right compatible with an economic value. It aims to become an alternative expert on water issues. On the other hand, AMPB frames forests as a local common good and a territorial right. It aims to be differentiated from technical experts and works to consolidate territorial authority.

Dans un contexte de globalisation et de marchandisation croissante des ressources communes, des organisations locales de gestion communautaire de l'eau et des forêts ont créé des réseaux transnationaux. Leur principal objectif est d'acquiescer une représentation directe au sein des arènes internationales de prise de décision afin de défendre leur modèle de gouvernance communautaire. Ces réseaux cherchent notamment à requalifier les représentations des ressources (d'une marchandise à un droit humain ou un bien collectif) et à légitimer certaines échelles de gouvernance communautaire (locale, régionale ou globale). Dans quelle mesure la requalification des représentations de l'eau et des forêts par les réseaux transnationaux communautaires impacte-t-elle leurs échelles de gouvernance ?

Cet article vise à répondre à cette interrogation à travers une approche géographique des mouvements sociaux transnationaux et une analyse de discours. L'analyse repose sur deux cas d'étude : la Confédération Latino-américaine d'Organisations Communautaires de Services d'Eau et Assainissement (CLOCSAS), et l'Alliance Mésoaméricaine des Peuples et Forêts (AMPB). D'une part, la CLOCSAS qualifie l'eau comme un bien commun global et un droit humain universel compatible avec une dimension économique dans le but de s'imposer en tant qu'expert international alternatif. D'autre part, l'AMPB qualifie les forêts comme un bien commun local et un droit territorial dans le but de se différencier des experts techniques et de légitimer les autorités territoriales.

INDEX

Keywords: common-pool resources governance, water, forests, transnational grassroots networks, community-based organizations, Latin-America

Mots-clés: gouvernance communautaire, eau, forêts, réseaux transnationaux de base, organisations communautaires, Amérique latine

AUTHORS

ÉMILIE DUPUITS

Émilie Dupuits est actuellement doctorante et assistante d'enseignement au sein du Global Studies Institute, rattaché à l'Université de Genève. Ses intérêts de recherche portent sur la gouvernance des biens communs (eau, forêts), à l'échelle régionale de l'Amérique Latine, et sur les réseaux transnationaux de la société civile, emilie.dupuits@unige.ch

GÉRALDINE PFLIEGER

Géraldine Pflieger est Professeure associée en politiques urbaine et de l'environnement, directrice de l'Institut de Gouvernance de l'Environnement et de Développement Territorial et co-directrice de la Chaire UNESCO en Hydropolitiques de l'Université de Genève, geraldine.pflieger@unige.ch