

**LINKING GREAT APE CONSERVATION AND POVERTY  
ALLEVIATION:  
LEARNING FROM EXPERIENCES AND IDENTIFYING NEW  
OPPORTUNITIES**



**REPORT OF THE POVERTY AND CONSERVATION  
LEARNING GROUP WORKSHOP  
MASINDI, UGANDA  
NOVEMBER 16<sup>TH</sup> - 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2010**

## **Acknowledgments**

The PCLG workshop in Uganda was organised by IIED with logistical support from Fauna & Flora International. Thanks are due to FFI Uganda Country Director Dr Arthur Mugisha and to Alessandra Giuliani (PCLG Research Assistant).

The field trip component of the workshop was organized by Village Enterprise Fund with the help of the Jane Goodall Institute-Uganda, Budongo Conservation Field Station, and the National Forest Authority. We would like to thank Susan Young, Charles Erongot, and Henry Oyo (VEF); Panta Kasoma and Peter Apell (JGI), Fred Babweteera and Geoffrey Muhanguzi (BCFS); and Juventine Boaz and Levi Etwodu (NFA).

Financial support was provided by the Arcus Foundation and the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) and we welcomed the participation of Helga Rainer (Arcus Foundation) and Terry Sunderland (CIFOR).

The workshop was coordinated by Dilys Roe (IIED) and facilitated by Tom Blomley (Acacia Natural Resource Consultants)

## Background and Objectives

Great ape ranges coincide with some of the poorest countries in the world – particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. Great apes attract a great deal of conservation interest and funding, due to their close genetic relationship with humans and their status as global flagship species for conservation. Highly endangered great apes are often protected through strictly controlled and enforced conservation areas that can – intentionally or otherwise – have negative impacts on the livelihoods of the already poor local communities, through restrictions on resource access and so on. At the same time, the economic benefits derived from great ape conservation – for example from tourism – are not often shared with local people at a level that generates real incentives for landscape-scale conservation. As a result a potentially valuable resource does not only fail to realize its full poverty reduction potential, but the actual, or perceived, negative impacts of conservation may result in local antipathy – or even outright hostility - to conservation efforts.

Many conservation organizations recognize this threat posed by poverty and have experimented with many different approaches to improving the livelihoods and alleviating the poverty of local communities in order to reduce the pressure on ape and ape habitat. However, there is much reinvention of the wheel with multiple organizations trying similar approaches without learning from the experience of others, as well as a recognized lack of capacity (particularly in terms of development skills) within conservation organizations to tackle not just local poverty, but the root causes of that poverty that are often related to higher level governance issues. The workshop was therefore intended to bring together field practitioners working with the conservation of great apes across Africa with the following broad objectives:

- to explore the current experience in linking ape conservation and poverty reduction - what works, what doesn't and why
- to identify the opportunities that facilitate good experiences and the constraints that hinder them
- to identify what needs to change - from specific practices to national policies - in order to maximise conservation-poverty linkages and what processes can be put in place to encourage those changes
- based on the above, to develop practical proposals for how exchange, learning and joint action can be continued in the future

This report is presented very much as a “working document” and is aimed primarily at those who attended the Masindi meeting in November 2010. Of particular importance are the notes presented towards the end of the report on next steps and the way forward. This, it is hoped, can be used as “raw material” in terms of planning how the PCLG could move forward over the next 12 months and beyond. To save space, the presentations are not included in this report – they are simply summarised in the text. The presentations are available on the PCLG website at: [www.povertyandconservation.info](http://www.povertyandconservation.info)

## Day One: Sharing experience and learning from others

### Overviews

**Linking great ape conservation and poverty, overview from Africa:** Dilys Roe, IIED

**Linking great ape conservation and poverty, overview from Asia:** Terry Sunderland, CIFOR

**AFRICA:** A brief review of national-level policy on biodiversity conservation (based on National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans – NBSAPs) and poverty reduction (based on Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers - PRSPs) reveal limited integration of the two agendas:

- Although the role of environment well recognised in most PRSPs, limited attention paid to biodiversity and to the role of the conservation sector.
- In most cases, biodiversity loss/environmental degradation is seen as contributing to poverty. There are only a few exceptions where biodiversity seen as a potential opportunity to address poverty - countries where nature based tourism is important – e.g. Uganda, Rwanda
- Far better attention to poverty within NBSAPs – but again focus tends to be on threats rather than opportunities.

There are a large number of organisations addressing ape conservation in Africa and a large number of different types of interventions that have been tried in different projects. However these can very loosely be grouped together according to the different geographies of ape range states. It is possible to identify two main types of ape habitat in Africa: countries with relatively intact forests and low human population density such as in DR Congo and Gabon; and “forest fragments”, with high human population densities between the fragments such as in Uganda, Rwanda. In “intact forest” countries, there tend to be vast areas of ape habitat outside protected areas and the main threats to apes are generally not poverty driven but arise from large-scale operations such as commercial bushmeat hunting and commercial forestry. In these countries common interventions have included: alternative protein projects; efforts to encourage forestry companies to improve their practices, community conserved areas In the forest fragment countries, the main populations of apes occur in state-run protected areas. The main threats are poverty- driven and include: slash and burn agriculture, subsistence hunting and human wildlife conflict. Here, common interventions include: public service provision such as schools and hospitals, public health, family planning, problem animal control and enterprise development.

It is difficult to draw firm conclusions as to whether ape conservation initiatives in Africa have successfully addressed poverty to date – largely due to a lack of monitoring data - but it seems clear that ape conservation is most likely to contribute to poverty alleviation when:

- Poverty is an obvious driver or threat
- Poverty is on a manageable scale
- There are opportunities to generate benefits from conservation
- The governance regime gives space for local interests. Not a strict PA
- There is local capacity to fight for, manage, and fairly distribute benefits
- Programmes are at an appropriate scale

- Appropriate development skills are available
- Good information on poverty / biodiversity linkages is available
- There is good stakeholder cooperation
- Benefits are accessible to the poor

However, these things rarely come together. When they don't trade-offs rather than win-wins are the norm.

**ASIA:** Orangutan conservation is quite different from African great apes. There are an estimated 20-30,000 orangutans in the wild but an additional 1,500 – to 2,000 in sanctuaries. These are expensive to run, but also capture a large share of the potential tourism benefits so they represent a huge drain on *in situ* conservation.

Similarly to Africa, there are a huge number of organizations working with orangutan conservation and all with stated development **and** poverty alleviation goals; just as there are national conservation strategies with poverty alleviation taking high priority (for example Indonesia is a signatory to the 2005 Kinshasa Declaration of great ape conservation which has explicit poverty goals). However, as with the intact forest countries in Africa, the threats to orangutans in Asia are largely *not* poverty driven but arise from a conflict between conservation and commercial, production interests. In particular threats can be identified as:

- The Indonesian “*Transmigrasi*” policy (1981-1998) which encouraged migration away from the main island of Java and made millions of hectares of forest land available for small-holder agriculture
  - Logging and subsequent oil palm development
  - Burning of forest lands for plantation conversion
  - Rubber agroforests, small-holder timber
  - Hunting (although religion specific) and pet trade
  - Resource conflict and retaliatory killing

Overall, government strategies for national economic development and poverty alleviation are primarily deleterious to environmental protection; on-the-ground strategies to link the two are confused by competition and duplication of effort; and currently ecotourism has not been developed sufficiently to generate local benefits. A lot of hope is currently being placed on REDD+ and other payments for environmental services schemes but these raise major issues related to land use planning, governance etc. be surmounted?

### ***Theme 1: Engaging poor communities in conservation***

**Engaging communities in Cross River Gorilla conservation in Nigeria.** Imaoyom Imong, Wildlife Conservation Society, Nigeria

**Engaging poor communities in conservation – what works, what doesn't and why?** Dominique Bikaba, Strong Roots, Democratic Republic of Congo

**Community interventions around the Volcanoes National Park.** Felix Ndajijimana, Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund International, Rwanda

**Cross River State, Nigeria:** The presentation described the situation of the Mbe Mountains, a key habitat for Cross River gorillas, but whose integration into the Cross River national Park had been rejected by the 9 surrounding communities. Instead these communities established their own conservation association (CAMM) with the aim of conserving the gorillas and simultaneously improving the livelihoods of the surrounding communities. WCS has been working with the communities to support this process. Three key interventions were selected to achieve these goals: local institutions for sustainable resource management; micro-enterprise development, and local capacity building for sustainable production and effective marketing of agricultural produce. The project has identified a number of key challenges including:

- How to achieve significant livelihood improvements through conservation – and thus how to sustain the interest and support of the surrounding communities.
- Correctly targeting groups that have the heaviest impact on the forest and/or those that bear the greatest impact of conservation in poverty alleviation efforts
- How to build an effective, self sustaining community based organization – particularly in terms of financial sustainability and effective enforcement of local by laws and resource use regulations

Key lessons learned from the experience to date have included the danger of raising high expectations of economic benefits from conservation in the short term and the challenges to financial sustainability that are presented by the scale of benefits needed for large associations.

**Kahuzi-Biega National Park – DRC:** Not all conservation approaches intend to reduce poverty and not all approaches to reduce poverty contribute to sustainable conservation – this dichotomy is recognised by Strong Roots in their work to support eastern-lowland gorilla conservation through community involvement. Key to engaging communities is to recognise that different communities have different types of needs and different attitudes towards conservation. This in turn determines the types of interventions that will work. Three types can be identified around Kahuzi-Biega NP:

- Those who recognize the importance of apes conservation but whose livelihoods are dependent on resource exploitation and so present a threat. Interventions that work: participatory planning, alternative livelihood/livelihood improvement projects and law enforcement
- Those that assume that all levels of forest resource use are sustainable and that there is no need to be concerned about conservation. Interventions that work: participatory planning, alternative livelihood/livelihood improvement projects and environmental education
- Those whose only interest is to reclaim land in the National Park and have no interest in engaging with conservation initiatives. Interventions that work: law enforcement and environmental education.

Understanding different communities and identifying their needs as part of the conservation planning process is critical to determining whether or not conservation will be able to successfully contribute to poverty alleviation. Usually a combination of interventions is necessary to achieve success – law enforcement on its own is not enough, neither is a sole focus on alternative livelihoods projects.

**Volcanoes National Park, Rwanda:** Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund International has a number of initiatives to engage with communities. These include support to a local school and a commitment to local employment. In particular however DFGFI focuses on “ecosystem health”

(disease, nutrition, water and sanitation) and on working with marginalized/indigenous communities (land rights, income generation, agricultural improvement). A key challenge faced by DFGFI is the financial sustainability of these initiative as well as their limited development skills. The main problem however is the rapidly increasing population in Rwanda in general and around the park. This places huge pressure on the park resources and also means that average farm sizes are declining - making household production levels harder and harder to sustain.

A number of lessons have been learned from DFGFI experience to date:

- a) Social infrastructure projects (such as health and education) have far greater outreach and numbers of beneficiaries than income-generating projects
- b) But income-generating projects have a higher level of impact – the value of money in household/individual pockets can not be under-estimated
- c) The poorest households have benefitted least from interventions, yet these are the ones that are most likely to access the park and exploit the natural resources.

### Discussion – key issues arising from Theme 1

**Population pressure:** a huge challenge particularly in Rwanda - implies a need to think about more direct interventions such as family planning as well as strategies for attracting people away from the forest/park.

**Conservation organizations capacity:** need for partnerships to supplement conservation organizations limited resources and skills to deal with poverty issues.

**Making the link between conservation and benefits:** how critical is this as long as the desired behaviour change is achieved?

### *Theme 2: Income generation and revenue sharing schemes*

**Participatory planning and scientific tourism in the Reserve de Faune de Lomoko Yokokala.** Jef Dupain, African Wildlife Foundation, Democratic Republic of Congo

**Conserving Uganda's Productive Landscapes For Ecosystem Services: The Northern Albertine Rift Chimpanzee Corridor.** Lily Ajarova, Chimpanzee Sanctuary and Wildlife Conservation Trust, Uganda

**Gorilla Conservation and Poverty: ICDP experience from Bwindi and Mgahinga Conservation area (BMCA), Uganda.** Agripinnah Namara, Consultant, Uganda

**Participatory planning and income generation, DRC:** The African Wildlife Foundation has been working to develop conservation benefits for local communities by focusing on process as much as outputs. At the landscape level this has involved participatory planning to identify areas of “wildlife suitability” compared to areas of “human suitability”. This led to the identification of the Lomoko Yokokala Reserve at the heart of the MLW landscape as an area of key

conservation importance, while surrounding areas are less sensitive and more suitable for human use and resource exploitation. Within the reserve itself the focus is on ensuring socio-economic benefits. This objective is highlighted in a ministerial decree and operationalised by ICCN – the state conservation agency and has been operationalised in a number of ways:

- Local participation in conservation planning and decision making
- Local employment of community game guards (including of women and of marginalised communities)
- Income generation from “scientific tourism” with associated local jobs (as cooks, porters and guides).

Experience to date has highlighted a number of challenges:

- Importance of community involvement from the start of the process
- The need for local capacity development
- The challenge of identifying individuals who can genuinely represent the community
- The challenge of dealing with government agencies – especially with regard to involving communities
- The importance of “*quid pro quo*” agreements that link conservation and livelihood

**Payments for Environmental Services, Uganda** The Chimpanzee Sanctuary and Wildlife Conservation Trust is working with private landowners to protect a degraded landscape that forms a corridor between forest fragment – that are chimp habitat – along the northern Albertine Rift. This is a pilot project and is intended to identify appropriate land management practices and educate private forest owners on these and then to evaluate the impacts of the PES scheme so that targeting of limited resources can be effective. In the initial stages of the scheme the payments for land management will be covered by GEF but it is hoped to identify some private sector buyers to take over these payments at the end of the GEF funding period.

**ICDP Strategies, Uganda:** Bwindi Impenetrable Forest National Park was created in 1991 in context of resistance from local people. A series of ICD strategies were implemented in response to integrate conservation and development interests. Impacts of interventions:

- **community social infrastructure projects** (schools, bridges, roads) (all income quintiles benefitted)
- **for tourism / “gorilla levy”:** deliberate efforts must be made to target the poor
- **controlled access to park resources (multiple use) through sustainable harvesting:** - such as weaving, medicinal plants, beekeeping etc. Harvesters have to be registered (primary beneficiaries) while buyers (secondary beneficiaries) but more wealthy benefitted more due to commercialization, elite capture, exclusion of primary producers
- **tourism:** most effective strategy in generating local benefits but highly locations specific and also the strategy that showed the most marked failure in reaching the poorest.
- **improved agriculture:** improved food security and income, but poorest again did not benefit since, having limited public visibility, they are difficult to reach through agricultural extension services

The key lessons from the ICDP experience was that pro-poor poverty alleviation is a major problem due to marginalization of the poor. This is further exacerbated by the fact that the poorest people are on the most marginal land and are the most impacted by crop and livestock predation from wildlife.

## Discussion – key issues arising from Theme 2

The differential impacts of poverty alleviation interventions: the poorest are often the hardest to reach but also the most affected by conservation and/or human-wildlife conflict.

Human-wildlife conflict: This is *the* issue on the ground in terms of immediate obstacles to poverty alleviation. The poor are disproportionately affected by conservation as it is they that rely more on resources within protected areas. Ironically, better wildlife protection has increased populations and incidents of human-wildlife conflict, which has huge livelihood impacts. Some strategies for addressing HWC actually bring further costs to the poor – eg planting and maintaining wildlife repellent plants on tiny plots of land. Furthermore the poor are often not empowered to take direct action to address HWC.

### **Theme 3: Learning from other experiences**

#### **Linking Conservation & Development: emerging lessons from ICDPs in the Virungas.**

Giuseppe Daconto, Care International, Rwanda

**Experiences with developing pro-poor approaches in community forestry** – Tom Blomley, Acacia Natural Resource Consultants, UK

**What works for poverty reduction? Lessons from the development sector.** Dilys Roe, IIED, UK

**The approach of Care International:** ICDP's still form the basis of CARE's approach to conservation, but with a key focus on the "D" including: using a rights-based approach; a growing focus on governance; mainstreaming rural livelihood development (such as through value chain approaches, access to financial services etc); building local capacity; and explicit social targeting.

The key impacts of these ICDP approaches can be grouped into 4 types – governance, economic, advocacy and attitudes with the biggest impacts felt in the governance arena. However the overall conclusion based on ICDP experience is the impact on both conservation and development is unclear. In particular the ICDP approach seems to be limited in its attention to complexity and to larger scale drivers of both biodiversity loss and poverty – focusing instead on local interventions. Improving the impact of ICDPs requires:

- refocusing of the "D" – building links with the mainstream development sector, increasing attention to governance and improved social targeting
- turning the "C" into "E" - moving beyond protected areas to landscapes and broader environmental issues.

**Pro-poor community forestry:** Although community forest management exists in many different forms in different countries, experience from Tanzania and Nepal shows that many poor

people are actually excluded from this approach. There are many reasons for this – sometimes deliberate, fuelled by a belief that the poor are responsible for forest loss; and sometimes through problems common to many conservation interventions – elite capture of benefits, increased human wildlife conflict etc. It is therefore necessary to distinguish between “pro-people” and “pro-poor” approaches to conservation (the latter seeking to ensure that benefits are shared equitably within a community, including amongst the poorest). This implies making specific efforts to ensure that the poor are included - such as through interventions that do not exclude participation of poor people (i.e. promoting agriculture for people with inadequate tenure), improving the representation of the poor on forest management committees and so on.

**Lessons from the development sector:** Poverty alleviation is not just a challenge for the conservation sector – the development community also struggles with how to define, measure and monitor poverty and assess the effectiveness of interventions. Key lessons learned are that it’s not all about income – assets matter (including social assets) as does the *regularity* and *security* of income – more than its actual scale. This has a number of implications for conservation – not least the need to recognize that biodiversity itself can form part of the natural asset base of many poor people. Conservation is already delivering lots of development benefits - building assets and income; securing safety nets; increasing voice – BUT it is important to recognise that there are potential trade offs between poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation; that both conservation and poverty reduction are inherently political processes and that promoting pro-poor conservation implies promoting good (or “good enough”) governance at all levels – international to local.

### Discussion – key issues arising from Theme 3

Population pressure: a huge challenge particularly in Rwanda - implies a need to think about more direct interventions such as family planning as well as strategies for attracting people away from the forest/park.

Conservation organizations capacity: need for partnerships to supplement conservation organizations limited resources and skills to deal with poverty issues.

Making the link between conservation and benefits: how critical is this as long as the desired behaviour change is achieved?

In addition to the formal presentations, posters were also prepared by all the organizations not presenting. These covered the work of the Kibale Forest Fuel Wood Project; The Gorilla Organisation, Conservation Through Public Health, SNV Rwanda, International Gorilla Conservation Programme, The Great Ape Trust Gishwati Area Conservation Programme, REMODA, PROBICOU and Jane Goodall Institute. Those of CTPH, REMODA, IGCP and Kibale Fuel Wood Project are also available on the PCLG website with the presentations ([www.povertyandconservation.info](http://www.povertyandconservation.info)). The other posters were provided in hard copy only.

## **Conclusions from day one: What works, what doesn't and what can be done? Summary of group work**

### **A: WHAT WORKS?**

#### **1. Partnerships and multi-stakeholder processes**

- Multi stakeholder and multi sector approach to design and implementation
- Partnerships –within conservation and with development

#### **2. Inclusive and participatory planning**

- Participatory planning with community
- Active participation of women
- Understanding the community – what they value, what they want etc
- Building conservation support through the use of cultural values

#### **3. Sustainable income**

- Income generating projects – income to households
- Building local capacity to be self sustaining

#### **4. Environmental education programmes**

#### **5. Pro-poor Targeting**

- Targeting different groups of poor people
- Targeting households rather than communities

#### **6. Measurable and clearly defined goals**

#### **7. Good governance at all levels**

### **B: WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES?**

#### **1. Organisational Capacity**

- Capacity and expertise within organisations:
- Lack of multidisciplinary in projects and programmes
- Limited funding

#### **2. Governance issues at all level**

- National to local policy constraints
- Policy framework, political interference
- Limitations of tourism revenues sharing
- Power factors not supporting democratic processes

### **3. The population problem**

### **4. Unclear links between conservation and poverty**

- Making the link between conservation and poverty – evidence, understanding
- Lack of monitoring, impacts
- Donor conditionalities and limitations
- Community beliefs perceptions and attitudes

### **5. Realistic timeframes**

- Short term vs. long term benefits (including in terms of donor reporting)
- Donor short term perspectives

## **C: WHAT CAN BE DONE TO CHANGE THINGS?**

### **1. Building partnerships**

- Implementation partnerships and outsourcing of development expertise
- Strategic partnerships – rather than duplication
- Promote collaboration between projects, organisations and countries
- Working with govt – including local govt and national govt

### **2. Evidence, information and dissemination**

- Build evidence – research, m and e etc, identifying measurable impacts to make the link
- Information sharing – between communities to change attitudes and between projects on techniques and tactics
- Sharing knowledge about HWC – what works and what doesn't

### **3. Shaping policy and influencing governments**

- Evidence based policy advocacy and dialogue, streamlining with other sectors beyond conservation
- Stakeholder participation in policy review and reform
- Learning groups including with reps of governments
- Educating donors – seeing is believing
- Informing communities of their rights- to hold governments accountable

### **4. Project level considerations**

- Equitable sharing of benefits – between and within communities
- Family planning
- Scaling up/replicating best practice
- Empowerment of women/gender considerations
- Dealing with HWC

## Day Two: Field Trips

The field trips were based around the Budongo Central Forest Reserve – an area of 790 km<sup>2</sup> with 435 km<sup>2</sup> of forest on the northern limit of Albertine Rift under National Forest Authority jurisdiction. There is high population pressure around the reserve and considerable conflict between community aspirations and conservation objectives due to a number of factors including limited benefits from forest resources, crop raiding and hunting.

Village Enterprise Fund is a development NGO which seeks to address some of the conservation conflicts by integrating the fundamental needs of indigenous people for income and employment with those of environmental conservation. It does this through enabling business owners living adjacent to the forest to improve their standard of living through the production of goods and services while expanding their environmental stewardship.

VEF works in partnership with conservation organizations including the Jane Goodall Institute-Uganda, the Budongo Conservation Field Station, and the National Forest Authority. The field trips were designed to enable participants to visit several different models that link the human communities to the conservation of the Forest:

- \* Micro-enterprises and umbrella associations in joint development/conservation program
- \* Eco-tourism
- \* Community Forest Area
- \* Hunter and Snare Removal Program
- \* Collaborative Forest Management groups

Half of the participants visited VEF enterprises, a chimp trekking eco-tourism site established by JGI (now run by a private operator), and a community forest area. The other half of the participants visited VEF enterprises, the BCFS - in particular to understand its work with hunters and its snare removal programme - and the National Forest Authority's Collaborative Forest Management arrangements.

Participants were asked to address the same questions as the previous day: what works? What are the challenges? What can be done to change things?

### **A. What works?**

Income generating initiatives

- Enterprises
- Employment

Access to finance

- Seed funds
- Savings and loans scheme

Flexibility – freedom of choice etc

- Interest of the beneficiaries (rather than externally imposed)

- Flexible grant conditions

#### Participation and dialogue

- Information sharing and trust building
- Environmental Education and awareness

#### Institutional capacity – at local level

- Umbrella associations
- Existence of functional community institutions (also helped with conflict resolution)
- Training and capacity building

#### Empowerment

- Representation of women
- Communities empowered to make decisions

#### Targeting

- Functional Partnerships

#### **B. What are the challenges?**

- Human wildlife conflict
- Making the link between conservation and enterprise support
- Technical support – huge range of skills needed
- Working with transient populations – affects viability of loans, different cultures etc
- Trade-offs between targeting those most likely to be able to benefit from loans (middle income households) and those who are most heavily involved in forest harvesting (poorer households)
- Sustainability of community forest management
- Scale – poverty interventions can be a drop in the ocean when consider size of populations around
- Appropriate incentives
- Enterprise viability (dependent on market access) and financial sustainability (donor dependent)
- Transaction costs of community forestry (licensing etc)

### **C. What can be done to change things?**

Advocacy and disseminating policy research

Policy reform

- Policy reform to support sustainable use
- Address bureaucracy/cost around CFM

Learning

- Exchange visits – amongst and between communities – (example from Rwanda - take the hunters to Kahuzi Biega)
- Experimentation dialogue and information sharing around HWC

Improved interventions

- Better value chain analysis – market access, enterprise selection
- Targeting - beneficiaries and interventions
- Strengthening governance and transparency of community groups
- Increase technical support/skills development

Scaling up

- Partnerships - need for linkages with other organisations with complementary expertise, to scale up activities, access funds
- Scaling up micro credit – the time is ripe now for this
- Address food security

## Day Three: Moving Forward

### *Theme 4: Linking to “upstream” processes in environment and development*

#### **Session 1: REDD**

**REDD and REDD+ Opportunities and Overview.** Maryanne Grieg-Gran, IIED

**Great Ape Conservation and REDD.** Johannes Refisch, Great Ape Survival Partnership

**REDD and REDD+:** REDD is a mechanism by which incentives or compensation are given to developing countries to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. REDD+ expands the scope of REDD to include the conservation and sustainable management of forests as well as the enhancement of forest carbon stocks. It can be thought of as a multi-layered PES scheme operating at the international, national and sub-national levels. Although there are some concerns about the implications of REDD+ for biodiversity – it does appear to present some opportunities for great ape conservation – in those locations where the major threat to apes is loss of forest habitat. There is also a premium for ‘Charismatic carbon’ (in the voluntary market particularly)- which would certainly apply to ape habitat. But there are potentially high transaction costs of engaging with REDD – particularly in terms of the monitoring, reporting and verification of carbon and co-benefits. Concerns have also been raised by indigenous peoples organisations about the risks that REDD and REDD+ pose to forest dependent peoples, such as loss of forest benefits, or potentially the loss of forests to more powerful interests in government or the private sector.

**Great Ape Conservation and REDD:** As mentioned in earlier presentations, ICDPs are very much focussed at the local level and can generate a certain incentive for conservation but nothing on a scale that can compete with the drivers of forest loss or that can kick start transformation to a green economy. REDD payments, on the other hand, do have this potential. REDD thus presents an historic opportunity for the conservation community to transform economies. The Great Ape Survival Partnership (GRASP) is engaging with REDD through participation in discussions on REDD + and multiple benefits and collaboration with UN-REDD on pilot projects in UN-REDD and GRASP priority countries (DR Congo, Indonesia).

#### **Session 2: Linking into national policy processes**

**Mainstreaming Environmental Issues into Development - The Poverty Environment Initiative in Uganda.** Salome Alweny, National Environment Management Authority

**The Forest Governance Learning Group in Uganda and Cameroon** - Tom Blomley, Bashir Twesigye, Antoine Eyebe

**The Poverty Environment Initiative:** The PEI is a UNDP-UNEP initiative designed to increase attention to environmental issues within national policy processes – particularly poverty reduction policy. In Uganda attention has been focused on national and district development

plans and on sectoral policies and plans. A key objective is not just to ensure the language of the plans reflects environmental concerns but also to increase national budget allocations to the environment sector; and to build the long-term capacity of government to integrate environmental concerns into the design; and implementation of development plans and programmes. The experience of preparing the latest National Development Plan highlights a number of opportunities for conservation organizations to engage in the mainstreaming effort:

- Engage with the next revision of the NDP – this requires bringing issues of concern to public attention from now onwards using NEMA as the entry point
- Engage with revisions of the district development plans using district environment officers as the entry point

**The Forest Governance Learning Group:** The FGLG is an initiative coordinated by IIED that has established a series of “learning groups” in 10 countries in Africa and Asia. Each group has a diverse membership drawn from NGOs / civil society, government, private sector, journalists and is intended to promote learning – within and between national groups - around issues of forest governance and social justice in forest management and to identify opportunities for achieving change and influencing policy –through communication, policy research, advocacy and dialogue.

The Cameroon FGLG has had a number of achievements in recent years including dialogue with policy makers, functional platforms with communities, a couple of laws initiated and approved within the past two years; private sector interest to support conservation; and contribution to natural resources monitoring in Cameroon and the Congo Basin.

In Uganda the FGLG has brought considerable public attention to cases of illegal activities, corruption, incompetence and conspiracies to dissipate forest resources – through newspaper articles, policy dialogue and advocacy. FGLG Uganda, working through ACODE, a local NGO, also works on community land rights, on the legal, policy and administrative framework for collaborative forest management and on benefit sharing regimes. Impacts have included:

- Research inputs into investigations on the management of the National Forest Authority
- Provisions in government policies and plans
- Influencing political party manifestoes
- Increased donor funding for the sector – from the world Bank and European Union
- Increased dialogue on community benefits and benefit sharing in forest reserves

Both the Cameroon and Uganda FGLGs provide an effective way of moving great ape conservation up the policy agenda and linking conservation more strongly to a broader governance agenda.

### Discussion – key issues arising from Theme 4

The challenges of FGLGs – and the tension between making FGLG a visible, registered and “legitimate” organisation, and the need for informality and in some cases, invisibility, due to the sensitive nature of information being discussed.

The ability and willingness of conservation organisations to get involved in more confrontational advocacy and policy work

The difficulties faced by conservation NGOs and projects in getting access to key government decision makers (in ministries of planning, environment or finance). Is government ready to engage in a meaningful basis?

### ***Theme 5: Planning a way forward and next steps***

In the final session of the workshop, participants were asked to identify specific activities – both short term (over the next 12 months) and long term (over the next 3 years) that could contribute to the four key ways forward identified at the end of day one, and reinforced by feedback from the field trips:

- Building partnerships
- Evidence, information and dissemination
- Shaping policy and influencing governments
- Project level considerations

The results of the group work and plenary discussions are summarised in the tables below.

Participants also identified some immediate ACTIONS:

- Continuation of the workshop participants as the PCLG Great Apes Chapter – some discussion needed on possibly one or two extra participants to include – but emphasis on keeping the group small and manageable. **ACTION:** Dilys to consult with participants with regard to the need for additional members and Alessandra to establish list serve
- The next PCLG symposium (2011) to take up the theme of human-wildlife conflict as the key issue affecting conservation-poverty relationships on the ground. **ACTION:** Dilys to take forward
- Building on the work of FGLG in Cameroon and Uganda: In Cameroon, Greg Forets would be happy to take on an additional focus on conservation and host the PCLG; in Uganda since FGLG already deals with issues of conservation and livelihoods, if FGLG and PCLG are going to be separate initiatives they need to ensure close coordination. **ACTION:** Dilys to discuss further with Antoine regarding Cameroon and Bashir, Arthur and other Uganda participants re a working model for Uganda PCLG taking into account other opportunities such as the Uganda chapter of Leadership for Conservation in Africa.
- In January 2011 there will be a meeting in Kinshasa on coordination of bonobo conservation activities. This might present an opportunity to integrate some PCLG activities into the

bonobo working groups. **ACTION:** Jef and Tom to look for opportunities and feedback to group.

- Rwanda already has a conservation forum – this could possibly take on hosting PCLG. **ACTION:** Felix (?) to consider and discuss with Dilys
- Some potential for taking a forum forward in Cross River State. **ACTION:** Imong to consider and discuss with Dilys

**SHORT TERM ACTIVITIES (Over the next twelve months)**

|                                  | <i><b>Partnerships</b></i>   | <i><b>Evidence and Info</b></i>  | <i><b>Policy Influence</b></i>   | <i><b>Project Level</b></i>   |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| <i><b>National</b></i>           | <p>Establish and define roles of PCLG creating national chapters</p> <p>Create links between PCLG and other for a</p> <p>Establish national PCLGs</p> <p>Awareness raising campaign at local and national levels</p> | <p>Annual multi-stakeholder info sharing event</p> <p>Provide info about costs of HWC to local and national govt</p> <p>Scoping study on bonobo-poverty links</p> <p>Scoping study on chimps/gorillas cons poverty links in Uganda</p> | <p>Provide info about costs of HWC to local and national govt</p>  | <p>Advocate for prioritization of HWC by local govt and NGOs</p> <p>Integrate cultural values in chimp conservation (Uganda)</p> <p>Community-community exchanges</p> <p>Guidelines for improving internal governance for enterprise CBOs</p> |
| <i><b>Regional)</b></i>          | <p>Regular meetings of PCLG chapters</p>   | <p>Develop guidelines/best practice for establishing partnerships</p>  |  | <p>Document HWC to show scale of problem to poor households</p> <p>Community-community exchanges</p>  |
| <i><b>Africa-wide</b></i>        |  | <p>Establish e- network for info sharing</p> <p>Establish PCLG list serve – this group</p>   |  | <p>Community-community exchanges</p>  |
| <i><b>Internationa<br/>l</b></i> | <p>Create great ape conservation and development forum</p>   | <p>Establish e network for info sharing</p> <p>Desk review of national and international policy framework on apes poverty linkages</p> <p>Identify best practice in pov cons projects</p>  | <p>PES pilot studies in Africa and Asia and exchange experience to feed into broader processes</p> <p>Africa-Asia lit review of policy framework for</p> | <p>Community-community exchanges</p>  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>Documentary film about conservation and poverty</p> <p>Study on financial mechanisms for PAC (poss support from EEGL)</p> <p>Lit review to assess impact of different ICD models in different contexts</p> <p>Review of carbon free technologies for cooking and building</p> <p>Establish Great Ape Conservation and Development Forum to review successes and failures</p> <p>Scoping study on orangutans</p> |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|

### **LONGER TERM ACTIVITIES – from one year to three years**

|                        | <b><i>Partnerships</i></b>                             | <b><i>Evidence and Info</i></b>  | <b><i>Policy Influence</i></b>  | <b><i>Project Level</i></b>  |
|------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| <b><i>National</i></b> | National PCLG forum developing Joint funding proposals | Local level TEEB of conservation areas – looking at economic values but also costs | <p>Develop policies based on HWC testing</p> <p>Make case for all cons programmes to have poverty alleviation components</p> <p>Develop or review national great ape conservation policy to include poverty considerations</p> <p>Review policy e.g. REDD to ensure great ape conservation taken into account</p> | <p>Pilot project testing HWC techniques</p> <p>Pilot project implementing carbon free cooking around PA</p> <p>Establish CFM pilot projects based on lit review</p> <p>Scale up enterprise projects involving women</p> <p>Establish great ape habitat corridors</p> <p>Scale up human wildlife livestock health project</p> <p>Establish HWC fund within projects</p> |

|                      |  |   |  |  |
|----------------------|--|---|--|--|
|                      |  |   |  | Poverty alleviation projects along conservation areas                    |
| <b>Regional</b>      |  | <p>Assessment of cons impact of community engagement in CFM sites</p> <p>Annual workshop on ape conservation n and poverty</p> <p>Regional forum on HWC</p>   | Develop policies based on HWC testing                | <p>Pilot project testing HWC techniques</p> <p>Regional forum on HWC</p> |
| <b>Africa-wide</b>   | Academic practitioner partnerships – bridging the gap between science and practice | <p>Long term study to better understand cultural link between communities and apes</p> <p>Biannual international information sharing forum leading to policy review</p> <p>Package research outputs/results for different audiences</p> <p>Ape tourism benefit sharing models – what works what doesn't</p> |  |  |
| <b>International</b> | Making international partnerships and markets for crafts and other produce         | <p>Biannual international information sharing forum leading to policy review</p> <p>Global comparison of ape poverty linkages (policy brief/paper)</p> <p>Learning exchange between Africa and Asia</p> <p>Develop IUCN best practice guidelines</p>  | Engage in REDD and ensure ape conservation reflected |  |

## **Workshop Evaluation – Participants Feedback**

Participants were asked to score the workshop by putting marks on a target board (the closer to the centre the higher the mark) according to five criteria. The results were as follows:

1. Facilitation/Process: Overall score – good to very good
2. Field trips: one score of fair but otherwise most between good and excellent
3. Presentations: a couple of marks between fair and good but most rated the presentations between good and excellent
4. Way forward session: a mixed score – but most people completed this before the session was finished!
5. Logistics: one poor mark but the majority rated the logistics between good and excellent.

### **And finally....**

*“... Delighted to see conservation and poverty on the same agenda, great seeing understanding that these are cross cutting issues and that everyone here has the will to seek integration”*

*“...Hope this is the beginning of something and we don't just walk away from workshop”*

*“...The challenge is still ahead – need to apply the lessons we have learned here”*

*“ I came here with very little experience and hoped to learn. Very happy with experience and hope to share with others”*

*“....The presentations were great but the pace at which we moved was very fast!”*

*“...This was money well spent. The information gathered will help improve our project, help sell the case to donors “*

*“...Pleased to see culture in the action plan “*

## PARTICIPANTS LIST

| Name                                | Organisation  | Country  | Email   |
|-------------------------------------|---|----------|---|
| Agrippinah Namara                   | Consultant  | Uganda   | agrip_namara@hotmail.com                          |
| Arthur Mugisha                      | Fauna and Flora International (FFI)                                 | Uganda   | mugisha.arthur@gmail.com                          |
| Bashir Twesigye                     | ACODE/Forest Governance Learning Group                              | Uganda   | b.twesigye@acode-u.org                            |
| Charles Erongot                     | Village Enterprise Fund (VEF)                                       | Uganda   | erongotcharles@gmail.com                          |
| Dilys Roe                           | International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)      | UK       | dilys.roe@iied.org                                |
| Dominique Bikaba                    | Strong Roots (SRC)  | DRC      | popofdrc@yahoo.fr                                 |
| Eyébé Antoine Justin                | IUCN/Central African Regional Program for the Environment (CARPE)   | Cameroon | antoine.eyebe@iucn.org                            |
| Felix Ndagijimana                   | Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund/Karisoke Research Center (DFGFI/KRC)       | Rwanda   | fndagijimana@gmail.com                            |
| Fred Babweteera                     | Budongo Conservation Field Station (BCFS)                           |          | babweteera@forest.mak.ac.ug                       |
| Giuseppe Daconto                    | CARE International  | Rwanda   | giusepped.rw@co.care.org                          |
| Gladys Kalema-Zikusoka              | Conservation Through Public Health (CTPH)                           | Uganda   | gladys@ctph.org                                   |
| Helga Rainer (from 17th Nov pm)     | Arcus Foundation  | UK       | helga@arcusfoundation.org                         |
| Inaoyom Imong                       | Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)                                 | Nigeria  | inaoyom_sunday@eva.mpg.de                         |
| James Byamukama                     | International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP)                 | Uganda   | byajames@hotmail.com;<br>jbyamukama@awfafrica.org |
| Jef Dupain                          | African Wildlife Foundation (AWF)                                   | DRC      | jdupain@awfafrica.org                             |
| Jillian Miller                      | The Gorilla Organisation  | UK       | jillian@gorillas.org                              |
| Johannes Refisch (from 17th Nov pm) | UNEP/GRASP  | Kenya    | Johannes.Refisch@unep.org                         |
| Lilly Ajarova                       | Chimpanzee Sanctuary & Wildlife Conservation Trust (CSWCT)          | Uganda   | lilly.ajarova@gmail.com                           |
| Madeleine Nyiratuza                 | Great Ape Trust/Earthpark Gishwati Area Conservation Program (GACP) | Rwanda   | nyiratuzam@gmail.com                              |
| Margaret Kemigisa                   | New Nature Foundation (NNF)/Kibale Fuel Wood Project (KFWP)         | Uganda   | kemigisamarg@yahoo.com                            |

|                           |  |           |  |
|---------------------------|--|-----------|--|
| Maryanne Grieg-Gran       | International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) | UK        | maryanne.grieg-gran@iied.org               |
| Panta Kasoma              | Jane Goodall Institute-Uganda (JGI-U)                          | Uganda    | panta@janegoodallug.org                    |
| Paul Hatanga              | Chimpanzee Sanctuary & Wildlife Conservation Trust (CSWCT)     | Uganda    | phatanga@yahoo.co.uk                       |
| Peter Apell               | Jane Goodall Institute-Uganda (JGI-U)                          | Uganda    | dr.apell@gmail.com                         |
| Rebecca Goldstone         | New Nature Foundation (NNF)                                    | USA       | info@newnaturefoundation.org               |
| Robert Tumwesigye Baganda | Probiobiodiversity Conservationists in Uganda (PROBICO)        | Uganda    | tumwesigyeus@yahoo.com                     |
| Ruth Kahwa                | Rwenzori Mountains Development Association (REMODA)            | Uganda    | kahwaruth2005@yahoo.com                    |
| Salome Alweny             | PEI Uganda   | Uganda    | salweny@nemaug.org                         |
| Terry Sunderland          | Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)             | Indonesia | t.sunderland@cgiar.org                     |
| Tom Blomley               | Acacia Natural Resource Consultants                            | UK        | tom.blomley@acacia-natural-resources.co.uk |