



# COMMUNITIES AS THE FIRST LINE OF DEFENCE IN COMBATTING ILLEGAL WILDLIFE TRADE: Sharing Lessons to Influence Policy and Practice

## Learning Exchange Event Workshop Report

Nairobi, Kenya  
25-26 November 2019



## **Background**

Work on community-based approaches to combat illegal wildlife trade (IWT) through initiatives and events such as the “People not Poaching” platform, Local Communities - First Line of Defence against Illegal Wildlife Trade (FLoD), and the London Conference, among others, have produced important and, in some cases, unanticipated insights into the role of local communities in combatting IWT. A learning exchange event was organized in Nairobi, Kenya, from the 25<sup>th</sup> to 26<sup>th</sup> of November, 2019, in order to bring together key stakeholders in Eastern and Southern Africa to share lessons and insights and to develop policy messages and recommendations to guide future work on the IWT.

The learning exchange event was organized by the IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO), IUCN Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group (SULi) and the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), with support from the Partnership against Poaching and IWT, implemented by GIZ on behalf of the German government, and the UK government IWT Challenge Fund.

The full participant list is available in Annex 1 to this report, while the workshop agenda is included in Annex 2.

## **Session 1 – Introduction**

Leo Niskanen, Regional Technical Coordinator of the Conservation Areas & Species programme for the IUCN ESARO, gave opening remarks on behalf of IUCN. He welcomed the participants from across the region to the learning exchange event. He referred to IUCN’s founding principle: for conservation of nature and natural resources to be effective and sustainable it also needs to be equitable, just and fair. IUCN has for decades been a champion for and a driver of community-based approaches to conservation and has been highly active in the global policy arena to help ensure that the role of local communities is recognized and prioritized in global conservation policy and practice. He noted that despite the general global consensus on the important role of local communities in nature conservation, in reality many gaps and challenges remain. These have become glaringly obvious in recent years when the eastern and southern Africa region has been experiencing a high level of poaching of high value species such as elephant and rhino. The global reaction to this crisis had been, and continues to be, predominantly focused on state-led law enforcement approaches; sometimes these responses have been militarized, and sometimes they have resulted in human rights violations. The role of local communities in the fight against illegal wildlife trade has been largely forgotten in these efforts to address the situation, and in some cases the heavy-handed approaches that have been adopted have served to alienate and further marginalize local communities.

He noted that these developments have been a major source of concern to IUCN in this region, which has been the epicenter of poaching for high value species such as elephant and rhino. This is why IUCN ESARO has partnered with the IUCN’s Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group (SULi) and the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) on an initiative called Local Communities – First Line of Defence Against Illegal Wildlife Trade (FLoD).

Thanks to initiatives, such as FL0D, and the People not Poaching platform, evidence and lessons learned for effective local community engagement in the fight against IWT are slowly emerging and becoming clearer.

However, there is still work to be done to collect and distill lessons learned so that they can positively influence policy and practice at national, regional and global levels. He drew

attention to opportunities to influence policy and financing. In particular, he noted the Global Environment Facility's upcoming consultation with civil society organisations in December 2019, with a focus on illegal wildlife trade. Finally, he thanked GIZ for their generous financial support for the event.

Opening remarks were also made by Ivana Jurisic of GIZ. She drew attention to GIZ's Partnership against Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade, noting that GIZ is committed to supporting approaches across borders, regions and sectors. While IWT has become prominent on the global agenda and some progress is being made, human-wildlife conflict continues to be a major issue. Germany's commitment and focus on local communities has been evident in past and present partnerships and will continue to be a major part of their work.

Participants then introduced themselves, after which Akshay Vishwanath, Senior Programme Officer for IUCN ESARO, provided an overview of the objectives of the workshop. The overall objective of the workshop was to ensure that appropriate community-based approaches to combat IWT were more effectively incorporated into African level strategies at the national, regional and continental level. The specific objectives of the workshop were to:

- Share and synthesize lessons learned from partner organizations on community-based approaches to combat IWT;
- Develop policy messages on community-based approaches to combat IWT targeting the GEF Council Meeting in December 2019; and
- Identify other regional and international policy platforms to target with messages emanating from the workshop.

## **Session 2 – Overview of Communities & IWT**

### *Engaging communities in tackling IWT*

Dilys Roe, of IIED and SULi, gave a presentation on the work undertaken by IIED and SULi to highlight the work of communities engaged in tackling IWT. She drew attention to the international responses to the IWT crisis, with a focus on law enforcement and demand reduction, and to a lesser extent on communities and livelihoods. IIED and IUCN have been undertaking work since 2014 to highlight the role of local communities in combatting IWT. She noted a number of key lessons that have been learned.

1. Relying on law enforcement to stop poaching is difficult, expensive, and only rarely effective. A quarter of Earth's land is managed by communities, with 40% of the formal conservation area under community management. Community members live with and near wildlife and even the best-resourced law enforcement will struggle without community buy-in.
2. Communities have borne the costs of conservation and it is harsh and unfair for anti-IWT efforts to worsen this. There has been historical dispossession and exclusion, and anti-poaching efforts often unjustly target local communities. The loss of livelihood options through tightened access to wild resources is exacerbated by the huge social impacts of killing and incarceration of young men.
3. Communities can be powerful and positive agents of change. They can be the "eyes and ears" of enforcement and are highly motivated when they have stewardship rights and/or gain tangible benefits from conservation. There are now many powerful examples of communities taking the lead themselves or forming effective partnerships with authorities.
4. Empowering communities and increasing the value of wildlife to them can have much broader conservation benefits. Community based approaches can build support for

wildlife as a land use and tolerance for its impact more broadly. Overall, the net benefits of conserving must be greater than the net benefits of poaching.

A number of commitments have been made at international policy forums. These commitments are to:

- Tackle negative impacts of IWT on people
- Support sustainable livelihood opportunities
- Support community led conservation
- Recognise rights to benefit from wildlife
- Involve local people as law enforcement partners
- Reduce the costs of living with wildlife
- Support information sharing about community-based approaches.

However, there has been low levels of progress on the ground, particularly compared to efforts in law enforcement and demand reduction. IIED and IUCN have been working to increase community voice at international events, in particular at the London Conference in 2018 and the African Wildlife Economy Summit in 2019. In addition, there have been regional events in Africa, Latin America and Asia, and national dialogues are planned in Tanzania and Zambia.

#### *Local Communities: First Line of Defence against Illegal Wildlife Trade (FLoD)*

Holly Dublin, SULi, gave a presentation on the FLoD initiative. She drew attention to the growing policy commitments to community engagement in combatting IWT but noted that it is challenging to translate these commitments to action on the ground. The FLoD initiative was designed using an action research approach working with communities and NGOs to understand what works and why in particular contexts. Using a theory of change approach, the FLoD initiative works to interrogate the key assumptions of implementers and compare those with community assumptions. It is effective in highlighting flawed theories of change that result in reduced impact of projects. The initiative has grown to include a number of partners across eastern and Southern Africa.

Holly presented the FLoD Baseline Theory of Change (ToC), with four key pathways:

- A. Increase costs of participating in IWT
- B. Increase incentives for stewardship
- C. Decrease costs of living with wildlife
- D. Increase non-wildlife-based livelihoods

She outlined the basic methodology and drew attention to some key lessons from the initial pilot phase:

- Independent facilitation of the process
- Need to have an implementing partner at the community level - overall
- iterative validation of findings throughout the process
- Transfer full ownership and accountability over the ToC to all stakeholders at the site level
- Adaptive management principles in the community's implementation of subsequent interventions

#### *People Not Poaching*

Dilys Roe gave a brief presentation on the People Not Poaching platform ([www.peoplenotpoaching.org](http://www.peoplenotpoaching.org)). The platform was developed by IIED, SULi and TRAFFIC to capture the huge amount of experience in engaging communities in IWT. The site includes case studies, reports, journal articles, videos and other resources. There is an interactive map to find case studies and resources for specific countries, species, or types of

community engagement strategies. The case studies provide detailed information about the community engagement initiatives, including the lessons learned, what has worked, what hasn't and why. The site also has relevant policy documents for each country.

She encouraged participants to submit case studies. The web portal is intended to support the development of a community of practice of NGOs, donors, and community organisations all with an interest in how best to engage communities to tackle IWT. As the portal develops, IIED and partners are planning to use it to host webinars and other mechanisms for sharing information and disseminating learning and good practice.

In addition to the web portal, IIED and partners are working in two pilot countries – Tanzania and Zambia – to run national dialogue processes, involving community representatives, policy makers and IWT project implementers. IIED and partners are also organising regional and international south-south learning events where community representatives can get together and interact directly to share their experience and amplify their voice in international policy making processes.

### **Session 3: Experiences from the Field**

#### *Save the Rhino Trust, Namibia*

Simson Uri-Khob gave a presentation on the work of Save the Rhino Trust in Namibia. Rhinos had been poached out by the South African army, but in West Kunene there is now a Key 1 population of black rhinos, which has grown from 16 to 200. It is one of the last free-roaming populations of rhinos. Over 25,000 km<sup>2</sup>, there are 13 communal conservancies and two tourism concessions, supported by three NGOs. There is a very low human population, less than 1 person per square km, and four ethnic groups.

Poaching rose from 2013 to 2015, and the trust instituted a number of approaches. Rhino Ranger Programme provides benefits to the communities. An intelligence network provides a strong partnership with state law enforcement. Rhino tourism and a rhino pride campaign have been developed. In 2017, a total of US\$ 250,000 was recorded as net rhino tourism income to communities. There has been no poaching in the area since 2017.

#### *Olderkesi Community Wildlife Conservation*

Cottar's Safaris are the longest continuing safari company, currently operating on the Olderkesi Group Ranch. On the ranch there are 7,000 registered landowners, with 13,000 total inhabitants on 106,000 acres. Cottars recognized that the tourism industry is extractive, with 0.2% of tourism revenue reaching communities. Threats to the tourism industry include the subdivision of land and land use change away from wildlife-compatible land uses. Knowing that subdivision would threaten Cottar's business, the wildlife corridor, the cutting of forest for fencing and that it would ultimately result in increasing impoverishment of the Olderkesi people, we started our own negotiation process with the leadership to find solutions.

In 2006, Cottars Wildlife Conservation Trust (CWCT) was formed. In 2010, the Olderkesi Community Wildlife Conservation Trust (OCWCT) was registered, representing all 7,000 members, and in 2013, an agreement was reached to lease the conservancy. CWCT identified with the land committee where a community conservancy could be established, the income from which could fund appropriate land subdivision as well as leverage 'first rights of refusal' to OCWCT should individuals need to sell their land in the future. The arrangement is that CWCT pays a lease payment to OCWCT for a wildlife conservancy at a \$/ha/yr rate that is higher than that possible from competing land use.

There is a 'social control' mechanism to discourage illegal activities in the conservancy by individuals. This involves CWCT paying retroactively every 3 months, and deducting an agreed amount from the collective pay for each infraction (poaching etc); the OCWCT committee are then responsible to fine the culprit and replace / top up the lease payment. The by-laws of the OCWCT allow for the amount the individual is fined to be five times higher than what CWCT deducts.

CWCT helped to develop a land use plan (together with AWF) to identify future conservancy expansion, agriculture areas, urban areas, infrastructure. Investment has been initiated in schools, bridges and urban centres, as well as 'non land' based income earning activities, so that the youth in particular can join the modern 'multiplier' economy, selling services and goods to each other.

CWCT participated in the pilot phase of the FLoD initiative, which helped to learn where weaknesses existed. They learned that residents are not agreed on their own futures, with youth and women often having opposing views to the elders. The tool provided pathways to consensus and allowed the development of a land use plan that all could agree with.

#### *Zambia Community-Based Natural Resource Management Forum*

The Zambia CNBRM forum works through and with 76 Community Resources Boards in 35 GMAs, with a focus on the Kafue and Lower Zambezi ecosystems. Poaching does occur but is controlled, partly through community engagement. There are more than 1,000 community scouts, as well as an informer system. There is also social pressure – any illegal activities are punished through exclusion from jobs, training, cash support, and access to community conservation banks.

There are also activities to support nature-based enterprises, social enterprises, jobs and training and in particular training of women in conservation leadership. HEC mitigation support is provided, particularly chilli fencing and improved storage. There is also land use planning and conservation education. Community forest management and sustainable community fisheries management are also important activities. Finally, non-wildlife-based livelihoods are supported through community conservation banks, horticulture gardens and conservation agriculture.

#### *Tanzania Natural Resource Forum*

The Tanzania Natural Resource Forum focuses on the Serengeti ecosystem. Over the last five years, rhino and elephant poaching has decreased but bushmeat poaching for domestic consumption remains high.

There is no compensation for loss of life or goods from human-wildlife conflict, although there is consolation. There is limited involvement of communities in decision-making and limited legal recognition of communities in fighting IWT. However, through the Wildlife Management Areas, communities are engaged in conservation. There are also income-generating activities, including community conservation banks, beekeeping, poultry raising, trading of crops, fish farming and tailoring and selling of fabrics. There are joint patrols between game officers and village game scouts, as well as voluntary community groups for guarding elephants. Participatory rangeland management is also a key activity.

#### *CAMPFIRE*

The presentation focused on the Mbire District in Zimbabwe, where CAMPFIRE is operational. The area includes safari areas, as well as community conservancies. 42 game scouts have been trained and there is a major GEF-funded project in the area. Poaching of

elephant is reduced, but there is subsistence and commercial meat poaching in the area. Wildlife habitat is identified with spirit mediums, sacred animals are only hunted with spiritual authorization. The MaDoma ethnic group lives on the hunting and gathering for food, fully embracing sustainable use.

Under CAMPFIRE, the community can develop and enforce by-laws, but these are seldom a sufficient deterrent. There is funeral assistance and assistance for medical bills and school fees for victims of human-wildlife conflict. There is also infrastructural investment, such as construction of dams and drilling of boreholes, clinics, roads and dip tanks. Incentives are given for arresting poachers, as well as providing information leading to an arrest. Wildlife provides jobs for wildlife scouts, clerks, camp guards, drivers, cooks and waiters. There is a direct payment system with 50% being paid at the district level. The operators also contribute to a social fund. In addition, there are activities such as conservation agriculture and the establishment of nutritional gardens.

### *Mnisi Community Development Forum*

The Mnisi Community Development Forum (MCDF) operates in the Mnisi Tribal Authority in South Africa, adjacent to Kruger National Park, Manyeleti Nature Reserve and Sabi Sands. The vision is to extend nature conservation from the protected areas to our neighboring communities and to combat IWT and see communities develop through the benefits of nature conservation and self-sustained projects.

There is a high rate of poaching and human wildlife conflict, in particular loss of livestock. The MCDF is initiating a community ranger project to help combat IWT from outside protected areas. The aims are to:

- combat poaching and reduce the number of poaching incidents in the area;
- train and develop skills through South African Wildlife College for more than 30 community rangers with a stipend;
- create employment opportunities with a better living wage to combat poverty in our communities;
- control human and wildlife conflict;
- reduce livestock theft and deforestation;
- conduct awareness campaigns to educate the communities about nature conservation; and
- ensure that communities feel they have ownership of natural resources

In the long-term there is a goal to create a community game farm. The project requires funding of more than ZAR 10 Million to make it work and is partnering with the protected area authorities in the region. There is also a plan to invest in water infrastructure, a recycling project, and develop local small and medium enterprises.

Adjacent to protected areas there is high rate of poaching and human-wildlife conflict (HWC), particularly loss of livestock.

### *Big Life Foundation*

Big Life Foundation presented on their work in the Kilitome Conservancy near Amboseli National Park. Poaching remains an issue in the area, including for elephants and big cats, as well as herbivores for commercial and subsistence bushmeat trade. There are informer networks within the community and young men are employed as community rangers. Big Life Foundation participated in the pilot phase of the FLoD initiative and have instituted a number of changes since that process. A number of warning posts have been erected and the vehicles available for rangers have been increased. The rental fee has been increased



from KES 30,000 to 48,000 per member. Entry gates are under construction to increase revenue. The cultural boma fee has been increased from USD 20 to USD 30. An additional investor has been engaged who is putting up a tented camp. The number of educational scholarships has increased from six to eight.

An electric fence has been completed separating agricultural land from the conservancy. The consolation programme has received a major boost from Big Life who are paying 50% of the kitty. The response time for HWC incidents has been reduced. KWS has made a bursary allocation. Quality breeding bulls have been introduced and a new school has been established.

#### *Namibia Nature Foundation*

The Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF) supports community conservancies in Kunene South, Erongo, Kavango West, Kavango East, Omaheke and the Zambezi Region through project hosting, grant management programmes, technical support and financial management. The poaching situation in the area remains serious. In 2018, 57 rhinos were poached, and in 2019, 28 rhinos have been poached so far. National figures for elephant poaching have been reducing gradually from 101 in 2016 to 27 in 2018, with only 11 cases reported so far in 2019.

The NNF follows a non-confrontational approach to anti-poaching. The anti-social aspects of killing iconic species is highlighted. Information about possible IWT activities is passed on to the authorities. Pride Youth Groups have been developed that spread the word about protecting iconic species. In conjunction with the Legal Assistance Centre they work to train magistrates and prosecutors on IWT issues. They also undertake fisheries management supporting fish guards.

The NNF has brokered several wildlife credit schemes where tourists pay a fee to the conservancy for each target species seen in the conservancy. Money raised is matched by the WWF. NNF supports the conservancies in developing joint venture contracts with partners to ensure that the conservancy gets a good deal. They help to conduct natural resource assessments for low income conservancies to enable them to identify economic opportunities and provide financial and governance training to conservancies to optimize economic opportunities. A devil's claw project trains communities on how to harvest the product.

NNF supports a number of coexistence projects including elephant proofing infrastructure, supporting early warning systems for lion, as well as lion proofing livestock kraals. Pride campaigns are also important to raise community support of iconic wildlife. Conservation agriculture is another key part of support in this area.

#### *Mozambique Community Based Natural Resources Management Network*

This is a very new organization that is currently learning from other countries. The network is a multi-stakeholder platform aiming to build standards for empowering rural communities to participate in decision-making over natural resource management. The network does not only deal with wildlife, but more broadly with natural resources. The main focus is on governance.

The poaching situation has been severe, but the legal framework has improved. However, there are still weaknesses around corruption, poor institutional coordination and population growth around conservation areas.



Activities around law enforcement have included increasing fines for illegal activity as well as increasing the awareness around successful prosecutions. Communities are being empowered and sensitized and there is work to secure community land rights and build governance systems. In addition, there is work to engage prosecutors and justice institutions. Under the new law, communities are being integrated into management councils. Land use planning is being undertaken to register community land rights and undertake participatory mapping and zoning. There is also work to integrate community patrolling into national patrolling systems. Gender issues are integrated into the work of the network, with key gender focal points, and integration of gender into various working groups.

### *Hammond Trust*

The Hammond Trust operates in the Nyangambe Area adjacent to Hammond Ranch in the Save Valley Conservancy. The area is home to a lot of wildlife, but very marginalized local communities. Poaching has gone down over the years, although there is both poaching for wildlife products, such as ivory and rhino horn, and poaching for meat, skins and traditional medicines.

The Nyangambe community, in the interests of reducing HWC, decided to set aside land for wildlife. The fence between Hammond and the new conservation area was removed, and moved to the outer boundary of Nyangambe. Wildlife then moved into the new conservation area, which was integrated into the larger conservancy. The community is now able to get an annual quota which results in revenue accrued directly to the community.

For communities, advocacy on its own is not enough. There are joint operations between the state and private / community scouts. There are prohibitive penalties for illegal hunting, including attachment of property. At the local and traditional leadership courts, cases are tried and if found guilty, offenders may be disowned and forced to relocate. There are also incentive-based informer systems.

The revenues from legal hunting is allocated to development projects, community programmes, bursaries, and hunting also provide employment opportunities. Buffer zones have been formed between the wildlife area and community fields. Veterinary drugs have been provided to local communities to reduce disease.

### *Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association*

The Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association (KWCA) supports the network of conservancies in Kenya. These areas are home to a large percentage of Kenya's wildlife, and also high levels of endemism, e.g. Hirola. There were previously high levels of poaching but these have reduced over the last three years. Some factors that influence this decline are:

- continued persistence of traditional lifestyles and cultural norms that favour wildlife;
- high penalties on wildlife crime and IWT and strong law enforcement by KWS and the judiciary;
- more eyes and ears at the community level –over 3,200 community rangers in community and private conservancies to support law enforcement;
- strong media coverage on arrests linked to IWT, mainly rhino horn and ivory.

A policy and legal framework promotes incentivizing and engaging local communities in conservation. Under the 2013 Wildlife Act, there is formal recognition of community and private wildlife conservancies and conservation as a land use, and an incentive, allowing conservancies to retain conservation fees for investing in conservation. There is a legal requirement for protected areas to allocate a minimum of 5% of benefits to adjacent

communities. Land leasing for tourism is ongoing for direct income and other benefits including bursaries. There are expanding training and job opportunities, for example through the Koiyaki Guiding School.

There is a requirement to undertake county-level land use planning. In addition, community conservancies are undertaking spatial planning for ecosystems and conservancies. There are also community awareness activities, such as wildlife clubs, wildlife warriors, community committees. Mitigation of human-wildlife conflict through lion-proof bomas, lion lights and chili fences is ongoing. There is legal support for consolation and compensation for deaths caused by wildlife, but implementation to date has not been significant. An insurance scheme is under development.

Non-wildlife based livelihoods are also supported, including pasture production and grass banks and integrated livestock production and breeding.

#### *South Rift Association of Land Owners*

The South Rift Association of Land Owners (SORALO) works with community conservancies across the South Rift region of Kenya. The area has increased its number of elephants from zero to over 300 in 15 years, with communities at the heart of conservation. In the Shompole-Olkirimatian group ranches, a conservancy has been set aside. There are community scouts, a number of income-earning lodges, as well as a women’s centre.

### **Session 4 – Lessons Learned**

During Session 4, the participants were asked to enumerate the success factors and the barriers to engaging communities in IWT. These were structured around the four pathways of the FLoD ToC, as well as the Enabling Actions that underpin the ToC.

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Pathways         |  |
| •                | Pathway A: Increase costs of participating in IWT  |
| •                | Pathway B: Increase incentives for stewardship   |
| •                | Pathway C: Decrease costs of living with wildlife  |
| •                | Pathway D: Increase non-wildlife-based livelihoods   |
| Enabling Actions |  |
| •                | Support development and implementation of legal and institutional frameworks for effective and fair wildlife protection and management |
| •                | Fight corruption and strengthen governance   |
| •                | Build capacity and institutions  |
| •                | Better understand the differences in accrual of costs and benefits at the individual vs community level                                |

#### *Success factors for engaging communities in combatting IWT*

The group identified the following success factors for engaging communities in combatting IWT.

| <b>Category</b> | <b>Success Factor</b>                                 |
|-----------------|---|
| Pathway A       | Use of social norms against IWT                       |
| Pathway B       | Partnerships and collaboration which enhance benefits |
| Pathway B       | Diversification of financial benefits for stewardship |
| Pathway B       | Equitable sharing of benefits                         |

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Pathway B        | Ownership of wildlife (and land)   |
| Pathway C        | Directly offsetting costs of HWC   |
| Pathway C        | Diverse set of mitigation measures   |
| Pathway D        | Sustainable livestock management (fewer but high quality livestock)            |
| Enabling Actions | Information and knowledge sharing on community engagement on IWT               |
| Enabling Actions | Building community development vision around community value systems           |
| Enabling Actions | Community rights (user and land rights)  |
| Enabling Actions | Good governance and transparency   |
| Enabling Actions | Effective policies and incentives and mechanisms for private sector engagement |
| Enabling Actions | Supportive political will  |
| Other            | Effective land-use and landscape level planning and implementation             |
| Other            | Community voice and empowerment  |

### *Barriers to engaging communities in combatting IWT*

The group identified a long list of barriers to engaging communities in combatting IWT. The full list is available in Annex 3. The group then worked by country to vote on the top five for each country. Votes by country are available in Annex 4. These votes were then aggregated and are listed below.

| <b>Category</b>  | <b>Barrier</b>  | <b>VOTES</b> |
|------------------|---|--------------|
| Pathway B        | Insufficient incentives   | 25           |
| Other            | Lack of / weak land use planning                                      | 15           |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of community governance  | 14           |
| Pathway B        | Lack of competitiveness of wildlife as land use option                | 9            |
| Enabling Actions | Conflicting policy & legislation                                      | 8            |
| Pathway B        | Limited investment mechanisms   | 7            |
| Pathway C        | The law is silent on compensation for victims of HWC                  | 7            |
| Pathway B        | Lack of sufficient transparency and equitability for benefit sharing  | 6            |
| Enabling Actions | Corruption  | 5            |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of financial resources   | 5            |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of community involvement in decision-making                      | 5            |
| Pathway D        | Weak private sector engagement  | 5            |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of community capacity to exploit opportunities                   | 4            |
| Pathway A        | Ineffective law enforcement   | 4            |
| Pathway C        | Unclear solutions to human-wildlife conflict                          | 4            |
| Pathway C        | Reduced space for wildlife  | 4            |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of political will for community conservation                     | 3            |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of information sharing   | 3            |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of policy and legislation for devolution of rights and ownership | 3            |
| Other            | Lack of implementation of land use plans                              | 3            |
| Pathway D        | Diverse land use needs agriculture vs conservation                    | 3            |

| Category         | Barrier   | VOTES |
|------------------|---|-------|
| Pathway D        | Getting humanitarian and conservation donors / NGOs to invest in non-land-based income generation for youth / communities | 3     |
| Other            | Lack of tech support funding  | 2     |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of Time  | 1     |
| Enabling Actions | Too much bureaucracy  | 1     |
| Pathway D        | Cultural beliefs  | 1     |
| Other            | Weak operationalization of policies, acts and regulations   | 0     |
| Other            | Financial and economic system / models (resistance)   | 0     |
| Other            | Sector-based thinking vs. system thinking   | 0     |
| Other            | A growing culture of WE to ME   | 0     |
| Pathway B        | Limited markets for wildlife products   | 0     |
| Pathway C        | Challenges of HWC are normally felt at individual level   | 0     |
| Pathway C        | Socially acceptable system of offsetting costs for wildlife damage  | 0     |
| Pathway D        | Market linkages for non-wildlife products   | 0     |

### **Session 5 – Summary of Day One**

Diane Skinner, SULi, provided a summary of discussions during the first day of the workshop. She presented a summary of the presentations from each organization, organized by the pathways in the FLoD ToC.

#### **Pathway A. Increase costs of participating in IWT**

- Community scouts for wildlife, fish, timber, non-timber forest products (NTFPs)
- Social control mechanisms
  - Exclusion from jobs, training, cash support, loans, conservation enterprises
  - Habitual offenders being disowned and forcibly relocated
  - Community suffers if individual is involved
- Community anti-poaching programme
- Informer system
- Cultural beliefs prohibiting illegal use / ensuring sustainable use
- Community by-laws
- Warning signs
- Engaging the legal justice system
- Fish guards
- Increase fines and sentences, including attachment of property
- Community service for local offenders (using local / traditional courts)
- Increase awareness about successful apprehensions and convictions
- Pride campaigns

#### **Pathway B. Increase incentives for stewardship**

- Sustainable tourism activities with direct involvement of communities
- Lease payments for land
- Empowering women in nature-based enterprises
- Benefits from fisheries and forestry
- Jobs from scout programme
- Development projects

- Benefits from law enforcement expenditure
- Construction of dams and boreholes
- Employment in camps
- Social fund contribution by operators
- Cultural benefit
- Entry fees
- Reduction of livestock theft due to increased security
- Cultural boma fee
- Bursaries and scholarships
- Guiding school
- Wildlife credit schemes (payments to conservancy for each target species seen)
- Conservation fisheries
- Recognition of rights
- Supports traditional ceremonies
- Employment
- % of protected area revenues for communities

#### Pathway C. Decrease costs of living with wildlife

- Land use planning
- HEC mitigation, e.g. chili
- Voluntary community groups to guard farms
- Consolation payments (big problems around this)
- Participatory rangeland management and communal grazing land ownership
- Funeral and hospital assistance for wildlife victims
- Electric fence around agricultural land
- Reduce response time to incidents
- Elephant proofing infrastructure
- Lion proofing livestock bomas
- Pride campaigns
- Lion EWS support
- Buffer zones
- Perimeter fence
- Provision of vet drugs to local communities
- Mixed wildlife-livestock system
- Community awareness
- Bee fences
- Contribute to bursary allocation

#### Pathway D. Increase non-wildlife-based livelihoods

- Micro-credit schemes
- Horticulture gardens
- Conservation agriculture
- Beekeeping, poultry, cereal, fish farming, tailoring
- Recycling project
- Community Dam
- Conservation fisheries
- Technical and professional education
- Understanding community ambition, in order to properly link opportunities to communities
- Beadworks, honey groups
- Various events
- Pasture production & grass banks
- Livestock breeding and production

## **Session 6 – Policy influencing**

Dilys Roe gave a brief presentation on the various opportunities to influence policy. These include global events, such as IWT conferences, and the CITES processes. There are also continental or regional IWT conferences. In addition, there are continental and regional anti-poaching strategies. At the national and sub-national level, there are processes around IWT and anti-poaching, species conservation planning, community-based natural resources management, and land use planning.

Holly Dublin then provided an overview of the different ways to influence policy. These include:

- Community statements to read out
- Lobbying & advocacy
  - Visits with lawmakers at home or abroad
  - Testifying to lawmakers
- Interventions
- Working groups (e.g. at MEA meetings)
- Personal relationships
- Talking with opponents
- Policy briefs
- Written responses to open consultations (e.g. IUCN resolutions)

## **Session 7 – Policy messages**

During Session 7, the participants were split into groups and asked to develop policy messages for the top ranked barriers (identified in Session 4). The full list of policy messages are available in Annex 5.

A small group then worked on developing policy messages for the GEF-CSO Consultation. These are available in Annex 6.

## **Session 8 – Policy platforms**

### *GEF-CSO Consultation*

Akshay Vishwanath gave a presentation on the upcoming GEF-CSO Consultation. Prior to each GEF Council meeting, a one-day GEF consultation with civil society organisations (CSOs) is held to highlight local CSO experiences on the ground on a particular topic. For December 2019, the GEF Council selected *Illegal Wildlife Trade: A CSO perspective* as the topic. The consultations aim to bring civil society, GEF Council members and other stakeholders together to discuss the threats posed by IWT and the possible solutions to this global threat, by focusing on the active and positive engagement of rural communities, CSOs, indigenous peoples and local communities, working with government, the private sector and other relevant stakeholders.

The structure of the December 2019 GEF-CSO Consultation is structured around two themes:

- Roundtable 1: The role of communities in the management of conservation areas & in law enforcement (1.5 hours). To discuss challenges and opportunities for the protection and management of conservation areas including law enforcement. From the perspective that local communities are in the best position to take part in law enforcement e.g. as game scouts or provide valuable information or to provide valuable information to authorities responsible for law enforcement.

- Roundtable 2: The benefits of a wildlife economy for the local communities (1.5 hours). How communities can receive direct and indirect benefits from wildlife. The session will also discuss HWC and the measures that can be taken to mitigate impacts and enhance co-existence. The dialogue will focus on challenges and opportunities for local communities from wildlife and barriers to achieve that goal.

Akshay noted that the guidance received had been that these would be moderated panel discussions with no presentations. Policy messages would have to be conveyed through questions to the panel, which would be up to the discretion of the moderator. If there is an opportunity to ask a question, it is recommended to preface your question with a policy statement.

### *National dialogues on community engagement in IWT*

Dilys Roe gave a presentation on national dialogues on community engagement in IWT. She provided a possible template for structuring such an event.

1. Set the scene
  - Ensure everyone is clear on the purpose and scope of the dialogue, e.g. opening presentation on communities and IWT
  - Use examples of how communities have been engaged to date – case studies – highlighting opportunities and barriers
2. Dialogue with policy makers
  - Dialogue with key policy makers. Use a panel discussion or other interactive format to encourage real dialogue (not a series of important people making pre-prepared speeches...)
  - To what extent does national/devolved *conservation policy and legislation* encourage community engagement to tackle IWT? Be prepared with details of what policies/strategies exist and what they say.
  - How can community engagement be enhanced? Again, focus on barriers and opportunities
3. Dialogue with IWT Programme leads and donors
  - Dialogue with key IWT programme/project leads and donors. As with policy makers, use a panel discussion or other interactive format to encourage real dialogue
    - What are the BIG IWT programmes in your country (e.g. GEF Global Wildlife Programme, USAID, etc.). To what extent do they encourage community engagement and how? (You need to do your homework beforehand and know what is going on in your country)
    - How can community engagement be enhanced? Again, focus on barriers and opportunities. Have community reps and IWT programme reps/donors on the panel and ask them all what they think and facilitate a discussion between them.
4. Make a forward plan
  - Agree the next steps
  - Developing a road map for improving community engagement in conservation and IWT policy making and in projects – how can the barriers identified earlier be addressed and how can the opportunities be maximised?



## 5. Essential requirements

- Do your homework and be ready to present it
  - o Make sure you know what policies, strategies, legislation exists in your country and what it says about community conservation and IWT
  - o Make sure you know what IWT programmes and projects are currently active and who is running them
- Employ a good facilitator. Dialogues need to be dialogues - active discussions between stakeholders, not a series of speeches
- Make sure you identify and invite the right (relevant) people – policy makers/practitioners who can make decisions, community representatives who truly represent their community and can articulate their position clearly
- Ensure the objectives of the meeting are clear and the planned outputs are produced which ensure the dialogue isn't just a one-off meeting and a dull meeting report

## 6. Checklist

- Who needs to be there?
  - o Key IWT and CBNRM policy people
  - o Key IWT projects/programmes/donors
  - o Key community representatives who are articulate and can present good case studies
- How many people need to be there?
  - o Make sure the key people are included but not everyone has to be there. Ideally c 30 people is a good group size. Identify a long list of names, roles and why they should be there and then prioritise
- Have you done your homework?
  - o Policy baseline – what do current IWT policies and strategies say about communities - what are the opportunities and barriers?
  - o Projects baseline – what IWT projects/programmes have you got in your country and what do they say about communities – what are the opportunities and barriers?
  - o Community perceptions baseline- what do communities think about their involvement? What are the opportunities and barriers?
  - o Policy makers baseline – what do policy makers think about engaging communities in tackling IWT – what are the opportunities and barriers?
- Have you identified a good facilitator?
- Have you identified a good rapporteur and agreed what the outcome report will look like/how it will be structured?
- Venue – do you need somewhere with breakout group space?
- Dialogue style – do you want a straightforward panel discussions or more interactive dialogue? (if so, make a plan to get flipcharts, sticky notes, marker pens, etc.)
- Budget and duration of meeting – check you have enough budget to cover the number of nights and number of people.

### *Tanzania National Dialogue Process*

Sophia Masuka from the Tanzania Natural Resources Forum (TNRF) gave a presentation on TNRF's 4<sup>th</sup> CBNRM Forum. The first forum took place in 2012 when TNRF undertook a national stocktaking exercise of CBNRM in forestry, fisheries and wildlife in Tanzania. The second forum took place in 2013, and the third in 2015.

The theme of the forum is *Engaging communities in combatting illegal wildlife trade*. TNRF is following a similar process to that outlined by Dilys. They are conducting a baseline exercise to gather information on project implementers, communications, etc. They are ensuring that government, CSOs, communities and development partners are part of the process.

The forum does face some risks, particularly around uncertainties with the local government and presidential elections in Tanzania.

#### *Zambia National Dialogue Process*

The Zambia CBNRM Forum is planning a national dialogue on IWT and communities in February 2020. They have been undertaking a baseline survey, documenting what current initiatives there are in IWT, conducting interviews for individual perceptions, collecting case studies, and gathering data on existing legislation and partners.

The goal of the national dialogue is to share our findings of the various activities we have undertaken, build consensus on how to work with communities, agree on national strategies going forward. The plan is to invite communities (CRBs, VAGs, CFG), support NGOs (WWF, FZS, TNC, GRI, CSL, CLZ), government departments (DNPW, FD) and donor organizations.

#### *Country planning for national dialogues*

Following these presentations, countries worked to develop a planning document for potential national dialogues in their countries. Initial planning documents for Kenya, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, and Zimbabwe are available in Annex 7.

### **Session 9 – Identification of next steps**

A number of next steps were identified:

- All participants will be added to the Communities & IWT WhatsApp group.
- Through that forum, participants were encouraged to inform each other of events.
- Participants committed to adding case studies and policy documents to the People Not Poaching portal.
- IUCN and IIED will develop a funding proposal for national dialogues.

Ivana Jurisic from GIZ made some final comments. She thanked everyone for their participation and noted that it had been a fascinating meeting. She particularly thanked everyone for their energy, enthusiasm and commitment. She was pleased to see that GIZ was supporting sensible activities and projects that are about tangible work on the ground.

Leo Niskanen from IUCN made some final comments as well. He noted that the meeting had been interactive and stimulating, and made a vote of thanks to facilitators, logistics team, participants and donors.



| <b>First name</b> | <b>Last name</b> | <b>Organization</b> |
|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Samson            | Silantoi         | SORALO              |
| Diane             | Skinner          | IUCN SULi           |
| Simson            | Uri-Khob         | SRT                 |
| Akshay            | Vishwanath       | IUCN                |
| Mike              | Watumwa          | South East Lowveld  |

Annex 2 - Workshop agenda

| <b>DAY ONE – MONDAY 25 NOVEMBER 2019</b>  |  |   |                  |
|---|--|---|------------------|
| <b>TIME</b>                               | <b>SESSION</b>   | <b>DETAILS</b>  | <b>PRESENTER</b> |
| 0800-0830                                 | <b>REGISTRATION</b>  |   |                  |
| 0830-0900                                 | <b>Session 1</b><br>Opening remarks and introductions      | Opening remarks   | IUCN             |
|   |  | Opening remarks   | GIZ              |
|   |  | Brief self-introductions  | ALL              |
|   |  | Objectives of workshop and overview of agenda                               | IUCN             |
| 0900-0950                                 | <b>Session 2</b><br>Overview of Communities & IWT          | Bringing community voice to the IWT debate                                  | IUCN SULi        |
|   |  | Communities: First Line of Defense against IWT                              | IUCN SULi        |
|   |  | People Not Poaching   | IIED             |
| 0950-1130                                 | <b>Session 3</b><br>Experiences from the field             | Presentations from each organization on their work with communities and IWT |                  |
| 1130-1200                                 | <b>TEA</b>   |   |                  |
| 1200-1300                                 | <b>Session 3 continued</b>                                 |   |                  |
| 1300-1400                                 | <b>LUNCH</b>   |   |                  |
| 1400-1530                                 | <b>Session 4</b><br>Lessons learned                        | Interactive session developing lessons learned                              |                  |
| 1530-1600                                 | <b>TEA</b>   |   |                  |
| 1600-1700                                 | <b>Session 4 continued</b>                                 |   |                  |
| <b>DAY TWO – TUESDAY 26 NOVEMBER 2019</b> |  |   |                  |
| 0830-0945                                 | <b>Session 5</b><br>Summary of Day One and Lessons Learned | Plenary session   |                  |
| 0945-1030                                 | <b>Session 6</b><br>Overview of policy influencing         | Plenary session   |                  |
| 1030-1100                                 | <b>TEA</b>   |   |                  |
| 1100-1300                                 | <b>Session 7</b><br>Developing policy messages             | Working session to develop policy messages                                  |                  |
| 1300-1400                                 | <b>LUNCH</b>   |   |                  |
| 1400-1500                                 | <b>Session 8</b><br>Policy platforms                       | Plenary discussion of policy messages                                       |                  |
| 1500-1530                                 | <b>TEA</b>   |   |                  |
| 1530-1700                                 | <b>Session 8</b><br>Policy platforms                       | Plenary discussion of policy messages                                       |                  |
| 1700-1730                                 | <b>Session 9</b><br>Identification of next steps           | Plenary discussion of next steps  |                  |

Annex 3 – Barriers to engaging communities in IWT

| <b>Section</b>   | <b>Barrier</b>  |
|------------------|---|
| Pathway A        | Ineffective law enforcement   |
| Pathway B        | Insufficient incentives   |
| Pathway B        | Lack of competitiveness of wildlife as land use option  |
| Pathway B        | Limited investment mechanisms   |
| Pathway B        | Lack of sufficient transparency and equitability for benefit sharing  |
| Pathway B        | Limited markets for wildlife products   |
| Pathway C        | The law is silent on compensation for victims of HWC  |
| Pathway C        | Unclear solutions to human-wildlife conflict  |
| Pathway C        | Reduced space for wildlife  |
| Pathway C        | Challenges of HWC are normally felt at individual level   |
| Pathway C        | Socially acceptable system of offsetting costs for wildlife damage  |
| Pathway D        | Weak private sector engagement  |
| Pathway D        | Diverse land use needs agriculture vs conservation  |
| Pathway D        | Getting humanitarian and conservation donors / NGOs to invest in non-land-based income generation for youth / communities |
| Pathway D        | Cultural beliefs  |
| Pathway D        | Market linkages for non-wildlife products   |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of community governance  |
| Enabling Actions | Conflicting policy & legislation  |
| Enabling Actions | Corruption  |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of financial resources   |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of community involvement in decision-making  |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of community capacity to exploit opportunities   |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of political will for community conservation   |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of information sharing   |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of policy and legislation for devolution of rights and ownership   |
| Enabling Actions | Lack of Time  |
| Enabling Actions | Too much bureaucracy  |
| Other            | Lack of / weak land use planning  |
| Other            | Lack of implementation of land use plans  |
| Other            | Lack of tech support funding  |
| Other            | Weak operationalization of policies, acts and regulations   |
| Other            | Financial and economic system / models (resistance)   |
| Other            | Sector-based thinking vs. system thinking   |
| Other            | A growing culture of WE to ME   |

#### *Annex 4 – Top barriers to engaging communities in engaging IWT for each country*

Note: Kenya was split into various regions as there were many participants from Kenya

##### Kenya – KWCA

- Insufficient incentives
- Reduced space for wildlife
- Lack of / weak land use planning
- Lack of community capacity to exploit opportunities
- Ineffective law enforcement

##### Kenya – Olderkesi

- Limited investment mechanisms
- Lack of competitiveness of wildlife as land use option
- Getting humanitarian and conservation donors / NGOs to invest in non-land-based income generation for youth / communities
- Lack of tech support funding
- Ineffective law enforcement

##### Kenya – Amboseli

- Lack of community governance
- The law is silent on compensation for victims of HWC
- Diverse land use needs agriculture vs conservation
- Lack of political will for community conservation
- Cultural beliefs

##### Kenya – South Rift

- Insufficient incentives
- Unclear solutions to human-wildlife conflict
- Weak private sector engagement
- Lack of / weak land use planning
- Conflicting policy & legislation

##### Mozambique

- Lack of community governance
- Lack of / weak land use planning
- Lack of information sharing
- Corruption
- Lack of Time

##### Namibia

- Insufficient incentives
- Lack of community governance
- Lack of implementation of land use plans
- Lack of community capacity to exploit opportunities
- Ineffective law enforcement



### South Africa

- Lack of financial resources
- Lack of community involvement in decision-making
- Corruption
- Lack of sufficient transparency and equitability for benefit sharing
- Ineffective law enforcement

### Tanzania

- Insufficient incentives
- Lack of sufficient transparency and equitability for benefit sharing
- Conflicting policy & legislation
- Limited investment mechanisms
- Lack of community involvement in decision-making

### Zambia

- Insufficient incentives
- Lack of / weak land use planning
- Lack of policy and legislation for devolution of rights and ownership
- Weak private sector engagement
- Too much bureaucracy

### Zimbabwe

- Lack of competitiveness of wildlife as land use option
- Conflicting policy & legislation
- The law is silent on compensation for victims of HWC
- Lack of / weak land use planning
- Lack of political will for community conservation

Annex 5 – Policy messages for top-ranked barriers

| Barrier  | Policy Statement   | Notes   |
|--|--|---|
| Insufficient incentives                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We urge for international and national policies to reform so that communities have better incentives to keep wildlife on their land</li> <li>• Historic policies of exclusion have rendered wildlife valueless to rural communities. This can be changed by policy reform on both national and international levels</li> </ul>  |   |
| Lack of / weak land use planning                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use policy should address the following: nature-based conflicts, such as HWC, support tangible benefits both monetary and non-monetary, securing sustainable biodiversity, and land tenure rights</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- one thing is land use planning, the next thing is about implementation.</li> </ul>   |
| Lack of community governance                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of enforcement strategy to ensure proper governance mechanisms are followed in delivering community projects / conservation interventions</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are regulations but not being implemented</li> </ul>   |
| Lack of competitiveness of wildlife as land use option     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land is a key resource for nature dependent communities living in marginal and fragile areas</li> <li>• Governments are urged to respect community land rights and put in place mechanisms to secure land rights to make wildlife a competitive land use option.</li> <li>• Call for greater incentives, investment and support for community participation in the wildlife economy.</li> </ul> |   |
| Conflicting policy & legislation within and across sectors | <i>No policy message developed</i>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National level, this can be fixed!</li> <li>- If the community is involved in decision-making, then they would have their preferred development option</li> <li>- Very big problem in Kenya</li> </ul> |

| Barrier  | Policy Statement   | Notes   |
|--|--|---|
| The law is silent on compensation for victims of HWC                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently communities see wildlife as a threat. It is therefore imperative for policy reforms and incentive mechanisms to make benefits greater than the cost to communities living with wildlife.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Economic benefits and rights, communities take responsibility for wildlife (revenue and decision-making)</li> </ul>  |
| Limited investment mechanisms  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need a policy that is conducive to public / private investment that can be attained by removing red tape, attracting JV and partnerships and participation should be influenced by pure business ethics and market forces.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- need to include a statement regarding the role of private sector in conservation.</li> <li>- different types of investment – in human resources, in the business development</li> <li>- private sector is not only about others coming from outside. We need mechanisms that empower our own private sector that can make partnerships. It is not third-party private sector.</li> <li>- Removal of bottlenecks – more conducive and not only limited to certain participants</li> </ul> |
| Lack of sufficient transparency and equitability for benefit sharing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be clear revenue-sharing mechanisms among the communities, investors and government</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No clear revenue sharing mechanisms</li> <li>- Communities don't know the exact amount of money that is generated from wildlife-related enterprises</li> </ul>   |
| Corruption   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We recommend that to eliminate corruption, the benefits from natural biodiversity should go as directly to the individual community members / landowners as possible</li> <li>• To improve governance and stop corruption, a comprehensive Theory of Change approach (First Line of Defense) should be mandatory</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Empowerment is necessary in financial training, governance and education</li> </ul>  |

| Barrier  | Policy Statement   | Notes  |
|--|--|--|
| Lack of financial resources                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We need a policy that will ensure that there is financial support for capacity development, conservation, project implementation, including cash dividends and project through government support and sustainable utilisation and investors, to ensure efficient and effective operations</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- best practices, standards</li> <li>- financial resources is v broad – and the policy message needs to be directed to a specific audience and tailored to that.</li> </ul>   |
| Weak private sector engagement                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We recognize that environmentally sound practices underpin good business. We acknowledge the importance and valuable contribution of the private sector in working with local communities and urge the sector to co-design win-win opportunities based on mutual trust, respect and equity that guarantees benefits to all. We urge governments and development partners to encourage, support and facilitate and incentivise private-community partnerships</li> </ul> |  |
| Lack of community involvement in decision-making | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are the victims of decisions that are made on our behalf by benevolent or belligerent organisations / institutions. As actors of development, we must be consulted and involved in decisions that affects our prosperity.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Main problem is the top-down approach</li> <li>- Communities are victim of decisions, but they “own” the resources, protect the resources and are drivers of economic development.</li> <li>- Needs to be done through participation, community voices, representation, bottom-up approach in ANY type of decision-making, whether it is land use, education, mining, land attribution, agricultural development, donor funding, benefit-sharing. Should be done at any level – community to national / international</li> <li>- Need enabling conditions: regulations / legal commitment, strong governance</li> </ul> |
|  |  |  |

| Barrier                                      | Policy Statement  | Notes   |
|--|---|---|
| Unclear solutions to human-wildlife conflict | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of policy framework for conflict mitigation and allocation of resources in support of loss of human life and property</li> </ul> <p><i>directed to the national or regional level</i></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no policy framework that deals with consolation to communities (wildlife victims)</li> <li>- Poor implementation of policy re: compensation</li> <li>- “compensation is there by law, but not in practice” (KE, TZ)</li> <li>- Need a policy statement on HWC for each country and a policy on consolation</li> <li>- Discussion of consolation vs. compensation</li> <li>- Discussion whether it is in law vs. whether it is just a statement.</li> <li>- Too broad, what does the community actually want to include in the policy statement?</li> <li>- Don’t give government control...rather let us take the rights over the wildlife, so that the government does not have to pay compensation.</li> </ul> |
| Ineffective law enforcement                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities live and share space with wildlife – first line of defence in IWT and preventing wildlife loss and habitat loss.</li> <li>• Communities are allies not opponents</li> <li>• Effective law enforcement bus be community centred, just built upon local knowledge and intelligence.</li> </ul> |   |
| Reduced space for wildlife                   | <i>No policy message developed</i>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Problems; population growth, urbanization, habitat loss, agricultural practices.</li> <li>- Wildlife is an important economic contribution at various scales, and we have national and international commitments to protect wildlife</li> </ul>  |

| Barrier   | Policy Statement  | Notes   |
|---|---|---|
|   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Can be achieved through proper land use planning at community and landscape level, promotion of wildlife economy</li> <li>- Enabling conditions: empowering communities, regulations / by-laws, enforced, tools, benefit-sharing</li> <li>- Rate at which our population is growing, we are still going to have a big problem.</li> <li>- We need to consider how the developed countries have urbanised and are now rewilding – how do we figure this out.</li> <li>- Building an economic model for conservation that is bundled with others, such as livestock and carbon – then we might arrive at valuations that are significant.</li> </ul> |
| Lack of community capacity to exploit opportunities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local communities are most often not aware of the abstract value of wildlife and other natural resources on their land. We urge for better education and full disclosure of values being generated by the diverse wildlife industries. We also urge more ownership and rights to communities of the wildlife on their land (conservation, business development, marketing, FLoD approach)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Abstract value = existence value</li> <li>- This is at the core – we need to ensure the abstract value is well understood.</li> </ul>  |
| Lack of political will for community conservation   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community-based conservation is yet to be mainstreamed in international and national policy and political processes.</li> <li>• Urge heads of African governments and leaders of intergovernmental platforms to take decisive action in building political will in support of community-based conservation</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Can we influence international governments?</li> <li>- We need to, because they influence the actions at the local level.</li> </ul>   |

| <b>Barrier</b> | <b>Policy Statement</b>  | <b>Notes</b> |
|----------------|--|--------------|
|                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Include community voices in all national and international policy platforms.</li></ul> |              |



## *Annex 6 – Policy messages for GEF-CSO Consultation*

### **Law enforcement**

- Communities as allies
  - First line of defence in preventing wildlife and habitat loss
  - We don't need more guns, we need communities for conservation
- Mainstreaming community-based conservation
  - Platforms for community voices
  - National and international policy processes
- Cost bearing/Benefit sharing
  - Build responsibility through direct share of resources at communities/individual level

### **Human-Wildlife conflict**

- Community-based Land and Natural resources management
  - Rights
  - Planning
  - Governance
  - Incentives
  - Cost bearing/benefits sharing of coexistence with wildlife and other natural resources
- Conflict mitigation/coexistence with wildlife and other natural resources
  - Insurance for life and property

### **Wildlife economy**

- Secure and Devolving the rights of land and natural resources
- Valuing Resources
  - Opportunity cost
- Communities as investors of wildlife economy
  - Community involvement in decision making
    - Because of History, ownership and guardians of resources

## *Annex 7 – Planning national dialogues*

### **Kenya**

Why?

IWT is a really critical issue that needs to be tackled

- Factors that drive IWT?
  - Poverty
- Availability of market for illegal trade
- Perception by communities that they are being disenfranchised
- Issues around land use change
- Inadequate benefits from conserving wildlife
- IWT not being treated as a priority by NGOs, donors and the communities themselves
- Policy gaps on IWT – what is the status of policy – there are probably gaps

As a result of those:

- Important to have a Kenyan national dialogue on communities and IWT

Convenors:

Organiser: KWCA – KWS (MOTW)

Co-organiser: IUCN/IIED and identify a potential donor to be part of this group

- Set up a planning committee or working group
- Attendees:
  - Select NGOs, those working in community areas
  - Community leaders – KWCA regional associations would be the platforms to nominate participants from communities
  - Potential representatives of tourism associations (one Apex and five under that)
  - Government – national and county (environment, livestock, agriculture devolution, treasury)
  - Invite some people from this meeting from other countries
  - Parliament committees – target Parliamentary Caucus on Environment (for representation – maybe Chair and Co-Chair)

Preparation before the dialogue (background research and preparation of presentations):

- An assessment of policy and legislation on community and IWT
- KWS status report on IWT in Kenya
- Summary of the laws and penalties for IWT
- Key communities document IWT status and strategies within their landscapes
- Mapping of organisations in communities and IWT in Kenya – where they work and what they are doing, what strategies and what results – successes and failures
- Develop a fact sheet on IWT and communities – explore different definitions, perspectives, points of view

Time: April – May 2020

Venue: Nairobi

Facilitator: IUCN/IIED

Attendance: 70 – 100 people

Working group develops:

- A workshop purpose and theme
- Finds funding

- Designs programme for the dialogue
- Identifies and invites speakers
- Further develops the list of attendees
- Appoints a rapporteur

If successful:

Then need another follow up dialogue on securing space for wildlife (at the landscape level instead of species focus). Possibly Oct-Nov 2020.

### **HIGHER-LEVEL THOUGHTS:**

- Exchange of players among these national dialogues (find a way to attend Tanzania and Zambian National Dialogue meetings)
- Possibly structure the Kenya National Dialogue by FLoD TOC/Pathways and Enabling Actions – developing a national Theory of Change for Community Engagement in Combatting IWT
- Seeking funding opportunities within our countries at GEF for funding through Global Wildlife Programme

### **Mozambique**

#### Context

- Mozambique natural capital is enormous, and has a huge potential to improve the country's economy and rural communities' livelihood
- Mozambique Government has made an effort to set institutions in place to regulate and support sustainable use of land and natural resources, including establish a comprehensive legal framework that regulates implementation;
- The operationalization of the laws are somehow weak, mainly due to weak institutional capacity and weak inter-institutional collaboration
- Communities are considered (in every natural resource related legislation) as a key contributor to improve sustainable natural resources management. However, despite the large legislation, communities continue to be neglected as *de facto* owners and protectors of the natural resources in Mozambique;
- Weak consultation and weak involvement of rural communities in development processes and investments are missing the opportunities for rural development through sustainable use of natural resources;
- Communities are the ones who bear the cost of human-wild life conflicts, and the consequences of illegal wildlife trade;
- Weak governance systems at community level, weak security of rights and capacity are behind the reasons of weak involvement of communities in decision-making processes over natural resources management;
- Population growth, poverty, weak inclusive land-based investments, are increasing pressure over natural resources, reducing the opportunities for rural economic growth, in a very climate change vulnerable country
- IWT is a real problem in Mozambique, and it requires a system approach to solve it, as it threatens to endanger wildlife species and impoverish the rural communities
- Mozambique participation in the wildlife economy Conference in Zimbabwe was solid, and a national dialogue could be an opportunity to build a strategic plan on key issues and consensus raised in the conference;
- As the country is improving its wildlife, and conservation legislation, the current establishment of the CBNRM Network (a multi-stakeholder platform) brings a new momentum to improve dialogue, approaches and standards for an effective a sustainable management of natural resources, where communities are in the center

**Organizers:**

- CBNRM Network (R-GCRN)
- ANAC (National Administration of Conservation Areas)
- DNDR (National Directorate of Rural Development) from the Ministry of Land, environment and Rural Development

**Co-Organizers:** Potential donors (Can IUCN/GIZ support?) or NGOs (WWF?)

**Key participants:**

- Members of the CBNRM Network (R-GCRN)
- Government institutions: Representatives from National Directorates of Land, Fisheries, Mining, Forest, Water
- Representative of Ministry of Finance
- Warden from National Parks
- Key NGOs involved in rural development, Wildlife Trade and Natural Resources Management
- CSO
- Community members living in potential and critical areas
- Key donors and International agency's

**Preparation road map:**

- Internal discussion, among the members of Network
  - Literature review (national plans, legislation, and current Government interventions)
  - Gather data
- Discussion with ANAC and DNDR
- Plan of activities and budgeting
- Find resources and negotiate venue
- Invitation
- Dialogue
- Reporting and share the proceedings

**Potential Dates**

- June: 29<sup>th</sup> or 30<sup>th</sup> 2020

**Expected results**

- Consolidated the need to improve security of rights, Governance and land use planning in wildlife and natural resources management projects and programs;
- Established a roadmap for improving communities' involvement in wildlife economy strategic plans and activities;
- Improve inter-institutional collaboration to build a solid coalition to tackle IWT starting from community involvement
- Initiated a regular process of dialogue and information sharing to improve opportunities of wildlife economy

**Namibia**

Is this needed? Yes, useful to do one - new stuff coming up that's not being addressed e.g. rosewood harvesting.

Namibia also being used as a transit country from Angola, Zambia, etc.

Pangolins also transited into Windhoek and then sold – both live animals and scales

Rhino poaching in Etosha and the commercial/private custodian farms – lack of incentives for urban dwellers to report on poaching/suspicious activities compared to on communal lands

*What would the dialogue do?*

Explore in particular how the NW communal experience can be translated to other resources e.g. timber

Address the harm to Namibia's reputation if it continues to be a transit country

Explore how to develop pride amongst farmworkers and towns which are near the game farms so that they have the same attitude to rhinos as they do on the communal land. Raise awareness about the value chains between the farms and the towns

*Policy issues to address*

Weak and outdated legislation – parks and wildlife act needs to be promulgated (might have recently happened)

Big policy gap around timber harvesting, trade and transport. V grey area. People are getting permission to clear bush for agriculture but they are really there to get the timber and communities getting nothing

Transit policy

Lack of coherence between MET and Forestry

*Key actors to include*

ROOIKAT

NACSO members

Conservancy representatives

Customs

Law enforcement

Magistrates

Legal Assistance Centre

MET as the main policy focus (including the APU people) but also Min Ag and Forests, NPC, OPM

Commercial game farm associations – or potentially could have many landowners who have rhinos

*Desirable outcomes – actions to take forward*

Identify necessary policy reforms, and incorporate community concerns and perspectives into new regulations e.g. on timber

Identify constraints for effective law enforcement from anti-poaching to magistrates – and a strategy for how to address that.

Development of simple checklist for people to be able to identify and report something that is wrong – e.g. like the very simple transport police posters in the UK.

**South Africa**

Theme: National dialogue on community rangers

Convenor: MCDF can convene, assisted by other stakeholders such as SAWC with broader geographic mandate and capacity

Stakeholders:

- Government ministries, including justice ministry
- Community organisations

- Training institutions
- Media
- Parks agencies, national and provincial
- USAID, WWF, etc.

## **Zimbabwe**

Dialogue theme: negative law enforcement perceptions of communities in terms of poaching.

### Key stakeholders

- Traditional leadership
- CBOs
- Institutions in PAs, e.g. ATS, DAPU
- Law enforcement agencies, PWMA, ZRP, Customs & Border Control, Army, PO
- Safari operators
- NGOs, e.g. FZS, AWCF, LRT
- Donors, e.g. EU, UNDP, GEF

### Process

- Baseline & desktop study
- Workshop
  - o Results of baseline and desktop
  - o Case studies
  - o Focus group discussions (focusing on the current negative perception of communities, exploring the role communities play in protecting wildlife, and exploring the possibility for partnership with communities going forward)
  - o Identify roadmap
- Communicating results of dialogue
  - o Government – Ministries
  - o NGOs
  - o Donors
- Create a forum to represent community voice