



**BEYOND ENFORCEMENT:  
Communities, governance, incentives and sustainable use in combating wildlife  
crime**

**February 26-28th  
Glenburn Lodge, Muldersdrift, South Africa**

A symposium organised by IUCN CEESP/SSC Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group (SULi)/International Institute of Environment and Development (IIED)/Austrian Ministry of Environment/ARC Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions (CEED), University of Queensland/TRAFFIC - the wildlife trade monitoring network.

**MEETING OBJECTIVES**

The primary objective of the meeting is to evaluate whether and under what circumstances community-based interventions<sup>1</sup> are likely to achieve success in combating current patterns of illegal use and trade of wildlife (plants and animals). The meeting aims to inform and support implementation of relevant commitments laid out in the London Declaration on Illegal Wildlife Trade and elsewhere.

**BACKGROUND**

Poaching and associated illegal wildlife trade (IWT) is devastating populations of iconic wildlife species such as rhinos and elephants, as well as a host of lesser known ones such as pangolins, some birds, reptiles, primates, medicinal plants and timber species. IWT is a major focus of current conservation concern and policy development, including through the African Elephant Summit (Botswana, November 2013), the EU Parliament Resolution on Wildlife Crime (January 2014) and the high-level London Conference on Illegal Wildlife Trade (February 2014). Forthcoming is a further high-level Conference on Illegal Wildlife Trade in Botswana, March 2015 to assess what has been achieved since adoption of the London Declaration.

The London Declaration notes that: “We recognise the importance of engaging communities living with wildlife as active partners in conservation, by reducing human-wildlife conflict and supporting community efforts to advance their rights and capacity to manage and benefit from wildlife and their habitats” (para 12).

However, despite this recognition, within international discussions the emphasis to date has been strongly on strengthening (government-led) law enforcement and reducing consumer demand for illicitly sourced wildlife commodities. Considerably less emphasis has been placed on the role of the local communities who live with wildlife. IWT has an enormous impact on local communities, who are affected by insecurity and the depletion of important livelihood and economic assets, while often being excluded from the benefits of conservation. They can also be very negatively affected by heavy-

---

<sup>1</sup> The term *communities* is used here to comprise ‘indigenous peoples and local communities’ as per agreement at CBD CoP12.





handed, militarised responses to wildlife crime, that frequently make little distinction between the illegal activities driven by large scale profits (crimes of greed) versus those driven by poverty (crimes of need). Most fundamentally, however, the longterm survival of wildlife populations, and in particular the success of interventions to combat IWT, will depend to a large extent on engagement of the local communities who live with wildlife populations. Where the economic and social value of wildlife populations for local people is positive, they will be more motivated to support and engage in efforts to combat and manage poaching and illicit trade. But where local people do not play a role in wildlife management and where it generates no benefits, strong incentives for illegal use are likely to exist. Even the most focused and well-resourced enforcement efforts (which few countries can afford or have the political will to implement) will struggle to effectively control wildlife crime in the face of strong incentives for complicity by local people.

There are examples from Africa and from other regions (including Central and South Asia, Oceania, North America and South America) of governance models that empower local communities to manage wildlife sustainably and generate social and economic benefits. In a number of cases, these approaches have been successful in reducing illegal wildlife use - sometimes dramatically - and incentivising strong community engagement in enforcement efforts. Community game guard programs are some of the most well-known of these, and there are many others. However, there is a clear need to raise awareness of these examples, distil lessons learnt, and ensure this experience influences the ongoing international IWT policy debate. Crucially, the potential of community-based approaches needs to be analysed in the context of contemporary challenges of rising profits from illicit trade, increased access to firearms by community members, worsening poverty in many areas, erosion of traditional governance systems, rapid urbanisation and changing community value systems, and large-scale threats from climate change combined with progressive habitat erosion affecting subsistence agriculture.

## PROGRAMME RATIONALE

The programme for this symposium directly responds to international commitments made with regards to the interaction between communities and Illegal wildlife trade (see Table below). Specifically, the London Declaration - which in turn recognises The African Elephant Action Plan and the urgent measures endorsed at the African Elephant Summit in Gaborone, the EU Parliament Resolution on Wildlife Crime, The St Petersburg Tiger Declaration on Tiger Conservation, the Global Tiger Recovery Programme and the Thimpu Nine Point Action Agenda, and The Bishkek Declaration on the Conservation of the Snow Leopard – includes some explicit commitments on community support and engagement. Other international forums – such as United For Wildlife (UfW) – have made similar commitments. The Clinton Foundation's Partnership to Save Africa's Elephants does not explicitly mention the role of communities in its 3 pronged strategy (stop the killing, stop the trafficking, stop the demand) although in practice community-level factors should necessarily underlie the first two.

To date, however, there has been little movement forward on implementing these commitments and little clarity has emerged regarding how they can be operationalised. This symposium aims to highlight successful examples of community-based approaches to combating wildlife crime that conservation agencies, institutions, donors and organisations could support in order to implement these commitments, as well as probe the limitations and challenges facing such approaches.





These commitments on communities and illegal wildlife trade must be understood and interpreted in the context of an enormous body of calls over the past 40 years to include communities in conservation initiatives and ensure that conservation respects their rights and needs. These include the CBD Decisions on *Article 8(j) and related provisions* (Dec. XI/14), *Sustainable use of biodiversity: bushmeat and sustainable wildlife management* (Dec. XI/25), and recent CoP12 decisions on these topics<sup>2</sup>; CITES Resolution on *CITES and Livelihoods* (Res. Conf. 16.6); and many IUCN Resolutions including *Promoting and supporting community resource management and conservation as a foundation for sustainable development* (WCC-2012-Res-092). Furthermore, during the European Commission's Consultation on the EU Approach against Wildlife Trafficking and the EU's *Wildlife Conservation Strategy for Africa*, multiple organisations have asked for a stronger reflection of the important role of indigenous peoples and local communities, of positive incentives, and of approaches including sustainable use.

The programme addresses community approaches in the context both of high value animal species (rhinos, elephants, tigers) and of lower value plants and animals. The current intensive global focus on IWT is largely driven by record levels of poaching and trafficking of high-value species, and policy responses are being framed accordingly. However, the problem is not limited to such species, and while effective interventions may differ between high and low value species, important insights may be gained by drawing on experiences involving the latter.

<sup>2</sup> See Decisions of CoP 12 at <http://www.cbd.int/decisions/cop/?m=cop-12>.



## FINAL PROGRAMME

<b>Day 1: 26th February</b>		
<i>Delegates arrive morning of 26th Feb for a group lunch</i>		
<b>1.30pm start</b>		
<b>1. INTRODUCTION (Open session)</b>		
<i>Chair: Max Abensberg-Traun</i>		
	Minister Edna Molewa, Minister of Environmental Affairs, South Africa	Opening address
	Braulio de Souza Dias, Secretary-General, Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)	Illegal Wildlife Trade and biodiversity conservation
	John Scanlon, Secretary-General, Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) (via representative: Tom de Meulenaer)	Communities and wildlife crime in context: an overview of illegal wildlife trade and current international responses
	Rosie Cooney, IUCN CEESP/SSC Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group and Dilys Roe, International Institute for Environment and Development	Introduction to the symposium: objectives and approach
	Duan Biggs, ARC Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions, University of Queensland, Australia	Presentation of draft "Theory of Change"
	<i>Questions and discussion</i>	
<b>2. WILDLIFE CRIME AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES: WHY BOTHER?</b>		
<b>2a. Communities and wildlife crime: what are the linkages? The broad context.</b>		
<i>Chair: Nick Ahlers</i>		
<i>3pm</i>	Introduction to the session	
	Caroline Petersen, United Nations Development Programme	Illegal Wildlife Trade and local development - what are the links?
	Brian Child, University of Florida	The sustainable use approach, communities and wildlife trade

	Henry Travers, Imperial College London and Jacob Phelps, Centre for International Forestry Research, Indonesia	Typologies of wildlife crime
	<i>Questions and discussion</i>	
<b>3.45-4.00</b>	<b><i>Afternoon tea (Open session ends)</i></b>	
<b>2a. Communities and wildlife crime: what are the linkages? Case studies. (Closed session begins)</b>		
<i>4pm</i>	Samia Saif, Durrell Institute of Conservation and Ecology	Who kills the tiger and why? Motivations of tiger poachers in the Sundarbans (Bangladesh)
	Edson Gandiwa, Chinhoyi University of Technology	An assessment of wildlife crime in Southern Zimbabwe: a case study of Gonarezhou National Park and adjacent communities
	Kenly Greer Fenio Greer, US State Department	Community attitudes on poaching rhino horn in South Africa and Mozambique
	Kimon de Greef, Independent Researcher	Abalone poaching in Hangberg: a functional alternative to the state fisheries sector?
	<i>Questions and discussion</i>	
<i>5.30pm</i>	Wrap up of day and close (Holly Dublin)	
<b>6:30pm</b> River Lapa	Namibian team: representatives from the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, NACSO, WWF in Namibia, IRDNC and Save the Rhino Trust <i>Moderator: Holly Dublin</i>	Special evening session to discuss (informally and in-depth) Namibia's experience in supporting communities and reducing illegal use and trade

<b>Day 2: 27<sup>th</sup> February</b>		
<b>9am start</b>		
<b>Recap of Day 1 – Rosie Cooney</b>		
<b>2. WILDLIFE CRIME AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES: WHY BOTHER? <i>Cont.</i></b>		
<b>2a. Communities and wildlife crime: what are the linkages? Case studies. <i>Cont.</i></b> <i>Chair: Nick Ahlers</i>		
	Noelia Zafra Calvo, United Nations University	Assessing local communities' trade-offs to support cost-effective conservation strategies: the case of the Ruvuma landscape
	Jo Shaw, World Wide Fund for Nature, South Africa and Rodgers Lubilo, South African Wildlife College	Community attitudes toward wildlife and conservation in Mangalane, Mozambique
	Mlandelwa Nqobizitha Ndlovu, Resource Africa	Community perspectives on benefits derived from conservation of rhino in the Kruger National Park
	<i>Questions and discussion</i>	
<b>2b. Enforcement strategies: when do they work, and what are their limitations?</b> <i>Chair: Duan Biggs</i>		
<i>10.00</i>	Introduction to the session	
	Aidan Keane, Imperial College London	Enforcement responses to wildlife crime - what have we learnt?
	Quy-Toan Do, the World Bank	The economics of enforcement-led responses to wildlife crime
	Elisa Reuter, German Police Service	Keeping the horn on the rhino: using crime prevention theory to understand and combat rhino poaching
	<i>Questions and discussion</i>	
<b>10.45-11.00</b>	<b>Morning tea</b>	
<i>11am</i>	Ana Puyol, TRAFFIC presenting on behalf of Patricia Mencay Nenquiui, Asociación de Mujeres Waorani de la Amazonía Ecuatoriana (AMWAE), and Bernardo Ortiz, TRAFFIC	Using integrated approaches based on economic alternatives as the main driver of change to combat illegal use and trade - insights from the Ecuadorian Amazon

	Adrian Lombard, International Association for Falconry	The CMS Global Action Plan for the Saker Falcon: promoting conservation and combating illegal trade through engagement of stakeholders
	<i>Questions and discussion</i>	
<b>2c. Impacts of enforcement-led strategies on communities and community-based conservation</b> <i>Chair: Roland Melisch</i>		
11.30am	Introduction to the session	
	Khristopher Carlson, Small Arms Survey	The militarisation of poaching and anti-poaching
	Kumar Paudel, Greenhood, Nepal	Understanding the impact of enforcement-led approaches to IWT on local communities on the Araniko-Trail, Nepal
	Gordon Bennett, barrister at New Square Chambers	Negative impacts of wildlife law enforcement in Botswana, Cameroon and India
	Nathalie van Vliet, Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)	Formal regulations on wildlife use in Central African countries and their local impacts on people's livelihoods and biodiversity
	William Kamgaing, Graduate School of Asian and African Area Studies, Kyoto University, presenting on behalf of himself and Takanori Oishi, Research institute for Humanity and Nature, Kyoto, Japan	Anti-poaching operations by military forces and their impacts on local peoples in southeastern Cameroon
	<i>Questions and discussion</i>	
12.30-1.30	<b>Lunch</b>	
<b>3. RESPONDING TO THE LONDON DECLARATION COMMITMENTS</b>		
<b>3a. Understanding and quantifying the negative impact of wildlife crime on sustainable livelihoods and economic development</b> <i>Chair: Dan Challender</i>		
1.30pm	Introduction to the session	
	Greg Stuart-Hill, WWF in Namibia	How poaching is affecting communities
	Lim Teck Wyn, Resource Stewardship Consultants Sdn Bhd, Malaysia	Traditional and commercial exploitation of flora and fauna in Taman Negara National Park, Peninsular Malaysia
	<i>Questions and discussion</i>	



### 3b. Engaging indigenous and local communities in conservation: the role of governance, rights and incentives, and challenges of this approach

Chair: Mike Murphree

2:15pm	Introduction to the session	
	Calvin Cottar, Cottar's Safari Service, Kenya	Rights and tenure as the basis for new ways to reduce illegal wildlife trade
	Laura Darby, UNEP-UNESCO Great Apes Survival Partnership	Great Ape ecotourism and Illegal wildlife trade
	Alejandro Morales, ARCAS - Centro de Rescate y Rehabilitación de Vida Silvestre, Guatemala	Sustainable egg harvesting and community engagement in protecting Olive Ridley Turtles ( <i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i> ), Guatemala
	<i>Questions and discussion</i>	
<b>3.15 – 3.45</b>	<b>Afternoon tea</b>	
	Louise Swemmer, South African National Parks	Neighbouring communities, conservation and wildlife crime – A SANParks Perspective
	Clara Lucia Serra Diaz, Regional Environmental Authority, Córdoba, Colombia (via pre-recorded video)	Incentives and community engagement in conservation and anti-poaching of the American crocodile in Cispata Bay, Colombia
	Alex Kisingo, College of African Wildlife Management	Governance and compliance failures in fighting illegal ivory trade: Perspectives from Tanzania
	<i>Questions and discussion</i>	
<b>4.45</b>	Duan Biggs, ARC Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions, University of Queensland, Australia	Review of draft "Theory of Change" in light of proceedings, followed by discussion
<b>approx 5:15</b>	Wrap up of day and close (Holly Dublin)	



<b>Day 3: 28<sup>th</sup> February</b>		
<b>Recap of Day 2 – Rosie Cooney</b>		
<b>9am start</b>		
<b>3. RESPONDING TO THE LONDON DECLARATION COMMITMENTS <i>Cont.</i></b>		
<b>3c. Involving communities in law enforcement efforts</b> <i>Chair: Dilys Roe</i>		
	Introduction to the session	
	David Wilkie, Wildlife Conservation Society	Rewards and risks associated with community engagement in anti-poaching and anti-trafficking
	Hasina Randriamanampisoa, Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust, Madagascar	Community engagement in protection of the ploughshare tortoise in Baly Bay, Madagascar
	Joe Kassongo, Juristrale, Democratic Republic of the Congo	Where and how to engage communities in strengthening law enforcement, and what factors underlie success  <i>Impliquer les communautés dans les efforts de renforcement de la loi: où et comment s'engagent les communautés dans le renforcement de l'application de la loi et quels facteurs sous-tendent la réussite</i>
	<i>Questions and discussion</i>	
	Max Jenés, PAMS Foundation	Ruvuma elephant project: communities and anti-poaching in the Selous-Niassa corridor, Tanzania
	Daniel Ole Sambu, Big Life Foundation and African Wildlife Foundation	Community engagement in law enforcement networks
	Susan Canney, Mali Elephant Project, The WILD Foundation	Protecting elephants, biodiversity, livelihoods & people: an integrated community-government response to combat wildlife crime in Mali
	<i>Questions and discussion</i>	
<b>10.15 – 10.45</b>	<b>Morning tea</b>	

<b>10.45-12.30</b>	Discussion and finalisation of symposium Statement and Recommendations <i>Chair: Rosie Cooney</i>
<b>12.30-1.30</b>	<b>Lunch</b>
<b>1.30-3.00pm</b>	Discussion and finalisation of symposium Statement and Recommendations
<b>3.00-3.30</b>	<b>Afternoon tea</b>
<b>3.30-5.00</b>	<b>Panel Discussion</b> among high level representatives of key governments, donors, and policy-relevant institutions, reflecting on the implications of the findings of the symposium for practice and policy. <b>(Open session).</b> <i>Moderator: Holly Dublin</i>
<b>5.00-5.30</b>	<b>Media question and answer session</b>
<b>5.30</b>	<b>Close of meeting</b>
Most participants leave the morning of March 1	