Poverty and Conservation Learning Group

Taking the Learning Group Forward
Inception Meeting Notes

12-13 December 2005

SUMMARY

What is the Poverty and Conservation Learning Group?
The Poverty and Conservation Learning Group (PCLG) is a multi-stakeholder forum, facilitated by IIED, guided by an international advisory group. It is intended to promote organizational learning on the nature, extent and implications of linkages between biodiversity conservation and poverty in order to:
- Strengthen organisations working on these issues;
- Help build consensus on key issues;
- Improve practice and policy-making.

Members of the Learning Group are representatives of organisations from a range of backgrounds (conservation, development, indigenous rights); sectors (NGOs, government agencies, private sector, civil society); and levels of operation – international, regional and national.[1] .The meeting participants agreed that there should be a limited number of individuals representing each organisation but that it may not always be practical to limit this to only one representative per organisation.

What does the Poverty and Conservation Learning Group do?
Many factors affect the relationship between biodiversity conservation and poverty – particularly prevailing national and international aid, trade and development paradigms. While recognizing the importance of understanding these macro-level influences, the meeting concluded that the Learning Group should be primarily concerned with the local level – the synergies and trade-offs between different motivations and subsequent strategies to conserve biodiversity[2] and the livelihoods of local people.

The poverty-conservation debate is a dynamic one. Many individuals and organizations - from all sorts of backgrounds – are engaging in the debate, are involved in practical activities or are rethinking policy. Keeping up with these developments, finding out who is doing what and where – and with what result – is a challenge. The Learning Group should usefully employ a mix of strategies for achieving its goals:
- Collecting, analysing and disseminating information;
- Making links between different organisations and within different communities of interest;
- Maintaining an overview of ongoing initiatives – setting findings of individual initiatives in a bigger context;

---

[1] Local groups are also represented though their involvement in networks and other initiatives.
[2] Recognising that conservation approaches will vary according to the motivation to conserve – ie for the intrinsic value of biodiversity or for the use its resources provide to society.

- Organising a series of learning activities – meetings, discussions, exchanges, publications - on hot topics.

What's Happening Next?

√ The **Learning Group website** www.povertyandconservation.info will be launched in March 2006. This will provide a "one-stop shop" for relevant information, hosting a series of powerful databases and providing links to key organizations, events, documents, tools and projects. It will also provide a central point for analyzing, synthesizing and disseminating new research findings as they emerge from various sources.

√ An email bulletin service – **Biodiversity and Society (BioSoc)** - will be launched in March, highlighting key texts on the poverty-conservation debate on a regular basis.

√ A series of **learning activities** – meetings, discussions, exchanges, publications – will help Learning Group members get to grips with key issues. Some events will involve the entire Group, others will be targeted to specific sections of the Group, and others will be opened out to participation by a broader range of affected stakeholders. Some activities will be led by the Learning Group secretariat, others by individual members. The first two activities will be a **side event on Equity and Protected Areas**, to be held during CBD COP8 in Brazil (March); and a **workshop on CBNRM, Poverty and Biodiversity** to be held as part of the International Association for Impact Assessment Meeting in Norway (May).

Your Help and Advice is Needed

√ To plan a full agenda of learning activities, the Learning Group secretariat needs to hear your views of priority issues/hot topics to address. Section 5.1 includes a list of those issues identified during the consultation process and this meeting. We now need to narrow this down to a maximum of 6 topics we can get to grips with over the next two years – including the top 3 priorities to move on first. Current suggestions for those priorities are rights based approaches; governance; impacts of big conservation organisations on local people; indicators for "success"; values and criteria for conservation priorities.

√ Some Group members will already have significant expertise in issues that others wish to learn more about and we would like to hear from any organisations that would be willing to lead on activities around specific issues.

√ The information dissemination activities of the Group are dependent on you making your information available. Please keep the secretariat informed of new publications to review in BioSoc, case studies to include on the website, updates on projects and initiatives.

Contact the Secretariat on: PCLG@iied.org

Day 1: Introducing the Learning Group

1. Background
Over the last 12 months IIED has been consulting with a variety of organizations on the need for, and potential scope of, the Poverty and Conservation Learning Group. The overall response to these consultations was positive and demonstrated a demand for a facilitated forum that could bring together stakeholders from different backgrounds, from different geographical locations, and with different perspectives, and promote information exchange and encourage mutual learning on different aspects of poverty-conservation linkages.

In order to consolidate the individual discussions held during the consultation process, a meeting was convened in December 2005, to which 46 organisations actively involved in, or affected by, conservation-poverty linkages were invited. The selection and invitation process was intended to produce as balanced a mix as possible of conservation, development, and indigenous peoples' organizations and to include national and regional bodies as well as international agencies. Each organization was asked to select one individual as a representative, although in some case more than one attended due to the diversity of staff with responsibility for these issues. Of the 46 invitees, 27 organisations were able to participate in the meeting. Annex 1 lists the organizations invited and the individuals representing them.

2. Aims of the Meeting
The meeting was convened with three key aims:
1. To recap on the rationale for the Learning Group and to introduce potential Group members to each other – including sharing information between member organizations on interest in/activities related to conservation-poverty links.
2. To review and agree proposed protocols of the Group (as set out in Learning Group "structure and function" document, circulated prior to the meeting).[3]
3. To develop a learning agenda for the next 1-2 years.

The first "Learning Event" was planned to coincide with this first meeting. Representatives of a range of international "poverty-environment" initiatives were invited to present their work on the second day of the meeting, with a view to identifying areas of potential synergy and collaboration as well as enduring knowledge gaps. The intention was that the findings from this session could then be used to further shape the agenda for the Learning Group and to identify where it might add value to these existing initiatives.

The outcome of each of the sessions is reported below.

3. Introductions

3.1 Introduction to the Learning Group
The meeting was hosted by the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre in Cambridge, UK. The meeting was opened by the deputy director, Kaveh Zahedi who gave a brief overview of

---

[3] All of the Learning Group documents referred to in this report are available on our website: www.povertyandconservation.info

the work of the Centre and its desire to better integrate its work with the international poverty reduction agenda. Dilys Roe then presented a brief introduction to the Learning Group:

The idea for the Poverty and Conservation Learning Group was developed by IIED in late 2003 in response to a number of perceived issues:

1) An apparent divide between conservation and development practitioners and policy makers on how – and whether – to link biodiversity conservation with poverty reduction;
2) The potential duplication of effort by a number of different organisations that are grappling independently with the problem of linking conservation and poverty reduction;
3) The lack of an established forum through which participants from a range of backgrounds can participate on an equal footing to share and analyse emerging experience in conservation-poverty linkages and identify knowledge gaps and research needs.

A proposal was submitted to the Ford Foundation in mid 2004 to enable IIED to scope out the need and demand for such a Group; identify potential members and explore alternative models and structures for the Group; and to investigate its potential research, learning and communications activities. In addition, this start-up phase provided the space to document the development of the conservation-poverty debate over time; map the ongoing initiatives of existing institutions and networks; and conduct a preliminary review of on-the-ground experience in linking conservation and poverty reduction.

In order to achieve its overarching goal - facilitating learning on conservation-poverty linkages between and within different communities of interest – IIED believes the Learning Group needs to fulfil two major – but different – functions:
1) promoting good practice amongst *policy makers and practitioners* through information provision and dissemination via an open access website
2) facilitating dialogue and mutual learning amongst different types of *organisations* actively working on conservation-poverty linkages (including those who are often under-represented in international debates) through provision of a programme of "learning activities".

Overall, as time progresses and relationships within the Group develop IIED sees the nature of the learning activities moving from sharing of experience; to identifying best practice; to building consensus; to advocacy around common positions.

3.2 Introductions to the Learning Group Participants
A considerable part of the day was devoted to hearing from each of the participants about their organisation's interests in poverty-conservation linkages, and the relevant activities they were involved in. While this was a long, and to some extent, arduous process it was considered important to fully acquaint each participant with the other organizations as not all were familiar or aware of each other's work. As well as introducing their organization, participants were asked to position themselves against a spectrum of different perspectives on poverty-conservation linkages.

Details of the activities of each organisation are presented in a separate Learning Group document "*Poverty-Conservation Linkages – A Survey of Organisations and Initiatives*" and so are not reproduced here. Box 1 below presents the results of the organizational perspective mapping exercise. It should be noted that many organizations have multiple perspectives, depending on the specific context in which they are operating. Furthermore, **aligning with any of the perspectives depends very much on how conservation and poverty are defined.** This exercise is not,

therefore, by any means intended to represent the *de jure* positions of the organisations involved. These limitations in mind, it is still useful to review the range of different perspectives held.

In very general terms it can be seen that the majority of donor agencies did not see a significant link between biodiversity conservation and their mission of poverty reduction. If there was a link, it was not perceived as part of the agenda of those organizations to address it. From these organizations point of view there is a clear need for better evidence and clearer articulation of the way in which biodiversity conservation can contribute to poverty reduction.

Indigenous peoples' organizations highlighted that the link can be negative as well as positive – conservation can cause – or exacerbate – poverty in some cases. Equally some macro-economic growth strategies can cause significant biodiversity loss in pursuit of poverty reduction.

The majority of organizations thought that there was a clear link but that this was very context specific, with no blueprint solution.

Box 1: Organisational Perspectives on Poverty-Conservation Linkages

1. ***Poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation are not linked. They can and should be pursued independently of each other***
   Development Cooperation Ireland, World Bank, Norwegian Ministry of Environment

2. ***Poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation may be linked- but not on our agenda.***
   Development Cooperation Ireland, World Bank, DfID

3. **Poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation are linked – the one undermines the other.**
   UN Permanent Forum, Tebtebba Foundation, African Wildlife Foundation

4. **Poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation are linked – the one depends on the other.**
   Cenesta, International Alliance, Tebtebba, Forest Peoples Programme, USAID, WAMIP, TILCEPA, IUCN, Ford Foundation, SwedBio.

5. **Poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation are linked - but there is no generic model.**
   USAID, CANARI, PROFOR, ResourceAfrica, Birdlife, WWF-UK, FFI

4. Reviewing the Structure, Function and Activities of the Learning Group

4.1 Proposals
Prior to the meeting a document was circulated setting out the proposed structure and function of the Learning Group (see *Poverty and Conservation Learning Group – Proposed Structure and Function)*. The proposals for membership of the group, activities, key issues to address, and so on are summarized below. Group members were asked to review these proposals and to provide feedback on them.

Summary of Proposals
a. Membership:
- Targeted learning activities to focus on *organizations* that develop – or have the capacity to influence – policy.
- Attention to be paid to achieving representation from the range of organizations with an interest in conservation-poverty linkages. Particular efforts to be made to identify member organizations that could facilitate regional or national level learning processes that will feed in to the international Group
- Individual practitioners to be engaged in sharing experience and promoting good practice.
- Membership to be restricted to one individual per organisation

b. Facilitation
- The Group to be convened and facilitated by IIED supported by a small steering committee. Steering committee members will include those with experience of running learning groups as well as those with experience of conservation-poverty linkages

c. Function
The Learning Group has two functions:
1. promote good practice amongst *policy makers and practitioners* through information provision and dissemination via an open access website
2. facilitate dialogue and mutual learning amongst different types of *organisations* actively working on conservation-poverty linkages (including those who are often under-represented in international debates) through provision of a programme of "learning activities".

d. Activities
- Two main types of activities: 1) web-based information dissemination and 2) a series of learning "events".

1. *Information provision.* A multi-lingual website is being developed at www.povertyandconservation.info. This will act as a repository for information and a key means for dissemination. The website will include four main databases: bibliographic references, **case studies; organizations; and initiatives. T**he website will also function as a **web portal**, providing links to other sites of interest, members institutional sites, related databases, networks and so on. The site will also contain:
- an **e-library** for documents that are not available on other live websites,
- access to an email news service – **BioSoc** - highlighting recent relevant publication
- a section for useful **methodologies and tools**,

- a **practitioners exchange forum** to facilitate rapid exchange of information, post requests for assistance and so on from project managers, protected area officials and so on.
- a section for posting **Learning Group documents** (including thinkpieces, position papers, workshop proceedings, archived newsletters).

2. *.Learning Events:* We propose a mix of virtual and face-to-face events including roundtable discussions, workshops, training and so on. The themes and scope of these events will be designed to address a series of key issues – to be agreed by the Group members. Some events will involve the entire Group, others will be targeted to specific sections of the Group (eg a donor roundtable) and others will be opened out to participation by a broader range of affected stakeholders – depending on the thematic and geographic coverage (eg a session exploring the impacts of conservation activities on indigenous peoples and other affected communities).). Where possible events will be linked to existing regional and international meetings such as CBD events, UN meetings, IUCN events, Poverty-Environment Partnership meetings and so on. We will also experiment with video-conferencing and e-conferencing as a means for facilitating participation in these events.

Participants were also asked to help develop the list of key issues around which learning events could be structured. A list of key issues that had been identified during the consultation process was included in the *Proposed Structure and Function* document, and participants were asked to further refine and develop this list.

Recognising that a wide variety or organizations - all with different needs and priorities – was represented, participants were asked to divide into three sub-groups under the broad categories of conservation organizations, people-focussed organizations (indigenous peoples organizations, development agencies) and "dual-mission" organizations with the hope that each of these groups might define a different set of key issues, representing their different priorities. This request was, however, met with a significant degree of resistance – participants preferring to remain in mixed groups. On the one hand this meant that the variations in the perspectives of different stakeholder groups could not be highlighted but at the same time demonstrated the value that participants saw in learning from different perspectives.

e. Key Themes for Learning Events
The consultations for the Learning Group identified a number of priority issues under three main themes:

1. The need for better understanding.
- What is the empirical body of knowledge? Which components of biodiversity are most important for poverty reduction? Which groups of the poor are 1) most dependent and 2) most likely to benefit from interventions?
- What are the incentives for making the conservation –poverty link? To what extent does poverty really undermine conservation success and to what extent can biodiversity really contribute to poverty reduction?
- What is a "rights-based approach"? What does this mean in practice for both conservation and development agencies?
- How can conservation really make a difference where decades of rural development have apparently failed?

- What is the overall impact of international conservation programmes on indigenous and other local people?
- What are the implications for North-South financial flows?

2. *The need for practical tools and methodologies*
- What strategies for linking conservation and poverty reduction have worked on the ground – and what are the criteria for success?
- What mechanisms can be used to translate sound evidence into organizational/policy change?
- How can power imbalances be addressed when deciding trade-offs, approaches, objectives?
- How can existing small-scale successes be scaled up?
- How is "best practice" defined in different conservation contexts (protected areas, community conserved areas, co-managed areas etc)?
- How can "pro-poor" conservation be financed and who will cover the costs?

3. *The need for an appreciation of externalities*
- What are the implications of China – and other rapidly industrializing countries – for biodiversity?
- What are the implications of continuing urbanization?
- What are the likely impacts of continued infrastructure development both for local communities and for conservation?
- What is the role of external policy conditions (trade, MEAs, etc) in helping or hindering poverty-conservation links
- What is the role of the private sector?
- How can markets be made to work for local communities?

4.2 Participants' Feedback

a. Membership
- The Group should include both practitioners and policy-makers (and focus on making the links between them)
- Participation by individuals representing organizations would be made more open if the Chatham House rule applied (comments made during meetings can be reported publicly but not attributed to specific individuals or organizations)
- There may be more than one relevant individual within an organization who should participate.
- Representatives from the private sector and from government should be included.

b. Facilitation
- Facilitation by IIED Secretariat, supported by Steering Committee of up to 12 drawn from across range of stakeholders

c. Activities
- Learning events should be targeted at wide range of organisations (expand existing Group to include private sector and government)
- Public engagement through open access website should be supplemented by other non-web based outreach mechanisms (drawing on members networks)

- Plan on 2-3 events per year including thematic roundtables, workshops (linked to int'l events). These will mainly be face-to-face events but should also explore video/e-conferencing
- Include field-based activities
- Include regional and national meetings – facilitated by members
- Provide a quarterly newsletter with updates on the Group's activities.
- Launch an email-based news bulletin/briefing paper service
- Develop joint activities that build on common interests – car pooling
- Extend into advocacy – convert the unconverted
- Highlight practical tools and methodologies for policy influence, impact assessment

d. Key Issues
- Quantifying biodiversity-poverty relationships, challenging received wisdom and busting prevailing myths. (how much biodiversity, which aspects of poverty reduction etc)
- Mainstreaming biodiversity in national and international planning mechanisms
- Market based mechanisms – what works and what doesn't
- Implications of landscape approaches
- Rights based approaches
- How to address underlying threats
- Trade-offs – managing and minimising
- Political economy of conservation decision making
- Tools and tactics for increasing policy influence.

e. Perceived Value of the Learning Group
- Access to different perspectives (from different disciplines, from different regions)
- Help build capacity on environment in development agencies, on socio-economic issues in conservation agencies
- A forum to discuss the undiscussable
- Mechanism for sharing practical experience and identifying key gaps
- Mechanism for capturing new knowledge and setting it in context
- International – national – local linkages

f. Obstacles to overcome
- Trust – building relationships
- Building the Group – but maintaining focus
- Maintaining momentum
- Avoiding becoming just another talk shop

Day 2: Mapping Global Initiatives Addressing Conservation-Poverty Linkages

1. Aims of Day:
Day two was intended to act as a pilot "learning event" for the Group – the focus being on the range of existing international initiatives on conservation-poverty linkages. The aims of the day were thus to:

- Share information about ongoing international initiatives addressing conservation-poverty linkages.
- Map initiatives to identify objectives/issues being addressed, scope (level targeted), geographical coverage, focus (e.g. sectors, issues), nature of initiative (research, network, practice); key achievements to date and constraints experienced.
- Highlight areas of potential collaboration and key gaps.
- Discuss implications of these initiatives for the Learning Group
- Confirm the role of the Learning Group in light of these initiatives (addressing key gaps, facilitating sharing of information).

A number of additional participants were invited to attend this second day. These were the coordinators of initiatives that were not already represented by participant organizations. Annex 2 details the additional participants and the initiatives represented.

2. Recap on Day 1
The meeting started with recapping on the outcomes of Day 1, and in particular, on the focus and objectives of the Learning Group:

Understanding what it is not probably helps clarifying what the Learning Group is about:

- A project implementation agency
- A research consortium
- A consultancy group
- A pressure group
- A provider of all the answers

The overall objective of the Learning Group is, as the name suggests, to facilitate learning on the nature, extent and implications of linkages between biodiversity conservation and "poverty" (or poor peoples' livelihoods) In order to:

- Strengthen organisations working on these issues;
- Help build consensus on key issues;
- Improve practice and policy-making.

The anticipated mechanisms for achieving these goals are:

- Collecting, analysing and disseminating information
- Making links between and within different communities of interest
- Maintaining an overview of ongoing initiatives – setting findings of individual initiatives in a bigger context
- Organising interesting meetings on key issues

The Group is thus focused on biodiversity – not the broader environment; on poor people's livelihoods – poverty reduction at the local level rather than macro-economic growth; and on the conflicts and complementarities of conserving biodiversity whilst improving rural livelihoods.

3. Presenting and Mapping Initiatives.
The following presentations were made:
- Initiatives addressing global architecture: CBD-MDG links; Poverty-Environment Partnership
- Initiatives addressing national policy frameworks: UNDP/UNEP Poverty Environment Initiative
- Broad biodiversity/conservation initiatives: Advancing Conservation in a Social Context; IUCN Poverty and Conservation Initiative; Nature & Poverty Initiative.
- Sectoral initiatives: Program for Forests (PROFOR); Wetlands and Poverty .
- Specific issue initiatives: Theme on Indigenous and Local Communities, Equity and Protected Areas (TILCEPA); Forest Peoples Programme.

Other initiatives mentioned – but not discussed due to time constraints - were Social Impacts of Conservation; Care International, SwedBio; Birdlife International and Fauna & Flora International programmes funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

All the presentations are available on the Learning Group website www.povertyandconservation.info and are not duplicated here. The summary of initiatives is presented in tabular format in Annex 3.

The initiatives represent a range of levels of interventions – from international to local – although only a few of them are set up to make the links between the different levels. Many of them are tackling the same problems – notably the
1) lack of integration of biodiversity issues into poverty reduction strategies at the national and international level.
2) Lack of local peoples' "voice" in national and international policy-making processes (and where it is present, a lack of recognition by policymakers
3) Limited civil society participation in policy making processes

The presentation of the initiatives demonstrated clearly the huge potential for duplication of effort and the need for greater communications – despite a number of them mentioning learning as a key priority. As an example, the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs is supporting five major biodiversity-livelihood programmes through Birdlife International, Wetlands International, Fauna & Flora International, African Wildlife Foundation and the Netherlands alliance of Mileudefensie, IUCN-NL and WWF-NL. The Learning Group meeting was the first time these five organizations have sat around the same table and learnt about each other's programmes. Greater. coordination between these activities could result in far greater impact and effectiveness.

4. Reflections on the Role of the Learning Group

The Learning Group as a "Dating Agency"
The 10 presentations highlighted the vast amount of activity occurring around the globe on poverty-conservation links. These represent just a fraction of research and advocacy that is occurring, but already highlight the huge potential for significant overlap and duplication of effort. A key role for the Learning Group is therefore to maintain links with each of these initiatives (as well as finding out but other activities we are not currently aware of), keeping abreast of developments within each, and facilitating links between initiatives so that they may add value to each other and build on their synergies. Different organizations may also find value

in developing joint activities that build on their common interests and learn from the different perspectives.

The Learning Group as Context

The presentations demonstrated a wide range of focus – from broad poverty-environment initiatives, to activities target at specific sectors or habitats (forests, wetlands), to activities addressing single issues (protected areas, indigenous rights). The *Conceptual Framework* document describes that range of different poverty-conservation linkages. With this "bigger picture" in mind, the Learning Group can position the findings of each initiative in context – fitting different pieces of a puzzle together and gradually developing a comprehensive picture of what we know and what we don't.

The Learning Group as an Information Portal

The poverty-conservation debate is a dynamic one. Many individuals and organizations - from all sorts of backgrounds – are engaging in the debate, are involved in practical activities or are rethinking policy. Keeping up with these developments, finding out who is doing what and where – and with what result – is a challenge. The Learning Group website and associated outreach mechanisms can provide a "one-stop shop" for relevant information, hosting a series of powerful databases and providing links to relevant organizations, events, documents, tools and projects. It can also provide a central point for analyzing, synthesizing and disseminating new research findings as they emerge from various sources.

The Learning Group as a Neutral Forum

The poverty-conservation debate mushroomed in 2004 following the publication of an article in WorldWatch magazine on the impacts of the big international conservation organizations on indigenous peoples. For some this is "THE issue" that needs to be addressed. For others, THE issue is something quite different, but sometimes equally contentious – for example, how can an organisations honestly assess why certain interventions have failed when sitting at the same table as those who give it money and to whom it promises success? Interestingly, the impacts of the big conservation organizations was NOT raised during the meeting in discussions on priority issues for the Group to discuss – even though it was vigorously debated in presentations and in breaks. If sufficient trust can be built between members, the Learning Group could provide a valuable forum for tackling such tricky issues – "discussing the undiscussable" as one participant phrased it.

The Learning Group as a Capacity Building Mechanism

What is a "rights based approach" to conservation? What does it mean in practice for conservation organizations to implement this approach? What tools are available to help us increase our influence over policy makers and decision makers? How do we engage with externalities that are beyond our control? The Learning Group is intended to help build capacity amongst its member organizations to address these issues – and others. We can do this through organizing - or facilitating -a series of learning activities on key themes – meetings, workshops, side events at international fora, site visits, commissioned papers, and so on. Some of these themes will be of relevance to the whole Group. Others will only be of interest to a subset. Others still may warrant greater participation from organizations not currently involved in the Group. Some Group members will already have significant expertise in some of these issues and can be resourced to share this expertise with others. In other cases organizations in one geographic region may benefit from exchange with a different region struggling with similar issues.

5. Next Steps
5.1 Identifying a List of Priority Issues for the Group to Address
The two day meeting did not produce a definitive list of issues around which learning activities could be devised – this highlights the different perspectives that exist and the different agendas that different participants hold. We recognize that the value of the Learning Group will vary from participant to participant and that not all the activities will be relevant to all the members. While this makes the task of prioritizing key issues and developing a comprehensive learning agenda more challenging, it also emphasizes the value of a group of this kind in bringing so many different perspectives and priorities into one forum.

The table below summarises the issues that emerged from the consultation process in the run up to this meeting, and the issues that were raised in the breakout sessions during the meeting. Participants are requested to review these lists and identify which are highest and lowest priorities. Participants are also requested to identify any other issues that are not currently on the list – however contentious they may seem to be. It is only by being open about such issues that we can hope to move forward and tackle them. Ideally we would like to produce a list of up to 6 priority themes – to be tackled over a 2-year period. **It would therefore be helpful is participants could summarise their inputs by identifying their one real priority to address**.

Raised During Consultation Process	Raised During Meeting
1. The need for better understanding. • What is the empirical body of knowledge? Which components of biodiversity are most important for poverty reduction? Which groups of the poor are 1) most dependent and 2) most likely to benefit from interventions? • What are the incentives for making the conservation – poverty link? To what extent does poverty really undermine conservation success and to what extent can biodiversity really contribute to poverty reduction? • What is a "rights-based approach"? What does this mean in practice for both conservation and development agencies? • How can conservation really make a difference where decades of rural development have apparently failed? • What is the overall impact of international conservation programmes on indigenous and other local people? • What are the implications for North-South financial flows?	• Quantifying biodiversity-poverty relationships, challenging received wisdom and busting prevailing myths. (how much biodiversity, which aspects of poverty reduction etc) • What is a "rights-based approach"? What does this mean in practice for both conservation and development agencies? • Implications of landscape approaches
2. The need for practical tools and methodologies • What strategies for linking conservation and poverty reduction have worked on the ground – and what are the criteria for success? • What mechanisms can be used to translate sound evidence into organizational/policy change? • How can power imbalances be addressed when deciding trade-offs, approaches, and objectives? • How can existing small-scale successes be scaled up? • How is "best practice" defined in different conservation contexts (protected areas, community	• Market based mechanisms – what works and what doesn't • Trade-offs – managing and minimising • Political economy of conservation decision making • Tools and tactics for increasing policy influence.

conserved areas, co-managed areas etc)? • How can "pro-poor" conservation be financed and who will cover the costs?	• Mainstreaming biodiversity in national and international planning mechanisms
3. The need for an appreciation of externalities • What are the implications of China – and other rapidly industrializing countries – for biodiversity? • What are the implications of continuing urbanization? • What are the likely impacts of continued infrastructure development both for local communities and for conservation? • What is the role of external policy conditions (trade, MEAs, etc) in helping or hindering poverty-conservation links • What is the role of the private sector? • How can markets be made to work for local communities?	How to address underlying threats

5.2 Learning Activities

Forthcoming Events
Protected Areas and Poverty
 The next Conference of Parties of the CBD is due to be held in Curitiba, Brazil from 20th-30th March. IIED is planning to organize a side event – in collaboration with TILCEPA, Care International and others – on Protected Areas and Poverty. Participants who are planning to attend COP8 and would like to be involved in this – or those who would like to attend but do not have sufficient resources – are requested to contact IIED for further details.

Community-Based Natural Resource Management and Poverty
IIED has been commissioned by the Norwegian Ministry of Environment to undertake an assessment of the actual and potential contribution of CBNRM to achieving the Millennium Development Goals and the objectives of the CBD. The outcomes of this assessment will be presented at a workshop on the same theme to be held as part of the International Association for Impact Assessment meeting in Stavanger, Norway, 22-26 May 2006. The assessment will focus on Southern Africa but will also draw on comparative experience in India, South East Asia and Central America. IIED would welcome any contributions to this study – particularly details of existing analyses and poverty or biodiversity impact assessment – and suggestions for participants/speakers in the workshop.

Thematic Activities
As these notes describe, one of the main functions of the Learning Group will be to organize a series of learning activities and events around priority themes. In some cases these will be organized and facilitated by IIED. In other cases, where members have expertise in a particular area, we hope they could take this theme forward and devise a set of activities that the Learning Group could support. Forest People's Programme have volunteered to tackle rights-based approaches to conservation; Care International are exploring a theme on governance. Suggestions from other organizations are very welcome.

Information Activities

The Learning Group website - www.povertyandconservation.info - will be launched at CBD COP8 in Brazil in English, French and Spanish. Although the website is still under development, it can be viewed in its raw state on http://povertyandconservation.info/test.php. There is currently a hyperlink to the home pages of each of the organizations participating in the Learning Group meeting. Please advise IIED If you would like this link to be redirected – eg to specific project or publication pages – or deleted. Please also forward any additional links you would like made – eg to relevant documents or other online resources.

A regular email service highlighting key publications will also be launched at COP8 – again in English, French and Spanish. Each month, one key publication will be reviewed and full details provided of how to obtain the complete document. This service will be modeled on the excellent "Polex" (Forest Policy Expert) newsletter distributed by CIFOR (http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/docs/_ref/polex/english/2005/2005_12_17.htm) but will obviously focus on biodiversity-livelihoods linkages. Suggestions for pertinent documents to review are most welcome.

5.3 Steering Committee

A 12-member steering committee will be appointed to help guide the Learning Group process. We will be approaching individuals shortly in connection with this, but would also welcome suggestions/nominations from meeting participants.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the support of the Ford Foundation in supporting the development of the Learning Group to this stage. We look forward to their ongoing engagement.

Thanks are also due to Jon Hutton and Kaveh Zahedi of the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre for hosting the meeting; to Steve Bass of IIED for facilitating the second day; to Stuart Douglas-Whitehead of UNEP-WCMC for logistical support and to Alessandra Giuliani for research and admin assistance. Finally, thanks to all the participants – many of whom traveled long distances to take part in the meeting.

Annex 1: Organisations invited to the first meeting of the Poverty and Conservation Learning Group

	Organisation	Representative
1	African Wildlife Foundation	Jo Elliott
2	Birdlife International	David Thomas
3	Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI)	Sarah McIntosh
4	Cenesta	Taghi Farvar
5	Development Cooperation Ireland	Tara Shine
6	Fauna & Flora International	Matt Walpole
7	Ford Foundation	Jeff Campbell, Suzanne Siskel
8	Forest Peoples Programme	Marcus Colchester
9	International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal People of the Tropical Forest	Viktor Kaisiepo
10	IUCN	Bill Jackson, Gonzalo Oviedo
11	KwaZulu Natal University	Japhet Ngubane
12	Ministry of Environment, Norway	Leif John Fosse
13	Resource Africa	Kule Chitepo
14	Swedish Biodiversity Centre/SwedBio	Maria Berlekom
15	Tanzania Natural Resources Forum	Liz Singleton
16	Tebtebba Foundation	Joji Carino
17	Theme on Indigenous and Local Communities, Equity and Protected Areas (TILCEPA)	Lea Scherl
18	UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues	Sonia Smallacombe
19	UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre	Kaveh Zahedi, Peter Herkenrath, Jon Hutton
20	University of Cambridge/UK Poverty and Conservation Working Group	Bill Adams
21	US Agency for International Development	Hannah Fairbank
22	Wetlands International	Mike Ounsted
23	Wildlife Conservation Society	Kent Redford
24	World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous People (WAMIP)	Francis Chachu Ganya
25	World Bank/ Programme for Forests (Profor)	Jill Blockhus
26	WWF International	Dawn Montanye
27	WWF-UK	Dominic White, Julie Thomas

	Organisations invited but unable to attend	Contact
1	Indigenous People's Biodiversity Forum	Alejandro Argumedo
2	Asia Pacific Indigenous People's Pact	Jannie Lasimbang
3	Care International	Phil Franks
4	Oxfam	Robin Palmer
5	Catholic Institute for International Relations (CIIR)	Elisabet Lopez
6	CBD Secretariat	David Cooper
7	The Nature Conservancy	Bill Millan
8	Global Environment Facility	Lee Risby
9	Equator Initiative	Sean Southey
10	Ecoagriculture Partners	Sara Scherr, Claire

		Rhodes
11	United Nations Development Programme	Charles McNeill
12	United Nations Environment Programme	David Smith
		Bruce Campbell, Will
13	Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)	Sundelin
14	World Resources Institute	Frances Seymour
15	Norwegian Development Agency (NORAD)	Jon Heikki Aas
16	Swiss Development Cooperation	Francois Droz
17	Kalpavriksh	Ashish Kothari
18	European Commission	Simon Le Grand
19	KfW	Matthias Bechtolstein
20	DGIS	Hans Wessels

Annex 2: International Poverty-Conservation Initiatives and Representatives

International Initiatives Presented

1	Poverty Environment Partnership (multi donor)	Steve Bass
2	Poverty Environment Initiative (UNDP/UNEP)	Powerpoint Supplied
3	Advancing Conservation in a Social Context (MacArthur Foundation)	Tom McShane
4	Nature and Poverty Initiative (Mileudefensie/WWF-NL/IUCN-NL)	Peter van Sluijs
5	CBD-MDGs Links	Peter Herkenrath
6	TILCEPA	Lea Scherl
7	Forest Peoples Programme 10C Project	Marcus Colchester
8	IUCN Poverty and Conservation Initiative	Gonzalo Oviedo
9	Wetlands and Poverty	Mike Ounsted
10	Profor	Jill Blokhus

Initiatives Invited but Unable to Attend

1	CIFOR Poverty Environment Network	Arild Angelsen
2	Equator Initiative	Sean Southey
3	Care International Impacts of Protected Areas project	Phil Franks

Annex 3: Summary of International Initiatives Linking Poverty and Conservation

	Type	Goal	Main themes/sectors	Geographic focus	Finance
CBD	Programme (Convention)	Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and benefit-sharing regarding genetic resources (significantly reduce the rate of biodiversity loss by 2010)	- Agriculture biodiversity - Forest biodiversity: policy integration in PRSP - Protected Areas: profits should be used for poverty reduction - Strong links with MDGs - Links with MA - CBD is focusing efforts to make the link between poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation work	Many countries of the world (except for USA)	
PEP	Network (mostly bilateral aid agencies); highly informal	To improve inclusion of environmental work in donor activities for poverty reduction	All environmental assets/hazards linked to poverty	Low income countries	Self funded
PEI	Partnership	Support country-led efforts to integrate the environmental concerns of poor and vulnerable groups into policy and planning processes for poverty reduction and pro-poor growth	Mainstreaming environment into poverty reduction strategies at the national level.	Africa, Latin America, Asia	
ACSC	Programme	To advance sustainable conservation outcomes	Three streams of investigation and action: - Integrative research - Conservation loci - Site-based interventions		MacArthur Foundation
IUCN PCI	Partnership	To secure and enhance rural livelihoods	Improved management of ecosystems across the world	Asia, Latin America, Africa	
Nature and Poverty	Programme	Reducing rural poverty by the conservation and sustainable use of nature, securing and improving access to natural livelihoods resources and enhancing their management	- South East Asia: forestry conservation - Congo Basin: Logging - West Africa and South East Asia: sustainable marine resources - South America: conservation of wetlands	Latin America, Middle and western Africa, South Eastern Asia	
Profor	Partnership	Enhancing forests' contribution to poverty reduction, sustainable development, and		Africa, South America, Asia	Funded by the implementing

		protection of environmental services.			organisations
Wetlands and Poverty reduction project	Programme	Reducing poverty in wetlands areas (underlying assumption: sustainable livelihoods)	Poverty reduction is to be achieved through the sustainable management of wetlands. Activities: • Promoting partnerships and policies • Field base research and activities • Capacity building • Awarness and outreach	Africa, South America, Asia (Wetlands)	Funded by DGIS
TILCEPA	Network	Seeks the full and effective recognition of the rights, roles and responsibilities of local, indigenous and nomadic communities in the development and implementation of the conservation of natural resources	Linking conservation and poverty reduction • Social issues are part of conservation • Respect for human rights • Aims for poverty reduction or at least not exacerbate poverty • Better balance in power relations for NRM	Global	
FPP **10c project**	Project	Help indigenous peoples in their claims for lands and the preservation of their traditional practices. Spread awarness on these issues.	Map indigenous peoples' lands and document traditional practices used to manage their lands	Suriname, Guyana, Cameroon, Venezuela, Thailand, Bangladesh	SwedBio, DGIS, Hivos

	Activities	**Stakeholders**	**Policy Space**	**Achievements**	**Lessons/Key challenge**

CBD	Programmes of work (capacity building, research, field implementation, advocacy, communications,consensus building) Secretariat attending meetings; publications Govt agencies and observers carry out PoWs	Participants: govts (env ministries but now trying to include the heavyweights), NGOs, CSOs Target beneficiaries: local people, framers, Ips etc	National govts; International (MDGs) and national (PRSPS) WSSD PoI; other MEAs; WTO	Pov-cons indicators Linking sectoral programme with other initiatives (MDGs)	Pov-cons links not recognised by dev agencies Benefit sharing clause focus on genetic resources need to expand to biological resources Implementation of decisions at national.local levels IPs interventions on s-e indicators not well accepted by scientific bodies (still very bio focussed, IK not considered "scientific") Broader participation by CSOs (focus of CoPs is govt focussed (but addressed in GBFs) Ministries controlling land and NR not involved (is addressed in text and at CoPs but doesn't really happen at national level)
PEP	Consensus building Conceptual and analytical work Review/monitor work (self help) Promote knowledge	UN, donors, banks, INGOs, recipient govts	DAC/dev agencies; recipient countries	Publications on key issues Events – policy dialogues (MS, WSSD) Informality Credibility – research plus consensus	Few economists/poverty people involved Follow up – external impacts Focus on browner rather than greener issues Field implementation No dev country members No field – policy links
PEI	Mainstreaming	National govts (planning ministries)		Using stories from the field – best practice	Top down rather than locally driven (but recognising importance of bringing in other actors Govt led rather than Country led
ACSC	Providing space to bring together people from different disciples – linking academics and practitioners Synthesising existing research (multi discipline) and making relevant for conservation actors Field based intervention	Field practitioners Govt agencies Cons and Dev NGOs Donors academics	? "conservationists talking to themselves" – not yet identified who would be the drivers of change	Multi disciplinary sharing of ideas Tools for thinking not tools for action	Complexity Externalities
IUCN Pov	Pulling together existing	IPOs	National level policy	Launched Sept 05, many	Supply rather than demand driven

Cons Init	work and developing new Policy and field research Advocacy Tools Capacity building	Govt agencies IUCN members?	and plans – cons and dev International Pov-Env agenda	proposals in development	Tackling devpt as much as conservation agenda Need to include an IP perspective
Nature and Poverty	Implementing alternative livelihood options (field based) Capacity strengthening Policy influence	Local communities National and local governments	Int'l – local Dutch govt policy Local policy Sectoral int'l policy – eg sustainable palm oil	Website Learning – identifying good practice; impact assessment methodology being tested (regional meetings twice a year with project partners)	Need to address governance Need to include clear role for communities Future funds insecure May be too broad Limited x-project learning
Profor – Poverty Forest Linkages Toolkit	Rapid appraisal methodology Case studies Toolkit Capacity building Strengthening customary rights	Local govt agencies (forestry staff) Local NGO facilitators Rural poor	PRSPs and national forest programmes	Rapid PPAs Developing aggregate data Startegies and skills of influencing PRSPs	Forests tend to be overlooked in pov red planning How to modify governance regimes Not measuring bio impacts across the board How to implement and monitor PRSPs
Wetlands and Poverty	Promoting partnerships – learning and technical inputs Research – best practice, lessons learned Demonstration projects - test hypothesis that sust use – pov reduction) Capacity building	Implementing NGOs	PRSPs MDGs RAMSAR	Demand led – providing funds Partnerships est with Oxfam and Care 70 paper submissions on wetlands and poverty Building on existing activities WG to support Lobbying for pov red within RAMSAR	Awareness and outreach – but will happen as programme matures Wetlands missing from PRSPs – and many PRSPs not written by those that count anyway
TILCEPA	Promoting participation – creating space for Ips and vulnerable groups to contribute to debate Promoting and supporting CCAs Research – mapping impacts of PAs Lobbying	Local and indigenous communities IUCN – commissions and membership	In't conservation for a – WPC, CBD, IUCN resolutions and decisions Local - int'l links	Getting LC and IP involvement in int'l for a (WPC and CBD PoW on PAs) Raising awareness about CCAs at int'l level	Needs more funding Getting to the core of the cons agenda Creating ownership

	Technical advice				
FPP – 10C project	Research Monitoring applications of rights principles Advocacy – lobbying for rights based approach Mapping customary use Helping Ips document customary use and devp mgmt plans	Indigenous (mainly) and local communities	Int'l cons policy (of organisations and CBD) CBD article 10c (protect and encourage customary use of bio resources) -	Raise awareness about rights issues Increase IP voice	Problems at national level in discrimination against IPs – assimilation policies, lack of citizenship, land tenure etc Conservation policy based on old model (little adoption of new IUCN categories) Lack of capacity in cons NGOs Conditionality on respect for rights How to restitute the 50% of PAs that are on indigenous land