



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/LG-Bushmeat/2/4
4 July 2011

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

JOINT MEETING OF THE CBD LIAISON GROUP ON
BUSHMEAT AND THE CITES CENTRAL AFRICA
BUSHMEAT WORKING GROUP
Nairobi, 7-10 June 2011

OUTCOMES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE CBD LIAISON GROUP ON BUSHMEAT AND THE CITES CENTRAL AFRICA BUSHMEAT WORKING GROUP

I. CO-CHAIRS SUMMARY

1. The over-exploitation of mammals, birds, reptiles, and amphibians in many tropical and sub-tropical countries is increasingly threatening food security and livelihoods in many countries, and is a major cause of biodiversity loss. Participants at the joint meeting of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Liaison Group on Bushmeat and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group¹, Nairobi, 7 – 10 June 2011, recognized with alarm the growing scale and commercialization of bushmeat hunting and trade across range states, and an increasing trend of organized illegal international trade in bushmeat.
2. The ‘empty forest syndrome’ due to loss of forest fauna has reached critical levels in many countries across the tropics and sub-tropics. Population growth, poverty in rural areas and the absence of livelihood alternatives, increased urban consumption, forestry activities, and extractive industries in remote forests are contributing to unsustainable levels of commercial and subsistence hunting.
3. The increasing scale and commercialization of bushmeat use is also posing a severe threat to the food security, customary practices, livelihoods, and cultural and spiritual identity of indigenous peoples and local communities. The joint meeting emphasized the importance of full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the development of policies and measures to better manage tropical and sub-tropical wildlife. The involvement should be based on the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, as well as on Article 10(c) and 8(j) of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
4. The loss of biodiversity also poses a threat to the long-term stability of forest ecosystem services and their economic utilization, including the production of timber and non-timber forest products, and carbon storage. For example, up to 75 per cent of tropical tree species depend on animal seed dispersal. Many tree species will no longer be able to reproduce without their seed dispersers.
5. National economies and governments lose significant revenue if the wildlife as a key resource is managed poorly, and depleted irreversibly. The degradation of forest ecosystems and decline in wildlife species severely weakens national and local economies and makes them more vulnerable to climate

¹ The CBD Liaison Group on Bushmeat defines bushmeat (or wild meat) hunting as the harvesting of wild animals in tropical and sub-tropical countries for food and for non-food purposes, including for medicinal use. By changing this definition from the previous one, which focused only on forests, the Liaison Group recognizes the need to improve wildlife management in forests and across other tropical and sub-tropical ecosystems.

/...

change. Ensuring the conservation and sustainable management of species used for bushmeat poses complex challenges, but feasible solutions exist in many locations and regions. Some countries have developed and implemented successful policies and measures. The joint meeting called for increased collaboration, in particular at regional level, to exchange information, data, and best practices and policies between governments and key stakeholders.

6. Stronger leadership by governments, the private sector, and indigenous peoples and local communities, is needed to address the trade in bushmeat. The joint meeting recognized the efforts of some countries and private sector companies to address this issue, and urges all relevant actors to improve the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity in tropical and sub-tropical countries, *inter alia* by implementing relevant provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity and CITES, particularly its Resolution Conf. 13.11 on Bushmeat, and by applying relevant guidelines and tools, including forest certification.

7. To further promote successful approaches, the joint meeting endorses the recommendations of the first meeting of the Liaison Group on Bushmeat, with the revisions and additions as listed in annex I to this report. The joint meeting recommends to the fifteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) of the Convention on Biological Diversity to forward the recommendations contained in annex I for adoption to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

8. The group recommended a number of approaches for alternatives to unsustainable harvesting of bushmeat², including:

- (a) Sustainable wildlife management, community wildlife management, game ranching, and hunting tourism;
- (b) Domestication and raising of wild animals in small farms (mini-livestock);
- (c) Sustainable harvesting of non-timber forest products; and
- (d) Certification and eco-labelling of wildlife products.

9. Participants commend the close collaboration between CITES and the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the other partners³ in the organization of the joint meeting, and encourage the continuation of joint activities and the involvement of further partners, including the private sector, and indigenous peoples and local communities.

10. The joint meeting recommended to the CITES Standing Committee to consider the recommendations contained in annex I. The findings of the Standing Committee should be reported to the Conference of the Parties to CITES at its 16th meeting.

11. The co-chairs and participants thanks the organizers and gratefully acknowledged the financial contribution of the European Commission for this joint meeting.

II. WORKSHOP REPORT

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

12. Mr. Tim Christophersen opened the meeting at 9.30 a.m. on Tuesday, 7 June 2011 on behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Mr. Ahmed Djoghla. He read a

² The CBD Liaison Group on Bushmeat defines alternatives to unsustainable bushmeat consumption and trade as activities that effectively reduce pressure on wildlife resources to sustainable levels, by (i) providing other sources of protein or income, or (ii) through sustainable and legal hunting.

³ Partners that contributed to the organization of this joint CBD/CITES meeting are COMIFAC, CIFOR, CMS, FAO, UNEP-GRASP, IUCN, and TRAFFIC.

statement on behalf of Mr. Djoghlaif, which thanked the European Commission for providing the funding for this meeting, and emphasized the importance of the excellent partnerships with CITES and the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), and with the other partners who collaborated in the organization of the meeting: CIC, COMIFAC, FAO, IUCN, TRAFFIC and UNEP-GRASP. The number and scope of partners coming together for this meeting showed the need for a shift in the scale and scope of the policy response to the bushmeat crisis, which should enhance the national implementation of global and regional commitments for the sustainable use and conservation of wildlife in tropical and sub-tropical forests. Addressing the bushmeat crisis is an increasingly urgent concern not only for biodiversity, but also for food security, livelihoods, and the cultural and spiritual well-being of indigenous peoples and other forest dependent communities. He expressed his hope to further build on this meeting to establish a global partnership to combat unsustainable hunting for bushmeat as well as illegal wildlife trade.

13. Mr. Juan Carlos Vasquez provided opening remarks on behalf of the CITES Secretary General, Mr. John E. Scanlon. He stressed the need for the meeting to identify practical and feasible solutions for resolving what is popularly known as the 'bushmeat crisis'. In particular, he highlighted the need to provide technical assistance to Governments that were struggling with several challenging issues such as the identification of species entering the bushmeat trade; the lack of existing, reliable information about bushmeat-dependent peoples and their livelihoods; the lack of understanding about the nature and scale of the trade; and the potential health risks associated with some of the species that are harvested. It was stressed that on one hand some international trade in bushmeat is clearly contrary to CITES as it involves wild specimens of species listed in appendix I, but on the other hand, legal, sustainable and traceable trade in bushmeat species listed in CITES appendix II can be authorized under conditions and procedures set forth in the Convention. He highlighted that CITES has recently enhanced its ability to address illegal trade, in particular through the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC), an initiative of the CITES Secretariat, the World Bank, INTERPOL, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, and the World Customs Organization. Finally, it was mentioned that there clearly is greater scope for collaboration between the different Biodiversity-related Conventions in the areas of wildlife management, biological research, sustainable livelihoods, law enforcement, capacity-building and public awareness. The introduction of a local dimension to the bushmeat implementation process is one of the major value-added aspects of this joint meeting, he concluded.

ITEM 2. INTRODUCTION OF PARTICIPANTS

14. Participants introduced themselves, listing their affiliation, expertise, and expectations. A participants list is provided in annex II. Participant's expectations focused on the need to develop clear and practical guidance to improve the sustainable use and conservation of tropical wildlife. They also expected to strengthen their capacity and expertise on this issue through participating in the workshop, and to strengthen the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, CITES, and other relevant commitments, at national level. However, many participants from developing countries also noted the need to further strengthen capacity, political will and coordination at national and international level to successfully address the bushmeat crisis.

ITEM 3. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

3.1. Election of officers

15. After the participants introduced themselves, they elected Mr. Linjouom Ibrahim of Cameroon and Mr. Kurt Duchez of Guatemala as co-chairs of the workshop.

3.2. Adoption of the agenda

16. Participants adopted the agenda as proposed by the Executive Secretary in document UNEP/CBD/LG-Bushmeat/2/1.

3.3. *Organization of work*

17. The proposed organization of work was adopted as contained in the annotations to the provisional agenda (UNEP/CBD/LG-Bushmeat/2/1/Add.1)

18. Mr. Tom De Meulenaer provided an overview of the activities of CITES on bushmeat, which were initiated in the year 2000 with the establishment of a CITES Bushmeat Working Group. He noted that bushmeat trade may be highly organized and professional, or conducted simply by the roadside. Estimates of export of bushmeat range from 14 to 60 per cent for the countries of Central Africa. Most of the transboundary and international trade in bushmeat is conducted informally, and is often illegal and/or unsustainable. He said that controlling the illegal international trade in bushmeat posed major enforcement challenges. Examples of seizures of bushmeat in Europe suggest that illegal trade from Africa is significant (at least several tonnes of meat per week) and possibly increasing. It may involve rare Appendix I species, which are excluded from international commercial trade, or Appendix II-listed species that can be commercially traded when this is conducted legally and sustainably in compliance with CITES. Many species that were frequently traded as bushmeat were however not CITES listed. CITES had, at the time, fully recognized the importance of trade in bushmeat. Resolution Conf. 13.11 recognized the seriousness of the problem and that illegal bushmeat trade constituted the greatest threat, for example, to gorillas, chimpanzees, elephants and crocodiles in Central Africa. It contained a number of recommendations for Parties where bushmeat hunting and trade was prevalent, as well as measures for education, capacity-building and awareness-raising, and called for broad collaboration among organizations and Parties to assist range States in regulating trade in bushmeat and tackling associated issues of poverty, habitat degradation, human population growth and utilization of natural resources. In 2004, a more focused Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group was created, but it failed to provide reporting at the fourteenth and fifteenth meetings of the Conference of the Parties to CITES in 2007 and 2010 respectively. However, Mr. De Meulenaer expressed his hope that this meeting would see the revival of the CITES Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group, with enhanced collaboration with the Convention on Biological Diversity Liaison Group on Bushmeat and agreement on the implementation of Decisions 14.73 and 14.74 (Rev. COP15), directed to the Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group.

19. Mr. Tim Christophersen introduced the work of the Secretariat of Convention on Biological Diversity, based on decisions IX/5 of 2008 and X/32 of 2010, starting with the publication of CBD Technical Series 33 “Conservation and Use of Wildlife-based Resources: The Bushmeat Crisis”, followed by the first meeting of the Liaison Group on Bushmeat in October 2009. Based on the mandate of decision X/32 of the Conference of the Parties, the second meeting of the Liaison Group was convened, jointly with CITES (para. 4(a)). The meeting was expected to contribute to the fulfilment of the requests in decision X/32, notably the revision of the Liaison Group recommendations of 2009, and the development of small-scale livelihood alternatives. He recalled that the group had to deliver the expected outcomes by the end of the week so that at its fifteenth meeting, the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) can take up the results in November 2011.

ITEM 4. UPDATE ON THE CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE USE OF SPECIES HUNTED FOR BUSHMEAT

Presentations by countries

20. In **Bangladesh**, bushmeat did not add significantly to the Gross Domestic Product, reported Mr. Abu Saleh Mostafa Kamal. However, several species were declining due to habitat loss, revenge killing (human-wildlife conflicts), and poaching. He noted that for Muslims, there was generally a religious barrier to eat wild meat. Bangladesh has strong regulatory approach to wildlife management, with the Forest Department and Department of Environment under the Ministry of Environment and Forests being responsible for hunting and combating poaching. Many formerly stable or abundant species have declined, and poaching seems to show a downward trend, but that is presumably due to the decreased populations of wildlife. Populations of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

Red Listed forest dependent species have declined (e.g., Gaur, *Bon gaurus*, Red Jungle Fowl, *Gallus gallus*), mainly due to habitat loss and poaching. The Gaur has successfully been domesticated.

21. Mr. Cyril Taolo from **Botswana** gave an overview of wildlife management in his country. Most wildlife resources were in the Western and Northern parts of the country, including in wildlife management areas, game ranches, and other protected areas, as well as to a lesser degree in community-managed areas. National parks, game reserves and wildlife management areas comprise 40 per cent of the country. With recent progress of the country to a middle income country, and decrease in absolute poverty, dependency on bushmeat has decreased. There was legal wildlife hunting through a system of licenses such as single-game licences, small-game licences, bird licences and special-game licences, which existed for those who primarily depended on hunting, but were, at the time *de facto* community hunting quotas. Social welfare programmes have reduced the dependency on subsistence hunting. Community based organisations can now sell their quota to safari operators for example, for additional income. Challenges for wildlife management include population growth and high demand for agricultural land, mainly for cattle rearing. Impacts of drought have also impacted wildlife. Elephants have increased, some large mammal species populations have remained stable and others have declined. Annual wildlife quotas have declined significantly since 1995. The Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act regulates hunting and categorizes species into protected and game animals. An important tool for Botswana has been community based natural resource management. Communities can apply to lease a controlled hunting area, for example, for a safari operation. Wildlife policy at the time, was undergoing review, and buffers around protected areas have been put in place. The National Land Use Map is under review, with possible impacts on the size of some wildlife management areas.

22. Mr. Thuch Phalla presented the status of wildlife resources in **Cambodia**, as well as challenges and opportunities. The forest cover of the country was almost 60 per cent, consisting of various forest types. There were 36 conservation areas, covering 26 per cent of the country, administered by the Ministries of Environment and Ministries of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. Wildlife use was widespread, including as pets, and use for food and for medicine. Animals or animal parts were traded mostly in domestic markets with hidden networks. Twenty-three species of animals were, at the time, listed as endangered on the IUCN Red List, but many more were used for bushmeat. Some species seemed to be extinct such as the rhinoceros, and the Kouprey ox, while other species such as tigers were in decline, with illegal hunting and trade as the main reason. New legislation such as the National Forestry Programme was being developed to address the threats more holistically. The demand for bushmeat within country and across borders remained high. Opportunities included key national activities in 2011 and 2012, such as the identification and definition of national conservation priorities for protected areas. This has improved monitoring and data management, as well as species and habitat management. Efforts for education and awareness-raising, and livelihood alternatives such as ecotourism and community and livelihood improvement, and law enforcement have also increased, but many challenges remained because of lack of capacity and resources.

23. Mr. Linjouom Ibrahim (**Cameroon**) said that in his country, the envisaged target of 20 per cent of the country's area to be declared as protected areas had almost been achieved (today 19.8 per cent). Management plans existed for elephants, apes/monkeys, giraffes, and other large mammals. Poaching has been successfully reduced through law enforcement, for example, through national bushmeat control brigades, which focus on forest concessions. To better implement policies and laws, there was a need to further empower indigenous peoples and local communities to be veritable partners. This could be done, for example, through putting in place a system of eco-guards as operational in other African countries to survey and monitor protected areas, and to monitor hunting and limit poaching. To be successful, adequate resources, and collaboration with national and international partners were needed, and the involvement of all stakeholders is crucial.

24. Mr. Jean-Baptiste Marmang introduced the status and main challenges and opportunities for bushmeat in the **Central African Republic**. He mentioned it was difficult to speak about bushmeat

without addressing wildlife management more broadly. There were wildlife management zones, which were areas with an average below 0.5 inhabitants per square kilometre. The code for protection of wild fauna from 1984 is the basis for wildlife management, including hunting, with the leading involvement of the Ministry of the Interior (for hunting and weapon permits). The Ministry of Water, Forests, Hunting and Fishing, and the Ministry of Commerce were also involved. Lack of coordination and partly contradictory legislation was a challenge. In zones which were specifically managed for wildlife management, including for hunting and hunting tourism, communities can generate revenue from wildlife, which can be reinvested in community development, or in improving control of poaching. There was a legal aspect to hunting, but poaching and illegal trade of bushmeat were also widespread, and it was very difficult for the government to control and enforce the law. The increase in the availability of guns in households has also increased illegal hunting. It was estimated that 59,000 tonnes of bushmeat end up in the illegal market each year, worth an estimated 33 billion FCFA (72 million USD). This means that hunting was an important aspect of the economy, while the government loses an important revenue source. Opportunities included that many ecosystems across the country were still relatively intact; that the special wildlife management zones (Zones Cynégetiques Villageoises - ZIC) were designated; that a mobile unit to enforce legislation had been established; and that the Fauna Conservation Code was being revised for the first time since 1984. Challenges include that wildlife was under multiple pressures, including from habitat loss and climate change, and became more susceptible for hunting. Challenges include: insufficient legislation and lack of capacity and resources for law enforcement; the proliferation of weapons of war and small arms as well as homemade weapons, and ammunition; the anarchic authorization to purchase weapons and ammunition, as well as ammunition depots selling even at the entry of ZIC by the Ministry of the Interior; corrupt officials; and the lack of coordination between ministries in charge of the sector. The exploitation of indigenous peoples and local communities in this trade was also a problem, as well as the absence of alternative income-generating activities in areas of intensive hunting.

25. Mr. Carlos A. Lasso introduced the situation in **Colombia**, which had a wide variety of natural ecosystems, with 41.5 million inhabitants, covering 50 ethnic groups, speaking 80 languages. The socio-economic importance of bushmeat indicated that bushmeat played an important role for subsistence hunting, but the topic of wildlife use has so far not been included in the National Biodiversity Policy or the food security framework in a specific way. Scientific analysis indicates that several species were not managed sustainably. For example for several CITES-listed species such as Hicotea turtles, illegal harvesting was a main cause of decreasing populations. Colombia had a complex regulatory framework for wildlife management, some cases with contradictory rules. However, it was important to highlight the Colombian progress on the incorporation of this topic. An analysis for bushmeat and wildlife use in Colombia was underway in 2011, which should support the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity Addis Ababa Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity. Challenges included that introduced invasive species increased the pressure on ecosystems, and that the regulatory framework needs to be harmonized. Opportunities included that Colombia recognized the links between bushmeat and food security, promoting the understanding of wildlife use in indigenous and local communities, local communities use on cross-border interaction and links between CITES and bushmeat.

26. Mr. Pierre Kama presented an overview of opportunities and challenges in the **Republic of the Congo (ROC)**. In Accordance with the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Republic of the Congo, as part of the CITES workgroup, and with partners in the Congo Basin, had been working to find solutions to poaching and the illegal trade in bushmeat, which was a major threat to wildlife at all levels. Therefore, the government had put into action several provisions, of which the most important were: (i) A review of the legislative and regulatory framework. The previous legislation relating to bushmeat was in place for 25 years. The new legislative text (law 37-2008), created on 28 February 2008, included the potential for game ranching, sustainable wildlife management, and specific measures for migratory species. (ii) The regulation of bushmeat harvesting within forestry concessions. Poaching was widespread in logging concession in the ROC, due to the access provided by logging roads. Forestry administration must recognise that the high demand for bushmeat was one of the principal causes of

pressure on wildlife in the Republic of the Congo, and put in place bushmeat management projects in collaboration with NGOs and local residents. This had led to the creation of anti-poaching surveillance units or Unités de Surveillance d'Anti-Braconnage (USLAB). The actions of USLAB included: fighting against non-selective hunting techniques (cable snares, explosives etc.), prioritizing subsistence hunting, controlling transport of meat, protecting protected species with a particular focus on ivory poaching, and alongside these enforcement activities, providing environmental education, alternative livelihood activities and ecological and socio-economic monitoring. USLAB were present in all the managed forestry concessions in Northern Congo, and represented a partnership between the government, NGOs and forestry companies. (iii) Other activities included: doubling efforts in the control of trade through airports, encouraging alternative livelihood activities and encouraging other rural development projects. A national agency for the management and conservation of wildlife had been created, the number of surveillance and anti-poaching patrols, as well as technical staff within Protected Areas, had been increased, a number of important forest brigades had been created, and good relations fostered with other stakeholders. Difficulties with bushmeat management include: insufficient personnel, increased corruption, a lack of financing for education on bushmeat laws, weak penalties for illegal activity, increased transport options for meat, a lack of collaboration from transport companies, a lack of consultation between ministries concerning quotas on gun cartridge fabrication. Further collaboration between ministries is key.

27. Mr. Leonard Muamba Kanda from the **Democratic Republic of the Congo** said that his country had five national parks, with unique fauna including gorillas and other charismatic megafauna. Sixty per cent of the country's forests were especially rich in biodiversity. The scourge of bushmeat trade affected key species (e.g., Bonobos) and other species, despite the fact that this was illegal, and controls should be in place. Bonobos could become extinct if the trade was not brought under control. It was mainly sought after in urban markets, and traders equipped rural populations with weapons and transport means for Bonobo meat. This was indicative for the illegal trade of many other species. The Democratic Republic of the Congo has had a national strategy for the survival of great apes, since 2005, and many efforts have been taken despite difficulties in the country to follow this strategy. The country also had a strategy on bushmeat (since 2009) but funding was lacking with which to put the strategy into action. The Parliament had just approved the new nature conservation law, which included specific provisions on bushmeat trade. Partners for the development for these improvements in legislation included the Global Environment Facility (GEF), but at the moment we suffer from the focus of the donor community on climate change, while overlooking the situation of bushmeat. The budget (e.g., of GEF) needed to be reviewed in that regards. On behalf of his country, Mr. Kanda appealed to the international community to adequately account for biodiversity conservation in the GEF budget, and other bilateral official development assistance budgets, and for awareness-raising activities on the implementation of the two Conventions (CBD and CITES). There was a need to strengthen capacity and increase resources, including for law enforcement, and importantly for awareness-raising. Many communities' livelihoods depend on functioning forest ecosystems, and they should be empowered to guide the use of their wildlife resources into more sustainable channels.

28. Mr. Martin de Porres Mbomio Nze highlighted the importance of **Equatorial Guinea** for biodiversity. Although, the dynamics of the trade are not yet fully understood, it was known that the absence of protein and livelihood alternatives in rural areas currently increases the dependence of rural people on bushmeat, with up to 53 per cent of protein intake from bushmeat. The socio-economic importance differs in different regions (for instance Bioko and the mainland). Inhabitants in Malabo mainly ate domestic meats, but consumption of bushmeat was still having a large impact on wildlife populations. It has to be understood that primates could be more valuable for communities alive than dead, through income from eco-tourism. Rural hunters were increasingly choosing to sell their meat to traders, and then purchased cheaper frozen alternatives. Bushmeat in many cases was the only source of cash income, while its status in urban areas as a luxury food was on the rise. The off-take of bushmeat

was increasing, and animals, at the time, were harvesting from further away from urban markets, indicating that areas close to urban markets have been emptied of wildlife. There was a growing urban population, due to rural-urban migration as young people search work in the cities. If livelihood alternatives can be found, which were as economically attractive as bushmeat, and maybe further away from bushmeat sources, it would have high potential to reduce the trade, and it would also be supported by overall development policies. There was a lack of ecological data, but recent research shows that the primates were increasingly victims of gun hunters. Colobus and Preuss monkeys were endangered across their range, but increasingly under threat from hunting. Many of the species were on CITES Appendix I or II. Unfortunately, no ecological data related to bushmeat hunting has been collected in recent years, but market data shows that overall trade is unsustainable. Anecdotal evidence suggests near disappearance of several species in many areas. Legislation against hunting in protected areas, and against hunting primates exists but needs more support and enforcement. GEF funds were being used to launch a study to increase the implementation capacity of protected areas. Policies need to increase ownership of local communities for ownership rights and involvement of local communities in management plans. A recent United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) GEF grant (PACEBCo project) was addressing this. Other work was underway: a CI/INDEFOR/Max Plank ape and elephant survey, BBPP and PhD work on Bioko Island, and a project to look at sustainable livelihoods, funded and run by ANDEGE, INDEFOR and ZSL. Current opportunities to tackle unsustainable and illegal hunting include the current work to increase protected area management capacity and local ownership rights, as well as current government plans for economic diversification (which could provide rural hunters with alternative employment). Recognized obstacles include the observation that hunting was not just a rural activity, there was a lack of incentives for small-scale enterprises that may act as alternative livelihoods, there was a lack of veterinary and technical support, and a lack of in-country training.

29. Mr. Kurt Duchez (**Guatemala**) noted that the country had 14 million inhabitants, and 7 million live in rural areas. Eighty per cent of the rural population was poor. More than half a million people used bushmeat as a primary protein source, and an estimated 150,000 people depend primarily on bushmeat to survive (which is illegal in Guatemala). Bushmeat was not only used as a protein source, but as an economic income. It was often used as an extra income, related to the primary income source. The north of the country (border to Belize and Mexico) includes the last vast forest complex in Mesoamerica. All species in Guatemala were forest dependent, because the country used to be completely forested. The tapir, for example, was, at the time, endangered because of habitat loss and hunting. Hunting was popular (including sport hunting), and they often payed rural hunters as guides with ammunition and guns. Pressure on wildlife has increased significantly, all across the country. The main income was often agriculture, with bushmeat as an important additional income. While rural dwellers collect plants for ornamental markets, they also hunt. Food was by far the most important reason for wildlife hunting (results from a study presented by Mr. Duchez suggest that 78 per cent of hunting was for food). There were 11 main species that were being hunted for food, with white-tailed deer and peccaries being the most important ones (41 per cent and 24 per cent of the harvest respectively). The core of the problem was the commercial trade of bushmeat. The practice of designating forest concessions (e.g., for mahogany and cedar logging), allowed local communities to live in these areas and use the natural resources, including hunting, but they were not allowed to trade. The government had a better control over the use of animals in forest concessions than outside concessions. However, 33 per cent of protected areas overlap with hunting areas, and protected areas were dispersed throughout the country, which made enforcement very difficult. There was also no effective border with Mexico, which made illegal trade across the border easy. Legislation included the constitution, which protects wildlife, and laws on protected areas and wildlife law (law 4-89), and hunting law and regulations (law 36-04), including a hunting calendar, and off-take limits. The hunting was divided into sports hunting and subsistence hunting. Major opportunities included awareness-raising and livelihood alternatives: ecotourism was built up as an alternative to local hunting. For example for oscillated turkey, up to \$USD 2,000 can be charged for one hunted turkey, and the local community protects their populations.

30. Mr. Elema W. Saru of the **Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS)** introduced the challenges faced by Kenya. Bushmeat has been identified by experts in Kenya as one of the most serious threats to wildlife populations. In Kenya bush meat ranked second in number of suspects arrested for various wildlife offences. Annual recoveries exceed 20 tonnes. The bushmeat problem threatened wildlife based community development, which often relied on the species most targeted for bushmeat. He introduced the approach of law enforcement of the KWS, which included de-snaring operations, and gathering of intelligence to tackle organized crime. Since 2002 specific units have been established in most affected regions. Teams operate covertly and target individuals and markets. Cross-border operations are also organized. KWS was also building forensic testing facilities. This was a critical capacity as it was required for juridical procedures to prove that meat has been harvested illegally. KWS also undertakes capacity-building and awareness-raising workshops. Collaboration with other government departments (veterinary department, provincial administration, customs, police, entry/exit points, agencies, etc.) played a role in combating bushmeat, and KWS used performance contracting – all wardens were rated on measures undertaken to control bushmeat. Bushmeat recoveries have been increasing since 2000, with peaks in 2007 and 2009, coinciding with periods of drought. Poaching was considered a misdemeanour so far, but new legislation will change this. Challenges include: (i) Demographic changes (rapid human population increase), which coupled with increasing poverty levels makes more people to rely on bushmeat; (ii) Weak wildlife policy and legislation; (iii) Low priority ratings (by the police and courts of law) for environmental crimes; (iv) Conflicting policies governing related sectors - Sub division of land making more animals prone to poaching; (v) Insecurity especially banditry activities in several remote areas; (vi) Proliferation of small arms in the region; (vii) Worsening of causal factors – drought, famine, poverty, human wildlife conflicts; (viii) Conflicting policies and legislation; (ix) Changes in culture and beliefs; (x) Inadequate budgetary allocations for law enforcement. Networking and collaboration among law enforcement agencies at the local, regional and international level is very critical to successful enforcement against bushmeat poaching.

31. Mr. C. Sasikumar noted that **India** had a deep-rooted tradition of non-violence against animals, many of which were revered as deities. Protected areas were the backbone of the relevant strategies, including 100 National Parks, 514 Wildlife Sanctuaries, 44 Conservation Reserves, 4 Community Reserves, 39 Tiger Reserves and 28 Elephant Reserves. A range of legislation regulates wildlife management, including the Wildlife Protection Act of 1972, the National Biodiversity Strategy and the National Wildlife Action Plan of 2002 – 2016. The Wildlife Act of 1972 prohibited all forms of hunting, including game hunting, and the law had provisions for stringent punishments. The National Biodiversity Action Plan was based on the principle that human beings were at the centre of sustainable development concerns, provided plans for implementing the recommendations of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and aimed to strengthen and integrate *in-situ* and *ex-situ* conservation of the natural resource base, and its sustainable utilization. The National Wildlife Action plan covers a range of issues including: ecological security and *in-situ* conservation; peoples' support for wildlife; effective management of protected areas; conservation of wild and endangered species and their habitat; control of poaching, taxidermy and illegal trade in wild animals and plant species; conservation awareness and education; domestic legislation and international conventions. India was a Party to all relevant international Conventions. Major issues in wildlife conservation included: habitat fragmentation; overuse of biomass resources; increases in human-wildlife conflicts; poaching and illegal trade in wildlife parts and products; spread of invasive alien species; impacts of climate change. Although bushmeat harvesting (hunting) was illegal in India, there were instances of poaching, and the trade of animal parts and products was often for medicinal and other non-food purposes, (e.g., tiger for skin and bones and elephant for ivory). However, there was a lack of distinct studies to ascertain the impact of illegal hunting, especially for food, on the species. In India the meat of domesticated animals is preferred over bushmeat. The indigenous tribes of Andaman & Nicobar Islands, however, exercise legal hunting rights under Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972. The main challenges to effective conservation and protection of wildlife was the need for: better management of wildlife habitat; increase in frontline staff; capacity-building and training of staff;

expansion of wildlife habitats; creation of viable wildlife corridors; effective implementation of scientifically prepared management plans for wildlife habitats; people's participation in conservation; better eco-development activities; mitigation of man-animal conflicts; village relocation with consent; better publicity and awareness. Apart from these, other challenges included the need for increased intelligence gathering and networking and wildlife crime detection, better enforcement machinery for control of wildlife offences, and the creation of activity-specific Rapid Action Forces - for control of poaching, man-animal conflict, fire control, etc. India will be hosting a range of key conservation meetings in 2011 and 2012, including the Convention on Biological Diversity's eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties in October 2012.

32. Mr. Theophilus V. Freeman thanked donors and partners involved in helping **Liberia** since the war. The country was known to harbour a rich and unique biodiversity, which was facing high threats through commercial and subsistence bushmeat use. Mr. Freeman outlined the problems faced for wildlife management, which included lack of ecological and socio-economic data. Revenue generated from bushmeat was considerable. The status and trend of harvesting was not well known, but it was estimated that 150,000 tonnes per year were extracted from the forest. Forest-dependent species depended on the local circumstances and access to roads. The bushmeat trade was important for a range of stakeholders, and played an important role in protein provision. A large number of forest-dependant people, and some urban women relied on bushmeat for income generation and trade was mainly arranged along highways. The revenue generation was used, among other things, to pay children's tuition fees for high school and university. The civil conflict ran from 1953 to 1983, which undermined any regular and sustainable economic activity. Since 1983, the situation has stabilized somewhat and now legal concessions have been put in place. This required the development of new legislation; the designation of protected areas; and the implementation of bilateral, voluntary partnership programmes for example with the European Union. At the time there were further processes, including participatory processes at local level (supported by the World Bank, and GEF) for the further development of protected areas. National policies concerning bushmeat include: New Forestry reform Law of 2006; Wildlife Law 1988; Draft wildlife and Protected Areas Management Law (2009); NTFP Regulation 2009; The Acts establishing Protected Areas. New legislation on access and benefit-sharing, and community rights were also enacted. Liberia was also piloting a REDD-plus project, and was establishing a research center, and had the goal to improve the management of NTFPs and promote ecotourism. Opportunities for Liberia existed in its high-priority wildlife and ecosystems (e.g., in the upper Guinea forest ecosystem). Liberia, with NGO partners, had been piloting an increase in domestic animal production (NGOs), bee-keeping and wild-animal rearing. It had also begun environmental education concerning the consumption of bushmeat and protected species. There was a need to put in place safeguards for protected areas (PA), and PA establishment, and government efforts to manage hunting are hampered by funding constraints.

33. Ms. Nora Neris provided an overview of bushmeat harvesting in **Paraguay**. At the time, the country had 7 million inhabitants and important biodiversity. Paraguay's eastern region suffered severe deforestation over a few decades. It had been estimated that there was an area of 8,000,000 hectares of rainforest in 1940, diminishing to only about 900,000 ha at present. As a result, many wildlife populations were declining and others have disappeared; nevertheless, there was still consumption of wild meat. The Paraguayan Chaco was always seen as an inexhaustible place for hunting wild animals. However, this seemingly inexhaustible abundance was threatened by the abrupt change of land use for agricultural and livestock-raising activities. There has also been an expansion of human settlements and construction of national and international highways, resulting in increased traffic and consequently an increase in poaching. At the time, intensive agricultural/livestock-raising activities and global climate change adversely affected the protected wild areas, although monitoring of impacts was lacking. Recent research into wildlife population trends showed that peccaries were declining in numbers. Hunting pressure was concentrated around national parks and other protected areas, with poaching also within the protected areas. Military posts in remote areas were the biggest consumers of wildlife, followed by rural communities, and indigenous communities. Indigenous peoples were classified as subsistence users, not as poachers. Poaching was usually conducted by urban dwellers, usually in holidays, and they hunted

indiscriminately (anything that moves). That was the most serious hunting impact on wildlife. Ms. Neris suggested that Paraguay implement an action plan for the management and conservation of wild hunting species. It should include knowledge of population dynamics of game species, habitat quality, hunting pressure, and programmes of environmental education, sanctuaries, legislation and control.

34. Mr. Ahmed Sulaiman El Wakeel (**Sudan**) highlighted that his country has lost an average of 321,600 ha of forest per year between 1990 and 2010, or 0.42 per cent per year. In total, between 1990 and 2010, Sudan lost 8.4 per cent of its forest cover or around 6,432,000 ha. Protected areas comprised 3.5 per cent of the country. Bushmeat has always been part of the Sudanese diet, with the exception perhaps of the most ancient agricultural societies based along the Nile. During periods of famine, conflict and critical fallback of food sources (crops and domestic livestock), many Sudanese consumed all types of wild fauna, from buffalo to field mice. Hunting with rifles was becoming more widespread in Southern Sudan, in and around protected areas where bushmeat was a source of protein and income, and also due to the widespread use of guns because of recent conflict. Economic pressures underlied the destruction of northern and central Sudan's ecosystems. Pasturelands, protected areas and forestlands have become battlefields, with negative impacts on wildlife. Harvesting of animals in Sudan was for domestic consumption, but increasingly also for commercial use. The trade has increased in recent years with the majority of meat being consumed within Sudan; however there was little monitoring of bushmeat use and trade. There was very limited control on the continued harvesting of important food species, such as the white-eared kob. Migration and land use changes have resulted in new villages existing along and around national parks borders and forests. The ready availability of firearms had been the most significant factor in the reduction of wildlife in Sudan, and had also compounded the problems of habitat destruction in northern and central Sudan. Uncontrolled and unsustainable levels of hunting have devastated wildlife populations and caused the local eradication of many of the larger species including elephant, rhino, buffalo, giraffe, eland and zebra. The main center of the ivory trade was the capital city. It was reported in 2005 that there were 50 souvenir shops, 150 craftsmen and up to 2,000 items in individual shops. The main buyers of ivory were reported to be Asian expatriates. Challenges include a lack of data to allow the implementation of PA management plans. The governance structure and legal situation of the wildlife and protected area management sector were complex and partially non-adaptive, and National parks in Sudan have been managed with an emphasis on law enforcement, fully depending on patrolling programmes. Cooperation with international agreements was managed at the federal level, and created confusion for site-level management, and little coordination and implementation of National Action Plans had occurred. Management was sectoral with little synergy and communication between sectors. There was a lack of public awareness, including among expatriates, about sustainable bushmeat harvesting. There were also opportunities: both civil authorities and some communities seem to have had a potentially positive attitude towards wildlife conservation. The new wealth provided by oil revenue might hopefully allow a gradual reversal of this situation. There were also potential alternatives to bushmeat, which could be tried, including sustainable game ranching and the formalization of the bushmeat industry. This could help ease pressure on wild populations and can even prove beneficial to the local populations (by restocking). Improved food security in targeted markets and communities might possibly lessen the pressure on wildlife resources by ensuring that adequate nutrition reaches people moving into areas adjacent to known areas of wildlife concentration. Provision of protein rich food sources, perhaps small ruminants, rabbits and chickens, could help to alleviate the need for hunting. Sudan was party to a number of international agreements, including the CBD, CMS, CITES, WHC, Ramsar, and the Kinshasa Declaration on Great Apes. It has partnerships with WCS and FFI, and one of the early partnership activities planned was a major aerial survey of the protected areas to count wildlife populations and assess habitat conditions. The first stage of the fieldwork was completed in early 2007.

35. Ms. Lowaeli Damalu introduced opportunities, challenges and strategies related to bushmeat hunting in **Tanzania**, which had 24.9 per cent of protected areas in a total land area of 945,262 square kilometers. Protected areas included 15 National Parks, the Ngorongoro Conservation area, 28 Game

reserves and 33 Wildlife Management Areas. Wildlife management was regulated *inter alia* by the Wildlife Policy of Tanzania of 1998 (Rev. 2007). Hunting for subsistence was a tradition in Tanzania, with a wide variety of hunting methods (guns, snares, dogs, spears, etc.). Bushmeat hunting and trade was one of the major challenges facing the country, as it was driven by poverty, political instability in some of the neighbouring countries, cultural, taboos and a growing human population. It was a source of protein and income for local people, with traders earning between \$USD 300 to \$USD 500 per month. Sixty-six per cent of the population preferred bushmeat over other protein. It also influenced the migration of people to villages close to the protected areas. The status of bushmeat trade was increasing, and changing in scope from subsistence use to commercial use. On average, 2078 tonnes of assorted bushmeat were confiscated annually, with a value of more than \$USD 50 million. For example in the Serengeti, it was estimated that 82 tonnes of bushmeat were consumed per week. The figures were indicative of what was seized, and actual off-takes might be higher than that. There had been an increase in anti-poaching patrol efforts while the number of arrests also increased since 2001 to 2010. On average, 4699 poachers per year were arrested, 50 per cent of them being bushmeat hunters and dealers. Five-year records show that 400,000 hunting weapons have been confiscated, with the majority (95 per cent) being snares. Bushmeat hunting and trade was among the contributing factors for declining populations of some wildlife species like Buffalo, Impala, Eland, Hippo, Puku, and Zebra in the Rukwa-Katavi, Rungwa Ruaha, Selous-Mikumi ecosystem. In Western Tanzania at one of the refugee camps near the Moyowosi/Kigosi and Burigi/Biharamulo Game Reserves from 1990 to 2000 the wildlife populations (Buffalo, Zebra, Roan antelope, Impala, Warthog and Hippo) declined by 40 to 80 per cent. This has had impacts on ecosystem dynamics and therefore threatened the future of targeted species as well as the entire ecosystem. There was also an economic impact on the tourist industry - one of the country's biggest foreign-currency earners. National policies relating to bushmeat include: the Wildlife Policy of Tanzania of 1998 (Rev.2007); the National Environment Policy of 1997; while the national legislations related to bushmeat included the Wildlife Conservation Act No.5 of 2009 (Cap 283); the National Parks Ordinance 1959 (Cap 282); the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Ordinance 1959 (Cap 284); the Environment Act and the Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute Act No. 4 of 1980. Opportunities included: wildlife laws criminalize bushmeat and there was political will and support to address the problem of bushmeat trade. Major challenges included: increased demands for bushmeat due to increased growing population, poverty and food insecurity among communities; increased technologies, for example, communication facilities and hunting methods; lack or inadequate coordination among stakeholders in addressing the bushmeat problem; inadequate capacity to monitor bushmeat trade; habitat destruction, disappearance of wildlife habitat, fragmentations; individual beliefs and behaviours towards bushmeat. At the time, ongoing strategies to address bushmeat trade included: strengthening law enforcement and improving protection of wildlife migratory routes and buffer zones; encouraging investment into other form of wildlife utilization; strengthening and widening the coverage of community based conservation programmes as well as awareness-raising at national and local level through various programmes; engaging private sectors and other stakeholders to address the problem through partnerships and involving local communities in conservation through Wildlife Management Areas.

Presentations by indigenous and local communities

36. Mr. Joseph Itongwa Mukumo, senior coordinator of the Programme d'Integration et de Développement du Peuple Pygmee, noted that indigenous persons in Central Africa are estimated to number between 1 and 3 million, and they generally lived in very bio-diverse regions, where they have practiced customary and sustainable hunting since time immemorial. This included hunting for subsistence (food), for health (medicinal use), and cultural and spiritual use. The economic value of bushmeat for these populations was also important, but the customary use was threatened by increasing pressure on the forest by extractive industries (logging, mining), as well as by armed conflict. This presented both a food security and a livelihood challenge for the indigenous peoples (IPs), resulting in malnutrition, loss of pharmaceutical benefits, cultural identity, ecological knowledge and the confusion of subsistence hunting with poaching. Alternatives for bushmeat hunting required that mechanisms for the sustainable use of forests were developed, which fully build on the knowledge and respect the rights of

the IPs. It would be conceivable to domesticate wild animals for farming, and increase the coordination and the partnership between key NGOs. A key condition was that Article 10(c) of the Convention on Biological Diversity was applied. It was also important to build on the knowledge and on the rights of IPs when establishing the distinction between sustainable and unsustainable hunting, and between legal and illegal. Indigenous people have to be fully involved in the legislation that impacts on their rights to hunt. One step towards this would be to institutionalize the COMIFAC working group on Indigenous People in Central Africa, which would help to improve national legislation in the region.

37. Mr. Louis Biswane (Association of Kalina and Lokono Peoples in Marowijne, Suriname) introduced indigenous peoples' perspectives from Latin America. Mr. Biswane mentioned that since 2004, customary sustainable use was more clearly recognized in Suriname. Wild animals are mostly used for food, but many species also for ornamental and pharmaceutical use. Indigenous hunters have excellent knowledge of the forest ecosystems, and of animal populations. The philosophy of indigenous peoples was that everything on earth is alive, even stones, and all animals and plants have protective spirits. Customary rules and laws ensure sustainability: avoid young and pregnant animals; take only what you need and do not waste anything; fully respect the animals, and completely protect certain species, such as giant turtles. There was still plentiful game in Suriname, but increasing pressure from mining and logging concessions drives fauna further into the forest. Habitat loss and road construction (open access for sport hunters and poachers) has caused decline in many species. There was no recognition of indigenous peoples land resource rights, and indigenous people were restricted from access to protected areas in indigenous territories. Key messages were that indigenous people need to be fully involved in the development of solutions. The focus should not only be on the effects of unsustainable harvesting on biodiversity, but also on biodiversity-dependent livelihoods. Alternatives for unsustainable hunting must be culturally appropriate, and developed from the bottom-up. There was a need for funds and for support. Underlying causes must be addressed: logging concessions, opening the forest for logging and mining and other extractive activities. Community-based monitoring of wildlife could improve the availability of data. Protected area establishment could be a solution, but only if indigenous peoples and local communities were fully and effectively involved, and if their rights and customary sustainable use were respected.

38. Ms. Lucky Sherpa, Member of the Parliament of Nepal, and co-ordinator of the Global Indigenous Parliamentary Network, noted that at least fifty million of the globally estimated 370 million global populations of indigenous peoples live in forests. While indigenous peoples represented less than 4 per cent of the global population, they boasted 95 per cent of the cultural diversity. Multiple problems were confronting indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs): eviction from ancestral land, loss of traditional knowledge, lack of rights of access and resource use. The UNDRIP should be fully implemented, and also be the basis for measures to address unsustainable bushmeat hunting, where IPLCs were concerned. The Convention on Biological Diversity had a strong focus on the rights of indigenous peoples, but key definitions were important, for example, the concept of "traditional" in relation to Article 8(j) was very problematic, as it implied a static concept of knowledge. Indigenous peoples were concerned that the increasing pressure on land and environment will become untenable. Poaching was very much linked with poverty. Law enforcement often focused on the poor locals, or minor middlemen, but the organized international crime gangs were rarely caught. A way forward must provide alternative local livelihoods, increase awareness-raising, and ensure socio-economic empowerment of indigenous peoples. Prior and informed consent should be obtained before measures are developed and enacted. The consultation of IPLCs should be ensured through a special mechanism.

Presentations by relevant organizations

39. Ms. Melanie Virtue introduced the work of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), which is an international treaty managed by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), with its Secretariat based in Bonn, Germany. CMS deals with six primary species groups, and is an umbrella for a number of binding and non-binding agreements, including the most relevant in the context of this

meeting: the Gorilla Agreement and the West African Elephant Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). CMS had 115 Parties (as of March 2011), with very good coverage in Africa, Europe and South America. The Gorilla Agreement has 10 Range States, and the WAE MoU has 13 Range States. Both agreements recognized illegal poaching, mainly for bushmeat and body parts (ivory, gorilla hands etc.), as a major threat. Major challenges included: logging roads make remote areas accessible for hunters; growing demand from cities and even worldwide; corruption and complacency of authorities, despite official legal protection of gorillas and West African elephants (both CITES App. I). It has become increasingly clear that illegal killing of gorillas and elephants, including for bushmeat, required better coordination among international organizations, including INTERPOL and World Customs Organization and the International Consortium for Combating Wildlife Crime. The Gorilla Agreement Action Plans encouraged livelihood alternatives, including the use of domesticated sources of protein; alternative employment (e.g., ecotourism, beekeeping); strict law enforcement; and capacity-building.

40. Mr. Johannes Refisch from the UNEP Great Ape Survival Partnership (GRASP) said that great apes faced a range of direct and indirect threats, including habitat loss, diseases such as Ebola, conflict, and importantly, bushmeat hunting. Bushmeat (the meat of wild animals) was an important component of trade, diet, and culture in many regions of the world. However, continued unsustainable hunting was a major threat to great ape populations resulting from poaching, both for consumption and the live animal trade. Management interventions to regulate an increasingly unsustainable bushmeat trade must evaluate the livelihood and ecological impacts of both hunting and interventions, with a specific focus on the impacts on more vulnerable keystone species such as great apes. The Great Ape Survival Partnership (GRASP) was a UNEP-UNESCO led partnership whose immediate objective was to lift the threat of imminent extinction facing most of the great ape populations. GRASP observed over the past decade that: Bushmeat hunting had become a large and well-organized business. In many countries a significant proportion of wild meat was sold to the urban elite who can afford to pay more for bushmeat, but who were not often reliant on bushmeat as a source of cheap protein; commercial bushmeat hunters had access to forest areas far away from villages and roads, often through access roads created by timber concessions, which at the time, covered a significant proportion of the forests in Central Africa. Working with timber companies to reduce this access should be a priority for maintaining healthy forest ecosystems; criminal networks were increasingly involved in bushmeat hunting and trade; there was little evidence that the provision of livelihood alternatives had reduced pressure on bushmeat species, as the vast majority of projects to date had not reported on their ecological and socioeconomic impacts. Carefully designed monitoring of management interventions, building in proper controls (i.e., control sites, or collection of baseline data in advance of project implementation) would allow the effectiveness of these interventions to be properly evaluated. In 2010, GRASP published the “Last Stand of the Gorilla” in collaboration with GRID Arendal and INTERPOL. This report has a dedicated section on bushmeat hunting, and explicitly asks for concerted action of United Nations agencies including CITES, World Customs Organisation, INTERPOL and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) to address the issue of environmental crime. Other GRASP activities over the past years included direct support to field projects in the Ivory Coast, Cameroon, the Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Indonesia in the area of law enforcement, monitoring and alternative livelihoods.

41. Mr. Edgar Kaeslin presented the work of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) on sustainable use of bushmeat, which focused on engaging in international policy processes and finding practical solutions at the local level. FAO helped developing countries and countries in transition improve their agriculture, forestry and fisheries practices and ensure good nutrition for all. This was achieved not only by engaging in normative and policy work, but also by implementing best practices and innovative solutions through practical field projects. Bushmeat has long been an important source of protein for indigenous and local communities all over the world. In the Congo Basin, it was estimated that up to five million tonnes of bushmeat are consumed each year. Increasing demand from urban centres and the rapidly growing commercial markets, both domestic and international, were the main drivers of the often illegal over-utilization of wildlife resources. By working towards the legal and sustainable use of bushmeat while avoiding health risks for people and animals, FAO contributed to

the conservation and integrity of wildlife, ecosystems and biodiversity. To complement its policy work, FAO recently prepared a regional GEF project on bushmeat for Gabon, the Republic of the Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the Central African Republic. It aimed to demonstrate in pilot sites that legal, sustainable use of non-threatened bushmeat species through community-based natural resources management can be an effective conservation strategy in the Congo Basin. Local community members played a key role in this project because they will be empowered to control and manage community hunting lands and will actively participate in the development of wildlife management systems and regulations for access to and use of wildlife.

42. Mr. Robert Nasi presented his organization, the Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), which had many projects on bushmeat, and had been working on this topic in collaboration with the Convention on Biological Diversity since 2001. The past 10 years have seen a progression through the political agenda, starting with a keynote address on Non-Timber Forest Resources (NTFPs) in 2001, followed by the establishment of a Convention on Biological Diversity Liaison Group on NTFPs, which in 2009 became the Liaison Group on Bushmeat. CIFOR had also co-published a CBD Technical Series on this issue, and was working with several private sector companies in the Congo Basin to improve the wildlife management policies of logging concessions, including the development of monitoring systems; possible use of livelihood alternatives; and improvement of tools and guidelines. He expressed his hope that the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in 2012 would see a policy change on bushmeat, based on the results of this joint CBD/CITES meeting.

43. Ms. Diane Skinner from IUCN presented the work that a number of Specialist Groups of the Species Survival Commission (SSC) of IUCN are undertaking on Bushmeat issues. A number of groups are working to refine the knowledge on the extent of harvest relative to population size for various species in order to determine sustainability of off-take and to monitor the sustainability of wildlife hunting. Groups are also working on education and outreach on the issue, as well as with governments to undertake policy and legislative reviews. A number of groups have undertaken work on understanding bushmeat trade chains and consumer preferences. Successes have been observed, for example, in New Zealand, where secure property rights allow sustainable harvest of sooty shearwater by Maori communities.

44. Mr. Roland Melisch from the wildlife trade monitoring network (TRAFFIC), presented on the organization's work related to the utilization and trade of wild animal species for meat and medicines, and related achievements, challenges and opportunities. TRAFFIC's approach under this programme theme is to support regional-level, government-aligned strategies combining economic, community and regulatory approaches to address concerns of overharvesting and illegal trade of bushmeat, aiming at adoption and implementation of enhanced management and monitoring schemes. In Central Africa, TRAFFIC supports the Central African Forest Commission (COMIFAC) for the development and implementation of the Central African Bushmeat Monitoring System (Système de suivi de la filière Viande de Brousse en Afrique Centrale - SYVBAC), and for the development and implementation of the Central African Wildlife Trade Law Enforcement Action Plan that was backed by the 6th Ministerial Council of COMIFAC held in Kinshasa in November 2010. At national level, TRAFFIC facilitated the Democratic Republic of the Congo's first National Strategy and Action Plan on Bushmeat, and helped the Government of Cameroon by providing the basis for a recent change of legislation regarding the regulation of bushmeat trade, and with the promotion of a human-health related awareness poster on bushmeat consumption. In Southern Africa, the emphasis of TRAFFIC's work had been to support local and regional solutions towards the legal and sustainable use of wild meat in Namibia, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zimbabwe, which allowed for an enhancement of the food security situation to the rural people. In Ecuador, TRAFFIC described its collaboration with indigenous women's groups to help reduce the illicit trade in wild meat that was threatening many of the wildlife species within the Yasuní Biophere Reserve. In Asia, TRAFFIC supports governments and intergovernmental wildlife trade enforcement

networks to ensure that trade in wild terrestrial animals destined for consumption is based on legal grounds and on sustainability. In Asia, the research and capacity-building emphasis has been on mammal and reptile use and trade.

45. Mr. Vincent Opyene from the Bushmeat-Free Eastern Africa Network (BEAN) is training field officers and builds capacity; supports field research and action; raises awareness; and facilitates information exchange. The scope of BEAN is on key protected areas in East Africa threatened by bushmeat hunting and trade, while the vision of the organization is: A bushmeat-free Eastern Africa through active partnerships that increase protection, alternatives, awareness and sustainable utilization of wild fauna to conserve the region's rich biodiversity for the benefit of present and future generations. The conceptual model of BEAN included a list of species, issues, and underlying drivers to be addressed. Results were determined and monitored through a results chain. An example of activities included awareness-raising and livelihood alternative projects in the Maasai Mara Game Reserve and Tsavo National Park and income and protein alternatives in Tanzania (Katavi NP and Serengeti). In Southern Sudan, BEAN had carried out an assessment of capacity and law enforcement; and additional projects in Uganda. BEAN also worked at regional level, through information management, collaboration on enforcement and governance. Long-term goals were to develop partnerships, and to raise awareness and make available protein alternatives to effectively address bushmeat trade in Eastern Africa.

46. On behalf of the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC), an IUCN Member Organization, Mr. Ali Kaka filed the following update for the report: The CIC held its 58th General Assembly (GA) in St. Petersburg, Russia in mid May, and former Assistant Director General of the FAO Forestry Department Mr. Jan Heino had been elected as new President of the CIC Division on Policy and Law. The new President of the CIC Division Applied Science at the time, was Mr. Gerhard Damm, South Africa. The GA also for the first time nominated a Special Presidential Adviser to CIC President Bernard Lozé on questions related to the African continent. The CIC will hold its 59th General Assembly, the Global Sustainable Wildlife Use Forum, 7-11 May 2012 in South Africa. This would be an excellent opportunity for the next meeting of the Convention on Biological Diversity Liaison Group on Bushmeat ahead of the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The CIC published the 9th, updated edition of the "Evolution of CITES" book. The Spanish and French versions will be available shortly. By publishing this book, the CIC manifests its commitment to support the implementation of CITES. The CIC signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the the World Organisation of Animal Health (OIE) and pursues the joint objective of both organizations to open a Global Wildlife Disease Centre in Sofia, Bulgaria. This could provide an important opportunity to retain standards in the bush meat consumption to control and monitor disease. The CIC continued to pursue its idea of forming a global sustainable wildlife management platform similar to the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF). The CIC will be inviting the nomination of candidates for its 2012 Markhor Award, which will be presented in a ceremony during the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in India in 2012. This provides an opportunity to reward and highlight a successful project on sustainable wildlife management in connection with sustainable use of local bushmeat. Participants of the Bushmeat Liaison Group were invited to nominate the next Markhor Award winner. The CIC was convinced that the Bushmeat Liaison Group, which CIC has supported in the past, should concentrate on identifying and documenting best practice examples on bushmeat utilization and trade and would be prepared to invest energy in raising necessary funds.

47. On behalf of Mr. Chouaibu Nchoutpouen, Programme Assistant in charge of Biodiversity and Desertification for the Secretariat of the Central Africa Forests Commission (COMIFAC), Mr. Leonard Muamba Kanda, Director of Nature Conservation, Ministry of Environment for the Democratic Republic of the Congo presented the role of COMIFAC in wildlife conservation in the Central African countries. The Democratic Republic of the Congo at the time, held the COMIFAC Presidency. COMIFAC was the primary authority for decision-making and coordination of sub-regional actions and initiatives pertaining to the conservation and sustainable management of the Congo Basin forests. It was made up of the forestry ministers of participating Central African countries (Burundi, Cameroon, the Congo, Gabon,

Equatorial Guinea, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, Sao Tomé and Príncipe and the Republic of Chad) and was facilitated by a Secretariat. It supported and monitored the implementation of the Yaounde Declaration, international conventions and forest development initiatives in Central Africa. The COMIFAC Convergence Plan described the common intervention strategies of the Member States and their development partners for the conservation and the sustainable management of the regional forest and savannah ecosystems. COMIFAC created the GTBAC (Groupe de Travail Biodiversité d'Afrique Centrale) in 2006 to contribute to the implementation of the Convention of Biological Diversity. In 2011, COMIFAC signed a Memorandum of Understanding with TRAFFIC to promote conservation and sustainable use of forest ecosystems and resources in Central Africa. Among others, this MoU will support capacity-building for law enforcement and for the development of SYVBAC, the bushmeat monitoring system for Central Africa.

ITEM 5. WORKING GROUPS ON THE CBD BUSHMEAT LIAISON GROUP AND CITES CENTRAL AFRICA BUSHMEAT WORKING GROUP

48. The participants were divided into three working groups (WG) for in-depth discussions. Working group A addressed sustainable use and livelihood improvements; working group B addressed legislation, enforcement, monitoring and compliance, and working group C addressed capacity development and awareness-raising. The groups were facilitated by resource persons. The working groups reported back to plenary on 9 June. Results have been reflected in the revised recommendations of the Liaison Group on Bushmeat, as well as in the co-chairs summary.

49. Working group results are presented in annex III.

ITEM 6. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT AND CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

50. Participants adopted the present report of the meeting.

51. The co-chairs congratulated the participants and organizers for the excellent results of the meeting, thanked the European Commission for making the workshop possible, and closed the joint meeting at 1 p.m. Friday, 10 June 2011.

52. A meeting of the CITES Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group was held from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. on Friday, 10 June 2011.

Annex I

**REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
LIAISON GROUP ON BUSHMEAT**

The Liaison Group on Bushmeat⁴ of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) met from 7-10 June 2011 in Nairobi, Kenya, and adopted the following recommendations, building on the work of the first meeting of the Liaison Group on Bushmeat in Buenos Aires, Argentina (15-17 October, 2009):

National level

1. *Increasing capacity to fully evaluate the bushmeat issue and establish appropriate policies and management regimes.* National Governments should, with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, evaluate the role of bushmeat and other wild animal products in national and local economies and cultures as well as the ecological services provided by harvested species and other biodiversity as an essential step towards conserving and sustainably using this resource. This can be done by:

(a) Formalizing the existing bushmeat market as a precursor to putting its management on a sounder footing;

(b) Increasing capacity to monitor levels of bushmeat harvest and consumption in national statistics to inform improved policy and planning;

(c) Incorporating a realistic and open assessment of wildlife consumption and its role in livelihoods and cultures into major policy and planning documents;

(d) Establish mechanisms for full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the process, to ensure inclusion of their views on the role of bushmeat in their diets and their cultures, and the impacts of unsustainable bushmeat use on their livelihoods, and to include traditional knowledge and customary laws in policy-making and planning.

2. *Engaging the private sector and extractive industries.* Wildlife management, including bushmeat species management, should be an essential part of management or business plans for natural resource industries (oil, gas, minerals, timber, etc.) operating in tropical, sub-tropical forest, wetland and savannah ecosystems. Where possible identify and apply existing biodiversity safeguards and standards within extractive industry guidelines and policies (such as safeguards for sustainable forest management - SFM). The private sector should be encouraged to provide food alternatives for staff working in logging concessions (for example: stipulated in the contracts between government and extractive industries).

3. *Land and resource rights and traditional knowledge.* The land and resource rights of indigenous peoples and local communities should be recognized and respected in accordance with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other related human rights mechanisms. Their customary sustainable use and management of wildlife resources, including associated accountability in accordance with customary rules and laws, should be promoted and respected, in line with Article 10(c) of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Capacity of these empowered indigenous and local communities should be built and strengthened to ensure that they have the capacity to exercise these rights. Conservation and sustainable use of wildlife resources would be enhanced through the

⁴ The meeting was convened in collaboration with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); the Great Apes Survival Partnership (UNEP-GRASP), which is led by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); the Central African Forests Commission (COMIFAC); the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS); the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR); the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN); the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC), and the Wildlife Trade Monitoring Network (TRAFFIC).

incorporation of traditional institutions, traditional knowledge and customary laws and practices into management and monitoring systems, as well as by favouring the use of the most ecologically friendly (e.g., species-specific), cost-efficient, and humane hunting methods.

4. *Review of national policies and legal frameworks.* States where bushmeat species occur are strongly encouraged to review existing policies and legal frameworks related to the conservation and sustainable use of wildlife. In addition to restricting harvesting in protected areas and of threatened species in accordance with existing legislation, it is recommended that States establish strategies, policies, capacity, and management systems that support the legal and sustainable hunting of targeted species. The review should ensure:

- (a) That rights and tenure issues are clearly defined in national legal frameworks;
- (b) The coherence of policy and legal frameworks through mainstreaming conservation and sustainable use of wildlife in the various sectoral and national planning exercises;⁵
- (c) That management schemes are practical and feasible for harvestable species as well as those in need of strict protection (e.g., endangered species);
- (d) Realistic approaches to enforcement in which control measures are consistent with capacity;
- (e) That legal and regulatory texts reflect current practices without compromising key conservation objectives;
- (f) Promotion of the sustainable harvest of low-risk species and of measures to enhance protection of high-risk species;
- (g) The full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities and include their views and proposals based on traditional knowledge, customary practices and laws;
- (h) That sanctions and penalties have a deterrent effect.

5. *Landscape-level management.* An effectively managed and coherent network of protected areas is essential to conserve wildlife, including threatened species. In order to conserve wildlife populations outside protected areas, management should be at the landscape level.

6. *Science, traditional and indigenous knowledge and monitoring.* Management decisions should be made based on the best available and applicable science, the precautionary approach and the practices and traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities. Further research is crucial and better information management is needed. Appropriate monitoring systems of bushmeat harvest and trade and wildlife habitats should be developed based on an integration of traditional, indigenous and scientific knowledge and implemented at national level, and allow for comparability of bushmeat harvest and trade at the regional level. Standardized methods to assess and monitor the status of wildlife populations should be developed and implemented. New, updated and additional reliable data on populations of harvested species and on levels of use and trade should be made available for consideration within CBD-SBSTTA, CITES Animals Committee, CMS Scientific Council, other relevant international conventions, the Great Apes Survival Partnership led by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP-GRASP) and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red listing process.

7. *Substitution and other mitigative measures.* The development of culturally acceptable and economically feasible alternative food and income sources is essential where wildlife alone cannot be

⁵ Including Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP), forest management plans, national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAP), national forest programmes (NFP), Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs), national adaptation programmes of action (NAPA), plans related to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), national bushmeat action plans, national wildlife management plans and regulations, species-specific national management and conservation plans.

sustainably used to support current or future livelihood needs. Alternative food and income sources, however, need to take into account local realities, cultures and preferences and should be developed and implemented with local communities or support community-based income projects. Mitigative measures (farming, ranching, captive breeding, etc.) may play a role in conserving wildlife resources.

8. *Capacity-building, training, education and awareness-raising.* To achieve conservation and sustainable use of wildlife resources, sufficient capacity-building and public awareness-raising targeting relevant audiences need to be implemented and where possible institutionalized at international, national and local levels across a range of themes, including:

- (a) governance and law enforcement including customary laws;
- (b) wildlife monitoring and management, including non-detriment findings;
- (c) monitoring and management of bushmeat harvest and trade;
- (d) the role of indigenous peoples and local communities;
- (e) the impacts of unsustainable bushmeat harvesting and trade on indigenous peoples and local communities and their livelihoods;
- (f) livelihood alternatives; and
- (g) collaboration across government, private and public sectors, educational training institutions and indigenous peoples and local communities.

9. *Health and epidemiology.* (a) Where wildlife hunting and bushmeat trade is regulated, a national strategy for disease surveillance including those transmitted by wildlife should be implemented. Appropriate public health information and capacity-building should emphasize prevention of disease and protection of both human and animal health. Furthermore, wildlife, domestic livestock and human health need to be monitored and legislation, regulations, and enforcement need to be developed and implemented to reduce the threat of epizootics from newly emerging infections in an environmentally friendly manner; (b) In regions with bushmeat trade, sanitary control and biosecurity measures are necessary to prevent the sale of tainted meat or contaminated animal products that may lead to the spread of harmful pathogens.

10. *Climate change.* REDD-plus⁶ programme development at a national level including biodiversity safeguards should take into account the importance of wildlife for maintaining healthy ecosystems and ecological services, and for the permanence of forest carbon stocks and forest adaptation capacity.

11. *Special management areas.* Where they do not already exist, specific areas for wildlife management should be designated at national and local levels, with the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and in full respect of their rights (in line with decision VII/28⁷ and the Programme of Work on Protected Areas, in particular programme element 2 on governance, participation, equity and benefit-sharing), similar to permanent forest estates designated to manage timber resources. These may span existing protected area systems and multi-use landscapes (e.g., game-management areas or districts).

⁶ With reference to decision 1/CP.16 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), REDD-plus comprises reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries.

⁷ Decision VII/28, Paragraph 22: *Recalls* the obligations of Parties towards indigenous and local communities in accordance with Article 8(j) and related provisions and *notes* that the establishment, management and monitoring of protected areas should take place with the full and effective participation of, and full respect for the rights of, indigenous and local communities consistent with national law and applicable international obligations.

12. *Law enforcement:*

- (a) Strengthen investigative capacity, enhance control, inspection and arresting procedures and methods, including domestically and at border-crossing points;
- (b) Improve knowledge and capacity of prosecutors and judges to prosecute and sentence illegal bushmeat harvest and trade cases, ensure that sentences are served in full and publicize arrests, prosecutions and sentences;
- (c) Enhance cooperation and coordination among wildlife trade enforcement officers and officials, prosecutors and judges and other relevant personnel in the implementation of the respective law;
- (d) Assure citizens, including indigenous and local communities, are aware of national, regional and local laws.

13. *National strategies and action plans to address bushmeat:* (i) supporting and strengthening national political will to plan and take action on key bushmeat and existing conservation commitments; (ii) governments develop or strengthen participatory and cross-sectoral processes in formulating and implementing the sustainable management and harvesting of wildlife.

International level

14. *National, regional and international strategies to address bushmeat.* Such strategies could include:

- (a) Supporting and strengthening national political will to take action on key bushmeat and existing conservation commitments at a trans-boundary and regional level;
- (b) Supporting, strengthening and monitoring the implementation of existing international commitments and agreements and encouraging new ones concerning the conservation and sustainable use of transboundary and shared wildlife resources.
- (c) International partners should seek to effectively integrate wildlife conservation strategies into relevant development assistance such as poverty-reduction strategies.
- (d) Parties are encouraged to create regional or sub-regional bushmeat working groups in co-operation with relevant regional bodies to be technically supported by the Secretariat.

15. *Participatory processes.* The international community supports national Governments to develop or strengthen participatory and cross-sectoral processes in formulating and implementing the sustainable management and harvesting of bushmeat species, in particular participation of indigenous and local communities, and the private sector.

16. *Impacts of international trade in natural resources.* International policy processes and institutions concerning trade and development should take steps to better assess, communicate, and mitigate impacts of extraction and trade in natural resources (e.g., timber, minerals, oil) on wildlife, wildlife-dependent communities, and resulting bushmeat demands to ensure that all international trade is based on sustainable principles.

17. *International trade in bushmeat.* Concerned with the potential threat that a growing international trade in bushmeat may have on wild populations and wildlife-dependent communities, the international community should take action to discourage trade in illegally harvested bushmeat including the close monitoring of such trade. The international community should provide the means to implement such actions and communicate law enforcement successes. Close cooperation between Parties, including law enforcement, and between the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) on this topic is required.

18. *International policy environment.* In order to optimize the sustainability of hunting, the international community should support integrated local, national, and transboundary action to build partnerships among relevant organizations and institutions to:

- (a) Build enforcement and monitoring capacity;
- (b) Develop and implement protein and income alternatives;
- (c) Increase awareness and education regarding bushmeat hunting and trade;

(d) Increase collaboration between the relevant conventions (CBD, CITES, Convention on Migratory Species – CMS), the World Health Organisation (WHO), the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE), and other relevant organizations.

These actions taken together have the potential to support communities to sustainably manage their wildlife resource and reduce the demand for bushmeat.

19. *Science.* Research should assure to include and integrate ecology, health, development, economics and social science to inform future policy.

20. *Incentives.* The international community should ensure that financial mechanisms and payments for ecosystem services such as REDD-plus take into account the importance of ecosystem functioning and the role of forest fauna in forest health and resilience, including the well-being of forest-dependent indigenous peoples and local communities.

21. *Forest certification.* Forest certification schemes and standards should take into account the role of conservation and sustainable use of wildlife in maintaining healthy forest ecosystems, as well as the well-being of forest-dependent indigenous peoples and local communities.

Annex II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY & CITES PARTIES

Bangladesh

1. Dr. Abu Saleh Mostafa Kamal
Deputy Secretary
Ministry of Environment and Forests
Room 1309 - Building 6
Bangladesh Secretariat
Dhaka 1000
Bangladesh
Tel.: +880 2 716 1676
Fax: +880 2 716 9210
E-Mail: pssec@moef.gov.bd , Kamal_asm@yahoo.com

Botswana

2. Mr. Cyril Taolo
Chief, Wildlife Officer
Department of Wildlife and National Parks
P.O. Box 131
Gaborone
Botswana
Tel.: +267 397 1405
Fax: +267 391 2354
E-Mail: ctaolo@gov.bw

Cambodia

3. Mr. Thuch Phalla
Deputy Chief
Habitats and Nature-based Tourism Management Office
Department of Wildlife and Biodiversity Forestry
E-Mail: phallathuch@yahoo.com

Cameroon

4. Mr. Linjouom Ibrahim
Deputy Director
Fauna Conservation
Ministry of Forests and Fauna
Tel.: +237 777 26628
E-Mail: linjouomi@yahoo.fr

Central African Republic

5. M. Jean-Baptiste Mamang
Directeur de la Faune et des Aires Protégées

Ministère des Eaux, Forêts, Chasse et Pêche
Boite Postale 830
Bangui
Central African Republic
Tel.: +236-75-50-7622
E-Mail: jeanbaptistemamang@yahoo.fr

Colombia

6. Mr. Carlos Andres Lasso Alcala
Coordinator of the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity
Instituto Alexander Von Humboldt
Avenida Carrera 28 A, No. 15-09
Bogota
Colombia
Tel.: +571 3202 767 ext. 265
E-Mail: classo@humboldt.org.co
Web: <http://www.humboldt.org.co>

Congo

7. Mr. Kama Pierre
Chéf de Service Gestion et Conservation de la Faune
Ministère du Développement Durable, de l'Économie Forestière et de l'Environnement
B.P. 98
Brazzaville
Congo
Tel.: +242 055 324 060
E-Mail: pierreduboskamal@yahoo.com; pierreduboskamal@yahoo.fr

Democratic Republic of the Congo

8. Mr. Leonard Muamba Kanda
Directeur / Chef de service Gestion et conservation de la faune
Organe de gestion CITES-RDC, Point Focal du GRASP/Secrétaire du Corite National MAB
Ministère de l'Environnement, Conservation de la Nature et Tourisme
64b, avenue Mombele
Commune de Limete
Kinshasa
Democratic Republic of the Congo
Tel.: +243 813 491238
E-Mail: lmuambakanda@yahoo.com; rdc_minenv@yahoo.fr

Equatorial Guinea

9. Mr. Santiago Francisco Engonga Osono
General Director of Environment
Ministry of Fisheries and Environment
Malabo
Equatorial Guinea
Tel.: +240 222 27 39 70
Fax: +240 333 09 92 05
E-Mail: engongaosono@yahoo.fr

10. Mr. Martin de Porres Mbomio Nze
Environmental technician, Focal Point for protected areas
Ministry of Fisheries and Environment
Malabo
Equatorial Guinea
Tel.: +240 222 79 32 30/+240 222 72 15 16
E-Mail: martinmbomionze@yahoo.es

European Union⁸

11. Hon. Catherine Bearder
Member of European Parliament
European Parliament
ASP 10G218
European Parliament
Rue Wiertz 60
Brussels B-1047
Belgium
Tel.: +32.2.28 47632
E-Mail: catherine.bearder@europarl.europa.eu

Gabon

12. Mr. Adrien Nongou
Directeur de la Faune et de la Chasse
Ministère des Eaux et Forêts, de la Pêche, du Reboisement, Chargé
de l'Environnement et de la Protection de la Nature
BP 1128
Libreville
Gabon
Tel.: +241 7383548
E-Mail: adrien_nongou@yahoo.fr

Guatemala

13. Mr. Kurt Duchez
Chief
Wildlife Department
National Council of Protected Areas
Tel.: (502) 55107732
E-Mail: kurtduchez@yahoo.com, kduchez@conap.gob.gt

India

16. Mr. Cherukulappurathu (C.) Sasikumar
Research Assistant
Wildlife Division
Ministry of Environment and Forests
Paryavaran Bhawan, C.G.O. Complex, Lodhi Road
New Delhi 110 510

⁸ CBD Party only

India

Tel.: +91-11-24360704

Fax: +91-11-24360704

E-Mail: sasiwllindia@gmail.com

Kenya

17. Mr. Elema W. Saru

Chief Investigation Officer

Kenya Wildlife Service

P.O Box 40241-00100

Nairobi

Kenya

Tel: +254 20 606 067/+254 20 600 800/602 345 Ext. 2017

Fax: +254 20 607 450/607 749

E-Mail: jews@kws.go.ke, investigation@kws.go.ke

Liberia

18. Mr. Theophilus Varney Freeman

Technical Manager, Conservation

Forestry Development Authority

Wiehn Town

Paynesville, Monrovia, Liberia

Liberia

Tel.: +231 6 51176

E-Mail: theo1949@yahoo.com

Paraguay

19. Ms. Nora Norma Neris

Advisor, Point focal du CMS

Direccion General de Biodiversidad

Secretaria del Ambiente

Madame Lynch 3500 c/ Primer Presidente

Asuncion

Paraguay

Tel.: 595-21-615-812 ext 620

E-Mail: biodiversidad@seam.gov.py, noraneris@hotmail.com

Sudan

20. Prof. Ahmed Suleiman El Wakeel

Biodiversity Project Coordinator, General Secretariat

Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources

Gamaa Street, P.O.Box 10488,

Khartoum

Sudan

Tel.: +249 183 784 279 / 781 479 / 777 160

Cell: +249 912 551 581

Fax: +249 183 787 617

E-Mail: hcnr@sudanmail.net, aswakeel@yahoo.com

Tanzania

21. Ms. Lowaeli Simon Damalu
Senior Game Officer
Field Anti-Poaching Operations and MIKE National Officer
P.O Box 1994
Ivory Room
Nyerere Rd, Dar es Salaam
Tanzania
Tel.: +255 22 2866 418/375
Cell: +255 784 660 701/+255 764 808 431
Fax:+255 22 865 836/863 496
E-Mail: lowaeli@yahoo.co.uk, dw@mnrt.go.tz

United States of America⁹

22. Ms. Nancy Gelman
Program Officer
Africa Program
US Fish and Wildlife Service
United States of America
Tel.: + 703 358 2125
Fax: + 703 358 2115
E-Mail: nancy_gelman@fws.gov

UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES

Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)

23. Ms. Melanie Virtue
Agreements Officer
Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals
UNEP/CMS Secretariat
UN Campus, Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10
Bonn
Germany
Tel.: +49 228 815 2462
Fax: +49 228 815 2449
E-Mail: mvirtue@cms.int
Web: <http://www.cms.int>

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

24. Mr. Edgar Kaeslin
Forestry Officer
Wildlife and Protected Area Management
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla

⁹ CITES Party only

Rome

Italy

Tel.: +39 06 57053213

E-Mail: Edgar.Kaeslin@fao.org

Web: <http://www.fao.org>

Great Ape Survival Partnership (GRASP)

25. Mr. Douglas Cress

GRASP Coordinator

Great Apes Survival Partnership

United Nations Environment Programme

P.O Box 30552-00100

Nairobi

Kenya

Tel: +254 20 762 6712

Cell: +254 704 913 000

E-Mail: Douglas.cress@unep.org

Web: www.unep.org/grasp

26. Dr. Johannes Refisch

GRASP Programme Manager

UNEP - Great Ape Survival Partnership

United Nations Environment Programme

P.O. Box 30552

Nairobi

Kenya

Tel.: +254 20 762 4517

Fax: +254 20 762 4249

E-Mail: Johannes.Refisch@unep.org

Web: www.unep.org/grasp

27. Ms. Audrey Wandera

Project Officer

Great Apes Survival Partnership

United Nations Environment Programme

P.O Box 30552-00100

Nairobi

Kenya

Tel: +254 20 762 4748

Fax: +254 20 762 4249

E-Mail: Audrey.Wandera@unep.org

Web: www.unep.org/grasp

28. Ms. Lauren Coad

James Martin Research Fellow

Oxford Centre for Tropical Forests

Great Ape Survival Partnership

United Nations Environment Programme

Tel.: +44 (0) 1865 275854

Fax: +44 (0) 1865 275850

E-Mail: lauren.coad@ouce.ox.ac.uk

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

29. Ms. Susan Linnee
Reporter / Blogger
Center for International Forestry Research
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel : +254 733 622 034
E-Mail: susan.linnee@gmail.com
30. Dr. Robert Nasi
Director
Forests and Environment Programme
Center for International Forestry Research
PO Box 0113 BOCBD
Bogor 16000
Indonesia
Tel.: +62 251 8622 622
E-Mail: r.nasi@cgiar.org
Web: <http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/>

International Union Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

31. Ms. Diane Skinner
Programme Officer
SSC African Elephant Specialist Group
International Union Conservation of Nature
P.O Box 68200
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel.: +254 20 249 3561 / 65
E-Mail: diane.skinner@iucn.org
Web: <http://www.iucn.org/>
32. Mr. Ali A. Kaka
Regional Director - Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office
International Union Conservation of Nature and International Council for Game and Wildlife
Conservation (CIC)
P.O Box 68200
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel.: +254 20 890 606
Fax: +254 20 890 615
E-Mail: ali.kaka@iucn.org
Web: www.iucn.org/esaro
33. Mr. Dan Stiles
Consultant
IUNC/SSC AfESG

International Union Conservation of Nature
PO Boc 5159 80401
Diani Beach
Kenya
Tel.: +254 721 252 311
Fax: +254 20 890615
E-Mail: kenyadan@roadrunner.com

World Customs Organization (WCO)

34. Mrs. Susan N. Onyancha
Deputy Head
World Customs Organization's,
Regional Intelligence Liaison Office for
East and Southern Africa Region - WCO - RILO ESA,
Customs Services Department - Forodha House,
1st Floor, Upper Hill,
P.O. Box 72236 - 00200,
Nairobi,
Kenya
Tel: +254 722 739294, + 254 20 2719453
Fax: + 254 20 271 7720/ 2719453
Email: rilo.esa@kra.go.ke, susan.onyancha@kra.go.ke

INDIGENOUS AND LOCAL COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

Association of Indigenous Village Leaders in Suriname

35. Mr. Louis Biswane
Board Member
Association of Kalina and Lokono Peoples in Marowijne
Association of Indigenous Village Leaders in Suriname
Munzorgweg 38
Distrikt Wanica
Suriname
Tel.: +597 8700807
Fax: +597 520 131
E-Mail: klim.marowijne@gmail.com, louisbiswane@hotmail.com

Association OKANI

36. Mr. Messe Venant
Coordinator/FPP
Association OKANI
s/c BP 14
Bertoua
Cameroon
Tel.: +237 77 30 46 34/22 07 92 23
E-Mail: messe@forestpeoples.org, associationokani@gmail.com

Autonomous and Local Peoples of Central Africa

37. Mr. Kapupu Diwa Mutimanwa
Regional coordinator
Autonomous and Local Peoples of Central Africa Network
Democratic Republic of the Congo
Tel.: +243998668497
E-Mail: repaleac@yahoo.com

Indigenous Information Network

38. Mr. Daniel Mpoiko Kobei
Executive Director
Ogiek Peoples Development Program
Indigenous Information Network
PO Box 74908-00200
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel.: +254 51 2213803
Fax: +254 51 62 527
E-Mail: dkobei@yahoo.com, opdp@ogiekpeople.org

Indigenous Peoples of Africa Co-ordinating Committee (IPACC)

39. Mr. Vital Bambanze
Chairperson, IPACC
Senior Member, Unissons pour la Promotion des Batwa
Member of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UN)
Burundi
Tel.: +257 79 927 914/+257 2225 1351
E-Mail: vbambanze@hotmail.com

Nepal Indigenous Nationalities Preservation Association

40. Ms. Lucky Sherpa
Co-ordinator-Global Indigenous Parliamentary Network
Member- Nepal Indigenous Nationalities Preservation Association
Tel.: 977-1-4115687
Fax: 977-1-4115590
E-Mail: sherpalucky@yahoo.com, ninpanepal@gmail.com

Shirika La Bambuti

41. Mr. Joseph Itongwa Mukumo
Senior Coordinator
Programme d'Integration et de Développement du Peuple Pygme
Shirika La Bambuti
165 Avenue Mutakato
C. Karisimbi, Ville de Goma
Goma/Nord-Kivu
Democratic Republic of the Congo

Tel.: +243 997 714 967
E-Mail: ipacc@iafrica.com, pidnordkivi@yahoo.fr

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Born Free Foundation (BFF)

42. Mr. Iregi Mwenja
Country manager
Kenya office
Born Free Foundation
P.O. Box 1519-00502
Karen
Kenya
Tel.: +254 20 388 4972 / 388 3974
Cell: +254 723 713 642
E-Mail: iregim@gmail.com, mwenja@bornfree.or.ke
Web: www.bornfree.org.uk

Bushmeat free Eastern Africa Network (BEAN)

43. Mr. Opyene Vincent
Coordinator, BEAN
P.O Box 7487
Plot 802, Mitala
Kiwafu Rd Kansanga
Kampala
Tel.: +256 772 226 009/591 289
E-Mail: Vincent.opyene@gmail.com, opyenevincent@yahoo.com

TRAFFIC International

44. Roland Melisch
Senior Director, Africa and Europe
TRAFFIC International
c/o WWF Germany
Kaiserstrasse 70
D 60329 Frankfurt
Germany
Tel.: +49 69 79144-358
Fax: +49 69 79144-230
Email: roland.melisch@wwf.de

Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)

45. Dr. Liz Macfie
Gorilla Coordinator
Species Program
Wildlife Conservation Society
Nairobi
Kenya

Tel.: +254-733-623872
E-Mail: Imacfie@wcs.org

World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)

46. Mr. Taye Teferi
Conservation Programme Director
WWF Eastern & Southern Africa Regional Programme Office
P. O. Box 62440
Nairobi 00200
Kenya
Tel.: +254 20 3877355
Fax: +254 20 387 7389
E-Mail: TTeferi@wvfesarpo.org

Zoological Society of London (ZSL)

47. Mr. David Gill
Project Consultant
Equatorial Guinea bushmeat alternatives project
Zoological Society of London
Tel.: +44 20 7449 6494
E-Mail: dgill.bata@gmail.com
Web: <http://www.zsl.org/>

EDUCATION/UNIVERSITY

Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle

48. Dr. Marine Robillard
Expert and consultant in environmental anthropology and Anthropolinks
Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle
57, rue Cuvier
Paris
France
Tel.: +33140795701
E-Mail: robillard@mnhn.fr
Web : <http://anthropolinks.com>

Virginia Tech

49. Dr. Heather Eves
Visiting Assistant Professor-Virginia Tech
Professorial Lecturer- John Hopkins SAIS
5607 7th Street South
Arlington VA 22204
United States of America
Tel.: + 703 820 8647
E-Mail: heather.eves@aya.yale.edu

CBD AND CITES SECRETARIATS

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

50. Mr. Tim Christophersen
Programme Officer - Environmental Affairs / Forest Biodiversity
Scientific, Technical and Technological Matters
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W.
Suite 800
Montreal Quebec
Canada
Tel.: +1 514 287 7036
Fax: +1 514 288 6588
E-Mail: Tim.Christophersen@cbd.int
Web: www.cbd.int

51. Ms. Nathalie Van Vliet
Consultant
Bushmeat
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
12, rue Jean Jacques Rousseau
Montpellier F-34 000
France
Tel.: + 33 (0) 6 30 91 80 27
E-Mail: vanvlietnathalie@yahoo.com

Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)

52. Mr. Tom De Meulenaer
Coordinator
Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE)
Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered
Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)
CITES Secretariat c/o UNEP/DEL/CITES-MIKE
c/o UNEP/DEL/CITES-MIKE
P.O. Box 30552-00100
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel.: + 254 20 762 5175
Fax: +254 20 762 3859 /4816
E-Mail: Tom.De-Meulenaer@unep.org
Web: <http://www.cites.org>

53. Mr. Juan Carlos Vasquez
Communications and Outreach Officer
Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild

Fauna and Flora
International Environment House
15 Chemin des Anémones, 1219 Châtelaine
Geneva
Switzerland
Tel.: +4122 917 8156
Fax: +4122 797 3417
E-Mail: juan.vasquez@cites.org
Web: <http://www.cites.org>

Annex III

WORKING GROUP RESULTS

WORKING GROUP A: SUSTAINABLE USE AND LIVELIHOOD IMPROVEMENTS

Facilitators: Ms. Nathalie Van Vliet, CBD Secretariat
Note takers: Ms. Lauren Coad, UNEP-GRASP; Mr. David Gill, ZSL
Rapporteur: Ms. Nora Norma Neris, Environment Secretary of Paraguay

Questions debated by the group:

Drawing on examples of alternative livelihood strategies outlined in the report “Report on small-scale livelihood alternatives to the unsustainable use of bushmeat, based on the sustainable use of biodiversity” (UNEP/CBD/LG-Bushmeat/2/2):

- 1) Suggest further strategies which might have the potential to be successful in reducing the pressure on bushmeat species.
- 2) Identify lessons learned, best practice guidelines and specific strategies which have proven to be successful in reducing the pressure on bushmeat species.
- 3) Identify methodologies and possible pilot projects that could be used to quantify the impacts of specific management interventions on bushmeat species.
- 4) Comment on recommendations of the report in terms of importance, urgency and feasibility

Identified alternative livelihoods:

Sustainable harvest of wildlife; Community wildlife management; Game ranching; Mini livestock (e.g. cane rats); Domesticated sources of protein; Diversification of sources of income; Certification of wildlife products; Payments for ecosystem services; Fish ponds; Sustainable harvesting/Domestication of other NTFPS (Mushrooms, Alanblakia sp., worms...etc)

Remarks concerning the list of alternatives:

- Most of the existing alternatives target rural areas, whereas in many countries supply is driver by demand from urban areas.
- Partnerships with extractive industry should be created, providing alternative sources of protein for employees and villages created within concessions.
- Rural development (including health, education etc.) in some cases increases the likelihood of success of conservation action
- In many places (for instance rural forest villages), there is no other alternative than the sustainable use of bushmeat
- We need to ensure that the alternative livelihood/protein resource is actually replacing bushmeat hunting.

Lessons learned and pre-conditions for success:

The group identified that very few studies have measured their impacts and outputs. The group used examples provided in the report on alternative livelihoods, combined with their own experience, to identify some pre-conditions for success:

- Alternatives for what, for whom? Objectives and target of the project should be clearly stated and the activity adapted in accordance.
- Expected outcomes, both in ecological and livelihood terms are clearly defined and indicators are used to monitor impacts.
- Where relevant (i.e. in PES schemes), conditionality needs to be defined and understood by participants
- The benefits gained by the intervention need to equal the loss through reductions in hunting
- The design of the intervention should integrate cultural preferences and socio-economic realities

- The process is participatory and follows an adaptive management approach
- Land tenure and resource access rights/ownership are clearly defined
- Where relevant, legal provision for bushmeat trade, or markets for alternative products, exist
- The intervention is implemented in accordance to national laws and strategies
- There is articulation of national bushmeat strategy within the wider food security strategy

Recommendations for up scaling of livelihood alternatives:

- Some types of alternatives (e.g., livestock) may not be suitable for up scaling (trade-offs exist between defaunation vs. deforestation in some cases – for example in the case of livestock ranching)
- Alternative livelihoods should be used within a combination of approaches (i.e. different sources of alternatives, education, law enforcement)
- Monitoring the social, economic and environmental impact of strategies (monitoring system at the national or regional level)
- Linkages at different scales (national, regional and local policies and strategies). Regulatory and legal frameworks give provision to the development of alternatives (e.g. regulations concerning game ranching and mini livestock activities;)
- Government and international community support through incentives, micro credit facilities, technical advice etc.
- Prevent leakages through a landscape approach
- Encourage multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral partnerships
- Provide opportunities to exchange lessons learned / knowledge between regions

Identify methodologies that could be used to quantify impacts:

The group debated the methods that could be used to measure the effectiveness of various alternative livelihood schemes. The group identified a number of key issues:

- The community should be involved and consulted in the setup of the project, and asked what they want the project to achieve.
- Baseline ecological and socioeconomic data should be collected where possible, or relevant control sites identified
- Adaptive management should be employed, monitoring success and failure and adapting the project in response to this information
- Socio-economic indicators include household goods, wealth indicators, income, education level, access to medicine, basic needs surveys, household interviews, changes in equity.
- Ecological methods to measure prey populations (include transect surveys, camera trapping, tagging) and measuring hunter effort (snare densities, behaviour change, hunter interviews).
- Other indicators of ecological health might include measure of habitat change (deforestation, degradation)
- Many methods for monitoring, and toolkits, already exist. They are just not currently being implemented to measure project success for the majority of projects.
- At what scale should we measure success – should we be looking at short term reductions (buying time), should we be focussing on the next 25 years? Will our intervention strategies change depending on our focus?
- Large-scale policies/interventions need to take into account population increase (Brutland report)
- Eleanor Ostrom's management design principles can be used as broad standards
- It may not be possible to measure impacts for all projects, if projects are at the village level, due to the number of sites involved. Possibility to use some in detail studies combined with more easily and quickly measured indicators.

Comment on the recommendations of the report:

1: Increase capacity to fully evaluate the bushmeat issue

1a: Increasing visibility of the existing bushmeat market

- Concerns were raised that raising the visibility of the market may encourage hunting, if no monitoring is in place, and this would negatively impact livelihoods. Many countries have little capacity for enforcement
 - Need to clarify what is meant by ‘visibility’. It could be confused with promoting hunting
 - The clandestinely in which the market works means that it escapes certain national indicators and this might encourage hunting. We need visibility to follow the market. Could we not add conditions such as certification, monitoring etc? We need to know the source of the bushmeat, trace the bushmeat, and see where it is being sold.
 - Because the bushmeat trade is illegal it is difficult to quantify because it is a hidden market. But what do we mean by visibility? Does it mean that it has to be legalised? Do we want to put that as a recommendation?
 - If it is illegal I don’t see that we can remove 1a, we have to know importance that bushmeat places. By putting it underground we can’t see it. Formalizing it seems reasonable, but this may be seen by some as legalizing something that is currently illegal
 - Legalise and formalise are different. Formalise is recognising the resource, whereas legalize is to make it legal.
 - We cannot as a global recommendation we cannot recommend countries to legalize. We have to let them chose how to regulate it
- ACTION: ‘Increasing the visibility’ changed to ‘formalise of regularise’*

Engaging the private section and extractive industries

- We should identify existing strategies (safeguards, standards) used by extractive industries, and make sure that they are implemented. I.e. if you are FSC you already have social and environmental standards
- Logging and mining are opening up the forest for these bushmeat activities, so we should put something in their contract that would be there to eliminate bushmeat hunting. Either signed with government or something else that would reduce extraction of bushmeat by industries
- Is it up to national govt to make these decisions rather than international agreements?
- Mining companies are bringing in staff without protein alternatives, so definitively their staff is going into the forest to hunt.

ACTION: Added: “Where possible identify linkages between existing extractive industry policies on biodiversity such as sustainable forest management. The private sector should be encouraged to provide food alternatives for staff working in logging concessions (for example stipulated in the contracts between government and extractive industries)”

Points 3 and 4 were being worked on in detail by working group b, and so we moved to point 5.

Landscape level management

A concern was raised that the focus on PA’s - there is a role for non-formal PA’s like corridors for wildlife. PA and Wildlife management areas.

Science

- We should also include monitoring of the habitats.
 - Criticism is that is replies on local knowledge and doesn’t use indigenous knowledge. Can we recognize indigenous knowledge as part of this process?
 - Can we have monitoring of project success, and also monitoring socio-economic impacts?
- ACTION: Added “And Indigenous knowledge” to the title. Text added on the importance of integrating indigenous knowledge, and the need to monitor the impacts of interventions on ecology and livelihoods*

Substitution and other mitigative measures.

- Need to make sure that the alternative strategies are culturally acceptable and economically feasible – can we put this in at the beginning?
- ACTION: added “culturally acceptable and economically feasible” to the text*

Capacity-building and awareness-raising

- Group c will be touching on this point. Maybe we could include that we need to target the right groups – i.e. the users and uses of the resource need to be identified.
- It was highlighted. In the report that most work has targeted rural areas, and we are starting to understand that we need to target urban consumers. Targeting the right audience – experience is many time we have chosen the wrong target as many times local rural people have no alternative.

ACTION: Added “targeting appropriate audiences” to the text

Health

- Suggested that this point is too theoretical. Doesn't say what should be done and who should do what. Need for surveillance. The ministry of health of agriculture should have a way of tracking disease patterns in those animals that are commonly hunted for bushmeat.
- A national scheme of disease surveillance that also includes wildlife populations could be created – there are these services for domestic stock, so these wild products should also be monitored and if possible stopped from getting into the market. For example at the AU commission level Africa Bureau for African Wildlife, they do track animal disease in wild populations, but this is not being used for bushmeat. This needs to be brought together.
- In my view (Congo Basin Participant) it's very difficult because if I look at the situation in our country, it is not easy for meat that comes out of the forest, for us to know whether it was taken from a sick animal. If we set up a provision relating to meat that is already on the market it would be difficult. We have teams that go into forest areas and work with the hunters themselves, the teams is looking for animals that have died on the spot. If we find it is an illness, precautionary measures are taken. As it is put here (the recommendation), this is not implementable.
- Bushmeat in the market is sometimes already rotten, or unhealthy techniques used to preserve the products for longer. Health risks that can be measured at the market level. Sanitation as well, such as traders washing their hands = good sanitary conditions for the meat
- There are two elements here – sanitation and disease. Can we split them into two categories?
- It was suggested that experience as shown that when people implement some of these health measures they may actually harm the wildlife that they want to conserve. Can we say that we have to think about health impacts using environmentally friendly measures, so that we don't have mass-culling of wildlife due to disease?
- One participant suggested that the term 'one health' is now being used, encompassing both animal and human health. As this term is not currently used by the CBD, it was decided not to include it

ACTION: Added text outlining the need for national strategies for disease surveillance. Deleted some text, which was thought to repeat the main point. Divided points into sanitation and disease.

Climate change

- There are National REDD focal points in the country who should be approached. This will not be agreed at an international level, but a national level
- Biodiversity safeguards in REDD projects are an existing mechanism that could be used to safeguard against overharvesting. We should identify where linkages between REDD biodiversity safeguards and bushmeat policies can be made.

ACTION: included text on biodiversity safeguards, and REDD programme development at a national level

Special Management Areas

- There are different levels of management systems; we need to say they should be used where appropriate (different systems will be appropriate for different situations).
- In Cambodia there have special areas that are only for wildlife management, in the legal framework; some of these have a management plan and some not yet. The recommendation should be kept
- Maybe we can add, 'where they don't currently exist?'

- Our law (participant unknown) allows for the three ‘C’s: community, conservation and commercial. Even in commercial areas if there are endangered species, the law allows you to zone that area and have it protected. I don’t understand what you mean at the national level, as its all at the local level that these are created.
 - When we talk of national it doesn’t mean city, it means nationally recognised, with national standards. If you remove national you are delinking it with the national management agency
 - We could remove national and local and keep it open; this would also allow for trans boundary areas
- ACTION: Added “Where they do not already exist”*

INTERNATIONAL LEVEL:

National and international strategies to address bushmeat

Supporting and strengthening national political will

- As this is the international section should we just be referring to international strategies to address bushmeat, not national?
- It is important to have the national political will - critical. We could take a and put it into the national level section
- The decision was made not to move it, as international also refers to regional and transboundary processes as they relate to bushmeat

ACTION: Removed ‘international’. Added (at transboundary and regional level)

Supporting and strengthening existing international commitments

- We should also look at follow up to see how the commitments are being implemented?
- Change to supporting, strengthening and monitoring implementation
- There was a discussion of the terms ‘wildlife resources’ and ‘natural resources’ – the latter was deemed too broad

ACTION: Changed to “supporting, strengthening and monitoring implementation”

Participatory processes

- Discussed changing this to ‘the international community supports national governments, as ‘invites’ was seen as quite weak language

ACTION: Changed to “supports”

Policy process

- Comment: this does not really describe policy process; it is about development assistance from the international community, if we say it has to be integrated into a poverty reduction strategy. It should say in terms of international development assistance, not process.

ACTION: Changed the title ‘policy process’ to ‘development assistance’

International policy environment

- This is to make the point that the international community supports national policies for these three things
- local should be mentioned before national
- We discussed that many of the important preconditions for a sustainable trade – one of these is land tenure and property rights. Can we say that the international community should support govts to provide property rights, or is this a national level policy?
- Land tenure is national by nature

ACTION: Moved local in front of national

International science

- What is the difference between international science and national science
- It is not useful to suggest that some science can be done at national levels and some at international – it is just science
- It only adds examples of science that should be done, and we can take it out

- Can we add international help to build capacity for this scientific work in-country?

ACTION: deleted this section.

Incentives

- This is just a statement on what incentives are. Maybe we want to say that incentives, coming out of different international schemes, should be directed towards supporting local communities and national governments. At the moment it is just a statement
- It is up to the international orgs to support countries that are involved in REDD from a financial point of view, and the benefits associated with it
- Currently there is no recommendation in my point of view – it is not the normal way of writing a recommendation
- I think that the incentives and point 10 are inter related. There is also the CDM. I think we should omit it here, and include it into climate change section in 10.
- The climate change s in national section is about implementation, and national governments will be in charge of implementation. Here we are talking about wider financial mechanisms through the international community.
- Could we say that the international community should engage in these mechanisms? Is this better?
- And mechanisms are designed so that fauna is conserved, or there is sustainable management

ACTION: Added 'The international community should engage in' at the beginning and added language to emphasise taking into account sustainable management

Forest certification

- We have to mention somewhere forest certification schemes and standards. This brings in monitoring and auditing

ACTION: Added language on standards

WORKING GROUP B – LEGISLATION, ENFORCEMENT, MONITORING AND COMPLIANCE

Facilitators: Mr. Juan Carlos Vasquez, CITES (Day 1) & Mr. Roland Melisch, TRAFFIC (Day 2)

Note takers: Mr. Dan Stiles, IUCN & Ms. Liz Macfie, WCS

Initial comments and process:

- Process: The group reviewed the old recommendations, keeping in mind the group's main focal issues, which are legislation, enforcement, and monitoring. A second task of the group was to address opportunities to improve collaboration among relevant stakeholders regarding enforcement and monitoring of the bushmeat trade, and this was also considered within the recommendations review. Due to lack of time, the group was not able to undertake the third task of listing specific solutions and practical actions other than those included in the revised recommendations.
- Important information: The first set of recommendations under review has gone through a number of iterations already. As no African participants were able to attend the first meeting in Buenos Aires, a subsequent meeting (SBSSTA) discussed this problem and concluded that African perspectives were under-represented. This meeting has the opportunity to revise the recommendations to correct that.
- The remainder of this report covers the group discussions, organized by Article number of the recommendations under review.
- The group made track changes edits to the CBD Bushmeat Liaison Group's recommendations and these were forwarded to the CBD Secretariat.

DISCUSSIONS ON SPECIFIC ARTICLES IN THE CBD BUSHMEAT LIAISON GROUP'S RECOMMENDATIONS (ORGANISED BY ARTICLE NUMBER):

NATIONAL LEVEL

Article 3 on Rights and Tenure

The group discussed rights and tenure to great depth and there were strong feelings that rights, access, and “local communities” are not defined clearly and that rights are not protected sufficiently in legislation.

ACTION POINT: In para 3 – Need to define “local stakeholders” by adding clarification (“indigenous peoples and local communities”), who have a vested interest in maintaining the resources [add] “for their own survival”

Legislation and policy must define more clearly how access to bushmeat is controlled and managed. Legislation that is not applied or if it cannot be applied, is not useful and cannot be enforced (e.g. if a permit is required, but can't obtain except in capital city, it will not be followed or enforced).

ACTION POINT: Definitions are very important – who has rights of tenure? What are off-take limits? Which communities? How to enforce? Who to enforce? What are penalties? Who must pay, and if so, how much? Does use include commercial use or not? All of these must be clearly defined in laws.

In some countries, legislation is needed to translate these conventions into national law. Legislation needs to rationalize how policies are made and applied. Legislators can propose laws, but it is the role of the government to make a law and then to enforce that law. Centralised vs. decentralised enforcement – once a law is signed, it must be translated to policies in relevant ministries, and then ultimately to provinces.

– In Kenya laws were drafted in 1976, and include user rights. Citizens have a right to access natural resources through a legal permit system. However, in the 1980s, this became unsustainable, so it was banned by Presidential Degree. For the last 30 years, Kenya has not allowed consumptive use by its citizens, only non-consumptive. However, it is still often said you “need to get a permit” to harvest.

– When we talk of management, we should emphasise “participatory management” of natural resources. Government must control, but with the involvement of local stakeholders, which should include NGOs, conventions, etc.

– In Congo-Brazzaville laws don't specify access clearly enough. Often laws are still very similar to colonial laws. They may say there is access, but it is not clear. Some confusion between rights in concessions and those outside. Law that describes who has access rights and how to implement usage rights.

– Capacity-building is very important – Cameroon is very advanced in creation of community hunting areas – have 40 zones in the anglophone zone.

– Perhaps use the term “minority group” – a group that needs protection, in contrast to other local groups that may have more power. “Indigenous” is a confusing term – some immigrant communities are just as “indigenous” as hunter-gatherers.

– Definitions are tricky – can't decide them here. Could we make a recommendation that each country should, in its laws, make its own definition of indigenous? [Not discussed further]

– People who leave as soon as an industry pulls out are not indigenous. Those who stay are truly indigenous.

– Customary laws – in most cases, these are recognised in legislation, but may not actually be implemented.

– We are talking about regulation of an “industry”.

– Remember that these issues are at the core of the matter and are globally relevant – not just Central Africa.

– This paragraph 3 focuses on recommending that rights and tenure are transferred (whenever possible) to local stakeholders. Given that we are recommended this – it must have a legislative framework. – which could be added as a separate paragraph (in paragraph 4)

– The “whenever possible” is classic CBD language. Should we delete this? There are situations that are exceptions where it cannot be possible (or not appropriate). Agreed to leave it in.

– Guatemala has 5 different hunting areas – very clear map produced showing what you can hunt and when you can hunt. Species are named – based on scientific information. (Actually relevant to paragraph 6 on Science).

Article 4 – Review of national policies and legal frameworks

- Main paragraph - Action Point – Add to main paragraph – ... “States establish [add “strategies”], policies, capacity, and management systems that ...”
- However – some discussion on confusion over the word capacity – can mean two things in French
- Spanish version has issues: Action Point – translation is missing some sentences in this Article!!
- CITES perspective – this recommendation is very complicated and large. It is asking for policy reviews, legal framework reviews, review coherence of policies, and review management system. The recommendation should be more specific on what we want the governments to do.
- Actually the points (a) through (e) are just restating, more specifically, the points in the main paragraph above.

Article 5 – Landscape-level management

- Suggestion to add that networks of protected areas should be created and include a large number of partners. Yes, this is a good idea, but perhaps has less to do with legislation, so agreed to leave this out for now.
- One delegate wanted to add to the first sentence – that in addition to protected areas, there are other categories and strategies for land use that allow for sustainable use of wildlife. However, this **is** included in the second sentence which states that management should be at the landscape level to conserve wildlife populations outside protected areas.

Article 6 – Science [add “and monitoring”]

- Spanish translation has different meaning than what is in English. English content is OK.
- Final sentence – problem in French – “knowledge” is translated as “donnée” = data”. This should be changed to include statistics / data. Knowledge translates to “connaissance”, but this is also not appropriate. “Données nouvelles et statistiques fiables”.
- Target audience for updated scientific information – need to include not only IUCN Red List consideration, but also CBD-SBSTTA, CITES-AC and SC, CMS, other relevant international conventions and GRASP.
- Title – expand to Science and Monitoring (in French Science et Suivi). However, Guatemala says that in their legislation, this won’t mean anything – if it doesn’t change anything within the paragraph, it doesn’t make a difference – however no objection

Article 7 – Substitution and other mitigative measures

- Last sentence makes no sense to several delegates. Should be “Mitigative measures may play a role in conserving wildlife resources”. Then delete rest.

Article 8 – Capacity-building and awareness-raising

- **Group C is dealing with this one.**
- One delegate suggested adding to this paragraph supporting capacity to monitor bushmeat off-take and trade. This was supported.
- Discussion on whether to add application of international conventions relevant to bushmeat and to replace this with “enforcement”. Overall support, however, on the suggestion that governance and LE **includes** conventions. So leave as is.

Article 9 – Health [add “and Epidemiological Surveillance”]

- Health laws in Guatemala don’t include wildlife... however this is a recommendation that legislation be developed, so it is OK.

- World Health Organization (WHO) missing from all these processes – this is a weakness. Recommend that CBD should seek inclusion of WHO and World Animal Health Organisation (OIE)
- Note that the CMS gorilla agreement technical committee has a membership slot for an Animal Health expert.

Article 10 – Climate Change

- In French, the term “healthy ecosystems” is not used. Say “état des écosystèmes”

Article 11 – Special Management Areas

- This addresses earlier concerns about work outside of protected areas.

INTERNATIONAL LEVEL

Article 12 – National, [add Regional] and international strategies to address bushmeat

- To streamline the list, it was suggested to merge with Article 14 – include 14 as 12c.
- Several delegates are interested in developing a Latin America Working Group on Bushmeat. Another delegate noted that the Central African group is under CITES only. The initiative was welcomed, however other regions also interested, saying that Asia should have a group, wherever it sits. Therefore add point (d) that “Parties should create regional bushmeat working groups, in cooperation with relevant regional bodies, to be supported technically by the secretariat”

Article 14 [Merged with 12 – see above]

Article 15 – Impacts of international trade on natural resources

- One delegate suggests both 15 and 16 are fine, but can we merge them to avoid duplication. End with “demands, and the international community should take action to discourage” (So would remove the phrase in the middle).
- However, others feel it is important to maintain the two separate.
- Retain as is.

Article 16 – International trade in wild bushmeat

- One delegate feels we have taken note of data as a necessary element under article 6 (now called Science and Monitoring) and under Article 8 (Capacity-building), but now think that paragraph 16 does not cover monitoring the trade. All agreed to add this.
- One delegate suggests international community provides financial means to support the monitoring activities.
- Second sentence – add “close cooperation between Parties “

Article 17 – International policy environment

- One delegate wants more specification of who are the “organisations and institutions”. However, we can’t name them, so add “relevant” organisations and institutions
- Add point (d): to increase collaboration between the relevant conventions (CBD, CITES, etc) with the WHO and the World Animal Health Organisation (OIE)

Article 19 - Incentives

- One delegate suggests adding “forest” ecosystem services because it is only those that get REDD funding. However, others said that there are other PES systems that can be applicable to other habitat types.
- French translation of “forest health and resilience” – consider revision.

WORKING GROUP C: CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT AND AWARENESS-RAISING

Facilitator: Ms. Melanie Virtue, CMS Secretariat

Rapporteur: Dr. Ahmed Suleiman El Wakeel

Note taker: Ms. Diane Skinner, IUCN

Target Audience: The group first identified the various audiences for any awareness-raising activities.

Local level:

Religious leaders; Commercial hunters; Subsistence hunters; Traders (Middle(women)); Migrants; refugees; Rural consumers; Vendors; Schools & colleges; Law enforcement; Technicians working in forestry and mining concessions; Women; Health professionals; Indigenous and local communities; Cultural leaders

National level:

Authorities (permit givers); Policy-makers (ministers, etc.); Law enforcement; School & University curricula; Businesses (including international companies); Urban consumers; Development agencies; Women; Health professionals

International level:

Law enforcement (WCO, Interpol); International trade agreements and certification schemes; Tourism; Consumers; Development agencies

Terminology and definition

The group reviewed the CBD Liaison Group's definition of Bushmeat:

“The CBD Liaison group defines bushmeat (or wild meat) hunting as the harvesting of wild animals in tropical and sub-tropical forests for food and for non-food purposes, including for medicinal use.”

The group had the following key points about the definition: ‘Bushmeat’ is not ideal – it does not mean the same thing in every region or every country, and many different organizations use many different terms and definitions, so this needs serious thought. The issue is really about sustainability of off-take from wildlife populations. Open the ecological scope to be broader than tropical and sub-tropical forests

Question 1: What are the key challenges and opportunities for awareness-raising on bushmeat issues?

Challenges were identified as:

Terminology and definition; Communicating to different levels and sectors; Choosing the right vehicle for communicating messages; Delivering culturally-appropriate messages; Low priority (minimum budget allocation) given to awareness-raising by national authorities; Limited resources; No link between laws and reality; Conservation NGOs playing the role of enforcers and sensitizers; Lack of coordination mechanisms between institutions engaging in awareness; Lack of land and resource rights; Vulnerability of wildlife outside PAs

Opportunities were identified as:

Use existing national public awareness infrastructure; Make use of political will where it exists; Sensitization champions at the community level (also can be an economic alternative); Utilization of, and building upon, traditional and indigenous knowledge systems; Collaborative monitoring of resources (Government, communities, NGOs, others); Marketing through social media; Link between bushmeat and health; Link between bushmeat and food security; Links with development aid; Tourism; Celebrity ambassadors

Question 2: What are key challenges and opportunities for developing countries to address the unsustainable hunting of bushmeat (including a specific list of obstacles, and capacity-building needs)?

Scale: Projects to date have been small-scale at a particular level – projects should be broad-scale all levels; Political will: Must be compatible with government priorities; Need to develop bottom-up approaches, taking into account traditional knowledge to complement scientific knowledge; Governments need to recognize land

and resource rights of indigenous peoples; Need to take this all to a new level, utilizing the corporate sector; capacity-building (law enforcement, tourism infrastructure, etc.)

Question 3: Which elements should be included in an electronic media toolkit on bushmeat (develop an outline)? Which organizations should be involved in its development?

The group identified a number of guiding principles, possible sections, tools and information, as well as the people who should be involved in the kit's production.

Guiding principles:

- Live tool with hyperlinks to external resources
- Languages: English, French, Spanish, Chinese as priorities (Arabic and Russian as the additional UN languages if funding allows)
- Global – Africa, Americas, Asia
- Multi-media – sound, video, images, etc.
- Must be downloadable and available offline
- Make use of radio and participatory video
- Need a clear roll-out plan notifying all sectors of the toolkit
- Need a corporate partner to have ownership...raise it to a new level

Sections:

Journalists; NGOs; Government agencies; Local communities; Health professionals; Businesses; Development agencies; Law enforcement agencies; Schools.

Tools and information pages:

How to conduct a market survey? How to monitor the bushmeat trade? How to identify species of bushmeat? What is bushmeat (clarify terminology)? What species are endangered? What is legal? What is illegal? Best practices for implementing alternative livelihoods; What works? Success stories for combating unsustainable bushmeat hunting; Resource list – people, tools, products; Funding opportunities; Health issues and dangers; What are the consequences of unsustainable bushmeat hunting on ecosystems, local livelihoods, and the national economy?; What do I gain by conserving wildlife?; What can I do to help?; What role does bushmeat play in local cultures?

Which organizations should be involved?

Everyone at this meeting, especially the organizations representing indigenous peoples, and inputs from Americas and Asia; Additional ideas: Great Ape Film Initiative; Regional partnerships and networks; Experienced communicators & toolkit-builders!

Question 4: What are key communication and awareness raising opportunities in the course of the coming 24 months?

- CMS COP - November 2011 – Norway
- CITES COP – March 2013 - Thailand
- CITES SC62 – 2012 - Switzerland
- CBD COP – October 2012 – India
- IUCN WCC – September 2012 – Korea
- IUCN Regional Conservation Forums – 2011 – all regions
- UNFCCC COP – December 2011 – South Africa
- IPS – August 2012 – Mexico
- India National Park Managers Conference– October 2011 - India
- CBSG – Sept-Oct 2011 – Czech Republic
- SCB Africa – June 2011 – Tanzania
- Africa Cup of Nations – 2012 – Gabon
- London Olympics

- International Trade Fairs
- Health industry meetings
- Nepal Ministry of Environment Mountain Conference – November 2011
- E50:50 – 2013 – India
- Yaoundé +10 - ?
- COMIFAC GTBAC – August 2011
- Other COMIFAC working group meetings
- Regional NBSAP meetings
- GRASP Council meeting - 2012
- TED conferences – February-March annually – Los Angeles
- Clinton Global Initiative – September annually – New York
- World Environment Day – 5 June annually
- Film festivals
- Culture Day for Great Lakes Region – 2012
- Extractive industry meetings
