

**CBD questionnaire for expressions of interest for participation in a collaborative  
partnership on sustainable wildlife management:  
Response from IUCN  
July 2012**

**What are your expectations for a collaborative partnership on sustainable wildlife management (with a focus on supporting developing countries in implementing the recommendations of the CBD Liaison Group on Bushmeat)?**

IUCN is positive about the potential of the CPSWM to provide an organised platform to ensure a coordinated and collaborative response to this topical, important and sensitive issue, and would like to play an active role in this initiative. We think it is important for the leading international biodiversity convention, the CBD, to be addressing this topic. We view the broad goals of this effort for sustainable wildlife management as reducing unsustainable offtake and illegal trade; securing and enhancing food security and livelihoods of local/indigenous communities; and achieving and supporting sustainable use of wildlife both to meet livelihood needs and, where possible, provide incentives for conservation and habitat restoration.

Strong partnerships and political backing are required to translate the growing body of research and policy into action on the ground in a coordinated manner. It is essential to draw together the different sectors engaged in this issue – conservation, indigenous/local community development, the private sector (particularly logging and mining), agriculture, academia, and so forth. However, it is critical that this partnership be well structured and organised if it is to be effective and efficient.

***Scope and focus***

We think it is appropriate for the scope of the CPSWM to initially reflect the thematic and geographic scope outlined in the CBD's bushmeat definition i.e. *"harvesting of wild animals in tropical and sub-tropical countries for food and for non-food purposes, including for medicinal use"....* Tropical and sub-tropical countries are generally the areas where communities depend most heavily on wild meat, medicinals and other products for food and livelihoods, and where sustainability problems are greatest, so should be prioritised. While Africa, and particularly Central Africa, is a very important region in this regard, it should be ensured that attention is likewise paid to Asia and Central and South America. South-east Asia, for example, has been identified as a wildlife trade hotspot where the illegal and unsustainable use of wildlife poses a disproportionately large threat to biodiversity. Over 40 % of the world's Critically Endangered large mammals, and over 60% of the world's Critically Endangered turtle species, come from Asia. In terms of establishing broad guidance and priorities for the work of the group, we agree that supporting the implementation of the Recommendations of the CBD Liaison Group on bushmeat in developing countries provides a sound basis for initial work.

Notwithstanding this initial focus, as the work of the Partnership develops we would like to see consideration of broadening of the thematic and geographic scope of the Partnership to encompass sustainable wildlife management in other parts of the globe, and to include consideration of sustainable wild resource management more broadly, including forests and fisheries.

### ***Role of the CPSWM***

The role of the CPSWM in supporting implementation of these Recommendations and on sustainable wildlife management generally needs to be articulated. We suggest the following as key aspects of its role:

- A platform to bring together organisations with diverse interests and expertise on these issues, including from perspectives of conservation, food security, human health, and economic and social dimensions in general;
- A mechanism to mobilise action on emergencies and emerging issues, facilitate collaboration, and jointly mobilise funding;
- Coordination of research efforts (e.g. supporting communication between researchers, enabling collaborative planning, data sharing, developing standardised methodologies, facilitating input from local/indigenous people and other major stakeholders);
- Hosting of a global bushmeat monitoring system (such as a database on bushmeat use, drivers of change, impacts on species and livelihoods, forms of governance of wildlife);
- Synthesis and dissemination of lessons learned from the field (such as on risk factors for decline in harvested species, effectiveness of strategies for sustainable use by wildmeat-dependent communities, approaches for supporting local wildlife management rights and capacity).

### ***Priorities for action***

In order to guide the work of the group, the Recommendations will need to be further refined and prioritised based on consultation with partners and stakeholders.

We view the following areas as some of the most pressing areas for action by this Partnership:

- Improving understanding of the role of wild meat/medicinals in food security, health and cultural practices of wild resource-dependent communities;
- Addressing how we can reduce overexploitation of species used for meat/medicinals (particularly vulnerable K-selected species), while maintaining and supporting sustainable use (particularly of r-selected species at lower risk of overexploitation). There are a number of different suggestions aimed at reducing demand (e.g. changing preferences in urban wildmeat markets, supporting alternatives such as wildlife farming or game ranching) or reducing supply (e.g. strengthening local tenure and wildlife management rights/capacity, increased enforcement of commercial trade). Currently studies are being undertaken around the world piecemeal, and a systematic evaluation of the evidence base to determine what works in what circumstances is urgently needed;
- Addressing how wild meat/medicinals management can better contribute to food security and other local rights and needs. Assessment of issues such as the impact of illegal commercial trade of wildlife on the potential for sustainable use of wildlife by local communities, the effectiveness of different local management approaches, and development of “pro-poor” approaches to standards and certification is required;
- Strengthening collaboration with indigenous people and local communities, and supporting local capacity and rights for wildlife management.

## **What are key experiences of your organisation in sustainable wildlife management at global, regional and national level?**

### ***Background on IUCN***

IUCN seeks to ensure use of wildlife for bushmeat does not threaten species survival and provides for human food and livelihood needs in many different ways, across many parts of the globe. IUCN is today the largest professional global conservation network, and a leading authority on the environment and sustainable development. IUCN is made up of a “triple helix” of its Members, Commissions and Secretariat. Its members comprise more than 1200 [organizations](#), including over 200 government and over 900 non-government organizations. The Commissions are international networks of volunteer scientists and experts, who provide information and advice to IUCN and to support conservation globally. Six Commissions are made up of almost 11 000 experts across around 160 countries. The Secretariat includes over 1,000 staff in 45 offices. Together IUCN works with hundreds of partners in public, NGO, and private sectors around the world. IUCN provides a neutral forum for governments, NGOs, scientists, business and local communities to find pragmatic solutions to conservation and development challenges, and carries out thousands of field projects and activities around the world. The Union’s headquarters are located in Gland, near Geneva, in Switzerland.

IUCN’s work can be broadly summarised as clustering around the themes of Science, Action, and Influence. As it is not possible to comprehensively describe IUCN’s extensive experience related to wildlife management, some key examples at global, regional and national level are provided here.

A key global knowledge product for wildlife management is the [IUCN Red List of Threatened Species™](#). The Red List is widely recognized as the most comprehensive, objective global approach for evaluating the conservation status of plant and animal species. For the understanding and management of wildlife and particularly bushmeat, this provides a resource for information on used species, including levels and drivers of threat, distribution, and representation in protected areas. In the future the Red List will include information on use and trade of wildlife, which will increase its relevance for bushmeat management because it will record whether each type of use is a threat or not.

Many IUCN Species Survival Commission Specialist Groups carry out research and gather information relevant to bushmeat and wildlife management, at global, regional and national levels. For instance, the African Elephant Specialist Group has recently carried out research into the scope, dynamics, and impact of the elephant meat trade in Central Africa. The Bat Specialist Group has carried out research on use of bats for food, the Deer Specialist Group has carried out research on the relationship of agricultural production and wildlife poaching in Tanzania, and the Antelope Specialist Group collates information on the use for bushmeat of antelope species, particularly in Africa. Members of the Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group have carried out work on wildlife management and use, and its contribution to local livelihoods, in a very wide range of countries.

IUCN Regional Programmes have extensive experience in addressing use of wildlife for food, medicinal use and other livelihood needs. For instance, IUCN in South America has past experience in sustainable use and trade of medicinal plants, freshwater fishes and

sharks. IUCN Programme for Central and West Africa (PACO) is currently collaborating with Oxford University, the Great Ape Survival Partnership (GRASP), the Wildlife Conservation Society and the Zoological Society of London on a pan-African review of alternative livelihood projects in the context of species overharvesting in order to understand if these approaches have a positive impact on conservation. This study will then be used to advise policy and donors on species conservation projects. In addition IUCN under the USAID Central African Regional Program for the Environment's small grants program has supported initiatives to reduce illicit harvesting of bush meat. IUCN documented also lessons learned from partners in the Congo Basin working on approaches to community conservation that could address the bush meat trade and improve wildlife management. Similarly, IUCN Asia has acquired substantial experience related to the sustainable use of biodiversity; this has included the implementation of several large projects dealing with Non-Timber Forest Products, community fisheries, trophy hunting and medicinal plants. IUCN Asia maintains a Secretariat presence in ten countries across the region and also operates a Regional Biodiversity Conservation Programme, with a focus on species conservation and management, protected areas and CBD implementation.

TRAFFIC, the wildlife monitoring network, a joint programme of IUCN and WWF, has an active work programme across Africa, Asia, Europe and the Americas addressing use of [wild animals for food and medicine](#) through promoting national, transboundary and regional strategies, incorporating tools to support better trade monitoring, encouraging greater enforcement efforts to address trade in threatened and protected species, and considering alternative methods to meet human needs currently being met through unsustainable hunting. TRAFFIC's Central Africa programme, based in Cameroon, has developed a regional bushmeat monitoring system termed SYVBAC in French (*Système de suivi de la filière Viande de Brousse en Afrique Centrale*) that endeavours to monitor the trade in the Congo Basin region, and has helped develop a National Bushmeat Strategy and Action Plan in DR Congo. Research in Kenya, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zimbabwe has helped highlight the scale of the problem and specific challenges in these areas. On the other hand, an analysis of game meat production and wildlife-based land uses on freehold land in Namibia has shown the potential to contribute significantly to conservation, food security and to Namibia's national economy. In Asia, TRAFFIC carries out research on highly trafficked species such as pangolins and freshwater Asian turtles and other reptiles hunted for food and medicines, and works closely with enforcement agencies to combat illicit trade. In the Americas, TRAFFIC has investigated the trade in reptiles, particularly snakes, in Mexico and Central America, and is working closely with associations of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in Ecuador, and monitoring markets. In Europe, recent work by TRAFFIC has revealed the level of illegal trade in wild birds, particularly from countries in Southeast Europe to restaurants in Italy and Malta, and in Russia research has examined hunting and trapping for fur. Since the inception of the Liaison Group on Bushmeat (LGBM), TRAFFIC has contributed substantially to the LGBM's organisation and findings, and helped prepare recommendations towards and at SBSTTA on the matter. TRAFFIC has further supported the publishing of the CBD Secretariat's Technical Series Report on Livelihood Alternatives for Unsustainable Use of Bushmeat (Nr 60), and has supported the development of a media toolkit on bushmeat for the Parties to CBD.

At global level, IUCN influences international environmental conventions, policies and laws relevant for wildlife management. IUCN works in fora such as CITES, the

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Fauna and Flora and the CBD toward pragmatic and science-based policies to address conservation and livelihood concerns over use of animals for food and other livelihood needs.

IUCN member organisations bring a great breadth and diversity of experience. While IUCN members have not been consulted comprehensively in the development of this submission, three examples out of many are provided here.

- The Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) has carried out research in many regions on wild meat. In Laos, WCS has worked since 2003 on the linkages between wildlife management and household food consumption/human nutrition. Current research on linkages between wildlife management and household meat consumption in 10 villages in northern Laos, which will be published later this year.
- The International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC) is a politically independent advisory body on sustainable wildlife use, with members ranging from Governmental Agencies and Ministries responsible for wildlife use to networks of specialists and individual members in more than 80 countries around the world. It holds globally recognised expertise in the fields of advice in developing national sustainable wildlife management legislation and policies; know-how in establishing sustainable hunting practices in developing countries with participation of local communities; and conservation and sustainable use of migratory bird species.
- The Zoological Society London (ZSL) works on bushmeat at all geographic scales (and both in range states and in the UK/Europe), and on research, implementation and policy. This includes desk-based and field-based interdisciplinary bushmeat research in West and Central Africa; monitoring the conservation and health implications of the illegal bushmeat trade from Africa to Europe; working with local communities on bushmeat alternatives in Equatorial Guinea; working with progressive timber companies in Cameroon to develop practical management actions that can minimise the impact of unsustainable bushmeat harvesting in their concessions; and conservation of flagship species threatened by hunting such as apes, tigers, elephants, rhino, okapi and pygmy hippo.

**Which organisational format would you suggest for a possible partnership on sustainable wildlife management (Please cite examples of other international partnerships, if possible)**

We do not have detailed specific proposals for an organisational format. Two suggestions for consideration are: first, that leadership of the platform is assumed by different organisations on a rotational basis; second, that the Secretariat is hosted by one suitable organisation, with command placed with a rotating Chair. While the first suggestion may be perceived as more equitable the frequent changes of organisational home may destabilise the operation of the platform.

We also suggest that the operation and effectiveness of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests, a broadly analogous thematic platform for global collaboration, be examined for potential lessons for this initiative.

**Which resources could you contribute to the partnership, if any?**

The knowledge resources, expertise and practical experience of IUCN and TRAFFIC in this area have been detailed above, and as an active participant IUCN would mobilise these to promote the objectives of the CPSWM.

Many IUCN members may be able to offer specific resources. The CIC is offering to host the Collaborative Partnership's secretariat, with all necessary infrastructure. If this is accepted by the partners, CIC is also offering to contribute funds allowing the partnership to select and hire a full time coordinator. The Zoological Society of London (ZSL) has indicated it is willing to contribute central London meeting rooms/facilities; its Secretariat responsibilities for the UK Bushmeat Working Group, which could be used to disseminate info and discuss relevant issues; and staff and students within the Bushmeat Research Programme who could carry out relevant research.