



## **Darwin Initiative Workshop**

22 February 2006

Quality Hotel, London

**Public Awareness**

**Proceedings**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>PROGRAMME .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>PRESENTATIONS, DISCUSSIONS AND SEMINARS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Plenary Session 1 'Role and contribution of awareness raising initiatives within conservation programmes' by Ros Aveling .....	2
Plenary Session 2: 'Lessons and Experiences from 'Community Biodiversity awareness in Kyrgyzstan' by James Hindson .....	4
Seminar 1: Raising Awareness of biodiversity contributing to livelihoods: issues and best practice.....	5
Seminar 2: How best can Darwin Initiative projects influence national and international agenda? .....	7
Seminar 3: Tools for raising awareness and assessing their effectiveness. A reflection from a Darwin project .....	10
<b>CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS – ADDRESSING AWARENESS RAISING CONCERNS.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>ANNEX 1: WORKSHOP PROGRAMME.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>ANNEX 2: DARWIN INITIATIVE WORKSHOP – PARTICIPANT LIST .....</b>	<b>15</b>

## **Introduction**

The Darwin Initiative Workshop took place on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of February 2006, in London. It was a discussion forum for UK project leaders and interested parties who met to share experiences and reflect on the principles and actions regarding raising awareness on conservation action. The plenary session was chaired by Professor David Macdonald, Chairman of the Darwin Advisory Committee.

The Chairman welcomed participants and took the opportunity to send apologies from the Minister who was not able to attend the workshop. He outlined the significant financial support that the Darwin Initiative has received: £50 million in over 400 projects worldwide<sup>1</sup>. The enthusiasm that the Initiative generates is significant – the Chairman noted that the Minister is keen to see Darwin projects every time he is abroad. His support and encouragement is key and DI team members work in this respect is appreciated.

The Chairman moved on to highlight the importance of the Darwin Advisory Committee (DAC), including the effort and diligence that committee members show throughout the year. David McDonald welcomed new DAC members including: Karen Laurensen, Ros Aveling, Janet Barber, Johannes Vogel, all of whom are active and valued members of the conservation community and are keen to take the Initiative forward.

It was also noted that besides considering applications, the DAC members reflect on the lessons learnt from Darwin Initiative. The DAC discusses what projects have been successful and how one may evaluate and judge success – to guide not only the future of forth-coming projects but also to share wider lessons with the conservation community. The committee wants to see projects that are crosscutting, acknowledging that different projects will have different emphasis.

The speech moved on to highlight how biodiversity is crucial to well-being as it underpins every aspect of the human enterprise. In this regard, the conservation profession has moved a long way and is not just multidisciplinary but also recognizes the central position of understanding the human dimension and human well being as a driver for conservation activities. He concluded that the Darwin Initiative team and their projects should strive to be at the forefront of changing ideas, underlining the importance of awareness-raising – and of increasing the general public's understanding of the importance of biodiversity.

## **Programme**

The first plenary presentation '*Role and contribution of awareness raising initiatives within conservation programmes*' was given by the new Darwin Advisory Committee member Mrs Rosalind Aveling, from Fauna and Flora International (FFI). Dr James Hindson's, from the Field Studies Council (FSC) '*Lessons and Experiences from 'Community Biodiversity awareness in Kyrgyzstan'*' followed. After the plenaries, participants had an opportunity to network over lunch.

The afternoon session was chaired by Dr Paul van Gardingen from ECTF. This session consisted of three successive plenary presentations which were followed by three simultaneous group discussions on each theme:

1. Raising awareness of biodiversity contributing to livelihoods - issues and best practice
2. Feeding project findings into CBD national policy and regulatory practices: a comparison of policy change in Gabon, Peru and Malaysia;
3. Producing and using information incentives: lessons from a trans-boundary project in the Humid Chaco Regions of Argentina and Paraguay.

The presentations and seminar discussions are captured in the section that follows. The programme for the workshop can be found in Annex 1. A comprehensive list of participants can be found in Annex 2. For additional information please refer to the presentations, which are available from Darwin Initiative Website <http://www.darwin.gov.uk/events>

---

<sup>1</sup> Figure does not include Darwin Fellowships or Scoping Awards.

## **Presentations, discussions and seminars**

### ***Plenary Session 1 'Role and contribution of awareness raising initiatives within conservation programmes' by Ros Aveling***

Mrs Aveling elaborated on her views on what needs to change to make conservation activities more successful. The institutional memory from Fauna and Flora International was the backdrop for her reflections which started with an overview why biodiversity is not a key issue in Governments' agenda and actions followed by reflections on FFI experience at the grass root level, the presentation considered three main themes:

- a) the importance of changing behaviour in a way that changes conservation awareness work
- b) experiences of Darwin Initiative's project in Ha Long Bay, an education programme in Vietnam and
- c) a reflection of other initiatives from around the world.

The speaker noted that pressure on species and remaining land is intense, for example, remaining Protected Areas are under huge threat. Also alarming is the agricultural unsustainability in view of increased population and more natural disasters which impact on biodiversity. The speaker argued that even though these facts require immediate Government and citizen action, biodiversity conservation is not yet a global priority which leads the government's agenda. What needs to be done includes:

- a) Prevent loss of biodiversity without compromising human needs
- b) Make use of partnerships: this approach permeates the Darwin Initiative and includes support of local and national organizations which are fundamental to success
- c) Influence socio-economic and political processes that underlie the resource
- d) Analyse exactly what drives biodiversity loss at local and international levels.

The speaker highlighted that awareness raising is critical to achieving the above, but also has to focus on how to extract the value of what currently is being done. For example, project leaders need to consider if they are making the most of partnership opportunities and that they can use the data from DI projects to secure natural resources. She stressed the importance of making the most of the huge Darwin Network and invited the attendants to ask critical questions, such as:

- Do we make the most of what we find out (ie baseline data)? Do we empower local people with this knowledge?
- How proactively do we feed our data analysis into policy processes?
- How proactively do we connect our partners to those who can influence change?

She proceeded to indicate that awareness-raising is about changing behaviour. It is important to assess what is possible at the local situation, in many instances change is not what was expected.

The subsequent discussion on the Ha Long Bay case study provided an insight into how FFI attracted attention to the site and provided training to local communities. Aveling noted how for an initiative to gain momentum it is important to have local champions that can push an issue within local communities. She added that it is important to support mechanisms and programmes for championing outstanding leaders. The end of the presentation invited the attendees to reflect on the connection between the environment and what we do on an individual basis. She questioned the participants to think: Are we all changing our behaviour and are we fully recognizing the local cultural value of environmental resources?

After these remarks, the Chairman opened the floor to questions by remarking that the DAC should take a strategic view of international conservation, given its high level of investment.

The session initiated a fruitful debate which included comments and questions from the floor:

- Researchers do not fully understand the role of awareness in changing behaviours and ought to push for getting information out and to highlight the connection between production and consumption, which has been lost.
- To clearly spread awareness it is key to identify the best conduits by targeting both educational groups and certain demographic groups. For example, researchers and project leaders can start by looking at sharing results with people coming to the university system who will, in the future, drive decision making in the wider economy.
- Awareness doesn't always work when there are personal interests at stake such as middle men, for example in bush-meat trade.
- Decisions made elsewhere affect each other, the idea of 'think locally act globally' was put forward.
- The move towards linking livelihoods to conservation has not improved vastly over the last decade. To monitor progress, FFI is conducting audits of every partnership activity, to see both impact on livelihoods and impact on resource base. They have set up guidelines and policy to double check the impacts across all their programmes and projects.
- The surge of enthusiasm in understanding the role of human well being could cause some to be less alert that welfare is the biodiversity driver. In this respect biology is necessary but not sufficient to achieve ecological and social balance.

**Plenary Session 2: 'Lessons and Experiences from 'Community Biodiversity awareness in Kyrgyzstan' by James Hindson**

Dr Hindson, Director of the Field Studies Council (FSC), an Environmental education NGO, discussed how project leaders can use education as a fundamental tool to understand the nature of awareness raising and conservation. He prompted participants to question themselves about what is actually getting better in terms of sustainable development (see presentation).

The invitation to question behaviour was followed by a snapshot of the FSC work in Kyrgyzstan, where their project looks at areas where society, economy and environmental aspects overlap. The FSC worked with a network of 400 teachers across 24 schools. The speaker described the main outputs of the projects which include teacher materials ranging from a 'Textbook on a wall' - which was designed to give young people an understanding of biodiversity - to maps, designed to guide students in their own interpretation of sustainable development.

The speaker reflected on the success of teaching by action and of designing a programme where children created their own biodiversity reserves in designated school areas. A key element of success is the involvement of parents in the education programmes. The presentation raised questions and comments from the floor which included:

- *Awareness and understanding of education are two different issues.* Awareness is a small step to develop understanding of science. Before doing science, project leaders need to understand how to implement strategies that support education.
- *Making the transition between raising awareness and affecting change is complex.* The DI network ought to use economic rational and make use of markets to influence biodiversity conservation strategy. It is key to understand how to bridge gaps between educating people and helping them understand their position within the economy and in bringing alternative livelihoods. This is very difficult to implement.

*It was suggested that a set of best practice guidelines on awareness raising are drafted, which could include a checklist on issues to consider when designing and implementing projects. These should guide project leaders on how the Darwin Initiative understands awareness raising, with examples of strategies and tools that have worked for past and ongoing projects.*

The Chairman proceeded to recapitulate both plenaries and summarized the session by underscoring the importance of the human dimension and stakeholder wellbeing in any biodiversity conservation project because:

- *It is ethical and pragmatic.* It is simply right that people around the world are involved and considered in environmental decision making.
- *Increasingly, environmental and social issues are interconnected.* For example, concern over species will link into concerns of ecosystem welfare or human enterprise.

The Chairman concluded the session by highlighting that biodiversity now has a 'grown-up' seat at the international table of decision makers – that entails huge responsibility including furthering new sorts of understanding. Biodiversity is not just a sectoral interest of a few enthusiasts. This is something that has changed radically, as wider understanding of the environment seems to be extraordinarily important nowadays.

## **Seminar 1: Raising Awareness of biodiversity contributing to livelihoods: issues and best practice**

*Presentation and facilitation by Neil Thin, University of Edinburgh  
Supported by Stephanie Halfmann, ECTF*

The seminar raised questions on the importance of livelihoods within conservation. The speakers discussed that biodiversity is 'low in the pecking order' of rural poor people's priorities as other sorts of environmental concerns predominate in their lives. Traditional conservation concepts such as the protection of rare endangered species are not in general the best way of engaging rural people into the agenda of conservation and sustainable livelihoods. Neither is the use promotion of 'threats' and scare stories. The speaker remarked that unsustainable resource extraction is the area that conservationists can expect rural people to be concerned about.

The presentation continued by challenging the idea that livelihoods are taken seriously within the conservation community and encouraged the Darwin Initiative to engage in broader contexts. For example, by working in close partnerships with livelihood agencies and reporting on trade offs and synergies in order to avoid a 'jeeps and binoculars' approach to conservation.

The presentation continued to explore the livelihoods concept as an analytical framework to translate conservation initiatives into livelihood outcomes. Dr Thin raised the concept that in poorer countries of the world there are no formal links to livelihood flows, and that in rural areas of the world livelihoods are insecure – he added that this insecurity is sometimes exacerbated by conservation. When assessing the livelihoods component of a conservation initiative, he encouraged the participants to:

- practice '*socially responsible conservation*' as the bottom line, so that conservation does not exacerbate livelihoods risks or seeks to look at the compensation of such risks.
- *evaluate the trade offs within conservation programmes*: linkages tend to be conflictual between conservation and livelihoods thus project leaders should think of ways to manage conflict.
- *When designing a project, consider biodiversity is not at the forefront of people's thinking*. Assess not just direct relevance of biodiversity to livelihoods but vice-versa as their aims may conflict. An appropriate measure is to avoid tokenism and 'livelihood washing' by having a holistic view on projects.

He concluded the presentation by stating that livelihoods are not just tangible benefits or flows, they also contain a wider dimension of culture and ideology. It is key to think about dignity and quality of social life of local participants involved or impacted by Darwin initiative projects.

### **Discussion Group: Connecting livelihoods and conservation**

The main discussion group split into subgroups of 3-5 participants to share experiences of how individual projects integrated livelihoods aspects in their work. Several key points were identified.

The groups stressed that important elements when working successfully with local communities are people's dignity and culture that need to be taken into account, not only livelihoods.

Strategies for improving livelihoods are often linked to creating or enhancing access to markets, such as tourism and/or setting up small-scale enterprises e.g. for the production and trade of handcrafts. There are examples where initiatives have failed and led to frustrating experiences, due to the lack of economic expertise (business plan) and insufficient understanding of local markets (realistic assessment of local infrastructure is required). Participants agreed that any trade and business related activities within a DI project need a robust, well thought out, approach and an identified market first. The overall consensus was that project's emphasis on trade and use should be at local rather than at an international level.

A common problem of projects addressing livelihoods issues is their timescale: they have to work against intense short term pressure. An example of this is how to resist logging whilst alternative livelihood strategies are being developed but are not in place yet. Participants agreed that it was important to be realistic and not to raise people's expectations of what projects can achieve within their limited scale and resources.

The discussion moved on to highlight that ecotourism is a buzzword often mentioned within the context of improving livelihoods, however, often without an appropriate definition of the term or a clear idea of what the concept encompasses. This involves a danger of 'green washing', with no benefits for livelihoods or conservation.

It was pointed out that projects can quickly up-scale. Even when they are set out to address issues at the local (community) level, they can find themselves quickly having to deal with these issues on a national level; eg in areas where local changes are dependent on policy change. Again, the timescale of a project is perceived as a constraint, and including the right expertise at the right time (adaptive management, flexibility) is crucial.

Participants stressed that livelihood initiatives should not be patronising. It was also stated that there is need for self-reflection first in terms of what we, as individuals, do in our own country and remit to help conserve biodiversity, before advising others on alternative strategies overseas.

There was agreement that projects with an explicit livelihood component require a multi-disciplinary approach in order to build trust, strong partnerships and achieve sustainable outcomes. The question was raised whether relevant projects, with the current average amount of Darwin funding of £100,000 over three years, can afford to employ the scientific, economic and social expertise required. Suggestions included fewer projects on a bigger scale, or the approach of other and/or additional sources of funding, or making more explicit and active the links with other development activities.

### **Session Conclusions**

Participants from the group session presented the following findings:

- Livelihoods are more than just income: they include culture and dignity.
- Improving livelihoods is a long term complex process which poses a challenge to development and conservation projects (e.g. a logging company coming into the forest may offer direct benefits to local communities in the short term, this strategy conflicts with development projects such as cottage industries, whose benefits may take longer to accrue)
- Projects need to manage partners' expectations carefully as to what can be realistically achieved within a limited timeframe of a Darwin project.
- It is important to address agriculture biodiversity as a key component of resource conservation. It is not mentioned in MDG or in the CBD within this context.
- Projects need business and marketing plans to address alternative income strategies. For this reason, it is important to budget for a multi-disciplinary approach, i.e. marketing, social and scientific expertise. Access to other sources of funding or other donors to give more rounded finance to address livelihood issues is key and complementary to commercialisation.



## **Seminar 2: How best can Darwin Initiative projects influence national and international agenda?**

*Presentation by Prof Mike Bruford, University of Cardiff*

*Facilitated by Dr Paul van Gardingen, ECTF*

The discussion centred on how basic science and research from the Darwin Initiative projects can impact on CBD implementation and livelihoods policy. It commenced with an overview of the Articles within the Convention which are relevant to the Darwin Initiative's goal. It proceeded by drawing lessons from Darwin Initiative case studies including: 'Vicuna and Guanaco conservation in Peru' and 'Orangutans conservation in Malaysia'.

### **Camelids<sup>2</sup> in Peru**

The presentation highlighted the importance of producing scientific knowledge that can influence the use of domestic forms of camelids (llama and alpaca) and how best to conserve the species in the wild (vicuna and guanaco), taking into consideration sustainable economic use perspective. The project initiated considerable policy change, thus the presentation set the background on the status on use and conservation of these species by describing the historical uses of the vicuna in the Papa Galeras region.

Results from this Darwin Initiative funded study showed that the genetic signature of populations had been moved around. Until recently, the vicunas were demographically isolated. Through the results, it became clear that vicuna populations should be maintained independently, as they had been over a long period of time. The project managed to orient the authorities to avoid re- domesticating the vicuna and avoiding mixing species.

### **Orangutans in Malaysia**

The speaker also discussed the steep decline of orangutan populations, in Malaysia, which has been drastic, particularly after the post-colonial process of deforestation. The presentation explained how the population has declined by orders of magnitude, in a short space of time; if the rate of decline continues the population will be extinct by 2050. Therefore, the project set out to work out management options for vulnerable populations that are not in natural protected areas by engaging with government on how best to manage 'unprotected' forests in view of orangutan protection. The project generated a large amount of media attention, it covered controversial themes in the drafting of its management plan, namely tourism, logging and oil palm agriculture. Project participants came up with an orangutan conservation plan, in conjunction with the Danish Development Agency (DANIDA) and the Minister of the Environment which seeks to implement low impact logging around orang-utan populations coupled with increased tourism.

To finalise this presentation, a case study of Gabon was briefly discussed. As an output of Dr. Bruford's DI project, a course in Conservation Biology was ran at the national University. When the Government created 13 national parks - which cover 17% of the land mass - they sought to recruit graduates from this course. Therefore trainees supported by this Darwin Initiative project immediately got the opportunity to put theory into practice.

### **Discussion Group**

The discussion group adopted the approach of sharing experiences of how Darwin projects had been able to influence policy and practice in partner countries. The presentation by Professor Mike Bruford was used to stimulate the group discussion.

The participants were asked to share experience of how Darwin Initiative projects have helped to raise awareness of or exert influence on policy issues, comparing difference approaches to try to illustrate examples of best practice.

---

<sup>2</sup> Ruminant mammals of South America. They are related to camels.

It was stressed that the best way to influence policy was to work through and support local partners. Whenever possible, local stakeholders should be presenting information to policy-makers and others who influence policy. It was noted that a local stakeholder has much more credibility than someone from outside the community. There are many things that DI projects can do to enhance the status and ability of local partners to influence policy. Training (eg MSC courses), attending and presenting at international conferences and having publications recognised by the international community were all suggested as useful ways to empower local partners. Darwin was recognised as making very significant contributions to enhancing the status of local partners.

It was recognised that the institutional landscape of government organisations in many countries can be complex and poorly described. For this reason projects which seek to influence policy need to map institutional relationships and find out who makes decisions. It is important to identify and engage with the right person or organisation, recognising that there will often be conflict within government, for example, between groups representing agriculture and environment.

Relationships are extremely important, and it is essential to invest time in building these. This should not only be with government officials, but also with other interest groups. It was suggested that Darwin projects are likely to be far more effective in influencing policy when the project is linked within a consortium, for example, including a number of local NGOs and community groups. If it is also possible to engage with the private sector, this would again enhance the opportunities for success.

The point that local “champions” for the conservation cause can be very effective was reiterated. If these come from communities likely to be affected, they can present very powerful messages. It was also noted that all politicians and civil servants are also members of the own communities and that this can be another method to engage support. A number of participants also noted that children can often play a role in influencing the decisions of their parents.

Whilst much of the discussion focused on local processes and organisations it was noted that regional or international organisations can also have a very positive role, when they support local actors. This can be very important when it is necessary to “act globally to think locally”. An example was given of when changes within the CBD were necessary before local action was possible on some forest conservation issues.

At national level it was thought important to target documents such as the National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plan (NBSAP) and Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP). It was noted that in many countries these are little more than “tick-box” exercises and that it is crucial to link these plans to specific actions, which need to be costed and associated with distinct and measurable outcomes. It is important to invest in this process, ensure local ownership and if at all possible get the Finance Ministry involved as early as possible.

At the international level, it was recognised that the CBD itself was very important and that Darwin projects should try to have a higher profile in the CBD process. Projects should aim to get information to their CBD Focal Point(s). This was linked to a common theme of making information much more readily available to all interested stakeholders. It was also suggested that projects need to design outputs that meet the needs to specific policy actors who may not understand many standard Darwin outputs.

It was suggested that more could be done at the level of the Darwin Initiative to help individual projects to have policy impact. More information should be used by the UK delegations of CBD events and that the Darwin Initiative could consider making strategic alliances with key organisations with a global interest in biodiversity, such as Diversitas, IUCN and the Equator Initiative.

Policy impact may require projects to take advantage of unexpected opportunities when they arise. The flexibility demonstrated by the Darwin Initiative was considered to be an essential characteristic of the programme that has helped projects to deliver impact on policy. This combined with the DI's ability to engage with and strengthen local experts and institutions are aspects which define the value of the Initiative. Whilst much has already been done, it was suggested that far more could be done at the level of the overall programme. Two actions were identified as being required to achieve this, firstly to make information from existing projects much more readily available, and finally it was felt that the production of a best practice guide on influencing policy by Darwin Projects was required.

### **Session Conclusions**

- Policy has common themes: projects need to be flexible and adapt to make the most of policy change opportunities.
- When presenting a message, it is more effective if the local partner can voice it as it has more validity within the local people
- There is a need to understand host country institutional landscape and political economy. Try to figure out who really makes a decision and try to understand which mechanisms influence change, for example through informal networking
- CBD matters. It is useful and should be more effective: it is key to think how to feed information into the focal points. Acting globally can help to impact locally. It is key to get more information for Darwin – prior to the COPs.
- Try to make Darwin information be more readily available. Also think about format, appropriate to use and tailor to specific target groups.

### **Seminar 3: Tools for raising awareness and assessing their effectiveness. A reflection from a Darwin project**

*Presentation by Sandra Knapp, Natural History Museum*

*Facilitated by Anna Karp, ECTF*

This presentation explained how practical tools such as field-guides and databases help to disseminate knowledge. It also discussed the lessons from making these tools through the perspective that dissemination can come in all forms and can occur in all kinds of environments. The presentation explored these themes through a series of case studies, which are discussed below.

To illustrate the use of field guides as drivers of knowledge, an example was presented from Eastern Paraguay where there was little idea of the type of flora occurring in the national forest reserve as little inventory work had been carried out in the area. The hunter gathering Ache people were integrated into the project as para-biologists and focused on carrying out inventories of plants and insects. As they were illiterate, their strength lay in the identification of species such as beetles. The project helped to bring out their skills, previously unappreciated by people in the area. The main lesson learnt from the project was that flexibility is needed in order to be responsive to local needs and to adapt to circumstances on the ground.

The presentation drew from other similar projects to reaffirm that the involvement of local groups – from indigenous peoples to private landowners – is key for taxonomic or botanical projects.

#### **Discussion Group**

A single group discussion was carried out, namely bringing out participant's experiences regarding the use of awareness raising tools. During this session, participants were curious to know more about the NHM's extensive experience in the production of awareness raising tools.

The session started by reaffirming the need to test the tools and quality of information gathered with the eldest, the women and wider community. Participants agreed that when designing a tool it is important to think about the guide's purpose and target audience: who you are writing for and what gap is it intending to fill. The importance of having community's consent on documenting their fauna and flora was debated, in terms of feeding into good practice of DI projects.

It was recognized that the same field-guide may be used to inform different audiences, from government officials and para-taxonomists. Therefore, these tools need to be stand alone documents, devoid of jargon. If a tool is simple, it may have a very wide audience, across countries, as was the case of the NHM's field guide on ferns, which is used across Latin America.

The importance of talking to diverse stakeholders – not just to a narrow audience, was discussed. The idea of trying things out and experimenting was debated, such as inexpensive formats for guides, and the practical ways of reducing costs, for example by printing only in black on white. Other practical inexpensive formats include CDs, as practically every computer contains a CD ROM.

The group concluded by saying field guides have an impact through time, thinking long term will help to achieve sustainability. Making tools is a way to catalyse future work locally, which is more important than doing it as project leader of a Darwin Initiative project. The training of local para-taxonomists exemplifies this.

#### **Session Conclusions**

- Be pragmatic: making a field-guide or dissemination tool is not making a taxonomic study of a particular group.
- Think about what you want to make a dissemination material do.

- Target the audience: do not pigeon hole, it is possible that both politicians and conservationists are willing to read the same tool.
- Project leaders need to be prepared to change their mind according to local needs. They need to produce dissemination material that works as opposed to just a product (or an output as per specified in the application form). If a project leader wants to change, they can justify this to the Secretariat.
- Use local language.
- Getting local people involved in plant identification projects is critical, as is making sure that safeguard mechanisms are in place such as prior informed consent when it comes to IPR issues.
- Talk widely with stakeholders from government officials to grassroots groups, involve people to generate buy in. This will increase the chances of having lasting sustainability.

## **Conclusions and Next Steps – addressing awareness raising concerns**

After the end of this seminar session the Chairman thanked the attendants and proceeded to close with final remarks. The forum gave an opportunity to discuss key themes such as the importance of biodiversity within the international policy context and how the information from Darwin Initiative projects can help in both raising awareness and furthering education on the links between human welfare and conservation.

The proposed date for the next Darwin Initiative workshop is October 2006, the theme is yet to be finalised.

### **Summary of recommendations emerging from the workshop**

- The Darwin Initiative team and projects should be at the forefront of changing ideas – for which awareness-raising is important.
- ‘Awareness raising’ should consider what needs to change in order to make conservation activities successful. The linkages are complex, but typically it is about empowering local people and influencing policy, in order to change behaviour on the ground.
- Environmental and social issues are interconnected so a holistic view that recognises the trade-offs must be taken. This requires awareness amongst all stakeholders of the interconnected issues.
- Approaches to awareness raising should: take into account local people’s dignity and culture; be flexible and allow for adaptive management; not be patronising; manage partners’ expectations; budget for multi-disciplinary approach; make scientific knowledge useful and influential; recognise the long-term nature of change.
- Projects should make the most of partnership opportunities at local and international levels, including: making the most of the experience within the Darwin network; working with livelihood agencies.
- Darwin projects should aim to enhance the status and ability of local partners to influence policy.
- A set of best practice guidelines on awareness-raising should be developed, including a checklist on issues to consider when designing and implementing projects.
- Information and experience from Darwin Projects should be more readily accessible, and better targeted to inform the CBD.
- Useful tools and approaches highlighted included:
  - Use partnership opportunities
  - Ensure local ownership and empower local partners
  - Support local champions that can push issues within local communities or policy arena
  - Teaching by action, e.g. Education programmes where children create their own biodiversity reserves in designated school areas
  - Raise controversial issues (with care) as these can generate a lot of useful attention
  - Test any tools and the quality of information before using widely
  - Avoid jargon and technical language – the simpler the product, the more audiences it will reach.

**Annex 1: Workshop Programme**

Darwin Initiative Workshop

22<sup>nd</sup> February 2006

Time	Activity	Speaker
9:30-10:00	Registration: tea and coffee	
10:00-10:30	<b>Welcome and Introduction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome by Defra, including statement by Minister</li> <li>Introduction and overview of the workshop by Advisory Committee Chair</li> </ul>	TBA Prof David MacDonald
10:30-12:30	<b>Plenary Session</b> Raising awareness of biodiversity within the Darwin Initiative - Opportunities and challenges towards translating knowledge and best practice to conservation action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The role and contribution of awareness raising initiatives within conservation programmes.</li> <li>Lessons and Experiences from '<i>Community Biodiversity awareness in Kyrgyzstan</i>'</li> </ul>	Fauna & Flora International Mrs Rosalind Aveling  Field Studies Council Dr James Hindson
12:30 – 14:00	Lunch	
14:00 – 16:00 (incl. tea break)	Group Presentations and Seminars	
	Raising awareness of biodiversity contributing to livelihoods - issues and best practice <b>Seminar 1:</b> Discussion on the presentation's topic.	Dr Neil Thin University of Edinburgh Facilitator: Dr Neil Thin

	<p>Feeding project findings into CBD national policy and regulatory practices: a comparison of policy change in Gabon, Peru and Malaysia</p> <p><b>Seminar 2:</b> How best can Darwin projects influence national and international conservation agenda</p>	<p>Prof Mike Bruford University of Cardiff Facilitator: Dr Paul van Gardingen</p>
	<p>Reflections on how to improve dissemination strategies: experiences from the Natural History Museum in Paraguay, Argentina and Honduras.</p> <p><b>Seminar 3:</b> Raising awareness: tools for raising awareness and assessing their effectiveness. A reflection from a Darwin project</p>	<p>Ms Sandra Knapp NHM Facilitator: Anna Karp</p>
16:00 – 16:30	Wrap up and concluding Remarks	



**Annex 2: Darwin Initiative Workshop – Participant List**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Dr	Karen	Laurenson		Frankfurt Zoological Society
Dr	Jeni	Stewart	Dept of Zoology	NHM
Dr	Alan	Warren	Dept of Zoology	NHM
	Linda	Siegele	Biological Diversity and Marine Resources	FIELD
Dr	Roger	Mitchell	Research and Education	Earthwatch Institute (Europe)
Dr	Simon	Potts	Centre for Agri-Environmental Research	University of Reading
	Steve	Unwin	Animal Health	Chester Zoo
	Ann	Brown		Falklands Conservation
Prof	Simon	Owens	Herbarium	RBG Kew
	Georgina	McAllister		GardenAfrica
	Martin	Todd	Dept of Geography	UCL
Dr	Hugh	Pritchard	Seed Conservation Dept	RBG Kew
Dr	Anson	Mackay	Dept of Geography	UCL
	Florin	Ioras	Centre for Conservation and Sustainability	Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College
Dr	Yacob	Mulugetta	Centre for Environmental Strategy	University of Surrey
Dr	Pareesh	Shah		Rothamstead International
Dr	Ian	Hudson	SERPENT Project	National Oceanography Centre, Southampton
	Lis	Maclaren	SERPENT Project	National Oceanography Centre, Southampton
Dr	Robin	Gill	Ecology Division	Forest Research
Dr	Paul	Cannon	Ecology, Systematics and Biodiversity	CABI Bioscience
Mr	Paul	Rubio	Research and Development	SEE/Frontier
Mr	Nicholas	Moss	Research and Development	SEE/Frontier
Miss	Rachel	Turner	Research and Development	SEE/Frontier
	David	Minter		BioNET International
	Lizzie	Wilder	Biodiversity and Human Needs	FFI
	Ian	Mackie	Dept of Zoology	University of Aberdeen
	Janet	Barber		Kaleidoscope Research and Policy
	Richard	Bodmer	DICE	University of Kent
Dr	James	Mair	School of Life Sciences	Heriot Watt University
	Ian	Bride	DICE	University of Kent
Dr	Shaun	Russell	CAZS Natural Resources	University of Wales, Bangor
	Jorgelina	Marino	Dept of Zoology	University of Oxford
	Jim	Turnbull	Director	ADEPT Foundation
	Nat	Page	Romania project Co-ordinator	The Grasslands Trust
Prof	Lindsay	Ross	Institute of Aquaculture	University of Stirling
Dr	Paul	Bates	Dept of Zoology	Harrison Institute
	Dinarzarde	Raheem	Dept of Zoology	NHM
	Fred	Naggs	Dept of Zoology	NHM
Dr	Carol	Ellison	Invasive Species Management	CABI Bioscience

Title	Name	Surname	Department	Organisation
	Jonathan	Cook		Ambios
Prof	Gareth	Jones	School of Biological Sciences	University of Bristol
	Adrian	Oates	International Division	RSPB
	Alison	Shaw	Conservation Programmes	Zoological Society of London
	Don	Kirkup	Herbarium	RBGKew
	Mazidi	Abd Ghani	Biology	University of York and Universiti Malaysia Sabah
	Keith	Hamer	Biology	University of Leeds
	Jane	Hill	Biology	University of York
	Rod	Dutton	Geography	Durham University
	Caroline	Pridham	Programme Development	Birdlife International
	Harry	Evans	Invasive Species Management	CABI Bioscience
	Marion	Seier	Invasive Species Management	CABI Bioscience
	Trevor	Rees		LEAD International
	Elizabeth	Hughes		International Centre for Protected Landscapes
	Helen	Buckland		Sumatran Orangutan Society
	Norbert	Maczey	Sustainable Agriculture	CABI Bioscience
Dr	Stephen	Browne		World Pheasant Association
Dr	Philip	McGowan		World Pheasant Association
	Ayele	Gelan	Socio-economic research group	The Macaulay Institute
	Jill	Inglis	Head of Fundraising	David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation
	Dan	Ryan	Foundation Team	Eden Project
Dr	Craig	Turner	Ecology Dept	Jaquelin Fisher Associates
	Steven	Gray	Climate Change Programme	ODI
	Denise	Taylor		Education for Conservation Ltd
	Peter	Timbrell		Education for Conservation Ltd
Dr	Matthew	Simpson	Wetlands Advisory Service	Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust
Dr	Jay	Mistry	Geography department	Royal Holloway, University of London
Dr	Andrea	Berardi	Systems Department	Open University
Dr	Ahmed	Jama	Agriculture	University of Reading
	Seb	Buckton	Conservation Programmes	Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust
Dr	Johannes	Vogel	Botany	NHM
	Peter	Raines		Coral Cay Conservation
	David	Harper	Dept of Biology	University of Leicester
Dr	Richard	Griffiths	DICE	University of Kent
Mr	Marcelin Tonye	Mahop	Intellectual Property Rights	The Protimos Educational Trust
	Anju	Nihalani		Blue Ventures Conservation
	Sarah	Sanders	Global Programmes	RSPB
	Sarah	Woodcock		SEE/Frontier
Dr	Katherina	Dehnen- Schmutz	Dept of Biology	University of York
	Gary	Martin	Director	The Global Diversity Foundation
	Suzanne	Sharrock	Public Awareness an Understanding	Botanic Gardens Conservation International (BGCI)

Title	Name	Surname	Department	Organisation
	Dave	Moore	Biopesticides	CABI Bioscience
Prof	David	Macdonald	Zoology	University of Oxford
	David	Ouoba	DEV	UEA
	Rajindra	Puri	Anthropology	University of Kent
	Paul	Burgon	ODG	University of East Anglia
	Hattie	Wells		Global Diversity Foundation
	Stephen	Brooks	Entomology	NHM
Dr	Neil	Stuart	Institute of Geography	University of Edinburgh
	Duncan	Moss	Institute of Geography	University of Edinburgh
Ms	Andrea	Deri	Capacity Development	LEAD International
	Krishna	Paudel	International Rural Development	University of Reading
Dr	Mike	Peck	Biology and Environmental Science	University of Sussex
	Shaila	Fennell		
	Charles	Howie	Geography	Royal Holloway
	Anna	McIvor	Freshwater Biodiversity Assessment Programme	IUCN
	Juliet	Vickery	Terrestrial Research Unit	BTO
	Andrew	Mitchell	Executive Director	Global Canopy Programme
	Kate	Davis	Conventions and Policy Section	RBG Kew
	Richard	Kock	Conservation programmes	Zoological Society of London
	Liesje	Birchough	Asia Pacific Region	FFI
Prof	David	Goode	Geography	UCL
	Lynsey	Jones	Development	North of England Zoological Society (Chester Zoo)
	Henrik Barner	Rasmussen	Animal Behaviour Group, Dept of Zoology	UoOxford
	Andy	Woods-Ballard	Director of Operations	Global Vision International
	Phil	Hulme	Ecosystem Dynamics	CEH
	Alastair	Taylor	Science Directorate	NHM
	Venetia	Hargreaves-Allen	Centre for Environmental Policy	Imperial College London
Prof	Paul	Racey	School of Biological Sciences	UoAberdeen
	Kevin	Hand		Tree Council
	Shankar	Dahal	School of Development Studies	University of East Anglia
Dr	Daniela	Maldini	Director of Research	Earthwatch Institute (USA)
	Nathaniel	Spring	Research Manager	Earthwatch Institute (Europe)
	David	Ouoba	DEV	UEA
	Bryan	Carroll		Bristol Zoo Gardens
Dr	Sue	Shaw	Animal and Plant Sciences	Sheffield University
Dr	Andrew	Jones	Senior Ecologist	Grasslands Trust
	Andrew	Brierley	School of Biology	University of St Andrews
Dr	Ruth	Raymond	Head of Public Awareness Unit	International Plant Genetic Resources Institute
Dr	Ciara	Dodd	School of Biosciences	University of Cardiff
	Katherine	Yaya	School of Biosciences	University of Cardiff
Dr	Tom	Davidson	Environmental Change Research Centre (ECRC)	UCL

Title	Name	Surname	Department	Organisation
Mrs	Ros	Aveling		FFI
Dr	James	Hindson		Field Studies Council
Dr	Neil	Thin		University of Edinburgh
Prof	Mike	Burford		
	Sandra	Knapp		NHM
	Sarah	Moon	Darwin Initiative Secretariat	Defra
	Margaret	Okot	Darwin Initiative Secretariat	Defra
	Parmjit	Mandra	Darwin Initiative Secretariat	Defra
	Glenys	Parry	Darwin Initiative Secretariat	Defra
	Robert	Lowson		Defra
	Roy	Hathaway		Defra
Dr	Paul	Van Gardingen		ECTF
	Stefanie	Halfmann		ECTF
	Anna	Karp		ECTF