



UK BUSHMEAT WORKING GROUP

Meeting report: bushmeat and alternative livelihoods, etc.

Council Room, Zoological Society of London, 18th December 2013, 10:00-12:00

AGENDA

Chair: Dr Noëlle Kümpel

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| 0930 – 1000 | Tea and coffee on arrival |
| 1000 – 1010 | Noëlle Kümpel, Zoological Society of London (ZSL)
<i>Welcome remarks and introductions</i> |
| 1010 – 1045 | Francesca Booker and Mike Day, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)
<i>A systematic review of alternative livelihoods</i> |
| 1045 - 1055 | Juliet Wright, Imperial College London / ZSL Institute of Zoology
<i>Evaluating the alternative livelihood approach to reducing bushmeat hunting in West and Central Africa</i> |
| 1055 - 1105 | Malcolm Starkey, Wildlife Conservation Society-Gabon
<i>Lessons learnt from alternative livelihoods projects in Central Africa: methods and early results</i> |
| 1105 - 1115 | Josephine Makaga Head, consultant to Arcus Foundation
<i>Examining different approaches to affect behaviour change around bushmeat consumption</i> |
| 1115 - 1125 | Daniel Ingram, University of Sussex
<i>Quantifying the distribution and magnitude of the wild meat trade in West and Central Africa</i> |
| 1125 - 1135 | Noëlle Kümpel, ZSL
<i>Update on some illegal wildlife trade activities and events in the UK, including the United for Wildlife symposium and London Conference in February 2014</i> |

PARTICIPANTS

Attendees

Noëlle Kümpel	Zoological Society of London (ZSL)
Francesca Booker	International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)
Mike Day	International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)
Josephine Makaga Head	Consultant to Arcus Foundation
Mark Abrahams	University of East Anglia (UEA)
Ian Watson	Watson Fish Consulting
Dan Ingram	University of Sussex
Ruth Malleson	UCL
Tammy Davies	St Andrews University / ZSL Institute of Zoology
Malcolm Starkey	Wildlife Conservation Society-Gabon
Juliet Wright	Imperial College / ZSL Institute of Zoology
James Acworth	World Bank
Ian Redmond	Ape Alliance
Deepak Rughani	Biofuelwatch

Apologies

Guy Cowlshaw	ZSL Institute of Zoology
James McNamara	Imperial College / ZSL Institute of Zoology
David Brown	Overseas Development Institute (ODI)
David Stanton	Cardiff University
Christopher Stewart	Olam Gabon
Kate Abernethy	University of Stirling
Heather Eves	Bushmeat Crisis Task Force
Edmund Kingcott	Independent
E.J. Milner-Gulland	Imperial College London
Paul De Ornellas	ZSL
Gill Conquest	University College London (UCL)
Chris Ransom	ZSL
Marcus Rowcliffe	ZSL Institute of Zoology

MINUTES

The Chair of the group, Noëlle Kumpel of ZSL, outlined the purpose of the Defra-funded UK Bushmeat Working Group (UKBWG) as a forum for discussion on bushmeat-related research and policy amongst government, industry, NGOs and academia, particularly, but not exclusively, in relation to the UK. She then ran through the agenda, highlighting the focus on bushmeat indicators and monitoring systems, and allowing everyone in the room to introduce themselves, before welcoming the first speaker to present.

Francesca Booker and Mike Day, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)
A systematic review of alternative livelihoods

Francesca introduced herself and Mike as part of a team from IIED, the Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) and ZSL, who are carrying out a systematic review to understand the effectiveness of alternative livelihood interventions in reducing threats to biodiversity. As time was limited, she gave a brief outline of the main aspects of the project that are relevant to the group and for which the team were seeking feedback and further information.

She explained that a systematic review is not a literature review, but a formal (systematic) method to investigate the available evidence on a subject. It requires submission for peer review of the methodology used to gather and analyse the evidence – the protocol – so that it is transparent and repeatable. The review then attempts to answer questions – such as effectiveness – from the available evidence. This review is trying to answer the question, “Are alternative livelihood projects effective at reducing local threats to specified elements of biodiversity and/or improving or maintaining the conservation status of those elements?”.

Following a team workshop held last month, alternative livelihood projects have been defined as those which “seek to alleviate a human threat to biodiversity through providing, or encouraging the use of, an alternative resource, an alternative occupation, or an alternative method (lower impact) of exploitation”. Effectiveness is defined as: 1) threat alleviation through changes in human attitude, behaviour and/or wellbeing; and ultimately 2) improvements in the conservation status of the specified element of biodiversity under threat.

Francesca explained the search strategy, which was to target bibliographic databases, specialist resources (e.g. Eldis livelihoods resource group), organisation websites, theses and dissertation repositories, Google Scholar and meta-search engines (e.g. dogpile) and through a targeted call for papers¹. This has produced something like 30,000 documents, which will then be screened by title and abstract using inclusion criteria (which determine whether the documents assess an alternative

¹ A call for contributions in the form of data or projects was sent out to UKBWG members and distributed at the meeting; the project flyer can be downloaded here: <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/G03697.pdf>

livelihood for effectiveness for biodiversity conservation - in line with the agreed definitions). This is then likely to reduce the number of documents to perhaps only 20/30/40 articles, whereupon the data are then extracted again in a formal and systematic manner using set questions.

Francesca then listed the data extraction questions and invited feedback from the group.

Source and type of the evidence:

- Bibliographic information – author, affiliation, publication type, publication date
- Geographical coverage
- Type of alternative livelihood intervention – alternative resource/method/occupation
- Terminology used to describe the alternative livelihood intervention

Information on the intervention:

- Date and duration of the alternative livelihood intervention
- Project funder, implementer, budget
- Is the project a standalone project or a component of a wider conservation or development program?
- Stated objective of the alternative livelihood intervention
- Conservation target
- Scale of the alternative livelihood intervention
- What proportion of the threat (human population) does the intervention target?
- What is the link between the alternative livelihood intervention and the conservation outcomes?
 - Direct link (livelihood improvements depend on conservation outcome directly)
 - Contractual link (alternative livelihood links to the conservation outcome via a contract or agreement, which may/may not be performance-based)
 - Indirect link (no link between the alternative livelihood intervention and the conservation outcome)

Francesca ended the presentation there and asked the group if they had any questions or feedback.

Ian Watson asked if donors have done any monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of alternative livelihood projects themselves. **Francesca** said that they were looking at donor/NGO/research reviews but can only use them if their website has a searchable platform, as they are tied to using replicable methods. **Ian** noted that it is notoriously difficult to find things on Europa, for example, so it may be a good idea to email Director Generals directly; **Francesca** clarified that they would only be able to include them under these circumstances as a note for additional research.

James Acworth asked what the alternative was usually in the case of hunting? In his experience, this tends to involve restricting access; the establishment of a protected area (at least one funded by the World Bank) should have an environmental and social impact assessment (ESIA) conducted – although this often just defines the issues that need to be addressed, this could be followed up. He said it was not clear whether this was taken into account in the methods as these refer only to potential impacts, there are no standardised legal requirements, and it is often not clear whether interventions are helping all of the community. **Francesca** replied that she was not sure that ESIA's were applicable to this methodology. **James** furthered that one could then use the ESIA's to look at the effectivity of interventions via monitoring reports, as the development banks have strong M&E frameworks. He added that another source could be management plans of protected areas.

Francesca responded that the review would need to look at impacts, not just feasibility, but could map these as a second question.

Ian Redmond asked whether interventions were targeted at the hunters or others doing the damage, as this would need to be the case in order for them to work in terms of impacts. He also asked whether the interventions were designed by outsiders or the communities themselves. **Mike Day** explained that this is where the definition of alternative livelihood was important – the team was also searching for terms such as income diversification etc. – and also noted that scale was important.

Noëlle asked whether developed country examples should be included. **Francesca** thought yes. **Mark Abrahams** asked whether it could be the case that the intervention might have nothing to do with the outcome and so how were they measuring causality? **Francesca** said that they were asking relevant questions of the papers to try to clarify this.

Ian Watson suggested the need to look at the fundamentals of what makes an alternative livelihood work – as if it was not working, this might be the reason for there being no biodiversity impact. **Noëlle** agreed that the issue of whether alternative livelihoods work for socio-economic reasons is important but ultimately the intervention needs to have a biodiversity impact, and asked whether for example the World Bank monitors biodiversity outcomes as well as socio-economic ones? **James** conceded these were not as well documented and that often although publicly mentioned it was hard to find detail in mission reports from, for example, the Global Environment Facility on this. **Francesca** agreed this was a difficult issue – often they would search and find the name of a project online but no more; **Mike** noted that this was the reason the review team included the secondary question regarding reducing local threats to biodiversity. **James** noted a number of issues: impacts were not well enough documented; often research was blocked from being done; and often an intervention was focused at too large a scale for a biodiversity-focused project/NGO – being often aimed at wider rural development.

Noëlle thanked the speakers and attendees for a stimulating discussion and urged people to get in touch directly with Francesca and Mike with further questions, information, contacts or suggestions. She hoped that the review team would be able to come back and present the findings of the review when completed in 2014.

Juliet Wright, Imperial College London / ZSL Institute of Zoology
Evaluating the alternative livelihood approach to reducing bushmeat hunting in West and Central Africa

Juliet gave an update on her PhD, being conducted jointly between Imperial College London's Conservation Science group and the ZSL Institute of Zoology, one year in. She noted that as is evident from looking at the agenda for this meeting, there has been a recent upsurge in interest with regards to evaluating alternative livelihood projects. In part this is due to the recent IUCN World Conservation Congress Resolution 111 calling for rigorous measurement of the impacts of alternative livelihood projects on species, ecosystems and people. She noted that we need to move away from a trial-and-error approach to project implementation, as practitioners need access to synopses of

UK Bushmeat Working Group meeting minutes, ZSL, 18 December 2013

evidence from multiple case studies to enable evidence-based decision-making. She also noted the need for empirical evaluations, as the absence of rigorous outcome monitoring and reporting prohibits assessment of the effectiveness of livelihood interventions.

Juliet described how we are moving away from the term 'alternative' livelihoods to discuss livelihood interventions more broadly. Alternative livelihoods have been implemented under different guises over the years: Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDPs; compensation for resource use restrictions around protected areas), community-based conservation (conservation through development; sustainable use of biodiversity), community-based natural resource management (CBNRM; devolution of control over management of natural resources) and most recently payments for environmental services (PES; direct and in-kind payments to communities for conservation). She suggested that alternatives are still needed for long-term sustainability, in depleting natural resource systems in particular, but that we need to move away from the notion that these have to be small-scale farm-based activities, despite the fact that is often what they are.

Juliet explained that alternative livelihoods aim to reduce reliance on natural resources by developing substitutes in the form of either an alternative occupation, an alternative resource or an alternative (improved) method. Potential outcomes are an attitude change, behaviour change, economic (wellbeing) change or ecological change.

Juliet then outlined the aims and objectives of her PhD. The overall aim is to empirically evaluate, at both the regional and local level, the impact of substitution interventions on the conservation of bushmeat species. She aims to look at the continuum of possibilities from attitude change to threat reduction to ecological improvements via the following objectives:

- To understand the possible outcomes and functions of alternative livelihood projects
- To identify which social, economic, political and institutional variables effect these outcomes
- To understand the factors that influence decisions to engage with substitution activities and those which lead to behaviour change
- To investigate how community dynamics influence the adoption and spread of substitutes and conservation-related behaviours
- To investigate the trade-offs between livelihood options for the rural poor considering short-term needs and long-term aspirations

She plans to investigate these aspects through:

- Multi-tier conceptual framework – conducting a regional overview of factors that influence success (this will follow on from the work of Lauren Coad et al [see below] and involve talking to non-project managers – both participants and non-participants in projects)
- Discrete choice experiments – evaluating trade-offs between sustainable and unsustainable livelihood options
- Diffusion of innovation – looking at the adoption and spread of substitute activities
- Theory of planned behaviour - understanding the human decision-making process with regards to adopting substitution activities

Fieldwork will take place in some or all of Nigeria, Cameroon and Gabon. **Juliet** ended by thanking her funder, the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC), and supervisors, E.J. Milner-Gulland at Imperial College London and Marcus Rowcliffe and Noëlle Kümpel at ZSL.

Deepak Rhugani asked if Juliet was aware of the African Biodiversity Network² and its work. **Ian Redmond** expressed concerns regarding the demand issue – for example, hunters could just come from elsewhere. **Juliet** agreed this was a concern and was grappling with how to address this without the project getting unmanageable and over-ambitious.

Malcolm Starkey, Wildlife Conservation Society-Gabon

Lessons learnt from alternative livelihoods projects in Central Africa: methods and early results

Malcolm noted that he was presenting this work on behalf of his co-authors Lauren Coad, Sylvia Wicander, Dominique Endamana, Paul Loundou Gretchen Walters, Kenneth Angu, and thanked funders and collaborators IUCN, Environmental Change Institute at the University of Oxford and the Central African Regional Program for the Environment (CARPE). He explained that while he had been living in Lopé, central Gabon, he had been frustrated by the fact that scarce conservation funds were spent on community development with no thought on how this would change people's behaviour or whether they were working, and in many cases there was no longer any trace of these projects.

Malcolm started with some context on Central Africa: the region has high levels of biodiversity, and bushmeat is essential to local livelihoods for protein and income. Alternative livelihoods are a key strategy defined by major donors/implementers such as the Central African Forest Commission (COMIFAC) and the Congo Basin Forest Partnership (CBFP), and they have received significant investment to date (around UD\$8,000,000 for 15 projects) and have significant investment planned (e.g. €3,000,000 from the *Programme d'Appui à la Conservation des Ecosystèmes du Bassin du Congo* (PACEBCo) for 2014/5 and a significant component of the CARPE 3 budget from 2014).

Malcolm then described the methodology used in the group's review. The first step was to identify projects: 64 projects were selected for evaluation from a list of 85 compiled by Wicander (2012)³. The second step was to devise a comparative framework for standardised questions for interviews with the projects or via evaluation of project reports and papers. The framework included questions on political context, project site, project conception and funding, institutional arrangements and participation, project design, actual implementation, project outputs and project outcomes. A non-systematic approach to identifying projects (via expert opinion and a snowball method) was taken deliberately as there is often no trace of relevant projects available publicly. More detailed interviews were then held with managers of 15 of these projects (note that more than one project could be instigated at a site – e.g. one site could have multiple alternative livelihoods being implemented at a time, or several over time).

Malcolm summarised their principal findings:

- Virtually no outcomes monitoring (only 1 out of 15 projects)
- Limited business planning
- Insufficient documentation of assumptions

² <http://africanbiodiversity.org/>

³ Wicander, S. (2012). The lessons learned from alternative livelihood projects to reduce bushmeat hunting in West and Central Africa. MSc dissertation, University of Oxford.

- Conditionality and sanctions rare
- Insufficient, sporadic and short-term funding

However, he noted that reporting of outcomes was rare and often positively biased in reports to donors as projects need ongoing funding (Global Environment Fund reports were some of the worst in this respect). The third step therefore comprised of more detailed case studies to gather this information first-hand. This gathered information from project participants via semi-structured interviews, focus groups and the PROFOR-IUCN Poverty-Forest Toolkit⁴ (for two projects) and from other key actors (e.g. park conservators, funders and local authorities) via interviews. So far 5 projects have been evaluated in depth in Cameroon and Gabon.

Early findings from step 3 are:

- Communities are heavily involved in project conception but not delivery
- Projects are short-lived due to funding
- Very poor business planning
- Communities report no change in livelihoods
- No outcomes monitoring
- Disillusionment at project closure

Malcolm informed the group that the project report was due in early 2014 and offered some perspectives on the findings so far. He noted that although major development donors such as the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the African Development Bank (AfDB) were funding these projects, basic development lessons were rarely applied, and basic adaptive management was not in place. Regarding the methods used for the review, he noted that the comparative framework was useful but limited, and participant interviews were essential to understanding the real picture. He then questioned whether micro projects (which target a specific location and a specific target population) are ever going to be effective, and whether we should be thinking of alternative livelihoods at a macro scale Instead? **Malcolm** ended by suggesting that alternative livelihoods projects should perhaps not be focused on protected areas, as this will encourage people to move into such areas in search of livelihood opportunities.

James Acworth said that he was concerned about this last point – as this would otherwise force people living around protected areas into poverty and by default force them to move; he suggested we legally have an obligation to compensate the poorest for conservation interventions such as protected areas. **Malcolm** explained that Gabon may be a special case, as subsistence hunting was not a major threat (it had only been recorded as a medium level threat to one protected area) and populations around protected areas are currently limited in size. **Noëlle** pointed out the need to look at impacts and plan at landscape scale, to ensure development in the right places, and to ensure compliance is built in if introducing alternative livelihoods in environmentally sensitive areas such as around protected areas.

James asked whether direct cash transfers could be more cost effective in the long run. **Noëlle** agreed that in theory they could, but were often not as preferable with donors as concrete ‘development’ projects.

⁴ <http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/forest/?5352/povertyforesttoolkit>

Josephine Makaga Head, consultant to Arcus Foundation
Examining different approaches to affect behaviour change around bushmeat consumption

Josephine updated the group on a review she is currently carrying out on behalf of the Arcus Foundation, evaluating the impacts of interventions and the different methods that could be employed to reduce the hunting of great apes. She is focusing on different types of social marketing – environmental education, radio, television etc. She noted that scoping research prior to testing an intervention is key but is often not done.

Josephine briefly outlined the methods being undertaken for the review. Following a meta-analysis of the factors that may influence project success (e.g. population density, ethnicity, present of conflict, presence of conservation initiatives) in Arcus priority landscapes, she has chosen two landscapes to review on the ground: the TL2 (Tshuapa-Lomami-Lualaba) landscape in Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC; focusing on bonobos) and a landscape in Lao People’s Democratic Republic (PDR; focusing on gibbons). **Josephine** explained that she was just back from 6 weeks in DRC and will visit Lao PDR in early 2014. In DRC she interviewed around 50 people (hunters, transporters, consumers, chiefs, religious leaders, farmers, fishers, etc.) on livelihood strategies and interventions and barriers preventing them from changing their behaviour.

She is currently writing up the results, but suggested that her main finding so far is that it won’t be a single approach but a suite of approaches, including alternative livelihoods, that is needed. The outcome of the project will be a report on the general findings of her review and specific advice for these two landscapes, in order to help guide Arcus’s funding priorities.

Daniel Ingram, University of Sussex
Quantifying the distribution and magnitude of the wild meat trade in West and Central Africa

Daniel discussed how overexploitation is one of the top five pressures driving species closer to extinction and listed some current indicators of overexploitation such as the Large Fish Indicator (LFI). He then went on to explain the aims of his PhD, which started in October under Jorn Scharlemann at the University of Sussex, starting by explaining different types of global offtake of terrestrial species. **Daniel** then discussed a database he will be expanding containing data from over 260 sites across Central and West Africa⁵, which will be used for spatial modelling and as a conservation tool in the future. He then gave a call for bushmeat offtake / consumption data; and requested people to contact him via e-mail if interested in contributing or learning more⁶.

⁵ Based on the database presented by Gemma Taylor in the 18 October 2013 UKBWG meeting; minutes available at www.zsl.org/ukbwg

⁶ Further information now available at www.offtake.org

Noëlle Kümpel, ZSL

Update on some illegal wildlife trade activities and events in the UK, including the United for Wildlife symposium and London Conference in February 2014

Noëlle drew attention to two major events focused on the international wildlife trade being held back to back in London in February 2014. The first is a two-day symposium hosted by the United for Wildlife collaboration⁷ being held at ZSL on 11-12 February; details are available here: <http://www.zsl.org/science/events/wildlife-trafficking-symposium,793,EV.html>. Nearly all places have been taken, but the symposium will be livestreamed and recorded for those unable to attend in person – details are on the website.

She then reported that the UK government will host an international heads of state conference on the illegal wildlife trade on 12-13 February (<https://www.gov.uk/government/topical-events/illegal-wildlife-trade-2014/about>). The aim of London Conference is to agree a high level political commitment to take urgent action to tackle illegal wildlife trade, focusing on elephants, rhinos and tigers. The conference will address three interlinked aspects of illegal wildlife trade: strengthening law enforcement and the criminal justice system, reducing demand for illegal wildlife products, and supporting the development of sustainable livelihoods for communities affected by illegal wildlife trade.

Finally, there will also be a seminar on Combatting London's Wildlife Crime, hosted by the Mayor's Office for Policing And Crime (MOPAC) and the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA), on 13 January 2013.

Any other business

Ian Watson had prepared some very useful thoughts on alternative livelihoods which were distributed to the group and it was hoped could be discussed further at a future meeting. Unfortunately some attendees (including the chair) had to leave promptly for the second stakeholder meeting on illegal wildlife trade at Defra (to update stakeholders on the scope and development of the London Conference on Illegal Wildlife Trade), so there was insufficient time for further questions and the meeting was brought to an end. **Noëlle** gratefully recognised the support of Defra for the UKBWG, thanked the presenters and everyone for coming and drew the meeting to a close.

Many thanks to all who attended

⁷ United for Wildlife is a collaboration between The Royal Foundation of the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge and Prince Harry and the world's leading conservation organisations: See <http://www.unitedforwildlife.org>