



WWF

REPORT

LHI

2015

# Social Development for Conservation

## Living Himalaya Initiative

### Learning and Sharing Workshop



WWF India

June 15-16<sup>th</sup> 2015

## Table of Contents

Rationale:	3
Brief Overview of the Workshop	4
Setting the Context	4
Workshop Objectives	5
SD4C	5
Sharing of current work	6
Visit to Development Alternatives	8
Identifying Team Strength/Capacity and Gaps	9
Partnerships with Community Based Organisationa and Civil Society	10
Mainstreaming Micro-finance in Conservation	11
Social Auditing through Gender Responsive and Inclusive Planning	12
Ecological Monitoring by Local Communities	13
WWF Social Indicators	14
Next steps and Road Map	14
Annexure 1: Agenda of the Learning and Sharing Workshop	16
Annexure 2: Skill Mapping	17
Annexure 3: List of Participants	23



Phurba giving an update on Community work done by WWF Bhutan

## Rationale:

Countries and societies in South Asia and around the world today are facing what are really two sides of the same challenge. On one hand the gap between the rich and poor, and richer and poorer countries has been widening and on the other hand, limited excessive consumption and exploitation in order to manage effectively and equitably the competing human demands on land demands on land, water and ecosystem services.

In most of the Himalayan countries, poor people depend on the forest and other natural resource for their subsistence. Firewood for cooking and space heating, fodder for feeding livestock and grass for thatching and rope making are some of most significant resource extracted from the forests. Wild fruits, honey, medicinal plants and leaves are some non-timber forest products which are also extracted from the forests and these contribute to the household income of rural populations. Thus, natural resource based occupation are crucial for community survival. However, habitat degradation and fragmentation due to unsustainable extraction of natural resources and unplanned developmental activities are also putting livelihood of millions of people at risk.

The conservation of natural resources and biodiversity needs to address the fact that a large number of people of the Himalaya in the three countries i.e. Bhutan, Nepal and India still depend on natural resources for a living, and many of them are poor, have limited access to resources other than those provided by nature and basic social services. Tenure security is an added cause for overexploitation to maximize short term gains.

Almost all governments are looking at sustainable, pro poor and green growth as a way to foster equity in the development process through sustainable livelihoods and well-being for all. However, there is a need to pursue strategies on the ground that can ensure fair distribution and more equitable economic options for the millions of rural and forest-based people whose livelihoods depend on natural resources and the ecosystem services that they provide.

The WWF offices (PO's/NOs and field offices) working in the Living Himalaya Initiative are working towards integrating social dimensions in the conservation targets to deliver equitable social and economic benefits. Often this effort has remained project-based and has had limited magnification and amplification which is required to leverage and address the bigger development challenges. In addition, the impact of community engagement and empowerment in conservation projects is rarely at a scale that it can influence or change development planning at a large scale.

Even where POs/NOs and field offices have been able to show the linkages between conservation and development they often fail to communicate their successes. They also have not been consistent in making strategic connections to local, regional and national planning processes and policies that affect conservation outcomes and as a result have fallen short of making changes at a macro level scale.

To be relevant and influential from local to regional levels, WWF must not only be strong on conservation science and practice but also a competent, credible player for pro poor, inclusive and sustainable growth solutions. Thus, it is crucial that WWF build its internal capacity to work on these issues and be more effective in building partnerships and working at a scale which leads to larger impacts on the ground.

As most issues are common in South Asia especially the three LHI countries, it was decided that there is an urgent need to have WWF teams working in these countries on aspects related to community engagement like sustainable livelihoods, capacity building and empowerment, strengthening local institutions and resource governance issues come together to discuss current issues, challenges, share their work as well as identify some common issues which can be looked at together. For this purpose, a workshop was held in New Delhi on 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> June 2015 at the WWF-India office. The agenda for the workshop has been attached in annexure 1.

## Brief Overview of the Workshop

### DAY 1

#### Setting the Context

The workshop began with a joint session where Landscape coordinators and M&E experts joined the participants to discuss set the context for the workshop. This session was lead by Dr Sejal Worah, Programme Director, WWF-India. This was an interactive session where each participant especially, the Landscape Coordinators who are overall responsible for all the work which is done in their landscapes were asked to respond to the three questions given below:

1. Why does WWF need to engage with communities?
2. Communities are diverse- who should we engage with?
3. Given increasing external pressures. How do we realign our work with communities?

The responses were then used to discuss and come to an agreement on the rationale and context of the workshop.

#### Why should we engage?

1. Communities are the major stakeholders
2. Custodians of the natural resources.
3. To sustain and support our conservation efforts one needs to work with communities.
4. They are a part of the ecosystem
5. To reduce the impact of communities on the forest so that our conservation efforts can be sustained.

#### Who should we engage with?

1. Influential group
2. Main resource users.
3. Local governing bodies

However, the main conclusion was that one needs to evolve its strategy at every step when engaging with communities as communities are a diverse group and each group requires a separate strategy which is often site specific.

How to re-align our work?

- 1) Invest more Governance and Decision Making
- 2) Analyse and explain negative impacts of business as usual development
- 3) Promote and provide information on Alternative Development Models
- 4) Align government development priorities and development regulation.
- 5) Work on issues like land use planning
- 6) Engage more on aspects like ecosystem services value
- 7) Develop partnerships and alliances
- 8) Incentives as well as look at the costs and benefits.

Another important aspect which was discussed in length was the need to align WWF's work with government policies and regulations. This exercise was used to get the participants understand the context of the workshop and to make them able to think that it is important that WWF as an organization shall lay emphasis on the social dimension of conservation. This session was crucial as it was important to get buy in from the leaders of landscapes in the LHI which will help the teams responsible for community work to engage more effectively on these issues.

### Workshop Objectives

After this session, the objective of the workshop was set so as to flow from the context and rationale with consensus of the participants from the three countries.

The main objectives of the workshop were:

1. Sharing of approaches and intervention by 3 countries
2. Identifying crucial issues
3. Understand if these issues are being addressed
4. Assess team strengths and gaps
5. Develop steps to strengthen our work in context of Social Development & Conservation

In addition, each participant was asked to give their expectations from the workshop. Some of the expectations of the participants from the workshop were:

- To understand what is SD4C (Social Development for Conservation)
- To look forward and to learn from the approaches followed in each country.
- To develop and formulate a formal source book on institutional aspects- functional, normative aspects, do's and don'ts under the WWF conservation principle.
- To understand how communities can be involved in planning and conservation processes.
- To understand clear do's and don'ts to address social impacts and factors.
- To understand how strictly should one follow the processes during institutional building

### SD4C

Some of the participants were new to WWF and also did not have much information on SD4C and its functioning. For this purpose, a session was taken to give a brief overview on SD4C. It was explained that is a network of WWF colleagues/experts who have come together to explore how and why social development can make a difference for a successful and truly global conservation delivery. The need for this has been felt very strongly across the network in multiple WWF National,

programme and country offices which work in putting the social perspectives in conservation. WWF has been working through different programmes, projects and initiatives that link the sustainable use of natural resources and the livelihoods and well-being of the communities dependent on them. The SD4C members work in various capacities in offices around the network, and in all the regions. The strong and open collaboration, its cross-cutting scope and multi-level reach, makes SD4C a truly global and inclusive team, able to capture and broker thinking, learning and best practices from across the network. The SD4C has three regional networks and the Asia Pacific Regional network is one of them. Some of the functions of SD4C are to facilitate learning and exchange (communities of practice), conduct peer reviews, gap analysis and evaluation, highlight capacities, develop programmatic strategies for sustainable development in priority places, provide training and share capacity and design indicators to measure social impact etc.

There was a lot of interest to learn more about SD4C and how people can reach out and also learn from various projects which are looking at communities across the network.

### Sharing of current work

The next session encouraged each country to share their current engagement on social dimension and community work. Nepal was the first country to present their work. Some highlights were:

Nepal has enabling policies to include community in Natural resource management, WWF Nepal supports its government in implementing policies and rules and regulation in protected areas and buffer zones. According to the law, communities are handed over large tracks of forest land this could either be under the management of Buffer Zone Management Committee (BZMC) or Community Forest Conservation Committee (CFCC). The land surrounding protected areas fall under BZMC and the forests which fall under a corridor is managed by CFCC. The BZMC are divided into various Buffer Zone User Committees and the CFCC are divided into various Community Forests. The 50% share of the revenue generated from tourism in a protected area is handed over to the BZMC and CFCC. There are various policies in Nepal like the Land use policy 2012, Protection Forest Act 2011etc for which WWF Nepal supports and facilitates policy gaps and bottlenecks to ensure their smooth implementation.

In addition as early as 2004, WWF Nepal developed its sustainable livelihoods approach.

WWF Nepal also facilitate community engagement through

- Sharing practical knowledge and awareness like formation of eco clubs, celebrations of various events etc.
- Livelihood and economic benefits like access to micro finance and skill enhancement
- Capacity and stewardship for biodiversity conservation like engagement in biodiversity and species monitoring, institutional development etc.
- Partnership and leveraging in conservation like cost sharing and community monitoring.

The Challenges which were highlighted were lack of ownership, inadequate community capacity, contradictory policies and unstable political situation.

WWF-Bhutan was represented by only one participant and the context in which WWF Bhutan works was explained in detail.

WWF Bhutan landscapes comprise of the National Protected Areas and Biological Corridors which are categorised under the Northern Protected area complex (NPAC), Securing ecological connectivity between NPAC and TraMCA and Trans-boundary Manas boundary conservation area (TraMCA) is one of the main initiatives

WWF Bhutan does not engage directly with the communities. Government of Bhutan implements all the projects on ground, whereas WWF Bhutan only provides funds and helps in monitoring and evaluation on the project. They use an ICDP approach that aims to meet social development priorities and conservation goals. The main approaches are:

- Promote alternative livelihood options to reduce dependence on natural resource
- Empower communities to participate in planning and implementing conservation activities
- Build and assign communities to make informed decisions through awareness & education
- Minimize human wildlife conflicts

In spite of doing community engagement by catering to the needs of the local people and conservation goals, there are still challenges. The main challenges listed were limited capacity and skills of the Bhutan team and high expectation from local communities. In addition, WWF-Bhutan is still developing its strategy and the livelihoods programme may get substituted as a rural development programme.

WWF India then explained about the landscapes located within the Living Himalayas Initiatives (LHI). Karbi Anglong and North Bank Landscape in Assam, Terai Arc Landscape in Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and Bihar, Khangchendzonga Landscape in Sikkim and parts of North Bengal and the Western Arunachal Landscape comprising of West Kameng and Tawang districts of Arunachal Pradesh. A brief overview was given to explain the complexity of land tenure systems and forest management In India .

16% of the GDP comes from biodiversity which makes up the bulk of the GDP of the poor. About 300 million people depend directly on forests for subsistence and livelihoods (over 50% of the tribal population). Thirty four percent of India's land is used as a Common Property Resource. The forests in India are a part of the concurrent list which mean both the state and the centre has jurisdiction over the forest thus, making it governance more complex.

Some of the initiatives taken by WWF to engage with communities are providing access to alternative energy, promotion of alternative livelihoods, Interim relief schemes, solar fencing and buffer crop cultivation to decrease for Human Wildlife conflict, plantations and spring shed management. In addition awareness programmes, exposure visits and partnerships are also being done with other NGO's working in this area.

The key threats in the landscape are habitat degradation, wildlife poaching and trade, infrastructure development and climate change. Main challenges listed were complex land tenure system, overlapping jurisdiction, limited legal space for communities to engage in forest governance.

Based on the information provided by the three countries, in depth discussion was held to look at major issues which are cross cutting.

Some of the major issues that emerged were

1. Policy contradictions
2. Poor coordination and diversity in agencies
3. Issue of encroachment/relocation v/s human rights
4. Streamlining planning process
5. Identification of root cause of biodiversity loss

The main suggestions were that one needs to have very clear understanding of what we should mean by encroachment. It was also clear that there should be policy analysis and need to highlight amendments which need to be influenced and also get certain clarifications on certain government schemes and processes. It was proposed that we develop case studies from the field for a better understanding of the existing situation.

### Visit to Development Alternatives

The day ended with a field visit to Development Alternatives centre called TARA (Technology for Rural Advancement). They have developed green technology solutions for building construction waste recycling and recycled paper production. The company delivers business solutions to a global network of micro, small and medium enterprises. The various technologies which were displayed were

1. Paper Recycling Machine used for recycling of waste paper in schools, institutions and corporate organizations.
2. Fly Ash Technology used for making bricks from fly ash.
3. TARA Micron Technology used for production of micro concrete roofing tiles; the micro concrete roofing tiles are produced in Pantile and Roman pattern profiles.
4. Jal-TARA brand markets water testing and water purification solutions. These products help test the portability of water and offer cost effective solutions for purifying water



Visit to Development Alternatives



## DAY 2

### Identifying Team Strength/Capacity and Gaps

The second day began with the continuation of discussion on the issues the group had highlighted and the objective of realigning the work of the 3 countries with respect to communities in order to address the issues.

For this purpose, it was decided to map out the skills of each country so as to understand the strengths and weaknesses of each team. The participants were divided into teams of two especially in relation to where they work. Each team focused on the area in which they worked and according to that they highlighted their team's strengths and weaknesses. A template which had been developed by the Amy from AP SD4C team was adapted for this purpose. ( Annexure 2). This exercise helped to understand the expertise a team had with regard to its area of work. This activity acted as a reflection for each team to understand what they needed currently and also may need to align their work. The teams were also asked to add any points if they felt had been left out in the exercise. This activity broadly gave an overview of the various processes followed by the participants in their landscapes. Some major gaps in the three countries in the work and in our capacity are highlighted below:

#### Generic

- Consent is generally not taken by upstream/downstream communities when a project is being implemented.
- Free prior informed consent also may not be taken everywhere in writing
- Grievance Mechanisms not established formally in project sites
- Identification of exit points
- Handholding mechanism
- Letting go of community institutions
- Developing exit strategies
- Implementing exit strategies

#### Community based Resource Management/Governance (forest /aquatic etc)

- Institution building and accountability
- Governance and management mechanisms
- Assessment of current use of resource
- Mapping of seasonality, type and scale of use
- Developing participatory monitoring plans
- Facilitating ecological monitoring
- Getting right recognized/tenurial security

#### Planning and Policy

- 1) Field case studies to develop briefs for amendments/addition in policy
- 2) Social inclusion
- 3) Streamlining planning processes
- 4) Engaging with policy development (Green Growth Framework, CCA, Pro Poor)

## Food Security

- 1) Mapping of food vulnerability
- 2) Food security protocol development
- 3) Action research on food security and food sovereignty
- 4) Assessment of impact of interventions on food security

## Micro-finance: (mainly India and Bhutan)

- 1) Pro-poor microfinance, micro finance scheme development
- 2) Partnership with credit institutions, banks, MFIs

## Gender:

- 1) Mainstreaming gender concerns
- 2) Gender equality and social inclusion baseline establishment
- 3) Gender equality integration into planning

## Networking and Partnerships:

- 1) CSO mobilization
- 2) Platform/Coalition/Network Building
- 3) Developing common agenda
- 4) Engagement and Actions

It was agreed that we should learn from each other and as a start India should see the microfinance model developed by Nepal.

## **Partnerships with Community Based Organisations and Civil Society**

During the skill mapping exercise, a session was taken to build greater understanding on CBO's and CSO's, how does one define them and the kinds of roles they play. This was crucial as one of the important steps for realignment of our work has been to develop partnerships and this session helped to clarify how WWF can develop partnerships with local CBOs and CSOs especially working in the landscapes. Some of the main points which emerged during the discussions were:

CSOs and CBOs we engage with should have

- 1) Focused Vision
- 2) Shared Value
- 3) Shared strategy of engagement
- 4) Purpose
- 5) Accountability and Transparency
- 6) Learning & Evaluation
- 7) Sustainability
- 8) Financial Planning
- 9) Compatibility

Why should we engage?

- 1) For effectiveness and scale
- 2) To develop partnerships and representation
- 3) To hold others accountable
- 4) To ensure sustainability

A separate session was also taken to inform the participants about some of the important international treaties and policies. All the three countries are signatory/ party to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and some of the enabling provisions of this convention should be used by WWF to urge countries to implement them. The objectives as well as certain Articles were discussed in detail:

- The conservation of biological diversity
- The sustainable use of the components of biological diversity
- The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources

Article 8 of the convention about in-situ conservation and point J is of special importance as it talks about respecting and preserving the innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities. Article 10 of the convention focuses on sustainable use of components of Biological Diversity.

This was followed by a discussion on the Nagoya Protocol an important agreement which has come out of the CBD and streamlines the processes for access to genetic resources and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from their utilization. In addition, AICHI Targets which is seen as a framework for action by all countries and stakeholders to save biodiversity and enhance its benefits for people was also discussed.

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDG's) development and discussions which are under process was also discussed. The main purpose to discuss these international treaties was to align the work in the 3 countries according to these emerging targets. The other point of discussion was that our reporting should also precise so that WWF's work can directly feed in into these targets and the impact of our work can be linked not only at not only a regional and national level but also at the international level.

WWF Nepal also conducted two separate sessions on

## **Mainstreaming Micro-finance in Conservation**

This is seen as an innovative way to engage with communities. WWF-Nepal has setup 123 cooperative across two of its landscapes, the Terai Arc Landscape and the Sacred Himalayas Landscape. These cooperative have a total of 41,231 share members. WWF-Nepal engages with the CFCC which then engages with the cooperative. WWF-Nepal does not directly provide money to the cooperative. Each cooperative has a minimum of 25 members and the share membership for these cooperatives ranges between 1000-1500 Nepali rupees. At present both men and women are almost equally a share member of these cooperatives and 57% of these share members belong to the Janjati caste. At present, the total money being circulated in these cooperatives is more than 37 crore out of which around 11 crore has been WWF-Nepal's contribution.

These cooperatives have been set up to provide money to invest in alternative energy sources, agriculture, small business/ retail shops or green enterprises. The cooperative lends loans to individuals at an interest rate varying between 8 to 12% depending on the activity the cooperative is funding. The cooperative also has a responsibility to pay an interest of 3% per annum to the CFCC.

One of the main objectives of the cooperative is to reach out to the poorest of the poor in the area. The cooperative identifies these households through participatory well being ranking. Those households are chosen who are eligible and willing to be a member of the cooperative. These households are made a member of the cooperative and are lent money at lower interest rate of 4% per annum for income generating activities like barber shop.

The way ahead for Nepal is to strengthen and establish the green cooperative network and to make it more inclusive so that the benefits can be reached to the poorest of the poor. It helped other participants to understand that such cooperatives can be made successful and sustainable through regular monitoring and engagement. These cooperative are also helping in increasing the scale of work.

### **Social Auditing through Gender Responsive and Inclusive Planning**

The importance of natural resources in general and the forests in particular to the biodiversity conservation and sustainable rural development has been well recognized in the countries like Nepal. Since the early 2000's Nepal through its five year plans have brought Gender and Development approach with focus on gender mainstreaming.

WWF Nepal has helped in preparation of Gender and Social inclusion guideline for Conservation Areas as well as GESI mainstreaming at all levels of program (planning to reporting). It has monitored the work of Buffer zone committees, Forestry groups as well as its own interventions on the aspects of Gender mainstreaming as decided by the Government.



Tara Gnyawali and Bunu Baidhya, WWF Nepal

## Ecological Monitoring by Local Communities

The post lunch session was on how local communities can develop their own ecological monitoring protocols and assess their impacts on forest areas. This was taken by an external expert Dr. Ghazala Shahabuddin.

Dr Ghazala pointed out some of the monitoring indicators such as:

- 1) No of incidences of conflict
- 2) Visibility of the species like specific birds or butterflies
- 3) Regeneration pattern of any specific flora (esp NTFPs/Timber)
- 4) Comparison of a species compared to others in the ecosystem
- 5) No of honey combs/nests etc

Similarly basic protocols for monitoring were also discussed:

- 1) Frequency
- 2) Seasonality
- 3) Place, site, sampling design and scheme
- 4) Consistency
- 5) Simplicity

Dr Ghazala emphasized that the research design to monitor the vegetation of a forest needs to be simple and effective so that the work can be carried out by anyone. It is also crucial that the data collected is well documented and collated so that it can be used upon for long term monitoring.



To illustrate the above discussion, Dr Ghazala shared 2 case studies one done in Corbett Tiger Reserve, Uttarakhand and the other done in Sariska Tiger Reserve, Rajasthan. The study done in Corbett focused on how the woodpecker a bird species was seen as a monitoring indicator. The presence and absence of the woodpecker species in an area could be attributed to disturbed and undisturbed habitat it was spotted in. The other case study done in Sariska focused on how biomass extraction was affecting the avian community. This case study focused on recording some of observations while collecting the data on vegetation. Some of the observations like length of the tree, number of cattle being grazed can help in understanding the changing structure of the forest.

An exercise was also carried out by participants who were asked to choose a variable that they wanted to monitor and develop the monitoring indicators and also the protocol/time frame which is needed for its monitoring. This exercise helped the teams to think the different variable that they felt were important to monitor which could eventually feed back in the larger study. This could be used to monitor that if our efforts of working with community in terms of providing alternate energy and livelihoods sources were actually impacting the forests. Some of the teams were extremely enthusiastic and thought that these monitoring protocols should be used to support the existing work that is going on in different landscapes.

## WWF Social Indicators

Mr. Will Reid was present in the WWF India office and also took a session on the WWF monitoring indicators and touched upon the social indicators which WWF is planning to use to monitor all its projects .

WWF as an organization is now not only focusing on species conservation but conservation through community participation. It has been realized that many a times WWF has been accused of making a community worse off by promoting conservation of a species in such scenarios it becomes vital that the community angle is also looked upon with great detail. However, some of the participants were hesitant on how the new WWF policy will align with the upcoming SDG's. He also explained that experts from WWF have been involved in influencing the SDG's and are trying to align our work with these goals and vice versa.

In the session 3 main indicators were listed to measure the work implemented by WWF. These were:

- 1) Resource governance
- 2) Resource Conflict
- 3) Resource Access

SD4C experts have helped in the formulation of these indicators. Some of the explanations of these indicators were presented by Reid. For example if the resource is present in an area but the community does not have access then the resource does not help the community in any way. In the same way, resource conflict maybe among different user groups but it is necessary to resolve these conflicts so that each user group can equally benefit from the resource. The 3 indicators shall be monitored as genetic indicators across the entire WWF network. Under each of the 3 indicators specific criteria have been developed which can then help to monitor our community work.

Each of the 3 indicators can be seen as a tool to monitor the work being done across different networks and landscapes. This is being piloted in 5 offices at present.

## Next steps and Road Map

The final session brought all participants together to sit down and list out next steps (country wise) which should be undertaken by each team along with the requirements of their team in order to fulfill the steps pointed out.

Some of the overall steps listed by all countries were:

1. Teams should work more closely with SD4C and learn and share about diverse approaches in other countries.
2. Form an inclusive team at the LHI regional level.
3. Organise an annual learning and sharing session but on specific topic.
4. Data sharing between countries on social development and community engagement especially overlapping areas.
5. Re-visit stated objectives in each country to reflect a better balance between our species and community work
6. Re-visit each countries community engagement strategies.
7. Case studies to be developed and circulated so that each country can learn from the other
8. Setting up of SD4C e-group among the 3 countries

In addition all three offices felt very strongly that we need to urgently

- 1) Build robust institutions
- 2) Develop Partnerships/alliance
- 3) Leverage through linkages

Some of the requirements and action points were also listed:

Nepal :

- 1) Prepare process TOR for working closely in the region
- 2) Get buy-in from WWF Nepal office
- 3) Get more knowledge and information on global goals

Bhutan:

- 1) Capacity Building
- 2) Sharing best-practices through workshops/study visits
- 3) Technical support from India and Nepal
- 1) Land use planning and special analysis
- 2) Better understanding of biodiversity loss
- 3) Lead to be finalized for SD4C.
- 4) More involvement with stakeholders.
- 5) Engagement with development partners
- 4) Better assessment and evaluation

India:

- 1) Capacity Building.
- 2) Learn about mainstreaming micro finance
- 3) Strengthening and building of institutions
- 4) Development of exit strategies.
- 5) Develop partnership to increase scale.
- 6) Incorporating benefit sharing
- 7) Building better relationships with local government agencies like forest department

Post this, the expectations of the participants and agenda points was revisited and it was realized the workshop did not provide much insight into providing clear do's and don'ts to address social impact and factors. It also could not widely institution building process and resource governance. The request for development and formulation of a source book on institutional aspects- functional, normative aspects, dos and don'ts under the WWF conservation principle was also not looked at this workshop.

The session ended with a round of thanks and promise that some of the topics listed above will be discussed in future workshops and there should be an effort to organize annual meetings plus site visits where possible. It was also decided that an exposure visit will be organised to understand and learn from the microfinance and livelihood initiatives in TAL by December 2015.

## Annexure 1: Agenda of the Learning and Sharing Workshop

Date: June 15 to 16<sup>th</sup>, 2015

Venue: Delhi WWF Auditorium

### 15.06.2015

Welcome

Setting the context

Identifying critical Issues

Tea Break

Brief over view of SD4C

Current engagement on Community Work (Sharing by 3 countries)

Discussion: Are we doing enough in the present context?

### Lunch

Identifying new and emerging opportunities across landscapes/LHI

Assessing our current strength and weaknesses

Listing current expertise of the team members and existing gaps

Visit to Development Alternative

### 16.06.2015

How do we realign our work with communities on addressing the above issues and by using new opportunities

- Building and Strengthening local institutions

- Establishing partnerships with CSOs

- Community led governance of resources

How do we analyse social impacts of our conservation work (Social Impact Indicators)

SDG's/ABS/WWF social policies – Do we take these into consideration

### Lunch

How can community monitor its use own and its impacts on Forests (Dr Ghazala Shahbuddin)

Identify specific steps for which can help input into planning and policy processes

List out requirements—policy analysis, technical capacity etc etc needed for making our community engagement more effective

Develop a road map for effective community engagement

Closing remarks

## Annexure 2: Skill Mapping

<b>CURRENT STRENGTHS &amp; GAPS</b>	Lakhu and Snigdha	Bonu and Rai Bahadur	Jishu and Sikat	Phurba	Rupinder and Stephen	Tara and Aarti
<b>Capacity/Experience</b>						
<b>Rationale</b>						
Village identification	√	Strength	√	√	√	√
Household identification		Strength	√	√	√	x limited process
Why we are working here	√	Strength	√	√	√	x Community Empowerment
Identification of Parameters for data gathering	√	Strength	√	√	√	X
Assessment of baseline information	√	Gap	√	√	√	√
Identification of root causes of Bio diversity loss	√ Partial	Strength	√	x	x	Broad Project
<b>Consent/No Objection</b>						
Village/HH	√	Strength	√	√	√	X
FPIC (Free Prior Informed Consent)	√	Strength	Informal	√		X
Local Governance unit	√	Strength (Mountain), Gap (Terai)	√	√	√	√
Upstream	√ Partial	Partial	x	x	x	x
Downstream	Partial	Partial	x	x	x	x
Formal/Informal	√	Consent	Formal and Informal (Both)	√	√ Formal	√
Custodians like Forest Department	√	Strength	√	√	√	√
<b>Institution Development</b>						
Community based cooperative development	√	Strength	√	partial	√	√
Establishment of CBOs (Farmer and producer Organizations, fisher groups, etc.)	Partial	Strength	√	partial	√	√ CF/FECOFUN
Developing clear MOA/MOU/Byelaws for CBOs	√	Strength	Partial	Partial	√	√ CFCC, BZUC, IWRMC, CAUC

Registration and renewals etc	Partial	Strength	√	Partial	√	√ Facilitations
Capacity Building of CBO to run effectively	√	Strength	√	Partial	√	√
<b>Process Accountability, Local Governance</b>	√					√
<b>Institutional Governance</b>						x Learning with Partners
<b>Community based Resource Management/Governance</b>						
<u>Forest</u>						
Demarcation of resource use areas	Partial		Partial	√	x	√
Assessment of current use of Resources	√	Partial	Partial	√	√	√
Mapping of seasonality, type and scale of use	√	Gap	√	Partial	√	x Limited
Management Plan Preparation	Partial	Strength	Partial	√	√	√
Monitoring Plan Preparation	Gap	Strength	√	x	√	x Limited
Ecological monitoring	Gap	Strength	x	x		x
Community based anti-poaching operation	Partial		x	Partial	√	√
Getting rights recognized/tenurial security	Gap		x	Partial	x	x
Governance and management mechanisms	√	Strength	x	√		√ Formal Level
<i><u>If there are jurisdiction overlaps then -</u></i>						
Protected areas and community co-management Plans	Partial	Strength	x	Partial	√	
Shared governance mechanisms	Gap		x	Partial	x	
Joint monitoring	Partial	Strength	x	x	x	
Conflict resolution	Gap	Strength	x	x	x	
Incentive mechanisms-- benefits/fees etc	√	Strength	√	Partial	x	
<u>Fisheries/Aquatic resources</u>						
Demarcation of resource use areas	√		x	√	x	
Assessment of current use of Resources	√	Gap	x	Partial	x	
Mapping of seasonality, type and scale of use	√	Gap	x	x	x	
Management plan preparation	Partial	Strength	x	√	x	
Monitoring Plan preparation	Partial	Strength	x	x	x	
Ecological monitoring	Partial	Strength	x	x	x	

Community based anti-poaching operation	Gap	Gap	x	Partial	x	
Getting rights recognized/tenurial security	Gap	Gap	x	x	x	
Governance and management mechanisms	√	Gap	x	Partial	x	
<i>If there are jurisdiction overlaps then -</i>						
Protected areas and community co-management plans	Partial	Partial	x	x	x	
Shared governance mechanisms	Gap	Gap	x	x	x	
Joint monitoring	Partial	Partial	x	x	x	
Conflict resolution	Partial	Strength	x	x	x	
Incentive mechanisms-- benefits/fees etc	Gap	Partial, PES	x	x	x	
<b>Water</b>						
Community based drinking water/irrigation management	Partial	Strength	x	x	x	x
Capacity building of water user groups	Partial	Strength	x	x	x	√
Mechanisms for sharing water and its management/maintenance	Partial	Strength	x	x	x	√
<b>Watershed Management (IRBM Institutionalization)</b>						√
<b>Livelihood development and improvement</b>						
<u>Farm based/ Agro</u>	Gap	Strength	√	Partial	√	√
<u>Non-farm Based</u>						
Vocational training and skill-sharing	√	Strength	√	Partial	√	x
Enterprise/business development	Partial	Strength	Partial	Partial	√	√
Natural Resource based	Partial	Strength (Forest Based)	√	Partial	√	√
<b>Micro-finance</b>						
Formation of savings and credits groups	Partial	Strength	√	Some but limited	x	√
Pro-poor microfinance, micro finance scheme development	Partial	Strength	√	x	x	√
Partnership with credit institutions, banks, MFIs	Partial	Strength	x	x	x	x

<b>Renewable Energy (RE)</b>						
Access to clean energy	Partial	Strength	√	Some but limited	√	√
Alternate and renewable energy skills training on RE facilities	Partial	Strength	√	x	x	x Maintenance/Repair
Community based Carbon credit project development	Gap	Strength	x	x	x	x
<b>Rights and Entitlements</b>						
Legal and financial literacy	Partial	Partial	x	x	x	√ Limited
Farmer Rights	Partial	Gap	x	x	x	x
Labour rights and entitlements	Partial	Gap	x	x	x	x
Women entitlements	Partial	Strength	x	x	x	x
Indigenous Peoples and Human Rights	Gap	Partial	√	x	x	x
FVIC (Free Prior Informed Consent)	Gap	Strength		x	x	x
Grievance Mechanisms	Gap	Strength	√	x	x	x
Encroachment Vs Human Rights (balance)	Gap	Partial	x	x	x	x
<b>M&amp;E and Knowledge management and case studies</b>						
Socio economic baseline survey	Partial	Partial	√	x	√	√
Socio-economic impact monitoring/livelihood impact monitoring	Gap	Strength	√	x	x	√
Economic valuation studies	Gap	Partial	√	x	√	x
Social threats analysis	Gap	Strength	√	x	x	x
Monitoring indicators	Gap	Strength	√	x	√	√
Social Development Knowledge management	Gap	Partial	√	x	x	x Limited
Case study and linkage development	Partial	Strength	√	x	√	√ Limited
Assessment of impacts of interventions	Partial	Strength	√	x	√	√ Out Sourcing+ Limited, Donor Driven
<b>Environmental Education</b>						
Community environmental education	√	Strength	x	Partial	√	√

<b>Planning and Policy</b>						
Social Inclusion	√	Partial	Partial	Partial	x	√ Beginning, Strategically
Integrated Planning/district and village level	√	Strength	Partial	Partial	√	√ Not Enough
Analysis of enabling provisions of existing policies	Partial	Strength	Partial	Partial	√	√
Policy development at national (Green Growth Framework, CCA, pro poor)	Gap	Strength	x	x	x	√
Field case studies to develop briefs for amend/add in policy	Partial	Strength	x	x	√	x
Streamlining planning processes	Partial	Strength	Partial	x	x	√
<b>Gender</b>						
Mainstreaming gender concerns	Partial/Gap	Strength	Partial	x	x	√
Gender equality and social inclusion baseline establishment	Partial/Gap	Partial	X	x	x	√
Gender equality integration into Planning	Partial/Gap	Partial	Partial	x	x	√
<b>Food Security</b>						
Mapping of food vulnerability	Gap	Partial	x	x	x	x
Food security Protocol development	Gap	Gap	x	x	x	x
Action research on food security and food sovereignty	Gap	Gap	x	x	x	x
Assessment of impact of interventions on food security	Gap	Gap	x	x	x	x
<b>Human Wildlife Conflict (HWC)</b>						
Assessment of threat perception	√	Strength	√	√	√	√ limited
Streamlining process for compensation	Partial	Strength	√	√	√	√
Developing mechanisms to manage HWC	Partial	Strength	Partial	Partial	√	√ Guidelines Developed
Trust funds	Gap	Strength	x	Partial	√	√
Compensation Package/Policy	Gap	Strength	Partial	Partial	√	√
<b>Networking and Partnerships</b>						
Mobilizing CSOs (Civil Society Organizations)	√	Strength	√	x	√	√
Coalition/Network Building	√	Strength	√	x	√	√
Establishing Platforms and Partnerships	√	Strength	Partial	x	√	√
Developing common agenda	√	Partial	Partial	x	√	√

Engagement and Actions	√	Partial	Partial	x	√	√
Lobby and Advocacy Strategy	Partial	Strength	x	Partial	√	x
<b>MISC</b>						
Identification of Exit point	Gap	Partial	Partial	x	√	x Joint Thinking & Conceptualizing
Handholding mechanisms	Gap	Partial	√	x	√	√
Letting go of Community Institutions	Gap	Strength/Gap	x	x	x	√
Developing Exit Strategies	Gap	Strength	x	x	x	x
Implementing Exit strategies	Gap	Partial	√	x	x	x
ANY OTHER						

- *Red fonts categories have been added by participants*

## Annexure 3: List of Participants

S.No	Name of Participants	Organization	Email Id
1	Ms Aarti Gurung Malla	WWF-Nepal	aarati.gurung@wwfnepal.org
2	Mr. Tara Gnyawali	WWF-Nepal	tara.gnyawali@wwfnepal.org
3	Ms. Bunu Baidhya	WWF-Nepal	Bunu.baidhya@wwfnepal.org
4	Mr. Rai Bahadur Rai	WWF-Nepal	Rai.raai@wwfnepal.org
5	Mr. Phurba Lhendup	WWF-Bhutan	plhendup@wwfbhutan.org.bt
6	Ms. Snigdha Borah	WWF-India	<a href="mailto:Snigdhaborah1983@gmail.com">Snigdhaborah1983@gmail.com</a>
7	Ms. Rupinder Bakhshi	WWF-India	<a href="mailto:rupinderbakhshi@gmail.com">rupinderbakhshi@gmail.com</a>
8	Mr. Jishu Chakroborty	WWF-India	<a href="mailto:Chakroborty.jishu@gmail.com">Chakroborty.jishu@gmail.com</a>
9	Ms. Lak Tsheden Theengh	WWF-India	laktsheden@gmail.com
10	Ms. Jaya Upadhyay	WWF-India	<a href="mailto:Jaya632008@yahoo.com">Jaya632008@yahoo.com</a>
11	Mr. Saikat Sutradhar	WWF-India	<a href="mailto:sutradharsaikat324@gmail.com">sutradharsaikat324@gmail.com</a>
12	Mr. L.K Stephen	WWF-India	<a href="mailto:lkstephen@gmail.com">lkstephen@gmail.com</a>
13	Ms. Sakshi Kakar	WWF-India	<a href="mailto:skakar@wwfindia.net">skakar@wwfindia.net</a>
14	Ms. Sakshi Aggarwal	WWF-India	<a href="mailto:saggarwal@wwfindia.net">saggarwal@wwfindia.net</a>
15	Mr. Yash. M. Sethia	WWF-India	<a href="mailto:ysethia@wwfindia.net">ysethia@wwfindia.net</a>
16	Ms. Vishaish Uppal	WWF-India	<a href="mailto:vuppal@wwfindia.net">vuppal@wwfindia.net</a>
17	Ms. Sejal Worah	WWF-India	<a href="mailto:sworah@wwfindia.net">sworah@wwfindia.net</a>
18	Ms. Ghazala Shahabuddin	Expert (CEDAR)	ghazalafarzin@yahoo.com
19	Mr Will Reidhead	WWF International	wreidhead@wwf.panda.org

