

Conservation Initiative on Human Rights Report of a Scoping Meeting on Key Issues

2-3 Nov 2010

WWF-US (Washington, DC) and BirdLife International (Cambridge, UK)

Background

Actions to conserve nature and natural resources are closely related to the rights of people to secure their livelihoods, enjoy healthy and productive environments, and live with dignity. The pursuit of conservation goals can contribute positively to the realization of many fundamental human rights, and secure rights – for example, land tenure and participation in decision-making – can enable more effective environmental stewardship. However, conservation activities can also generate negative impacts if their links to issues of human rights and well-being are not sufficiently understood or addressed.

In recognition of the significant links between conservation and human rights, eight global conservation organizations have come together to form the Conservation Initiative on Human Rights (CIHR), with the aim of promoting the effective integration of human rights in conservation policies and practices. Participating organizations include Birdlife International, Conservation International (CI), Fauna & Flora International (FFI), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Wetlands International (WI), the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) and the World Wide Fund for Nature/World Wildlife Fund (WWF).

One of the main objectives of the Initiative is to promote shared learning, both about integration of human rights principles in conservation, and about effective institutional measures to support this. To advance this work, the CIHR hosted a *Scoping Meeting on Key Issues* from 2-3 November 2010, at the offices of WWF-US (Washington, DC) and the offices of BirdLife International (London, UK). The meeting brought together staff members from each of the CIHR organizations with human rights, indigenous, development and academic experts. The primary objective was to share and build common understanding of key conservation and human rights issues, including as a basis for identifying topics for more in-depth shared learning activities under the Initiative. In addition, participants discussed progress, opportunities and challenges related to implementation measures, and plans for future CIHR activities on these.

Presentations

The following two presentations provided an overall context for meeting discussions by introducing the CIHR, the focus of the meeting on key conservation and human rights issues, and a draft scoping paper produced as a resource for the Initiative in learning about key issues and approaches to them.

Introduction to CIHR – Kristen Walker Painemilla (CI)

This presentation provided background on the development of the Initiative, including development of a common framework of principles and implementation measures (see summary in Box below). CIHR participants CI, FFI, IUCN, TNC, WI and WWF have signed the common framework, while WCS and BirdLife have adopted frameworks that adapt these principles and measures to their own organizational contexts.

The presentation also reviewed CIHR objectives to:

1. Develop and maintain a common set of **human rights principles** as they relate to conservation
2. Identify and test **management practices** for implementing these principles and demonstrating compliance with them.
3. Support members in implementing human rights principles and management practices, especially through **shared learning** among participating organizations, stakeholders and experts
4. **Promote integration** of human rights principles in conservation and communicate relevant experience
5. **Report** on members' activities in putting in place management practices for implementation and monitoring of their human rights principles.

The shared CIHR work plan includes:

- Dialogue & Communication activities in international fora;
- Shared learning with rights-holders, stakeholders, experts to support implementation;
 - Phase 1: Learning about key issues, and ways to address them in practice (this meeting);
 - Phase 2: Focus on learning about implementation measures, to support actions by each institution; and
- Development of reporting frameworks and schedules.

Box: Summary of common CIHR framework principles and implementation measures

Principles adopted in the common framework are to:

1. Respect human rights - Respect internationally proclaimed human rights; and make sure that we do not contribute to infringements of human rights while pursuing our mission.
2. Promote human rights within conservation programmes - Support and promote the protection and realization of human rights within the scope of our conservation programmes.
3. Protect the vulnerable - Make special efforts to avoid harm to those who are vulnerable to infringements of their rights and to support the protection and fulfilment of their rights within the scope of our conservation programmes.
4. Encourage good governance - Support the improvement of governance systems that can secure the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities in the context of our work on conservation and sustainable natural resource use, including elements such as legal, policy and institutional frameworks, and procedures for equitable participation and accountability.

Implementation measures in the common framework include to:

5. Further develop these principles and implementation measures in consultation with our constituencies
6. Establish relevant institutional policies
7. Ensure implementation capacity is in place
8. Address conservation-human rights links in the design, implementation and monitoring of our programmes, including by:
 - Undertaking impact assessment and consultation in advance of conservation interventions
 - Reflecting local concerns in design and implementation
 - Monitoring and adapting
9. Establish accountability measures
10. Apply the policies and principles in agreements with subcontracting organizations and implementing partners

Key Issues at the Intersection of Conservation and Human Rights – Jenny Springer (WWF) and Jessica Campese

This presentation introduced an initial draft scoping paper on conservation and human rights issues, developed as a resource to support CIHR shared learning. The presentation noted the increased attention to rights in conservation, how this builds on though also differs from past conservation engagements with human well-being, roles of State and non-State actors, and practical challenges, especially for NGOs. It also reviewed key international human rights frameworks, as well as specific rights that frequently or prominently arise in conservation contexts.

The presentation summarized a number of key issues at the intersection of conservation and human rights, as outlined in the draft paper, including: 1) Participation in decision-making; 2) Free, prior, informed consent (FPIC); 3) Customary land and resource tenure; 4) Bio-cultural diversity; 5) Sustainable use and equitable benefit-sharing; 6) Displacement and restrictions on resource access, and 7) Law enforcement. Points on each issue include its relevance/importance; broad guiding principles for addressing the issue; and practical approaches to respecting, supporting and promoting rights in relation to this issue.

It was noted that further iterations of the draft will include conservation contexts in which rights issues commonly or prominently arise, e.g., protected areas, climate mitigation (REDD+) and adaptation, community-based natural resource management (CBNRM), species conservation, private sector/commodity certification, and water resources management. Participants were also invited to suggest relevant contexts, including during break-out groups.

The presentation concluded with questions for further discussion, including whether the "key issues" explored are the right ones, in what contexts these key issues most often arise, and, among issues (or contexts), which are priorities for more in-depth work. Meeting participants provided a number of comments and recommendations, including: adding greater focus on gender as a rights issue, adding efforts to address environmental impacts of large-scale development as a key context, exploring cross-cutting issues of governance in more depth, and adding more examples and resources for learning and action on rights in conservation. Next steps include to circulate a more complete draft within CIHR organizations, especially to generate discussion and feedback from field offices, and seek further external comment.

Key Discussion Areas – Conservation and Human Rights Issues

Following these initial presentations, most of the meeting consisted of discussions, in break-out and plenary sessions, especially addressing questions of:

- What are appropriate standards or best practices relevant to each issue in conservation contexts?
- What are practical opportunities and challenges that arise in addressing the issue?
- How might the Initiative pursue more in depth learning on the issue?

The following main points are distilled from working groups, group reports and plenary discussions.

Participation in decision making & FPIC: Much of the discussion considered these issues together, in recognition of their complementary nature, while also clarifying distinctions between them. FPIC is primarily recognized as a collective right of indigenous peoples; at the same time, the underlying principles also provide useful guidance to ensure full participation of local people more generally. Best practices include use of protocols, taking into account

traditional decision-making processes, cultural understanding and clear benefits to the local community. It was noted that principles of FPIC are particularly important in relation to protected areas creation and management and REDD+.

Opportunities include that principles of meaningful participation and FPIC are increasingly recognized in policy frameworks and best practice guidelines. There is increased recognition of and action on meaningful participation and FPIC by local communities, NGOs, donors, and other stakeholders, as well as practical experience that exists at field and policy levels. However, challenges remain in that understanding and political commitment often remains weak. A conservation NGO may seek to respect and promote decisions of participatory processes and FPIC, only to have these overridden by government, creating tensions and loss of trust with communities. NGOs themselves may not have a position or mandate to act as a neutral facilitator, especially where decisions may not align with their conservation objectives. Ensuring that representation is inclusive, and approved by relevant communities, is often a challenge. Challenging questions also arise about when the most appropriate course of action is to 'walk away,' e.g., where circumstances may preclude fulfilling an ideal or 'gold standard' regarding participation and FPIC. Many of these challenges also increase in the context of larger-scale processes, e.g., at policy levels or across landscapes.

To further learning and action on meaningful participation and FPIC, conservation NGOs and their partners can, *inter alia*, take stock of existing experiences and challenges at the field level; promote integration of lessons from field experience into policies and guidelines, including working together in specific country contexts; and adapt and integrate FPIC guidance into conservation NGO programming, planning, and M&E, including in collaboration with others (e.g., The Forest Dialogue process on FPIC).

Customary and statutory tenure: Standards and best practices for addressing conflicts between customary and statutory tenure include: being aware of customary and statutory tenure, access, laws – and any conflicts between them; recognizing/taking account of customary tenure in conservation activities; working with others to convene, mediate, or facilitate the reconciliation of customary and statutory tenure (and the possibility of plural systems), in the pursuit of conservation goals; and drawing on other internationally recognized standards, such as those under the CBD and relevant IUCN resolutions.

Challenges include: lack of well-documented information on customary tenure; long timeframes and substantial (technical, financial) resources needed to fully understand these systems; questions about the roles of conservation organizations as facilitators, in relation to their interests; and the often already political charged nature of conflicts between statutory and customary claims, the resolution of which is generally beyond the power of conservation NGOs.

Resources available to assist in pursuing more in-depth learning include advocacy and research organizations, academic studies, traditional knowledge, and organizations supporting community mapping. Specific research needs include:

- Identifying and synthesizing relevant material, including: literature review of existing experience, especially in natural resource management, drawing out key lessons; audit/inventory of experience and activity within CIHR organizations; understanding tenure in the context of REDD+ and carbon
- Prioritizing key actions for conservation organizations (and identify any gaps in existing material); and
- Developing toolkits and guidelines for conservation practitioners.

Further learning and action can also be facilitated through workshops to: share experience and expertise, document and disseminate experience and lessons learning, and build/nurture capacity. Resource needs include spaces for information exchange (e.g., IUCN Environmental Law Center Portal) and financing.

Bio-cultural Diversity: Standards and guidance on bio-cultural diversity are found in, *inter alia*, the CBD and guidelines, and several support and advocacy organizations (ICCA Consortium, TILCEPA, RRI, etc). FPIC guidelines are also relevant. The ongoing work to identify, document, protect, and enhance bio-cultural diversity within several groups (e.g., UNESCO + CBD, some well-designed REDD projects, BioCultural Community Protocols, etc) provide opportunities for learning and partnership. The strong positive synergies between cultural and biological diversity also provide an opportunity for conservation organizations to partner with local people in further supporting/promoting rights associated with bio-cultural diversity.

Challenges include: legal pluralism (which is also an opportunity); barriers to equitable 'translation' of traditional cultural values across languages, project approaches, scales, and timeframes; 'reductionism' of nature and traditional knowledge that can arise from market-based mechanisms; and lack of rights recognition with respect to local peoples' heritage, lands, resources, and institutions. One important place to begin acting may be reviewing existing policies and practices, at multiple levels, to identify what is and is not working within the context of conservation NGO efforts to respect, promote and support local people's rights in relation to bio-cultural diversity.

Sustainable development and equitable cost and benefit sharing: Among standards and best practices to consider, the group recommended: considering costs along with benefits, and being explicit about trade-offs where they exist; recognizing different forms of costs and benefits, rather than just financial elements; recognizing distributions of costs and benefits across different scales, including temporal and spatial scales; and drawing on existing principles and guidelines, such as the Addis Ababa principles, CCBA standards, the new ABS protocol, and Social Assessments of Protected Areas.

Key challenges in supporting sustainable development and equitable cost and benefit sharing, include:

- In practice, it is difficult to generate and sustainable substantial local benefits, and benefits are subject to elite capture at multiple levels;
- Costs are often greatly underestimated, particularly indirect costs;
- It is difficult to arrive at an equitable process and system that serves a spectrum of local actors and competing needs and interests; and
- There is often a lack of political willingness/acceptance for cost and benefit sharing at higher levels.

Emerging REDD and PES schemes can be opportunities for addressing some of these challenges, when carefully designed and implemented.

Other key resources and learning opportunities include: relevant WCC and WPC recommendations, CCBA standards, social impact assessment models, and experiences with costs and benefits sharing from organizations such as IIED and CARE. Research needs to support further action include:

1. Identifying and synthesizing relevant material, e.g., social safeguard policies and statements, and existing models of revenue and benefit sharing schemes;
2. Prioritizing key actions for conservation organizations (and identify any gaps in existing material); and
3. Developing toolkits and guidelines for conservation practitioners.

Displacement and access restrictions: Group discussion focused primarily on the situation of physical displacement of indigenous peoples and other traditional communities. It was noted that indigenous peoples are protected under international law (ILO 169) against relocation from their customary lands, except where necessary as an exceptional measure, and even then only with FPIC. More generally, relevant standards for conservation-related restrictions on access to or use of resources critical for local people's livelihoods is that they should be avoided, or minimized (seeking least restrictive alternatives) and/or compensated sufficient to fully restore or improve livelihoods. Situations involving in-migration, including to lands of other communities, offer a distinct set of challenges, yet in all cases rights provisions (e.g., to due process) provide protections against arbitrary/forced relocation.

Implementation challenges include that financial and technical resources, accountability, political will, and other factors important for the state and other actors to meet displacement-related obligations are often lacking. Economic (as opposed to physical) displacement is often less visible but also generates significant impacts. NGOs may need to determine when/ under what circumstances the best course of action is to withdraw from programmes or projects that risk not being carried out in compliance with international standards and best practices. Complications may also arise from uncertainty and conflict regarding who rights-holders/ resource owners are, and what their rights are.

To overcome some of these challenges, it was suggested that CIHR members can leverage their collective influence in taking action to uphold such laws and standards. CIHR organizations can also work to influence donors and other institutions to adopt human rights compliance as part of their standards and selection criteria. Conservation organizations can also learn from communities about their management plans for their lands. NGOs can provide greater support and capacity strengthening for field staff to engage in rights issues, and seek stronger partnerships with legal and human rights advocacy organizations. Regarding further learning, more guidance specific to conservation contexts is needed to complement available guidance from development institutions like the World Bank.

Law Enforcement: Discussion on good practice for legitimate law and just law enforcement included: training and involving community members in law enforcement; investigating and sanctioning violations, including violations of the use of force in law enforcement; fostering understanding and acceptance of law and regulation, including through meaningful participation in decision-making; and facilitating coordination between law enforcement and traditional leadership, or other local leadership. Weaknesses in governance present a main challenge, including due to corruption, the gap between laws and their enforcement, and lack of political will for enforcement. In many instances, wealthy or more powerful individuals, institutions, or communities have the ability to circumvent the law, and thus it is often the poor or vulnerable that bear the greatest costs of restrictive laws ('selective' law enforcement). There may also be conflicts between what local communities view as legitimate laws, and what is viewed as necessary for meeting conservation objectives, as in the case of certain customary practices (e.g., gorilla hunting). Such instances may be particularly controversial where new laws make long-standing practice illegal abruptly and without appropriate communication, participation or compensation. NGOs may also face challenges in determining the appropriate course of action regarding reporting of illegal activities in contexts where inhumane or unjust enforcement against them is a risk.

Opportunities for improving law and its enforcement include: facilitating more inclusive and just processes for the development of law; sharing information about the law to promote transparency and universal and fair application; including positive incentives for conservation stewardship; working with schools to share messages about the law; increasing cooperation through community mapping; identifying hot-spots for concerns with unjust law and

enforcement; and capacity strengthening for all stakeholders (communities, government, NGOs, private sector). There are also opportunities to learn from existing experience with conservation and conflict resolution, such as in the Albertine Rift (E. Africa).

Gender: Standards and guidance on gender mainstreaming and gender equity are available from many sources, such as the Millennium Development Goals, academic literature, donor protocols, and gender and development NGO guidance. There is also policy and guidance within several CIHR member organizations, including IUCN. Regarding opportunities, gender is recognized as a core issue by many stakeholders, including women’s roles in environment and development. This awareness creates space for action on gender from a rights-based perspective. However, there are many challenges to addressing gender in conservation, including cultural variation and conflicts in conceptualizations of gender equity, lack of (time) resources for women’s participation, and lack of power/ voice for women in claiming rights. For action going forward, gender is being addressed by dedicated advocacy groups acting in various contexts, e.g., within climate dialogue. Conservation organizations can engage more deeply with such groups in policy development discussions.

Proposed Topics for more in-depth Work

Workshop participants discussed the above-mentioned rights issues, and the conservation contexts in which these issues arise, in order to propose areas of focus for more in-depth learning by the Initiative. Proposed areas of focus are to be further discussed and validated, especially with further input from field programs of CIHR member organizations. Participant-identified criteria for the selection of priority issues and contexts included the following:

Primary criteria: There is a pressing need to address the rights issue or context, including at the field level;

- Issue or context arises frequently or prominently in the course of conservation NGOs’ work;
- There is a need for more clarity or in-depth understanding or guidance on the issue/ context;

Additional criteria

- There is some information or guidance available as a starting point. Multiple languages and contexts should be considered as sources for information/ guidance;
- There is momentum or interest in the issue/ context within the conservation community and/or more broadly;
- There are resources available (or potentially available) for supporting work, e.g., staff time, financing, experience, technical resources;
- It is feasible to develop meaningful work/ research/ guidance on the topic in time available (9-12 months); and
- There is some potential for “quick wins” or demonstrations of progress.

Participants clustered a number of issues and contexts and voted on these. The table below summarizes the results.

Proposed clusters of issues/contexts	Total # votes
REDD and forest conservation - encompassing a range of issues such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation • FPIC • Benefit Sharing • Customary Tenure • Law enforcement 	10
Protected Areas – encompassing a range of issues such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation 	9

Proposed clusters of issues/contexts	Total # votes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FPIC • Benefit Sharing • Customary Tenure • Law enforcement 	
Participation, sustainable development, gender, law enforcement - e.g., in the context of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water resource management • CC adaptation • Forest conservation 	9
FPIC (as related to a broad range of conservation contexts)	8
Tenure and participation - especially in context of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REDD • PAs • Ecosystem services 	6
Broader approach – across the spectrum of rights issues	4
Displacement and law enforcement	2

Based on these outcomes, the working proposal of the Initiative is to focus follow-on learning activities on REDD/forest conservation as a first priority (encompassing issues of participation, FPIC, tenure, etc.). The second priority will be either protected areas (encompassing a range of issues) or a cluster of issues (to be refined based on the above). Specific activities will depend on fundraising, but would ideally include a workshop on each of the top two priority topics, with associated research/analysis/issue briefs.

Key Discussion Areas - Implementation Measures

While the current CIHR focus is on substantive conservation and human rights issues, the program of work also includes plans for shared learning on the implementation measures that each CIHR member has committed to work towards at the level of their organization. Jenny Springer (WWF) reviewed the shared CIHR principles and implementation measures. Kristen Walker Painemilla (CI) presented Conservation International’s path and progress towards RBA framework development as a case study. David Thomas (BirdLife International) presented a summary of CIHR working group discussions on implementation opportunities and challenges to date. Points from this presentation, and the follow-on discussion, include:

- **Framing rights issues:** Conservation organizations already possess considerable experience with rights and human wellbeing issues. The Initiative should build upon this, to formalize/ systematize rights work and create clearer frameworks and more support for full rights integration in conservation policy, programming, and practice. This should include not only attention to addressing conflicts, but also a focus on conservation’s positive impacts on human rights.
- **Policy/ guidance development – approaches and pathways:** One implementation measure in the CIHR framework is developing institutional policies that will support practical action. However, policies (and associated guidelines, tools, M&E structures, accountability mechanisms, etc.) need to strike a balance between providing consistent guiding principles (reflecting international standards) and remaining practical and adaptable enough to support action in a wide range of specific contexts. ‘Bottom-up’ and ‘top-down’ elements need to “meet” in the middle, e.g., by translating (consistent, broad) policy into (locally relevant) practice and ensuring that practice also informs policy. Integrated approaches can also help to avoid ‘policy overload,’ and difficulties with practical implementation of (multiple, unconnected) policies.

- **Shared learning:** Many CIHR members have existing policies on equity and human wellbeing issues; and emerging experience with their implementation. CIHR members need the resources and opportunities to understand what the other organizations have done/ are doing. Members should take and create opportunities to share and learn within the individual organisations (at and between all levels); across CIHR organizations; and from other organizations and communities. These shared learning processes (along with common principles, as in the CIHR framework) also help to balance the value of consistency in approaches across organizations, with the need for institution-specific processes and variation.
- **Organisational ‘culture’ and resourcing:** Rights integration within conservation organizations is likely to face challenges with respect to organizational ‘culture’ and resourcing, depending on what level of priority rights issues are given (e.g., is respect for rights considered a ‘core value’), and how rights are included in organizational development plans and resource allocations. One promising development is the existing staff-time contributions within the CIHR.
- **Monitoring, reporting and outreach:** Challenges in monitoring and reporting include understanding the baselines with respect to rights integration, particularly given the wealth of ongoing work that may or may not be recognized explicitly as rights work across large and decentralized organizations. Effective monitoring and communication also depends on clarity regarding the desired end goals and appropriate indicators of progress. Communications and outreach also have to be geared towards a range of specific audiences, requiring different processes, mechanisms and information.
- **Accountability and/or complaints mechanisms:** Developing and implementing accountability and/ or complaints mechanisms within CIHR organizations is a longer term process, which needs to be grounded in policies and guidance that in many instances are still being developed. CIHR organizations have the opportunity to learn from existing accountability mechanisms (e.g., from the corporate and development sectors). A key challenge will be addressing accountability at multiple levels and with diverse partners, including other organizations and sub-contractors.

Conclusions and next steps

To conclude, participants reflected on what success for the Initiative would look like over the next three years, including enhanced understanding and capacity on rights issues in conservation, increased communication and accountability among NGOs, “mainstreaming” of rights integration, and more effective conservation outcomes. The meeting closed with a summary of the sessions and next steps, including comments on the draft scoping paper and development of the meeting report.

Annex I: Meeting Agenda

Objectives

- Share and build common understandings of key conservation and human rights issues
- Start identifying issues for more in-depth work going forward
- Develop plans for this work over the course of the year, and look ahead to plans for CIHR activities over the next two years

Time	Agenda item
12:30	Lunch for participants
1:00 – 2:00	Welcome & aims of meeting - Jenny Springer Introductions & Agenda
	Presentation: <i>Introduction to the Conservation Initiative on Human Rights</i> Kristen Walker Painemilla
2:00 – 2:45	Presentation <i>Scoping of Conservation and Human Rights Issues</i> Jenny Springer & Jessica Campese
2:45 - 3:15	Participant perspectives on the issues & organization of break-out groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection and/or grouping of issues for discussion • Review of discussion questions
3:15-3:30	Break
3:30-5:30	Breakout groups (and group leads): (1) participation/ FPIC (Lisa Gaylord) (2) customary law / sustainable use and sharing of benefits and costs (David Thomas) (3) law enforcement / restricted use and displacement (Juan Carlos Sanchez) (4) gender / bio-cultural diversity (Jorge Gastelumendi)
5:30	Close for the day
9:00 – 9:30	Brief recap of Day One and Day Two agenda
9:30-10:30	Key issues reports from breakout groups & discussion
10:30-10:45	Break
10:45-11:45	Key issues reports from breakout groups & discussion, cont
11:45-12:30	Agreeing on proposed priorities for more in-depth work
12:30-1:30	Lunch
1:30-3:30	CIHR Implementation Measures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of CIHR Framework - Jenny Springer - Case Study : Rights Based Framework Development in CI - Kristen Walker Painemilla - Overview of key opportunities and challenges in implementation - David Thomas
3:30-4:00	Summary/wrap up Close of meeting

Expected outputs:

- Shared understanding of key conservation and human rights issues strengthened, and practical opportunities and challenges identified.
- Priority issues for more in-depth work proposed, and workshop follow-up plans developed.
- Inputs provided to further develop a scoping paper as a resource for understanding and action on key conservation and human rights issues.
- Future work on support to institutional implementation measures outlined.

Annex II: Meeting Participants

	Attendees	Organization
1.	Paulina Arroyo	The Nature Conservancy
2.	Natalie Bailey	Africa Biodiversity Collaborative Group
3.	Jill Blockus	The Nature Conservancy
4.	Pete Brosius	Center for Integrative Conservation, University of Georgia
5.	Bruce Cabarle	WWF
6.	Hannah Campbell	Conservation International
7.	Jessica Campese	IUCN
8.	Johnson Cerda	Conservation International
9.	Janet Edmond	Conservation International
10.	Jorge Gastelumendi	The Nature Conservancy
11.	Lisa Gaylord	Wildlife Conservation Society
12.	Laura Henderson	WWF
13.	David James	Guyana
14.	Vanessa Jimenez	Forest Peoples' Programme
15.	Laura Johnston	Conservation International
16.	Heidi Kretser	Wildlife Conservation Society
17.	Adrienne McKeegan	Conservation International
18.	Kristen Walker Painemilla	Conservation International
19.	Mariana Panuncio	WWF
20.	Matthew Perl	WWF
21.	Daniela Raik	Conservation International
22.	Peter Riggs	Ford Foundation
23.	Dilys Roe	International Institute for Environment and Development
24.	Juan Carlos Sanchez	IUCN
25.	Helen Schneider	Fauna & Flora International
26.	Kemi Seesink	Wetlands International
27.	Jenny Springer	WWF
28.	Jennifer Talbot	University of Cambridge
29.	David Thomas	BirdLife International