



# SSC-CEESP Consultation on Sustainable Use and Human-Wildlife Interactions

Accompanying Document

C.J. Poole and H.T. Dublin

Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy and Species Survival Commission



This document is to be read alongside the main report. It contains the actual consultation as presented on SurveyMonkey, and also contains the full resolution text.

## RESOLUTION TEXT

### 4.039 Cross-Commission collaboration on sustainable use of biological resources

RECALLING the IUCN *World Conservation Strategy* (1980) that defined conservation as embracing "... preservation, maintenance, sustainable utilization, restoration, and enhancement of the natural environment";

RECALLING FURTHER that the Mission of IUCN is: *To ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable*;

AWARE that sustainable use is the second of three pillars of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD);

NOTING that the *Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity* have been adopted by the CBD;

ALSO NOTING that Resolution 3.074 *Implementing the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity* adopted by the 3rd IUCN World Conservation Congress (Bangkok, 2004) called for relevant components of the Union to work together to implement the Addis Ababa Principles;

FURTHER NOTING that Resolution 18.4 *Role and Mandates of the IUCN Commissions, Standing Committees and Task Forces* adopted by the 18th IUCN General Assembly (Perth, 1990), Recommendation 1.42 *Collaborative Management for Conservation* adopted by the 1st IUCN World Conservation Congress (Montreal, 1996) and Resolution 3.012 *Governance of natural resources for conservation and sustainable development* adopted by the 3rd IUCN World Conservation Congress (Bangkok, 2004) called on IUCN Commissions to strengthen collaboration and exchange to achieve the Vision and Mission of IUCN;

CELEBRATING that TILCEPA - a cross-Commission Theme/Strategic Direction linking the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP) and the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) - has been extremely successful in furthering an understanding of protected areas compatible with the concerns and capacities of indigenous peoples and local communities and has spearheaded related international and national policies;

RECOGNIZING that sustainable use of renewable natural resources requires the combination of biological knowledge and expertise, especially in relation to populations of threatened species, with historical, institutional, cultural, social and economic knowledge and expertise;

RECOGNIZING FURTHER that in the area of human-wildlife conflict, it is similarly crucial to bring together species knowledge and expertise with knowledge of the socio-cultural and economic factors affecting the incidence and severity of such conflicts; and

BELIEVING that there are opportunities for mutual learning and synergies to be harnessed through closer cooperation and joint work between the IUCN Species Survival Commission (SSC) and CEESP in general, and most directly and specifically on matters of sustainable use of biological resources and opportunity costs of living with wildlife;

**The World Conservation Congress, at its 4th Session in Barcelona, Spain, 5-14 October 2008, provides the following guidance concerning implementation of the *IUCN Programme 2009-2012*:**

1. CALLS ON the Commissions, especially SSC and CEESP, to establish a mechanism for increased cooperation on:
  - (a) the conservation, social, cultural and economic benefits of sustainable use of renewable natural resources; and
  - (b) other positive and negative interactions between people and wildlife in the context of conservation; and
2. ENCOURAGES cross-Commission exchanges, linkages and collaboration, especially among Commission members seeking the mutual enrichment and benefits that their different backgrounds and expertise are likely to generate.

## EMAIL ANNOUNCING CONSULTATION ONLINE

### Due date 10 May 2009: Consultation on sustainable use and human-wildlife interactions

Enter the survey here: [http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=hG4ZsyIMtBzRha2a5goclg\\_3d\\_3d](http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=hG4ZsyIMtBzRha2a5goclg_3d_3d)

Dear Colleague

At the IUCN World Conservation Congress in Barcelona (5-14 October 2008), members passed Resolution 4.039: *Cross-commission collaboration on sustainable use of biological resources*. This resolution calls on the IUCN Commissions, especially SSC and CEESP, to establish a mechanism for increased cooperation on the benefits of sustainable use of renewable natural resources and other interactions between people and wildlife in the context of conservation. The full resolution text is available on: [http://www.iucn.org/congress\\_08/assembly/policy/](http://www.iucn.org/congress_08/assembly/policy/)

The range of issues that could potentially be addressed through this resolution, and the range of actions that could be proposed, are extensive and diverse. Hence Simon Stuart and Aroha Mead, the respective Chairs of SSC and CEESP, have agreed that a scoping exercise is needed to identify key issues and narrow options for cooperation. This scoping exercise is to involve two stages: this initial online consultation with key stakeholders in the SSC, CEESP, other Commissions, the IUCN Secretariat and the IUCN Membership; and second a formal workshop with leading experts from SSC and CEESP informed by the results of the online consultation and charged with formulating firm recommendations to the two Chairs for advancing Resolution 4.039.

The purpose of this initial online consultation is thus to canvass informed opinion on:

1. The underlying issues that led IUCN members to attribute such importance to Resolution 4.039;
2. The prioritisation of those issues in terms of both their significance to the conservation of nature, and the degree to which they can be solved partly or fully through increased cooperation between Commissions;
3. The structural mechanism/s and resources that may be required in the short- (2009-2012 Quadrennium) and if necessary longer-term (beyond 2012) to foster the necessary collaboration.

Your contribution at this early stage is very important to identifying key issues and hopefully building consensus around the priorities identified.

Due to the complexities of the topics being considered, it was necessary to make this online consultation extremely comprehensive. It will therefore take you **APPROXIMATELY 30 MINUTES** to complete. Please note that you may leave and re-enter your survey link at any time from the same computer as long as it is completed by **SUNDAY 10 MAY 2009**, when the survey link will be terminated.

Please enter the survey here:

[http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=hG4ZsyIMtBzRha2a5goclg\\_3d\\_3d](http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=hG4ZsyIMtBzRha2a5goclg_3d_3d)

Thank you

On behalf of the Chairs of SSC and CEESP

## **ACTUAL TEXT ON FRONT PAGE OF SURVEYMONKEY LINK**

Thank you for taking part in this SSC-CEESP online consultation on sustainable use and human-wildlife interaction issues.

Due to the complexities of the topics being considered, it was necessary to make this online consultation extremely comprehensive. It will therefore take you **APPROXIMATELY 30 MINUTES** to complete.

Please note that you may leave and re-enter your survey link at any time from the same computer as long as it is completed by **SUNDAY 10 MAY 2009**, when the survey link will be terminated.

The answers to all questions will be treated as anonymous. However, we are also collecting data about expertise in this area within the Commissions, and so we have asked you to consider providing your name and email address for that purpose only.

The consultation has the following elements:

1. Classifying respondents

2. Sustainable use issues

2.1 Concepts related to sustainable use and its role in biodiversity conservation and human livelihoods  
2.2 What?: Identifying the focus of CEESP/SSC's contributions to sustainable use (2009-2012)

2.3 Who?: Defining the roles and responsibilities for these contributions

2.4 How?: Designing mechanisms for delivering these contributions

3. Positive and negative human-wildlife interaction issues

3.1 Concepts relating to human-wildlife interactions in the context of conservation

3.2 Identifying the focus of CEESP/SSC's contributions to interactions between people and wildlife in the context of conservation (2009-2012)

4. Capturing expertise of respondents

**THANK YOU FOR CONTRIBUTING YOUR TIME AND KNOWLEDGE TO THIS IMPORTANT CONSULTATION**

## THE CONSULTATION

The following are the actual questions and statements that appeared on SurveyMonkey. Statement numbers are the same numbers referred to in the main report. A short explanation may appear in *italics* – this was not shown on SurveyMonkey, but explains how the question was formulated to assist analysis. The figures from the main report that correspond to the questions are highlighted.

### **PART 1: Classifying respondents**

#### **Figure 2.1, Tables 5.1, 6.1**

**1.1 In contributing to this consultation, which part of IUCN do you MOST IDENTIFY with / are you MOST INVOLVED in?**

*One choice allowed only*

- IUCN Member institution (including sponsors of motion that was adopted as Resolution 4.039 in Barcelona)
- CEESP – TSL
- CEESP – TILCEPA
- CEESP – TCC
- CEESP – TGER
- SSC – SUSG
- SSC – Regional SUSG Group
- SSC – other Specialist Group
- Commission on Education and Communication (CEC)
- Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM)
- Commission on Environmental Law (CEL)
- World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)
- IUCN Partner organisation (e.g. TRAFFIC)
- IUCN Secretariat – regional level
- IUCN Secretariat – Headquarters

#### **Figures 2.2, 5.1, 6.1**

**1.2 In contributing to this consultation, in which IUCN Region have you had the MOST RELEVANT experience?**

*One choice allowed only*

- Asia
- Central America
- East and Southern Africa
- Europe
- Mediterranean
- North America and the Caribbean
- Oceania
- South America
- West Asia and the Middle East
- West and Central Africa

#### **Figures 2.3, 5.2, 6.2**

**1.3 In which IUCN Region are you BASED for work?**

*One choice allowed only*

- Asia
- Central America
- East and Southern Africa
- Europe
- Mediterranean
- North America and the Caribbean
- Oceania
- South America
- West Asia and the Middle East
- West and Central Africa

#### **Figures 2.4, 5.3, 6.3**

**1.4 Knowledge applicable to this consultation**

**Please tick whichever column is a most appropriate description of how familiar you are with the policy concerned (more than one selection is allowed)**

*Answer options: helped develop, have utilised, have only heard of, none of these. Multiple allowed.*

- IUCN Policy Statement on Sustainable Use (adopted through Resolution 2.29)
- CBD's Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for Sustainable Use (adopted through Resolution 3.074)
- IUCN Guidelines on the use of the Precautionary Principles
- Resolution 4.039 Cross-commission collaboration on sustainable use of biological resources

## **PART 2: Sustainable Use Issues**

### **Figures 2.5, 3.1, 4.1, 5.4, 6.4**

#### **2.1 Concepts related to sustainable use and its role in biodiversity conservation and human livelihoods**

**Please indicate your view for each of the following statements (note: the randomising of these statements and elements of repetition are deliberate):**

*Answer options: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree, do not know. Respondents were forced to answer all the statements. Each option was weighted as follows: Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 2; Neutral = 0; Disagree = -2; Strongly Disagree = -4. These weightings are then used to calculate the Rating Average for the statement. Although the statements were randomised in SurveyMonkey, they appear below in their original pairs.*

#### **VIEWS ON CURRENT GENERAL THEORY**

1. The concept of “sustainable livelihoods” is essentially indistinguishable from the concept of “sustainable use”.
2. The differences between “sustainable use” and “sustainable livelihoods” are clear in theory and practice.
3. The term “sustainable livelihoods” means people have sufficient food, water, shelter and security.
4. Achieving “sustainable livelihoods” means more than making sure the most basic needs of people are being met.
5. The concepts of “sustainable use” and “sustainable livelihoods” are adequately incorporated in the following definition: “the utilisation of biodiversity in a manner that maintains its potential to meet current and future human needs and aspirations and to prevent its long-term decline”.
6. “Sustainable use” is strictly defined as the utilisation of species or ecosystems in a manner that prevents their long term decline.
7. The term “sustainable use” only applies to the sustainable use of species.
8. People clearly distinguish between the “sustainable use” of species and the “sustainable use” of ecosystems.
9. The concept of “sustainable use” is encompassed within that of “sustainable livelihoods”.
10. The concept of “sustainable livelihoods” is encompassed within that of “sustainable use”.

#### **VIEWS ON CURRENT GENERAL PRACTICE**

11. The use of wild animals and plants for subsistence within poor rural communities is most often sustainable.
12. Despite traditional forms of subsistence use being sustainable in many poor rural communities, such practices are no longer sustainable for most wild species.
13. “Sustainable use” in both marine and freshwater realms requires greater attention.
14. The “sustainable use” community is still primarily focused on terrestrial wildlife.
15. Efforts to make uses sustainable are necessary only for those species listed in the “threatened” categories of the IUCN Red List.
16. A continuing challenge in conservation is to ensure that any use of wild species is sustainable.
17. In addition to the exploitation of timber and fisheries, most commercial uses of other wild species is leading to the depletion of many populations.
18. There are many examples of the commercial use of wild plants and animals being sustainable.
19. Current practice is focused on delivering sustainable livelihoods rather than helping to ensure that the use of wild species or ecosystems is sustainable
20. Current practice is focused on helping to ensure that the use of wild species or ecosystems is sustainable rather than delivering sustainable livelihoods

**Please list any other important concepts not included in the above statements: text box**

## 2.2 What?: Identifying the focus of CEESP/SSC's contributions to sustainable use (2009-2012)

### Please rank the following statements in terms of priority:

Answer options: priority, neutral, not a priority, do not know. Respondents were forced to answer all statements. The options were weighted as follows: priority = +2, neutral = 0, not a priority = -2. The weightings then calculated the rating average for the statement.

### Figures 2.6a&b, 3.2, 4.2, 5.5, 6.5 + Priority Tables in Overview, Ch5 and Ch6

We should focus our **UNDERSTANDING AND SHARING KNOWLEDGE WORK** on...

#### a) General

1. defining more explicitly the meaning of "sustainability" on the basis of clear, logical and defensible principles
2. why sustainable use is controversial and not fully accepted within IUCN's Membership
3. people's dependence on certain species as a fundamental component of their ability to cope with climate change
4. people's dependence on certain ecosystems as a fundamental component of their ability to cope with climate change
5. operationalising the CBD's Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines on Sustainable Use.
6. effective and ineffective approaches to conservation through sustainable use.
7. the emerging field of resilience and social-ecological systems.
8. the emerging field of nature-society theory.
9. the circumstances under which sustainable use of species can meet conservation and livelihood needs
10. the circumstances under which sustainable use of ecosystems can meet conservation and livelihood needs

#### b) Social and cultural

11. the social and cultural factors that result in uses of species being sustainable.
12. the social and cultural factors that result in uses of ecosystems being sustainable.
13. the use of species as it relates to enhancing the health and well-being of poor communities
14. the use of ecosystems as it relates to enhancing the health and well-being of poor communities
15. governance and tenure processes that support the sustainability of use.
16. the fundamental relationships between culture and the meaning, use and conservation of species.
17. the fundamental relationships between culture and the meaning, use and conservation of ecosystems.

#### c) Economics

18. the economic factors that result in uses of species being sustainable.
19. the economic factors that result in uses of ecosystems being sustainable.
20. Current and future supply and demand for specific species
21. Current and future supply and demand for ecosystem services

#### d) Biological/Ecological

22. the biological factors that result in uses of species being sustainable.
23. the biological factors that result in uses of ecosystems being sustainable.
24. the potential risks and benefits of use to the conservation of species being assessed for the IUCN Red List.
25. the potential risks and benefits of use to other wild species.
26. the potential risks and benefits of use to ecosystems.
27. setting quotas for the sustainable harvest of specific species.

Other UNDERSTANDING AND SHARING KNOWLEDGE WORK to focus on not included above:  
*text box*

## **Figures 2.7a&b, 3.3, 4.3, 5.6, 6.6 + Priority Tables in Overview, Ch5 and Ch6**

### **We should focus our POLICY WORK on...**

1. embedding human cultural aspects in the conservation and sustainable use of species.
2. embedding human cultural aspects in the conservation and sustainable use of ecosystems.
3. sustainable use within CITES.
4. sustainable use within UNFCCC.
5. sustainable use within CBD.
6. on the sustainable use of species and ecosystems as a contribution to poverty reduction strategies and other relevant policies at the local and national level.
7. the interface between species in use and human strategies for adapting to climate change.
8. setting levels of harvest that are so conservative that sustainability can be assumed.
9. advocating consumptive use of wild living resources where this can achieve effective conservation.
10. advocating non-consumptive use of wild living resources where this can achieve effective conservation.

Other POLICY WORK to focus on not included above: *text box*

### **We should focus our IMPLEMENTING WORK on...**

11. conservation and livelihood needs through sustainable use with local communities
12. the CBD's Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines on Sustainable Use.
13. the CBD's Ecosystem Approach
14. the IUCN's Guidelines on use of the Precautionary Principles.

Other IMPLEMENTING WORK to focus on not included above: *text box*

## **Figures 2.8, 3.4, 4.4, 5.7, 6.7**

### **2.3 Who?: Defining the roles and responsibilities for these contributions**

#### **Please indicate your view for each of the following statements:**

*Answer options: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree, do not know. Respondents were forced to answer all the statements. Each option was weighted as follows: Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 2; Neutral = 0; Disagree = -2; Strongly Disagree = -4. These weightings are then used to calculate the Rating Average for the statement.*

#### Within IUCN...

1. SSC should continue to lead within IUCN on sustainable use theory, practice and policy.
2. CEESP should take over the lead in the theory, practice and policy work on sustainable use within IUCN.
3. IUCN's work on sustainable use theory, practice and policy work should be undertaken by CEESP and SSC jointly.
4. All the IUCN Commissions should have a stake in IUCN's work on sustainable use.
5. All the relevant IUCN programmes should have a stake in the Union's work on sustainable use.
6. Sustainable use is already adequately mainstreamed in the policies and programmatic work of IUCN.
7. IUCN should look to rebuild sustainable use as a central, unifying theme in the Union's work.

#### CEESP and SSC together...

8. SSC and CEESP should be developing projects relating to sustainable use on the ground with the IUCN Regional Programmes.
9. SSC and CEESP should work mainly with the IUCN Thematic Programmes on matters pertaining to sustainable use.
10. SSC and CEESP should work mainly with IUCN Members with regards to sustainable use.

#### Within CEESP...

11. The main work on sustainable use should fall under the theme on Sustainable Livelihoods, pro-poor conservation and food sovereignty (TSL).

12. The main work on sustainable use should fall under the theme on Indigenous and Local Communities, Equity and Protected Areas (TILCEPA).
13. The main work on sustainable use should fall under the theme on culture and conservation (TCC).
14. The main work on sustainable use should fall under the theme on the governance of natural resources, equity and rights (TGER).
15. The main work on sustainable use should fall under a new joint theme group, incorporating expertise from TSL, TILCEPA, TCC and TGER.

Within SSC...

16. The main work on sustainable use should be carried out by members and leaders from the Sustainable Use Specialist Group.
17. The main work on sustainable use should be carried out by members and leaders in those taxonomic Specialist Groups representing species most in use.
18. SSC's overall work on sustainable use should involve relevant taxonomic Specialist Groups much more closely
19. SSC needs totally new mechanisms for delivering its work on sustainable use.

**Please note any other comments relating to the “Who?” or roles and responsibilities for future work on sustainable use if not included in the statements above. *Text box***

**Figures 2.9, 3.5, 4.5, 5.8, 6.8**

**2.4 How?: Designing mechanisms for delivering these contributions**

*This section was divided into two sub-sections: structural mechanisms and financial mechanisms. There were three statements in each section with a fourth option to write in a comment. Respondents could choose only one of the four options.*

**Rate the following in terms of which STRUCTURAL MECHANISM you think will work best:**

1. CEESP and SSC should establish a time-bound joint task force to deliver specific outputs relating to Resolution 4.039.
2. CEESP and SSC should establish a joint specialist group, working group or theme on sustainable use for 2009-2012 to assist in delivering Resolution 4.039.
3. CEESP and SSC should identify several priority issues it wishes to work together on and deliver outputs on jointly and establish relevant mechanisms around each.
4. Other: *Text box*

**Rate the following in terms of which FINANCING MECHANISM you think will work best:**

5. IUCN should make staff and resources in the Secretariat available to CEESP and SSC to support their joint work on sustainable use issues.
6. IUCN should find the resources to provide a full-time Programme Officer to work under CEESP and SSC on sustainable use.
7. SSC and CEESP's agreed joint work on sustainable use could and should be undertaken on a purely voluntary basis and does not need Secretariat assistance.
8. Other: *Text box*

### **Part 3: Positive and Negative Human-Wildlife Interaction Issues**

#### **Figures 2.10, 3.6, 4.6, 5.9, 6.9**

##### **3.1 Concepts relating to human-wildlife interactions in the context of conservation**

**Please indicate your view for each of the following statements (note: the randomising of these statements and elements of repetition are deliberate):**

*Answer options: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree, do not know. Respondents were forced to answer all the statements. Each option was weighted as follows: Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 2; Neutral = 0; Disagree = -2; Strongly Disagree = -4. These weightings are then used to calculate the Rating Average for the statement. Although the statements were randomised in SurveyMonkey, they appear below in their original pairs.*

1. Conflict is the predominant type of interaction where people and wildlife share common resources.
2. Human-wildlife interactions include more than just conflict situations.
3. Interactions between humans and wildlife generally bring benefits to both.
4. Interactions between humans and wildlife generally benefit one at cost to the other.
5. Interactions between humans and wildlife generally bring costs to both.
6. Mitigating negative interactions with people is the biggest challenge in the conservation of certain species.
7. Delivering benefits to offset the costs of living with certain species is the biggest challenge to conserving those species.
8. The term “human-wildlife conflict” refers primarily to those interactions involving large mammals, crocodiles and sharks.
9. Managing vermin and pest species is more important than managing the relationship between people and dangerous large animals.

**Please list any other important concepts not included in the above statements:** *text box*

#### **Figures 2.11a&b, 3.7, 4.7, 5.10, 6.10 + Priority Tables in Overview, Ch5 and 6**

##### **3.2 Identifying the focus of CEESP/SSC’s contributions to interactions between people and wildlife in the context of conservation (2009-2012)**

**Please rank the following statements in terms of priority:**

*Answer options: priority, neutral, not a priority, do not know. Respondents were forced to answer all statements. The options were weighted as follows: priority = +2, neutral = 0, not a priority = -2. The weightings then calculated the rating average for the statement.*

**To sustain co-existence between people and wildlife in the context of conservation, SSC and CEESP should focus efforts on...**

###### a) Biological and Ecological Aspects:

1. Understanding the biological/ecological impacts of human-wildlife interactions at the individual species and site level.
  2. Understanding the biological/ecological impacts of human-wildlife interactions that could be generalised.
  3. Collecting and disseminating lessons learned on the biological and ecological aspects of managing human-wildlife interactions.
  4. Incorporating the negative impacts of human-wildlife interactions as a key threat into the assessment process for the IUCN Red List.
  5. Identifying examples where wild species directly benefit through their association with people.
- Other biological and ecological aspects to focus on not included above: *text box*

###### b) Economic Aspects:

6. Understanding the economic factors associated with sustained co-existence at the site level.

7. Understanding the economic factors associated with sustained co-existence that could be generalised.
8. Collecting and disseminating lessons learned on the economic aspects of managing human-wildlife interactions.
9. Analysing the economic costs to neighbouring communities of living with wildlife.
10. Analysing the economic benefits of consumptive use of wild species to neighbouring communities.
11. Analysing the economic benefits of the non-consumptive use of wild species to neighbouring communities.

Other economic aspects to focus on not included above: *text box*

c) Social and Cultural Aspects:

12. Understanding the social and cultural factors associated with sustained co-existence at the site level.
13. Understanding the social and cultural factors associated with sustained co-existence that could be generalised.
14. Collecting and disseminating lessons learned on the cultural and social aspects of managing human-wildlife interactions.
15. Analysing the other costs (including cultural and social) to neighbouring communities of living with wildlife.
16. Analysing the other benefits (including cultural and social aspects) of the consumptive use of wild species to neighbouring communities.
17. Analysing the other benefits (including cultural and social aspects) of the non-consumptive use of wild species to neighbouring communities.

Other cultural and social aspects to focus on not included above: *text box*

d) Policy Aspects:

18. Designing effective planning and enabling policies at local level.
19. Advocating for the adoption of effective planning and enabling policies at local level.
20. Designing effective planning and enabling policies at national level.
21. Advocating for the adoption of effective planning and enabling policies at national level.
22. Disseminating information on effective planning and enabling policy work for the mitigation of Human-Wildlife Conflict.
23. Undertaking community engagement to develop effective policy with regard to human-wildlife interactions.

Other policy aspects to focus on not included above: *text box*

e) Management Aspects (conflict mitigation and compensation):

24. Designing innovative approaches to site-based mitigation.
25. Collecting and disseminating information regarding innovative approaches for site-based mitigation.
26. Replicating innovative approaches to site-based mitigation at other sites.
27. Collecting and disseminating information on the pros and cons of compensation-based schemes.
28. Collecting and disseminating lessons learned vis-à-vis the benefits of wild species to neighbouring communities through consumptive use.
29. Collecting and disseminating lessons learned vis-à-vis the benefits of wild species to neighbouring communities through non-consumptive use.
30. Engaging communities in the development and implementation of effective plans for mitigating human-wildlife conflict.

Other management aspects to focus on not included above: *text box*

## **Part 4: Capturing Expertise of Respondents**

### **Tables 2.1, 5.2, 6.2**

#### **4.1 I have direct technical expertise in the following area(s) of sustainable use:**

*Multiple selections were allowed.*

##### Taxonomic

- Marine fish
- Freshwater fish
- Marine mammals
- Terrestrial mammals
- Birds
- Reptiles
- Amphibians

##### General

- Personal practice of consumptive wildlife use – hunting, fishing, collecting of non-timber forest products and other plants and animals.

##### Economic

- Research on or assessment of the economic factors related to sustainability of use.

##### Cultural and Social

- Research on or assessment of the social factors related to sustainability of use.
- Research on or assessment of the cultural factors related to the sustainability of use.

##### Biological and Ecological

- Research on the biological aspects of sustainable use.
- Biological assessment of the sustainability of use, including setting quotas for sustainable harvest at the local or national level.
- Biological assessment of the sustainability of commercial trade, including conducting non-detriment findings within the context of CITES Appendix II trade.

##### Management

- Hands-on practice of species management through sustainable use – cropping, culling and marketing.
- Establishing equitable benefit-sharing mechanisms for the use of wild species.
- Designing effective governance and tenure arrangements in support of sustainable use.
- Building capacity.
- Advising stakeholders on successful arrangements and mechanisms for sustainable use.

##### Planning and Policy

- Developing and implementing relevant national policy on consumptive use.
- Developing and implementing national policy on non-consumptive use.
- Developing and implementing international wildlife trade policy.
- Analysing and developing policy related to sustainable use (e.g. on the role of governance and tenure).
- Influencing policy related to sustainable use.

Other expertise not included above, please specify: *text box*

## **Tables 2.2, 5.3, 6.3**

### **4.2 I have direct technical expertise in the following area(s) of human-wildlife interactions**

*Multiple selections were allowed.*

#### Taxonomic

- Sharks
- Marine mammals
- Terrestrial mammals
- Birds
- Reptiles

#### Economic

- Analysing economic costs of Human-Wildlife Conflict.

#### Cultural and Social

- Analysing other costs of Human-Wildlife Conflict.
- Analysing the benefits of consumptive and/or non-consumptive use of wild species to neighbouring communities.
- Collecting and disseminating lessons learned in relation to the costs of Human-Wildlife Conflict.
- Collecting and disseminating lessons learning in relation to the benefits of consumptive and non-consumptive use of wild species to neighbouring communities.

#### Biological and Ecological

- Understanding the biological/ecological underpinnings of human-wildlife interactions.
- Collecting and disseminating lessons learned on the biological and ecological aspects of human-wildlife interactions.

#### Management (mitigation and compensation)

- Designing site-level mitigation approaches.
- Compiling lessons learned from site-level mitigation approaches.
- Establishing and assessing the effectiveness of compensation schemes.

#### Planning and Policy

- Assisting effective planning efforts to reduce HWC.
- Assisting the development and adoption of enabling policies to reduce HWC.

Other expertise not included above, please specify: *text box*

### **4.3 So that we are able to meaningfully capture your expertise and follow up in terms of implementing the recommendations of this consultation, please provide us with your name and email address**

**(note: your answers to the survey questions will be treated as anonymous – the contact information will relate only to this expertise section):**

**Name:** *text box*

**Email address:** *text box*

*Ignoring this section was possible*