

DETAILED OVERVIEW

OF THE REPORT ON THE FINDINGS OF THE SSC-CEESP CONSULTATION ON SUSTAINABLE USE AND HUMAN-WILDLIFE INTERACTIONS

Under the guidance of the Chairs of the SSC and CEESP and in responding to **Resolution 4.039: *Cross-commission collaboration on sustainable use of biological resources***, a consultation was undertaken to canvass informed opinion on priority interests and potential areas for joint activities to be undertaken in the short term (2009-2012) and if necessary beyond the current Quadrennium. The online consultation was long (requiring over thirty minutes to complete), detailed and only available in English, but attracted a substantial response from diverse constituencies within IUCN.

Within the consultation, more focus was placed on the issues around theory, policy and practice of sustainable use and less on the topic of human-wildlife interaction (also featured in Res 4.039). In addition to identifying the focus of convergent interests in these two areas of endeavour, advantage was taken of the opportunity to poll expertise and provide a roster of such expertise to the SSC and CEESP Chairs for their consideration and use in the subsequent roll out of the agreed areas for collaboration and future activity.

Most of the questions in the consultation were in the form of statements to which the respondents had to answer in a range from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”, or from “priority” to “not a priority”. The various answer options were weighted so that an overall rating average for each statement could be calculated and represented in the graphs and tables of this report. Chapter 1 of the report describes the purpose and methodology of the consultation, a description of the various chapters and caveats for the reader. A complete breakdown of the respondents, along with the detailed results of the online survey, is found in Chapter 2. While all chapters can be read independently, it is advisable to read Chapters 1 and 2 as a whole before reading other chapters that are of particular interest. The focus of the survey was understandably on the roles of CEESP and SSC (Chapters 3, 5 and 6), as highlighted in the resolution, but others were welcome to contribute and, indeed, there was strong participation from members of CEM (Chapters 4), staff members of TRAFFIC and others across a range of geographical representation and expertise (note: in this report, other respondents besides CEESP and SSC members are referred to as “Rest”).

As the range of issues that could potentially be addressed under the purview of Resolution 4.039, and the range of actions that could be proposed, are extensive and diverse, the survey canvassed views across a broad array of topics rather than a deep inspection of a more limited set of issues. It also included the opportunity for respondents to add additional thoughts and ideas through written comments. By design, this survey attempted to secure an initial, indicative guide to inform further debate, not an exhaustive and comprehensive survey of opinions in the SSC, CEESP and beyond. Perhaps not surprisingly, the survey uncovered a surfeit of priorities for future focus. This represents the breadth and depth of different interests regarding sustainable use and human-wildlife interactions among the respondents. Bringing these diverse interests together to find reasonable and achievable joint undertakings presents a significant challenge, but a variety of mechanistic and structural solutions can now be explored constructively.

It is hoped that the results and findings presented in this report will provide important foundation material for the planned workshop between representatives of CEESP and SSC. Participants at the workshop can take guidance from these findings and explore their meaning in greater depth, while keeping in mind that (as with all surveys of this kind) there are inherent biases on the basis of the profiles of respondents. Workshop participants can then advise on the difficult task of prioritising the scope and focus of CEESP and SSC’s collaboration in the coming years.

The main findings from the online consultation are summarised below under the same section headings used throughout the main chapters of this report. Readers will need to refer to the Accompanying Document to fully interpret the information provided below.

1. Classifying respondents

- 1.2. A total of 323 respondents began the consultation, and 208 finished.
- 1.3. SSC comprised the largest proportion of respondents at 46.6%, followed by CEESP (15.9%), CEM (12.5%) and IUCN Partner Organisations (including TRAFFIC) (10.1%). The remaining 14.9% of respondents were from other IUCN Commissions, IUCN Members and IUCN Secretariat staff (Figure 2.1).
- 1.4. Within CEESP (51 respondents in total), the respondents were members of the following themes: TGER (43.1%), TILCEPA (33.3%), TCC (19.6%), and TSL (3.9%) (Table 5.1). Within SSC (145 respondents in total), the respondents are members of Other Specialist Groups (63.4%), SUSG (21.4%) and Regional SUSG Groups (15.2%) (Table 6.1).
- 1.5. The largest percentage of respondents (26%) have the majority of their experience in Asia. East and Southern Africa was next, followed by North America and the Caribbean, then Europe (Figure 2.2). CEESP respondents have extensive experience in East and Southern Africa as well as Asia, North America and South America (Figure 5.1). SSC respondents have extensive experience in Asia, Europe and East and Southern Africa (Figure 6.1).
- 1.6. The respondents are mostly based in the northern hemisphere (Figure 2.3). The majority of CEESP and SSC members are based in Europe or North America (Figures 5.2 and 6.2), but there also are a fair number of SSC members based in East and Southern Africa and in Asia (Figure 6.2).
- 1.7. For most of the relevant policy instruments mentioned in the “knowledge applicable to this consultation” question, the majority of respondents have only heard of the policy instruments identified and only around 30% of respondents have utilised these policy instruments in their work (Figure 2.4). SUSG members have utilised most of the policy instruments listed, except Resolution 4.039 (Figure 6.3).

2. Sustainable use issues

2.1. Concepts related to sustainable use

The results of the sustainable use concepts section are useful to a certain extent as there are some definite concepts where the respondents have consistent opinions (thinking was similar within their grouping) and where the groupings have convergent opinions (thinking was similar among the different groupings). CEESP and SSC mostly converged in their understandings of sustainable use concepts (Figure 3.1), which is encouraging as it does provide the two Commissions with a solid basis from which to work together. The differences and divergences that emerged are more complicated and could be explored usefully in greater depth at the CEESP/SSC workshop.

The following is a summary of the general views expressed:

- i. In the overall results on sustainable use concepts (Figure 2.5), there were:
 - Consistencies of opinion among respondents that:
 - “sustainable livelihoods” means more than basic human needs (S4);
 - sustainable use in the marine and freshwater realms requires greater attention (S13);
 - a continuing challenge in conservation is to ensure that any use of wild species is sustainable (S16), and that
 - efforts should not be restricted to those species listed in the threatened categories of the IUCN Red List (S15).

- Differences of opinion regarding:
 - the hierarchical relationship between “sustainable use” and “sustainable livelihoods” (S9 and 10); and
 - whether current practice is focused on delivering sustainable livelihoods or on helping to ensure that the use of wild species or ecosystems is sustainable (S19 and 20).
- ii. When comparing between the various respondent groupings (Figures 3.1 and 4.1), there was convergent opinion on S4, 13 and 16 (as in 2.1i above). SSC and CEESP converged slightly on two additional statements (S6 and 11); and diverged most notably on S9 and 10 – the hierarchical nature of “sustainable use” and “sustainable livelihoods”. SSC disagreed with both statements (indicating some divergent opinion within SSC – see vi below), while CEESP members more consistently agreed that the concept of “sustainable use” is encompassed within that of “sustainable livelihoods” (S9). CEM and Rest agreed with both statements – showing divergent opinion within their ranks too. CEM also diverged from SSC and CEESP by disagreeing that there are many examples of the commercial use of wild plants and animals being sustainable (S18).
- iii. Within CEESP (Figure 5.4), the themes converged in their thinking that: a continuing challenge in conservation is to ensure that any use of wild species is sustainable (S16); and that most commercial uses of other wild species are leading to the depletion of many populations (S17). There were divergent opinions among the themes on the definitions of sustainable use and sustainable livelihoods proposed (S5 and 6) - TCC did not feel strongly about the definition in S6, while TGER and TILCEPA felt it was more acceptable.
- iv. Within SSC (Figure 6.4), there were convergent opinions among groupings that: sustainable use in both marine and freshwater realms requires more attention (S13); sustainable livelihoods means more than just basic needs (S4); and that we need to be concerned about the use of all species, not just those threatened (S15). There were divergent opinions among groupings on:
 - The hierarchical relationship between “sustainable use” and “sustainable livelihoods” (S9 and 10). SUSG seems split, as its members disagreed almost equally with both statements. The Regional SUSG Groups more clearly agreed with S9 and disagreed with S10. The Other Specialist Group members have notable differences of opinion within their ranks on both statements.
 - Perceptions about the focus of current practice in sustainable use (S19 and 20). Regional SUSG Groups disagreed with S19, while the Other Specialist Groups agreed. SUSG felt more strongly than the others that current practice is focused on ensuring that use is sustainable (S20).

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

Full priority tables of all statements are found at the end of the Detailed Overview as useful stand-alone colour-coded summaries of the findings. The main findings are as follows:

Understanding and sharing knowledge priorities:

- i. The priority in this section was S10 (with SSC, CEESP, CEM and Rest listing it as a first-tier priority): ***the circumstances under which sustainable use of ecosystems can meet conservation and livelihood needs***. S9 was also considered first-tier by CEESP and SSC.
- ii. Overall, respondents ranked five first-tier priorities for future work: S10, 9, 12, 19 and 15 in order. Interestingly, no biological/ecological undertakings were considered first-tier priority. There were 12 second-tier priorities (Figure 2.6b).
- iii. There were ten other issues that SSC and CEESP could collaborate on (see Priority Table).
- iv. Within CEESP (Figure 5.5, Table 5.4), all four themes regard S10 and 15 as first-tier priorities. CEESP overall also rates S9, 11 and 17 ≥ 1.5 , and a further 11 statements as second-tier, but there was some divergence between themes on these priorities.

- v. Within SSC (Figure 6.5, Table 6.4), all three groupings consider S10 a first-tier priority. SSC overall also rates S9, 19, 18, 6 and 12 ≥ 1.5 , but groupings do diverge on a number of other priority issues.

Policy and implementing work priorities:

- vi. Only one issue was considered a clear priority by all respondents (S11: **conservation and livelihood needs through sustainable use with local communities**), showing an obvious linkage between priorities for focus on understanding and sharing knowledge and implementing activities. (Figures 2.7b, 3.3 and 4.3)
- vii. There were three other issues that SSC and CEESP could work on together (see Priority Table).
- viii. Within CEESP (Figure 5.6 and Table 5.5), the themes all consider S11 a priority. CEESP overall also rates S2 and 6 ≥ 1.5 and a further three statements as second-tier, but there was some divergence of views among themes.
- ix. Within SSC (Figure 6.6 and Table 6.5), there were no statements considered by all three groupings as first-tier priority (Figure 6.5), however S11 was rated ≥ 1.5 overall. There were various divergences among the three groupings on priority issues.

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

The main findings from the Who? section (Figure 2.8, 3.4, 4.4, 5.7 and 6.7) were that:

- i. Most respondents rate the statement that CEESP and SSC should work jointly on sustainable use theory, practice and policy higher than any other. Not surprisingly, some SSC members felt that SSC should continue to lead on sustainable use issues within IUCN, while some CEESP members felt that CEESP should lead.
- ii. Most respondents felt strongly that all the Commissions and relevant IUCN Programmes should have a stake in IUCN's work on sustainable use. This was particularly true for CEM respondents.
- iii. Most respondents agreed that IUCN should look to rebuild sustainable use as a central theme in IUCN, expressing the view that it is not yet mainstreamed in the policies and programmatic work of the Union.
- iv. Most respondents agreed that SSC and CEESP should work with the IUCN Regional Programmes to develop projects on the ground relating to sustainable use, while working with the IUCN Thematic Programmes and IUCN Members was seen to be of less importance. Within CEESP, TGER felt that that SSC and CEESP should work with the IUCN Regional Programmes, while TILCEPA felt it more important to work with the Thematic Programmes. TCC felt that working with the Regional Programmes, Thematic Programmes and IUCN Members as almost equally important. Within SSC, Regional SUSG members felt strongly that work should be done with both IUCN Regional Programmes and IUCN Members.
- v. Most respondents felt that CEESP needs a new mechanism to deal with sustainable use issues. Within CEESP there was divergence regarding which CEESP theme should undertake the main work of sustainable use, but all the themes (except for the one TSL respondent, who thought TSL should lead) agreed that a new joint theme group would probably be the best way forward.
- vi. While the majority of respondents overall felt that SUSG can continue to lead on sustainable use matters within SSC, CEESP, Rest and CEM felt that SSC needs a new mechanism. Most respondents agreed that any work within SSC should involve the relevant taxonomic Specialist Groups more closely. Within SSC, members were quite divided: while the majority felt SUSG should lead, a number of members indicated that SSC needs a totally new mechanism for its work on sustainable use.

2.4. How?: Designing mechanisms for delivering these contributions

The differences of opinions regarding the preferred structural and financial mechanisms for future collaboration between CEESP and SSC indicate that both topics could benefit from further discussion at the workshop. The main findings from the How? section (Figure 2.9, 3.5, 4.5, 5.8 and 6.8) were that:

- i. On structural mechanisms, the majority of respondents felt that CEESP and SSC should identify several priority issues they wish to work together on and establish relevant mechanisms around each. Within CEESP, there was some debate: TSL and TILCEPA felt most strongly about establishing a joint specialist group, working group or theme; while TGER and TCC prefer to establish relevant structural mechanisms around each priority issue SSC and CEESP decide to work on together.
- ii. On financial mechanisms, the majority of respondents overall think that IUCN should make staff and resources in its Secretariat available to CEESP and SSC to support their joint work on sustainable use. While CEM was keener to have support within the IUCN Secretariat, Rest tended more towards having a dedicated Programme Officer under SSC and CEESP. The CEESP themes were split: TSL and TILCEPA felt a Programme Officer under the Commissions would be best, while TGER and TCC felt staff in the IUCN Secretariat would be best. SSC members were also split (even within their groupings), as some members felt support staff in the Secretariat was best, while others felt a Programme Officer under the Commissions the best option.

3. Positive and negative human-wildlife interaction issues

3.1. Concepts relating to human-wildlife interactions

As with the sustainable use concepts section, SSC and CEESP show quite similar opinions on concepts pertaining to human-wildlife interactions. This can provide a positive basis from which to collaborate.

- i. In the overall human-wildlife interaction concepts section (Figure 2.10), there was:
 - Consistency of opinion among respondents that human-wildlife interactions include more than just conflict situations (S2).
 - Differences of opinion among respondents regarding whether interactions between humans and wildlife generally benefit one at cost to the other (S4) or whether interactions generally bring costs to both (S5); over whether the term human-wildlife conflict refers primarily to those interactions involving large mammals, crocodiles and sharks (S8) and whether managing vermin and pest species is more important than managing the relationship between people and these dangerous large animals (S9).
- ii. When looking at the various respondent groupings in more detail (Figures 3.6 and 4.6), there were convergent opinions that mitigating negative interactions with people is the biggest challenge in the conservation of certain species (S6). There were divergent opinions on S1 (is conflict predominant type of interaction where resources are shared) and on S4 (interactions generally benefit one party at cost to the other). CEESP felt less strongly that delivering benefits to offset the costs of living with certain species is the biggest challenge to conserving those species (S7). CEM felt that managing vermin and pest species is more important than managing the relationship between people and dangerous large animals (S9).
- iii. Among CEESP themes (Figure 5.9), there was a strong convergent opinion that human-wildlife interactions include more than just conflict situations. There were minor divergent opinions in the other statements.
- iv. Among SSC groupings (Figure 6.9), there was strong convergent opinion that human-wildlife interactions include more than just conflict situations. However, there were divergent opinions regarding six of the statements, including on the importance of increasing benefits vs. reducing costs of human-wildlife interactions, and whether the management of pest species is more important than managing interactions with large animals.

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

A full priority table of all statements is found at the end of the Detailed Overview as useful stand-alone colour-coded summary. However, the main findings are also in point form below:

- i. Only S25 (***collecting and disseminating information regarding innovative approaches for site-based mitigation***) was considered first-tier by all four groupings, but S3 and 8 were also ≥ 1.5 in terms of their overall rating average. All three of these statements refer to "collecting and dissemination information"-type activities. Nineteen second-tier priorities were identified (Figure 2.11b), indicating a clear need to do further prioritisation.
- ii. Looking specifically at SSC and CEESP, there are fourteen possible areas for joint work in addition to S25. Interestingly, CEESP, the Commission charged with economic policy, felt less strongly than SSC and Rest about working on the economic aspects of human-wildlife interactions.
- iii. Within CEESP, only one activity was a clear first-tier priority (S25). There were two second-tier priorities: S3 and 19. There were numerous instances where one, two or three of the themes thought other statements were priority (Figure 5.10 and Table 5.6).
- iv. Within SSC, only one activity was a clear first-tier priority (S3), focusing on the biological and ecological aspects of managing human-wildlife interactions. There were eight second-tier priorities (Figure 6.10 and Table 6.6).

4. Capturing expertise of respondents

The full details of expertise – including names, contact details and comments – were contained in a spreadsheet provided to the Chairs of the SSC and CEESP. A brief summary of the results is as follows:

Sustainable use expertise strengths: terrestrial mammals; personal practice of some form of consumptive use; research on social and biological factors relating to the sustainability of use; capacity building in terms of management and advising stakeholders on successful mechanisms for sustainable use; and influencing policy relating to sustainable use.

Sustainable use expertise weaknesses: freshwater fish and amphibians, in particular, but also other taxonomic groups; developing and implementing international wildlife trade policy.

Sustainable use additional expertise comments: 35 comments received, which included expertise on: plants, invertebrates, fungi, management plans, protected area management, and teaching and communications.



Human-wildlife interaction expertise strengths: understanding the biological/ecological underpinnings of human-wildlife interactions.




Human-wildlife interaction expertise weaknesses: managing interactions between sharks and people, most particularly, but also other taxonomic areas, and establishing and assessing the effectiveness of compensation schemes.

Human-wildlife interaction additional expertise comments: 21 comments were received, which included expertise on communications, teaching and collaborating with local communities.

PRIORITY TABLES

The following three tables are summaries of the results on prioritisation of future work in Chapters 2-4 and should be a useful stand-alone quick reference. They show the statements in descending order from the highest to lowest rating average (RA) as chosen by all respondents (as in Chapter 2). First-tier priorities are highlighted in red, second-tier in pink. The columns on the right contain stars where a particular grouping gave the statement a first or second-tier priority (Chapters 3 and 4). The colour coding presented focuses on SSC and CEESP only, as follows:

 Both SSC and CEESP list it as first-tier priority
 Either SSC or CEESP list it as first-tier, while the other lists it as second-tier

 Both SSC and CEESP list it as second-tier
 SSC only lists it as a priority (first- or second-tier)
 CEESP only lists it as a priority (first- or second-tier)

UNDERSTANDING AND SHARING KNOWLEDGE PRIORITIES				First-tier (≥ 1.5 rating average)				Second-tier (≥ 1.0 to <1.5 rating average)			
RA		Statement	Category	SSC	CEESP	REST	CEM	SSC	CEESP	REST	CEM
1.75	10	The circumstances under which sustainable use of ecosystems can meet conservation and livelihood needs	General	*	*	*	*				
1.63	9	The circumstances under which sustainable use of species can meet conservation and livelihood needs	General	*	*	*					*
1.55	12	The social and cultural factors that result in uses of ecosystems being sustainable.	Social / Cultural	*		*	*		*		
1.52	19	The economic factors that result in uses of ecosystems being sustainable.	Economic	*		*	*		*		
1.50	15	Governance and tenure processes that support the sustainability of use.	Social / Cultural		*			*		*	*
1.42	6	Effective and ineffective approaches to conservation through sustainable use.	General	*					*	*	*
1.42	18	The economic factors that result in uses of species being sustainable.	Economic	*						*	*
1.39	11	The social and cultural factors that result in uses of species being sustainable.	Social / Cultural		*			*		*	*
1.29	23	The biological factors that result in uses of ecosystems being sustainable.	Biological / Ecological					*	*	*	*
1.25	4	People's dependence on certain ecosystems as a fundamental component of their ability to cope with climate change	General				*	*	*	*	

1.22	21	Current and future supply and demand for ecosystem services	Economic					*		*	*
1.21	22	The biological factors that result in uses of species being sustainable.	Biological / Ecological					*	*	*	
1.20	26	The potential risks and benefits of use to ecosystems.	Biological / Ecological				*	*	*	*	
1.17	14	The use of ecosystems as it relates to enhancing the health and well-being of poor communities	Social / Cultural					*	*	*	*
1.10	1	Defining more explicitly the meaning of “sustainability” on the basis of clear, logical and defensible principles	General					*		*	*
1.07	24	The potential risks and benefits of use to the conservation of species being assessed for the IUCN Red List.	Biological / Ecological					*		*	
1.06	17	The fundamental relationships between culture and the meaning, use and conservation of ecosystems.	Social / Cultural		*					*	*
0.98	13	The use of species as it relates to enhancing the health and well-being of poor communities	Social / Cultural						*	*	
0.94	25	The potential risks and benefits of use to other wild species.	Biological / Ecological							*	
0.93	16	The fundamental relationships between culture and the meaning, use and conservation of species.	Social / Cultural						*		
0.91	20	Current and future supply and demand for specific species	Economic							*	*
0.85	5	Operationalising the CBD’s Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines on Sustainable Use.	General								
0.75	7	The emerging field of resilience and social-ecological systems.	General						*		*
0.72	3	People’s dependence on certain species as a fundamental component of their ability to cope with climate change	General								
0.61	27	Setting quotas for the sustainable harvest of specific species.	Biological / Ecological								
0.55	2	Why sustainable use is controversial and not fully accepted within IUCN’s Membership	General								
0.10	8	The emerging field of nature-society theory.	General								

POLICY AND IMPLEMENTING WORK PRIORITIES				First-tier (≥ 1.5 rating average)				Second-tier (≥ 1.0 to <1.5 rating average)			
RA		Statement	Category	SSC	CEESP	REST	CEM	SSC	CEESP	REST	CEM
1.67	11	Conservation and livelihood needs through sustainable use with local communities	Implementing work	*	*	*	*				
1.41	6	The sustainable use of species and ecosystems as a contribution to poverty reduction strategies and other relevant policies at the local and national level.	Policy work		*	*	*	*			
1.17	5	Sustainable use within CBD.	Policy work					*	*	*	*
1.13	2	Embedding human cultural aspects in the conservation and sustainable use of ecosystems.	Policy work		*		*	*		*	
0.96	1	Embedding human cultural aspects in the conservation and sustainable use of species.	Policy work						*		
0.95	13	The CBD's Ecosystem Approach	Implementing work							*	*
0.94	3	Sustainable use within CITES.	Policy work							*	
0.91	12	The CBD's Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines on Sustainable Use.	Implementing work								
0.80	7	The interface between species in use and human strategies for adapting to climate change.	Policy work						*		
0.80	9	Advocating consumptive use of wild living resources where this can achieve effective conservation.	Policy work								
0.80	10	Advocating non-consumptive use of wild living resources where this can achieve effective conservation.	Policy work								
0.73	14	The IUCN's Guidelines on use of the Precautionary Principles.	Implementing work								*
0.63	4	Sustainable use within UNFCCC.	Policy work								
0.31	8	Setting levels of harvest that are so conservative that sustainability can be assumed.	Policy work								

HUMAN-WILDLIFE INTERACTION PRIORITIES				First-tier (≥ 1.5 rating average)				Second-tier (≥ 1.0 to <1.5 rating average)			
RA		Statement	Category	SSC	CEESP	REST	CEM	SSC	CEESP	REST	CEM
1.57	25	Collecting and disseminating information regarding innovative approaches for site-based mitigation.	Management	*	*	*	*				
1.55	3	Collecting and disseminating lessons learned on the biological and ecological aspects of managing human-wildlife interactions.	Biological / Ecological	*		*	*		*		
1.53	8	Collecting & disseminating lessons learned on economic aspects of managing human-wildlife interactions.	Economic			*	*	*	*		
1.45	14	Collecting & disseminating lessons learned on cultural and social aspects of managing human-wildlife interactions.	Social / Cultural		*	*	*	*			
1.45	30	Engaging communities in the development and implementation of effective plans for mitigating human-wildlife conflict.	Management					*	*	*	*
1.40	22	Disseminating information on effective planning and enabling policy work for the mitigation of Human-Wildlife Conflict.	Policy					*	*	*	*
1.27	6	Understanding the economic factors associated with sustained co-existence at the site level.	Economic					*	*	*	*
1.25	23	Undertaking community engagement to develop effective policy regarding human-wildlife interactions.	Policy					*	*	*	*
1.24	24	Designing innovative approaches to site-based mitigation.	Management					*	*	*	*
1.23	19	Advocating for the adoption of effective planning and enabling policies at local level.	Policy					*	*	*	*
1.18	21	Advocating for the adoption of effective planning and enabling policies at national level.	Policy					*	*	*	*
1.13	7	Understanding the economic factors associated with sustained co-existence that could be generalised.	Economic					*		*	*
1.10	12	Understanding the social and cultural factors associated with sustained co-existence at site level.	Social / Cultural						*	*	*
1.10	18	Designing effective planning and enabling policies at local level.	Policy					*	*	*	*
1.04	20	Designing effective planning and enabling policies at national level.	Policy					*	*		

1.04	29	Collecting and disseminating lessons learned vis-à-vis the benefits of wild species to neighbouring communities through non-consumptive use.	Management					*	*	*	*
1.03	1	Understanding biological/ecological impacts of human-wildlife interactions at individual species and site level.	Biological / Ecological						*	*	*
1.01	9	Analysing the economic costs to neighbouring communities of living with wildlife.	Economic						*	*	*
1.01	10	Analysing the economic benefits of consumptive use of wild species to neighbouring communities.	Economic							*	*
1.01	11	Analysing the economic benefits of non-consumptive use of wild species to neighbouring communities.	Economic							*	*
1.00	13	Understanding social and cultural factors associated with sustained co-existence that could be generalised.	Social / Cultural						*		*
1.00	28	Collecting and disseminating lessons learned vis-à-vis the benefits of wild species to neighbouring communities through consumptive use.	Management					*	*		
0.99	27	Collecting and disseminating information on the pros and cons of compensation-based schemes.	Management						*	*	
0.97	16	Analysing the other benefits (including cultural and social aspects) of the consumptive use of wild species to neighbouring communities.	Social / Cultural						*		*
0.91	17	Analysing the other benefits (including cultural and social aspects) of the non-consumptive use of wild species to neighbouring communities.	Social / Cultural						*		*
0.83	26	Replicating innovative approaches to site-based mitigation at other sites.	Management								*
0.82	15	Analysing the other costs (including cultural, social) to neighbouring communities of living with wildlife.	Social / Cultural		*						*
0.70	2	Understanding the biological/ecological impacts of human-wildlife interactions that could be generalised.	Biological / Ecological								
0.70	5	Identifying examples where wild species directly benefit through their association with people.	Biological / Ecological								
0.52	4	Incorporating the negative impacts of human-wildlife interactions as a key threat into the assessment process for the IUCN Red List.	Biological / Ecological								