Conservation and Human Rights

CEESP Network Highlights

The flower petal model shown here illustrates how all of CEESP’s Themes and Working Groups are linked through shared concerns and strong collaboration. As we continue to follow the mandate received at the 3rd IUCN World Conservation Congress in Bangkok (November 2004), the Executive Committee of CEESP and the members all over the world are undertaking innovative work at multiple levels at the interface of environmental, economic and socio-cultural arenas. A few highlights are shared below. As always, please visit us at http://www.iucn.org/themes/ceesp/ for more information, including many recent publications.

**Working Group on the Social and Environmental Accountability of the Private Sector (SEAPRISE)**

Areas where oil companies and other extractive industries operate are also often areas of high biodiversity and low governance/civil society capacity to engage with the companies. SEAPRISE works on capacity building of civil society and governments in these areas, and toward greater accountability of these industries.

**Mining in Philippines.** SEAPRISE participated in a fact-finding mission to the Philippines to assess the environmental and human rights impact of mining activities. The findings are published in a report that was simultaneously launched in press meetings in Manila and London in January 2007. Their findings reveal the devastating effects of mining, including severe erosion, destruction of water catchments and marine environments, decreased food security, over 800 related extra-judicial killings... and virtually no economic gains for the country! Unfortunately the country government is keen on expanding rather than curtailing mining activities, which raises strong suspicions of corruptions and wrongdoing.

**Assessment of war-related oil spill Lebanon.** In August 2006, in collaboration with the Lebanese NGO Green Line and the WESCANA IUCN regional office (dealing with West Asia, Central Asia, and North Africa), SEAPRISE member Prof. Richard Steiner carried out a rapid environmental assessment of the war related oil spill in Lebanon. He prepared a report and conducted a follow up mission to Israel to discuss reparation measures with the offending government. The Theme on Environment and Security supported this work by offering a Report Addendum on legal implications.
Oil production in the Niger Delta. Throughout 2005 and 2006, supported by PRCM (Programme Régional de Conservation de la Zone Côtière et Marine de Afrique de l’Ouest), FIBA (International Foundation for the Banc d’Arguin), and WWF, SEAPRISE accompanied to Nigeria representatives from governments and civil society from Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Kenya, Mauritania, Mozambique, Senegal, and Tanzania. These people could see first hand the environmental and social impacts of oil production activities in the Nigele delta and met with top officials and local residents. The visit dramatically raised their awareness about the need to prevent similar devastations in countries soon to become oil and gas producers in Africa.

Looking ahead, SEAPRISE hopes to further raise, and directly address, the many and profound human rights implications of the extractive industry impacts on which it engages.

Forum for Food Sovereignty. From more than 80 countries, over 500 representatives of organizations of peasants and family farmers, artisanal fisherfolk, indigenous peoples, landless peoples, rural workers, migrants, pastoralists, forest communities, women, youth, consumers and environmental and urban movements gathered in the village of Nyéléni in Sélingué, Mali from 23 – 27 February 2007 in the name of the food sovereignty movement. They did so to share experience and strengthen the global movement. TSL co-chairs facilitated two of the five main workshops units and several CEESP members participated actively in them. The Forum provided an opportunity for partners across sectors to continue the rethinking of food and agriculture outside the dominant neo-liberal model.

GMOs Website. In response to a request by the IUCN Council, TSL has developed and launched a website [www.iucn.org/themes/ceesp/nogmo.htm] which links to information and action on genetically modified organisms (GMOs), including the IUCN policy/resolutions on GMOs, related IUCN activities, and links to external sources.

WAMIP General Assembly. TSL and the World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples (WAMIP) are organizing the first WAMIP General Assembly in Spain, September 2007, co-funded by the Spanish government and coinciding with the 9th Conference of the Parties to the UNCCD.

Strategic Direction on Governance, Communities, Equity, and Livelihood Rights in Relation to Protected Areas (TILCEPA)

The work of this joint Theme of CEESP and WCPA is closely linked to the work of TGER.

Protected Areas Governance. With the support and advocacy of TILCEPA and TGER, the IUCN governance matrix was approved at the categories summit in Almeria for incorporation into the revised IUCN Guidelines for Protected Areas (PA). This matrix helps clarify and provide a framework for identifying PA governance type.
as distinct from PA category. At the WCC in Barcelona, a workshop is planned with the government of Catalunia to present an analysis of their PA system using the government matrix. Other governments that were present in Almeria will go through similar assessments and will likely present their results in Barcelona. The next step in the governance discussion is to look beyond Protected Areas, at the landscape level. The forthcoming IVth WCC is an opportunity to start reflection on this.

Community Conserved Areas. TILCEPA and TGER are currently conducting two studies of governance of biodiversity and CCAs (see the article on page 350).

Alerts. TILCEPA is supporting a number of alerts related to flagrant violation of rights of communities living within or close to protected areas, or communities whose CCAs are endangered by commercial interests. The co-chairs have recently written to the President of the Republic of Paraguay, requesting him to protect the Ayoreo People and their territory and reconsider the proposed deforestation of more than 23,857 ha of pristine forest in Amotocodie, northern Chaco.

Regional Learning Networks on Collaborative Management. Two learning networks are on-going with technical support provided by TGER members: one in South-East Asia, on co-management of protected areas with indigenous peoples, and the other in West Africa, focusing on co-management of marine protected areas. Each learning network has sites from different countries (Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, The Philippines, Thailand, Indonesia, and Malaysia in South East Asia, and Mauritania, Senegal, Cap Vert, The Gambia, Guinea and Guinea Bissau in West Africa) has representatives from NGOs, indigenous peoples, and government. Groups from each participating site come together to compare experience and support each other in learning- a fact that has also managed to advance policy and practice by the pressure of positive example.

Conservation and Human Rights. In addition to this special issue of Policy Matters, TGER and its members and partners are coordinating a forthcoming Occasional Paper on conservation-related displacement, a concept paper on human rights approaches to conservation, a symposium on conservation and human rights at the 2007 Society for Conservation Biology Meeting, and a related field-based workshop in the Baviaanskloof protected area (South Africa).

Co-Management practice and policy in China. CEESP members have been working in China to sustain a large scale pilot initiative (two township- eleven villages) on co-management of natural forests. They are now preparing to support policy innovations for the whole country.

Innovative training for PA management in Morocco. A new specialization option for PA managers is being piloted at the National School for Forest Engineers (ENFI) in Salé (Morocco). For the first time, engineers are trained in conservation issues, participatory processes and issues of PA governance.

Governance of Biodiversity in the South. (see the article on page 350)
Developing a Working Definition of Culture. TCC is working on a series of concept papers developing a working definition of culture and cultural policy for IUCN. The paradigm of cultural conservation is more and more part of IUCN and its new programme, and such a working definition will become increasingly important in that work.

New and forthcoming publications and tools. TCC members are working on a resource book on biocultural diversity and on rapid cultural impact assessment tools for Protected Areas. A TCC member edited a recently published collection entitled *Pacific Genes and Life Patents, Pacific Experiences & Analysis of the Commodification & Ownership of Life*.

Forces for Sustainability Conference (Peace Palace). E&S, in partnership with the Institute for Environmental Security, and with the support of several other CEESP Themes and Groups, coordinated the *Forces for Sustainability Conference*, (March 2007, Peace Palace, the Hague). Here, CEESP members (in particular from SEAPRISE) and military and private sector representatives engaged in fruitful discussion and furthered efforts to increase coordination across sectors to address environmentally-related security issues.4

Theme on Environment, Markets, Trade and Investment (TEMTI)

The Chair of TEMTI is raising funds to launch the Theme’s activities over the next three years. A partnership with the IUCN secretariat is being developed. TEMTI’s core research project will focus on macroeconomic policies and practices and environmental change with a focus on the South American region. The Theme aims at producing and disseminating research results that advance the quality of the debate on economics and environment issues.

Notes

2. For more information on this, see the Almeria Summit papers available from the IUCN/WCPA site and Borrini-Feyerabend *et al.*, 2006.
3. For the latter two events, we are grateful for the partnership with the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and the South Africa’s Cape Action for People and the Environment Programme (C.A.P.E.).
4. For more information, see [www.envirosecurity.org/sustainability](http://www.envirosecurity.org/sustainability).
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Governance of Biodiversity and Community Conserved Areas: new and on-going projects with CEESP’s TGER and TILCEPA

Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend and Barbara Lassen

Governance of biodiversity is a relatively new—although rapidly expanding—field of interest in the conservation community. For instance, the 2003 World Parks Congress, the 2004 CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas and the 2005 Congress on Marine Protected Areas paid special attention to governance, explored its applications and developed relevant recommendations and plans. Community Conserved Areas (CCAs) are among the most innovative concepts and areas of work that emerged out of these reflections. Paradoxically, they are very effective protected areas (the definition is demanding it) but possibly not legally recognized as such. How is it possible? CCAs comprise natural and/or modified ecosystems containing significant biodiversity values, ecological services and cultural value that have been conserved in a voluntary, self-directed way by indigenous peoples or local communities. Such communities have usually done so through customary laws, as only some have legal ownership or are recognized by the state as the legal managers of the natural resources.

Some CCAs were established centuries ago (some have over 1000 years of recorded history), others have recently evolved by taking advantage of new conditions or legislation. All share three basic characteristics. First, a strong bond linking a well-defined community and a well-defined body of resources—a body that may have to do with culture, livelihoods, spiritual or other values. Second, the actual de facto capacity of the community to take decisions and implement those decisions regarding the management of the natural resources (what to do about them, what objectives to pursue, how to pursue them...). Third, the observation that the community management is successful in conserving biodiversity, possibly despite the other (cultural, socio-economic, spiritual, security-related, etc.) objectives that took precedence in the intention of the community itself. Remarkably, this makes the CCA definition more demanding than the IUCN or CBD definition of “protected area”, which refers to areas dedicated or managed for the conservation of biodiversity, but not necessarily successful at that...

Even in marine environments, sometimes considered the ecosystem where people act solely as “resource extractors”, one can find amazing examples of traditional values, care and effective conservation practices. (Courtesy Pierre Campredon)
While a few CCA examples may be said to be thriving, others face pressing threats from a variety of phenomena. Most of all, there is still a huge knowledge gap about where CCAs exist, what “types” exist, how do they function, what are their strengths and weaknesses, and how they can be supported for both conservation and community benefits. The IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP) has been seeking resources to study biodiversity governance, and in particular community conserved areas, for some time. At the end of 2006 it was successful in launching two initiatives that seek to both advance knowledge and positively influence policy. One of the initiatives is run by TGER—it’s Theme on Governance, Equity and Rights. The other is run by TILCEPA—its joint Theme with the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA).

**Participatory action research on governance of biodiversity in nine countries of the South**

CEESP/TGER is collaborating with a large, multi-partner research project exploring how governance processes and institutions can best contribute to the conservation of biodiversity. The project is EU-funded and works through a large partnership in Europe. Outside of Europe, CEESP is coordinating, and partially carrying out in a direct way, a total of nine participatory action research studies in specific sites rich in biodiversity. The sites are in Bolivia, Argentina, Indonesia, Nepal, Turkey, Mongolia, Iran, Niger and Ethiopia. Most of them are Community Conserved Areas and a few engage communities in some form of co-management and/or broad landscape conservation efforts. TGER’s coordination is stressing the active involvement of community members in the development of the studies, whose results will feed into a broad EU analysis and report. In the Fall 2007, a workshop among representatives from the Southern countries will draw lessons from the participatory action research and develop policy recommendations for EU aid policy and other international processes.

**Regional reviews of Community Conserved Areas**

In cooperation with Swedbio, CEESP is promoting a number of regional reviews of Community Conserved Areas. The goal is to deepen the understanding of CCAs and their relevant needs and opportunities in varying historical/regional contexts. From that understanding, policy recommendations will be drawn and supported at various levels, in particular through the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas. While working on the above, CEESP/TILCEPA will also identify and support one or more CCA in need of urgent field-based support. So far, studies are being carried out in the following regions:

- Eastern Himalaya (including North-East India, Eastern Nepal, Bhutan, the Chittagong Hill Tracts of Bangladesh and Northern Burma (Myanmar)

*The Kaya forests, in Kenya, are an example of Community Conserved Areas. They were developed for security purposes but they are successful in conserving biodiversity. (Courtesy Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend)*
Nyéléni was the inspiration for the name of our Forum for Food Sovereignty in Sélingué, Mali. Nyéléni was a legendary Malian peasant woman who farmed and fed her peoples well—she embodied food sovereignty through hard work, innovation and caring for her people. We, peasant farmers, pastoralists, fisherfolk, indigenous peoples, migrant workers, women and young people, who gathered at Nyéléni 2007 are food providers who are ready, able and willing to feed all the world’s peoples. Our heritage as providers of food is critical to the future of humanity. This is especially so in the case of women and indigenous peoples who are historical creators of knowledge about food, agriculture and traditional aquaculture. But this heritage and our capacity to produce healthy, good and abundant food are being threatened and undermined by neo-liberalism and global capitalism.
We debated food sovereignty issues in order to deepen collective understanding, strengthen dialogue among and between sectors and interest groups, and formulate joint strategies and an action agenda. Our debates gave food providers as well as environmentalists, consumers and urban movements the strength and power to fight for food sovereignty in Mali, the rest of Africa and worldwide. Through our alliances, we can join together to preserve, recover and build on our knowledge in order to strengthen the essential capacity that leads to sustaining localised food systems. In realizing food sovereignty, we will also ensure the survival of our cultures, our peoples and the Earth.

**Food sovereignty** puts those who produce, distribute and need wholesome, local food at the heart of food, agricultural, livestock and fisheries systems and policies, rather than the demands of markets and corporations that reduce food to internationally tradable commodities and components. It offers a strategy to resist and dismantle this inequitable and unsustainable system that perversely results in both chronic under-nutrition and rapidly rising obesity. Food sovereignty includes the right to food – the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through socially just and ecologically sensitive methods. It entails peoples’ right to participate in decision making and define their own food, agriculture, livestock and fisheries systems. It defends the interests and inclusion of the next generation and supports new social relations free from oppression and inequality between men and women, peoples, racial groups and social classes. It promotes a genuine agrarian reform and defends access to, and the sharing of, productive territories free from the threat of privatisation and expulsion.

Food sovereignty defends the interests and the right to food, and to produce food, of peoples and communities, including those under occupation, in conflict zones, facing and/or recovering from disasters, as well as those who are socially and economically marginalised, such as *dalits*, indigenous peoples and migrant workers. Food sovereignty provides a policy framework for food, farming, pastoralism, fisheries and other food production, harvesting and gathering systems determined by local communities.

At Nyéléni 2007, we strengthened dialogue among and between sectors and interest groups. This was through the main work of the forum which was spent discussing seven themes related to food sovereignty: local markets and international trade; local knowledge and technology; access and control of natural resources; sharing territories; conflicts, occupation, and disasters; social conditions and forced migration; and production models. (Background papers on each of these topics were collaboratively developed by the social movements and...

...[W]e deepened our collective understanding of Food Sovereignty which:

1. **Focuses on Food for People:** Food sovereignty puts the right to sufficient, healthy and culturally appropriate food for all individuals, peoples and communities, including those who are hungry, under occupation, in conflict zones and marginalised, at the centre of food, agriculture, livestock and fisheries policies; and rejects the proposition that food is just another commodity or component for international agri-business.

2. **Values Food Providers:** Food sovereignty values and supports the contributions, and respects the rights, of women and men, peasants and small scale family farmers, pastoralists, artisanal fisherfolk, forest dwellers, indigenous peoples and agricultural and fisheries workers, including migrants, who cultivate, grow, harvest and process food; and rejects those policies, actions and programmes that undervalue them, threaten their livelihoods and eliminate them.

3. **Localises Food Systems:** Food sovereignty brings food providers and consumers closer together; puts providers and consumers at the centre of decision-making on food issues; protects food providers from the dumping of food and food aid in local markets; protects consumers from poor quality and unhealthy food, inappropriate food aid and food tainted with genetically modified organisms; and resists governance structures, agreements and practices that depend on and promote unsustainable and inequitable international trade and give power to remote and unaccountable corporations.

4. **Puts Control Locally:** Food sovereignty places control over territory, land, grazing, water, seeds, livestock and fish populations on local food providers and respects their rights. They can use and share them in socially and environmentally sustainable ways which conserve diversity; it recognizes that local territories often cross geopolitical borders and ensures the right of local communities to inhabit and use their territories; it promotes positive interaction between food providers in different regions and territories and from different sectors that helps resolve internal conflicts or conflicts with local and national authorities; and rejects the privatisation of natural resources through laws, commercial contracts and intellectual property rights regimes.

5. **Builds Knowledge and Skills:** Food sovereignty builds on the skills and local knowledge of food providers and their local organisations that conserve, develop and manage localised food production and harvesting systems, developing appropriate research systems to support this and passing on this wisdom to future generations; and rejects technologies that undermine, threaten or contaminate these, e.g. genetic engineering.
6. Works with Nature: Food sovereignty uses the contributions of nature in diverse, low external input agroecological production and harvesting methods that maximise the contribution of ecosystems and improve resilience and adaptation, especially in the face of climate change; it seeks to heal the planet so that the planet may heal us; and, rejects methods that harm beneficial ecosystem functions, that depend on energy intensive monocultures and livestock factories, destructive fishing practices and other industrialised production methods, which damage the environment and contribute to global warming.

The following joint strategies and action agenda to realise food sovereignty were developed, presented below in summary, based on actions to promote the food sovereignty agenda, to resist policies and practices that undermine it and to strengthen the movement.

We will promote strategies, policies and lifestyles that strengthen community control, ecological sustainability, local knowledge and autonomy, and traditional wisdoms to assert food sovereignty in all of its dimensions as well as our associated Rights. We will identify and strengthen existing autonomous practices that provide food sovereignty as well as push our governments to respect and protect our rights to food sovereignty.

Local markets: we will assert the right of food providers and consumers to have autonomous control over local markets as a crucial space for food sovereignty.

Local knowledge: we will assert that local knowledge and cultural values are paths to realising food sovereignty and will identify local, collective, and diverse experiences and practices, as examples, recognising that they are ever changing and dynamic— not static— and gather strength through exchange and solidarity.

Agroecological production and harvesting: we will promote socially and environmentally sensitive production systems that can be controlled by local food providers.

Use of international instruments and programmes: we will assert food sovereignty and associated rights by utilising international legal instruments.

Agrarian reform and community control of territories: we will fight for a comprehensive genuine agrarian reform that upholds the rights of women, indigenous peoples, peasants, fisherfolk, workers, pastoralists, migrants and future generations and enables the coexistence of different communities in their territories.

We will resist the corporate-led global capitalist model and its institutions and policies that prevent communities from asserting and achieving food sovereignty.
This includes challenging government policies that facilitate corporate control of our food production and distribution, as well as taking direct action against corporate practices.

**International trade**: we will combine fights against trade liberalisation with struggles to promote local production and markets and thus build food sovereignty.

**Transnational corporations**: we will fight against the corporate control of the food chain by reclaiming control over our territories, production, markets and the ways we use food.

**Conflicts and occupation**: we will join struggles against occupation and fight the walls and militarization of borders that splinter peoples and prevent their access to local food and productive territories, recognising that conflicts and occupations present a serious threat to food sovereignty and that asserting food sovereignty is crucial for peoples and communities to survive and thrive under adverse conditions.

**Toxic technology**: we will continue to fight against genetically modified crops, animals, and trees; against industrial aquaculture; against cloned livestock; and against the irradiation of food.

**Monocultures & agrofuels**: we will mobilise and engage in international campaigns against the industrial production of agrofuels; these are often under the control of transnational corporations and have negative impacts on people and the environment.

**Climate change**: we will denounce industrial agriculture as a contributor to climate change and question the utility and effectiveness of carbon markets to reduce emissions and ensure climate justice.

**Strengthen the movement**: we will strengthen the movements for food sovereignty through mobilisation, alliance building, education, communication and joint action among movements throughout the world; and we will win.

**Mobilisation**: we will mobilise across sectors in our joint struggles against those governmental policies, corporations and institutions that prevent the realisation of food sovereignty.

**Alliance building and strengthening our own movements**: we will build the movement for food sovereignty by strengthening organisations, cooperatives, associations and networks, and building strategic alliances among diverse constituencies such as consumers, students, academics, health practitioners, religious communities, the environmental justice movement, water justice move-
ments and people affected by large dams, extractive industry, wars, occupation and disasters.

**Education**: we will promote political education in order to assert food sovereignty.

**Communication**: we will strengthen our own means of communication based on our cultures and local conditions, in order to counter corporate propaganda, challenge the globalised industrial food system and highlight good local experiences and knowledge.

**Days of action**: we will coordinate and participate in days of action that are organized and promoted by allied organizations, bringing a focus on food sovereignty and encouraging the participation of all constituencies, especially women.

**Notes**

1. Text is adapted by Maryam Rahmanian from the *Nyéléni 2007 Synthesis Report* (Forum for Food Sovereignty International Steering Committee, 2007)
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*For more information on this event and its outcomes, including the Food Sovereignty Action Agenda discussed by sectors, interest groups, and regions represented at the Forum, please see http://www.nyeleni2007.org or contact contact@nyeleni2007.org.*

*Pour d’avantage d’informations concernant cet événement ainsi que d’autres documents en français, incluant l’Agenda d’Action de Souveraineté Alimentaire, voyez http://www.nyeleni2007.org ou contactez contact@nyeleni2007.org.*

*Para más información así que otros documentos en Español, incluyendo la Agenda de Acción de Soberanidad Alimentaria, ver http://www.nyeleni2007.org o contactar contact@nyeleni2007.org.*

---

**A Co-Management Learning Network builds bridges between protected areas and indigenous peoples in South East Asia!**

Jeremy Ironside, Grazia Borrini Feyerabend, and Jannie Lasimbang

The Co-Management Learning Network (CMLN) was established in December 2005 to implement and exchange protected areas co-management (CM) experiences among seven pilot “learning sites” in seven countries of South East Asia (see table below). In light of the problems of ‘coercive’ approaches to protected area management, and of the strained relationships between indigenous communities and protected area authorities, this initiative promotes cooperation and mutual respect towards more effective and sustainable opportunities to conserve Southeast Asia’s important biodiversity.
The Co-management Learning Network is a partnership among “CM learning sites” engaged in similar processes towards shared governance (co-management) of protected areas. In Phase I of the initiative (December 2005 to June 2008) teams from each site—including government agency staff, indigenous peoples representatives and civil society organisations—are working towards:

- Supporting CM practice in each learning site and reflecting upon that practice in local participatory action research processes;
- Promoting mutual support and common learning within the regional CM network;
- Enhancing the capacity to develop and maintain co-management (policies, processes, agreements and institutions) in all the learning sites;
- Enhancing understanding, awareness and recognition of CM practices beyond the learning sites—in all concerned countries and in the region.

While co-management learning networks have been successfully implemented in other parts of the world, this is a new initiative for the South East Asia region. Acceptance of indigenous peoples’ rights to participate in the management of protected areas varies greatly across the participating countries and in the region.
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countries. In the Philippines, for example, the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act of 1997 allows indigenous communities to claim their land ownership and resource management rights, and in some cases this has resulted in protected area authorities and local indigenous communities negotiating co-management agreements. In Indonesia, government decrees issued since 2002 have mandated the collaborative management of Kayan Mentarang National Park through a joint policy board, including the participation of an independent indigenous organization (FoMMA). This policy advance is slowly being transformed into concrete action on the ground. In other countries, the policy discussion and acceptance of CM is only in a budding stage and still lacks legal provisions for ‘sharing power’ in protected area management.

In the learning sites of the CMLN network, the rights and responsibilities to co-manage all or part of the protected areas are being defined in a variety of ways, including:

- Negotiating watershed management agreements in which upstream indigenous communities receive benefits for maintaining the health of the watershed supplying water to downstream communities (The Philippines);
- Negotiating, demarcating and developing sustainable resource use plans for community areas inside protected areas (Malaysia, Cambodia);
- Strengthening dialogue and cooperation between lowland and upland indigenous communities in watersheds, partially one included in a protected area (Thailand);
- Demonstrating the value of indigenous traditional knowledge for protected area management (Laos);
- Using pilot co-management activities for policy level advocacy (Vietnam); and
- Defining protocols for sharing management tasks and responsibilities, and establishing indigenous representative structures (Indonesia);
These experiences are the focus of participatory action research in each site, regularly exchanged and discussed in the network’s regional workshops. The workshops are dedicated to mutual support and common learning among teams from each site. The teams include representatives of indigenous peoples, PA authorities and supporting civil society organisations. In addition, study tours are held between the sites, and technical support is provided through networks such as TGER and TILCEPA. The lessons learned in the CMLN are being documented and will be disseminated as the activities in each of the sites and the broader network develop and evolve. Reports on progress will be shared through the CMLN’s own web site (available soon!).
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Poverty Indicators for Protected Areas: Report from a workshop hosted by UNEP-WCMC in collaboration with the Poverty and Conservation Learning Group

Alessandra Giuliani

UNEP’s World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) recently hosted an international workshop at its offices in Cambridge (UK) to explore the potential for developing a set of poverty indicators that could be associated with the World Database on Protected Areas. This workshop was intended to both share experience on a key poverty-con-
PAs to biological diversity and their impact on communities, as well as the effectiveness with which such areas are managed.

The workshop brought together representatives from conservation and development NGOs from around the world interested in studying the impact of protected areas in more depth. The meeting had two key objectives: first, to review the current state of knowledge on methodologies for assessing the socio-economic impacts of PAs on local communities and, second, to explore the feasibility of and institutional partnerships necessary for assessing PAs’ contribution to conservation and development goals.

The workshop started with a series of presentations from participants to frame the discussion - an exciting opportunity for all present to share experiences and lessons learnt on the linkages between poverty and PAs. The rest of the workshop evolved around breakout sessions and open discussions. Many stimulating debates took place during the two day meeting, owing to the outstanding level of expertise, goodwill, and commitment to the topic of all the participants. Fruitful discussions resulted in agreement on several key issues:

- the development of an internationally recognized set of criteria and methods to assess the governance process and well-being impact of protected areas is both desirable and timely;
- the first step towards the creation of such a set of criteria and methods is to undertake an in-depth analysis of indicators and methodologies that have been developed and utilised thus far in this field and to summarise the lessons learned;
- the development of such criteria and methods is a complex task and should be performed by a partnership of concerned organisations; and
- UNEP-WCMC is well situated to lead the process of partnership development and fundraising for this work.

More generally, the workshop confirmed the high level of interest currently present at the international level in the linkages between poverty and protected areas.

In the closing session, many participants expressed their personal or organisational
interest in maintaining involvement in the project. As an immediate next step, TILCEPA and TGER members agreed to take a lead in developing a toolkit of methodologies and indicators to assess the socio-economic impacts of PAs, in collaboration with UNEP-WCMC, the PCLG and others.

Alessandra Giuliani (pclg@iied.org) is the PCLG Research Assistant. Alessandra is a member of TGER and TILCEPA.
Celui-ci a lancé avec d’autres partenaires une initiative sur les Droits et les Ressources (Rights and Resources Initiative), sous-tendue par le projet de recherche « Amélioration des moyens de subsistances et de l’équité dans la foresterie communautaire ». Ce projet de recherche vise à contribuer à l’objectif de réduction de la pauvreté par le moyen des ressources forestières. L’initiative est soutenue par un financement conjoint de la Fondation Ford et du CRDI (Centre de Recherche pour le Développement International).

**Le projet « Amélioration des moyens d’existence et de l’équité dans la foresterie communautaire »**

C’est de l’initiative « Resource Rights Initiative » que découle le projet « Amélioration des moyens d’existence et de l’équité dans la foresterie communautaire ». Ce projet met l’accent sur les droits et le bien-être des populations les plus vulnérables. L’objectif général du projet est d’appuyer les politiques, les stratégies, les processus institutionnels à divers niveaux ainsi que les pistes innovantes favorables aux pauvres et qui apportent une plus-value à la foresterie communautaire en respectant l’écologie durable, les bénéfices du bien-être et l’équité sociale en faveur des femmes et des autres groupes marginalisés dans les pays et sites sélectionnés. Les pays d’intervention du projet sont :

- en Asie: Inde, Laos, Philippines
- en Amérique Latine: Brésil, Bolivie, Guatemala, Nicaragua

Les objectifs spécifiques de ce projet sont :

- identifier et répondre aux demandes spécifiques d’information et de renforcement de capacités ;
- renforcer les capacités institutionnelles pour la recherche, l’analyse, le suivi et le plaidoyer en faveur de la gestion durable des forêts ;
- identifier et développer les mécanismes pour promouvoir le dialogue effectif des acteurs ;
- renforcer les programmes et activités de sensibilisation en faveur de la gestion durable des forêts, initiés par les partenaires et autres organisations.

Pour atteindre ces objectifs, le projet prévoit les activités suivantes à réaliser :

- mise en place d’un réseau de partenaires intervenant dans la foresterie communautaire ;
- mise en place d’un comité de pilotage et tenue de rencontres périodiques ;
- sélection des sites d’interventions ;
- identification des besoins de formation des communautés et de renforcement des capacités des partenaires ;
- organisations de rencontres des acteurs de la foresterie communautaire en vue d’échanger sur les démarches de plaidoirie en faveur de la gestion durable des forêts ;
- réunions de consultation des partenaires sur les rapports produits ;
- séminaires avec les communautés ;
- rédaction de rapports et campagnes de diffusion.

Ces différentes activités doivent aboutir aux produits suivants :

- rapport national de synthèse final ;
- renforcement des compétences et capacités des partenaires locaux ;
- appui au dialogue et à la communication entre les multiples acteurs ;
diffusion des résultats du projet à travers les médias et les canaux de prise de décision.

Ainsi ce projet de recherche revêt une logique participative et cherche à avoir un impact durable sur les différents partenaires, avec répartition des responsabilités entre eux.

La répartition des responsabilités entre les partenaires
CIFOR adopte une approche collaborative dans la recherche et développe des partenariats dans divers secteurs et avec diverses catégories de structures (municipalités, universités, organismes de recherche et de formation, ONG régionales ou locales, groupes de base et fédérations tels que les groupements de femmes ou les communautés locales, propriétaires de forêts et associations d’exploitants). Ces différents partenaires sont sélectionnés sur la base de leur expérience ou de leur intérêt pour la promotion des politiques favorables aux plus démunis, les mécanismes institutionnels, la participation des acteurs à la base et les programmes relatifs à la forêsterie communautaire et à la réduction de la pauvreté.

Dans le cadre du projet, les partenaires nationaux seront réunis au sein d’un comité de pilotage. CIFOR jouera surtout un rôle de facilitateur. Les partenaires décideront en commun de la méthodologie de recherche et se répartiront les tâches. Ils auront aussi la faculté de proposer des sites de recherches qui seront soumis aux critères de sélection des sites définis par CIFOR et ses partenaires stratégiques.

Les critères de sélection des sites
Au maximum, trois sites seront sélectionnés dans chaque pays par CIFOR, et leur sélection tiendra compte de l’existence de processus organisationnels et de production relatifs au foncier, aux systèmes de gestion collective des forêts, aux stratégies de développement, et aux impacts et implications institutionnels. Les critères de sélection incluent :

- la demande et l’intérêt pour la forêsterie communautaire par les populations locales (particulièrement les groupes les plus vulnérables), les organisations non gouvernementales, les organisations de recherche et les structures administratives compétentes pour le ressort territorial des sites ;
- l’existence de problématiques non résolues dans la recherche ou de priorités dégagées dans des études antérieures ;
- l’importance des forêts sur les revenus des exploitants locaux ;
- l’existence de conflits entre les exploitants et/ou d’opportunités de partenariat et de collaboration entre les multiples acteurs.

Conclusion
Le projet de recherche « Amélioration des moyens d’existence et de l’équité dans la forêsterie communautaire » s’inscrit dans le sillage des objectifs du millénaire pour le développement et la démarche participative lui permet d’impliquer les partenaires dès le début de la réflexion et de la mise en œuvre au niveau national. Les résultats devraient être produits par cette recherche devraient bénéficier des multiples acteurs dans le domaine de la forêsterie communautaire.

M. Kante Bocar Oumar (bokante@gmail.com) est juriste de formation. Dans le cadre d’un mémoire de DEA, il a travaillé sur « la protection nationale du patrimoine mondial au Sénégal ». Il est actuellement inscrit en thèse à l’École doctorale de droit public et fiscal de l’Université Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne, en France. Parallèlement il travaille au bureau de l’Afrique de l’Ouest de CIFOR comme cadre associé au programme Gouvernance forestière. Bouda Henri-Noël (h.bouda@cgiar.org) est forestier, chercheur associé au bureau régional du CIFOR en Afrique de l’Ouest. Il s’occupe depuis 2003 des thèmes de recherche relatifs à la décentralisation et la gestion des ressources naturelles. Il partage son temps entre le programme “Forêts et Gouvernance” et le programme “Forêts et Moyens de Subsistance”.
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Concern about the existing and potential negative impacts of biofuels (or rather, agrofuels as social movements prefer to call them) is rising, and not only amongst environmental NGOs. At a seminar on agrofuels that took place in April 2007 in Asunción, Paraguay, the most representative Paraguayan farmers’ movements and a large number of NGOs adopted a joint statement that rejects what is called the “trap” of agrofuels. The statement warns that the large-scale production of agrofuels under the current agro-industrial model will strongly exacerbate existing problems related to the export-oriented production of soy and other monocultures, including rural unemployment and depopulation; contamination and degradation of soils; watersheds, deforestation, biodiversity destruction; the introduction of genetically modified crops; and an increase in health problems related to pesticide intoxication. Similar concerns were raised at an informal strategy meeting of Latin American NGOs and farmers’ organizations that took place at the occasion of an international conference on the impacts of Eucalyptus plantations organized by Via Campesina-Brazil in April. What follows is the Paraguayan statement, in Spanish and English respectively.

Declaración oficial de Chake Ñuha—Seminario Nacional sobre las trampas del agrocombustible y los servicios ambientales en el Paraguay

Paraguay se ha puesto como meta el exportar agrocombustibles a corto plazo. Los planes son exportar al menos 50 millones de dólares en el término de cuatro años, y simultáneamente dejar de importar por lo menos 150 millones de dólares de carburantes fósiles en el mismo período. Según ciertas investigaciones científicas este cálculo no sale; investigadores como Pimentel1 afirman una ecuación energética negativa en la producción de agrocombustibles porque necesitan más insumos fósiles para producción, elaboración y transporte que emiten después en la combustión en el motor del coche.

El auge de la superficie cultivada con plantas energéticas solo se puede realizar a través de una expansión exponencial de monocultivos en gran escala a cuenta de la tala de los remanentes del bosque, sustitución de cultivos ya existentes o expulsión de pequeños productores campesinos e indígenas. Esta expansión de por sí significa más consumo de combustibles fósiles y emisión de dióxido de...
Conservation and Human Rights

La expansión del monocultivo es la causa directa de la grave situación que vive actualmente la mayoría del pueblo paraguayo, con una economía volcada a la exportación de soja forrajera, con un costo en salud de miles de personas contaminadas, la casi desaparición del Bosque Atlántico con la consecuente pérdida de biodiversidad, la disminución del empleo rural y la pérdida de la cultura indígena y campesina, un constante éxodo del campo a la ciudad donde los emigrantes rurales se enfrentan a la miseria y el desempleo. Las cifras de crecimiento macroeconómico no significan una mejora de las condiciones de vida de la mayoría si no el enriquecimiento desmedido de una delgada capa social egoísta y sus aliados transnacionales.

Planteamos un rechazo a todas las medidas políticas y económicas que promueven el desarrollo de agrocombustibles y la expansión de monocultivos de gran escala:

1. Rechazamos la renovación de la ley de biocombustibles que solo significa alivios fiscales para que las transnacionales instalen la infraestructura necesaria para profundizar el saqueo de nuestros Recursos Naturales. Esta nueva industria no implica ningún progreso para la población, repite el esquema de los silos de soja transgénica, son industrias sin trabajadores que se alimentan de un agro sin agricultores. Tal como el modelo sojero que se ha expandido sin contribuir a las mayorías, ahora Paraguay se vende a los nuevos agronegocios energéticos con la presión fiscal más baja de la región y ofreciendo sin mayores escrúpulos, los remanentes de bosques y las tierras de las comunidades campesinas e indígenas.

2. Denunciamos la “Alianza del Etanol” y la propuesta de que Paraguay suministre al alcoyucto brasileño por ser este un proyecto que tendrá graves consecuencias en la población y el medio ambiente. Esta alianza estratégica con el Brasil en la producción de alcohol carburante, es para la exportación a EE.UU., Europa y Japón. Los acuerdos económicos sobre agrocombustibles de Paraguay con EEUU y la Unión Europea están en la misma línea.

3. Asimismo denunciamos el Primer Congreso Americano de Biocombustibles a realizarse entre el 10-12 de Mayo en Buenos Aires, Argentina, donde participarán el ex vicepresidente de los Estados Unidos, Al Gore; el ex presidente de Colombia, Andrés Pastrana; el ex Embajador de Estados Unidos en Chile, Gabriel Guerra Mondragón y Alberto Moreno, director ejecutivo del Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo (BID). Este evento parece ser la presala del remate de los recién inaugurados fondos del BID, fondos que se estiman pueden llegar a un monto de US$ 200.000 millones para aprovechar y dominar la producción de los agrocombustibles. El mismo BID junto con el gobierno de Brasil estrechamente ligado al empresariado paulista y de los EEUU aunarán este fondo.

4. No se reconoce que estas estrategias implican inherentemente expansión de infraestructura de comunicación, tales como carreteras, puertos, ductos etc que promoverán mayor deforestación y no resolverán los obstáculos de comercialización y aislamiento que sufren los campesinos e indígenas paraguayos. Esta expansión de infraestructura implica la concreción del mega proyecto del IIRSA (Iniciativa para la Integración de la Infraestructura Regional Suraméri-
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Official Declaration of Chake Ñuhá on the Agro-fuels and Environmental Services Traps— Asunción, Paraguay, 24 April 2007

Paraguay has set a short term goal of exporting agro-fuels. The plan is to export at least 50 million dollars worth of agro-fuels in the next four years and in the same time frame to stop importing at least 150 million dollars worth of fossil fuels. However, according to scientific research, the math of this proposal does not add up. Researchers like Pimentel argue that the net result of the energetic equation for agro-fuel production would be negative, not positive, because more fossil fuels are needed for production, processing and transportation than would be conserved by burning agro-fuels instead of fossil fuels to power a car.

Furthermore, in order to increase the cultivation surface dedicated to energy plants, large scale monocultures will be exponentially expanded. This expansion would entail cutting down the remaining forests, substituting current crops and forcing the eviction of small farmers and indigenous peoples. Expanding agro-fuel

5. Este desarrollo de mercado no es para resolver la pobreza del país ni para aliviar el cambio climático, aspira esencialmente a abastecer el nuevo mercado de la industria automotriz del norte especializado en agrocombustibles y tampoco resuelve la dependencia del Paraguay de importaciones de combustibles fósiles.

6. Asimismo, rechazamos todas las propuestas de implementación de servicios ambientales por que son estrategias maquilladas para expropiarse de nuestros recursos naturales y territorios.

Nuestra propuesta es:

1. Que las políticas públicas favorezcan la permanencia de las comunidades rurales e indígenas, apostando por su desarrollo comunitario y territorial con una reforma agraria integral y la recuperación de la Soberanía Nacional (Alimentaria, Territorial y Cultural) como eje principal de la democracia de nuestra sociedad.

2. Que en vez de promover la producción a gran escala de agrocombustibles, se planteen medidas serias para asegurar la Soberanía Alimentaria y Energética en América Latina con medidas de disminución de consumo de energía en el Norte y a la vez que se aseguren mejores condiciones de abastecimiento en el Sur y se apueste por el arraigo y la repoblación del campo.

3. Exigimos una moratoria global para los monocultivos de agrocombustibles y el comercio internacional de agrocombustibles, incluyendo en estos el comercio de bonos de carbono. Requerimos de una moratoria para evaluar las potencialidades y los peligros de este desarrollo, denunciamos que somos víctimas de la consecuencia de los monocultivos industrializados y tememos que el mercado de agrocombustibles pueda producir consecuencias aun más catastróficas. Entendemos que el fenómeno del cambio climático requiere medidas urgentes, pero estas inevitablemente tienen que primeramente ser resueltas en el nivel de consumo de los países del Norte y no a través de potenciar el Modelo Agroexportador y generar mas presión sobre nuestra tierra y nuestra población.

Cana).
monocultures also requires more fossil fuel consumption and releases more carbon
dioxide emissions than the agro-fuels hypothetically produced and the emissions
hypothetically avoided. The expansion of monocultures is the direct cause of the
dire situation that the vast majority of the Paraguayan people endure. It is a pillar
of the soy feed export economy which destroys the health of thousands of people
intoxicated by soy plantation fumigations, promotes the clear cutting of the Atlan-
tic Forest, the corresponding loss of biodiversity, causes the loss of rural jobs and
the loss of the cultures of indigenous peoples and small farmers, as well as the
constant exodus from the countryside to the city where the rural emigrants face
unemployment and misery. The statistics of macroeconomic growth do not mean
that there is an improvement in the living condition of the majority, but rather in-
dicate the disproportionate accumulation of wealth of a tiny oligarchy and its tran-
snational allies.

We reject all policy and economic measures that promote the development of
agro-fuels and the expansion of large scale monocultures:

1. We reject the reform of the biofuels law which will only give tax breaks to tran-
snational companies for putting in place the infrastructure needed to accentu-
ate the pillaging of our natural resources. This new industry does not bring any
progress to the people. It just duplicates the GMO soy silos paradigm, that is to
say that it is an industry without workers that is based on agriculture without
agricultural workers. Just like it did with the soy model which has not brought
any benefits to the majority of the population, Paraguay is selling out to the
new agro-energy business offering the greatest tax incentives in the region and,
with nary a twinge of conscience, offering up the last remaining forests and the
lands and territories of indigenous peoples and small farmers.

2. We denounce the "Ethanol Alliance" and the proposal whereby Paraguay will
supply the Brazilian "Alcohoduct"c because they will have grave consequences
for the people and environment. This strategic alliance with Brazil for carburant
alcohol production is for exporting to the U.S.A., Europe and Japan. The eco-
nomic agreement between Paraguay and the U.S.A. and the European Union on
agro-fuels are drawn up in similar terms.

3. We also denounce the First American Congress on Biofuels to be held May
10th to 12th in Buenos Aires, Argentina with the participation of a former vice-
president of the United States, Al Gore; the former president of Colombia,
Andrés Pastrana; the former U.S. Ambassador to Chile, Gabriel Guerra Mon-
dragón, and Alberto Moreno, Executive Director of the Inter-American Develop-
ment Bank (IDB). This event seems like a pep rally for the recently approved
IDB funding that is estimated at something like USD 200 billion to control and
shape agro-fuel production. The IDB in conjunction with the Brazilian Govern-
ment which is closely tied to a Sao Paolo business community and the European
Union will administer this fund.

4. There is no acknowledgement that these strategies necessarily include expand-
ing communication infrastructure, like highways, ports, pipelines, etc, that will
cause greater deforestation and will not remove the obstacles faced by Para-
guayan small farmers and indigenous peoples for marketing their products nor
will it mitigate their isolation. This infrastructure expansion is part of the im-
plementation of the IIRSA mega-project (Initiative for the Integration of South
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American Regional Infrastructure).

5. The development of this agrofuel market is not intended to help diminish the poverty of the country nor mitigate climate change, nor lessen Paraguay’s dependence on fossil fuels. Rather it aspires to supply the new agrofuels market of the Northern auto-industry.

6. Furthermore, we reject all proposals for implementing environmental services schemes which are thinly disguised strategies for expropriating our natural resources and territories.

Our proposal is:

That public policies promote the permanence and well-being of rural and indigenous communities by promoting community and territorial development as part of an integral agrarian reform and the recuperation of National Sovereignty (including Food, Territorial and Cultural Sovereignty) as the principal axis of the democracy of our society.

Instead of promoting agro-fuel production, we need sound measures for ensuring Food and Energy Sovereignty in America Latina as well as measures for diminishing energy consumption in the North and better energy supply in the South and special efforts to support rural communities' permanence and the repopulation of the countryside.

We demand a worldwide moratorium on agro-fuels monocultures and the international trade in agro-fuels, including the trade in carbon credits. We need a moratorium to evaluate the potential impact and the dangers of this market. We denounce that we are victims of the adverse impacts of industrialized monocultures and that we fear that the bio-fuel market could result in even more catastrophic consequences. We understand that the climate change phenomenon requires swift responses. But climate change mitigation strategies have to focus on decreasing the consumption of the North and must not hinge on promoting agro-export models that put the screws on our land and peoples.

Organizaciones firmantes:
ALTER VIDA, ASAGRAPA, BASE IS, CCDA, CEIDRA, CMB, CNOCIP, CONAMURI, Federación de Pueblos Guaraníes, GRR (Arg), IDECO, Iniciativa Paraguaya de Integración de los Pueblos, MAP, MCNOC, ONAC, SEPA, SERPAJ, PY, SOBREVIVENCIA/Friends of the Earth-Paraguay, Universidad Nacional de Pilar

Notes
1 http://www.news.cornell.edu/stories/July05/ethanol.toocostly.ssl.html
2 Un evento que pretende perfilarse “la principal plataforma de intercambio de ideas, tendencias y proyectos en el sector emergente de los biocombustibles. Se analizarán proyectos ya en curso en América y Europa, así como la manera de replicarlos e incluso optimizarlos en América Latina."
   http://www.biofuelscongress.org/index_esp.asp
3 A proposed pipeline for ethanol transport
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IUCN, The World Conservation Union, is a unique Union of members from some 170 countries including nearly 90 States, over 200 government agencies, and some 1000 NGOs. Over 10,000 internationally-recognised scientists and experts from more than 180 countries volunteer their services to its six global Commissions. The vision of IUCN is “A just world that values and conserves nature”.

IUCN’s six Commissions are principal sources of guidance on conservation knowledge, policy and technical advice and are co-implementers of the IUCN programme. The Commissions are autonomous networks of expert volunteers entrusted by the World Conservation Congress to develop and advance the institutional knowledge, experience and objectives of IUCN.

CEESP, the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy, is an interdisciplinary network of professionals whose mission is to act as a source of advice on the environmental, economic, social and cultural factors that affect natural resources and biocultural diversity and to provide guidance and support towards effective policies and practices in environmental conservation and sustainable development. Following the mandate approved by the 3rd World Conservation Congress in Bangkok, November 2004, CEESP contributes to the IUCN Programme and Mission with particular reference to seven thematic areas:

- Theme on Governance of Natural Resources, Equity and Rights (TEGR),
- Theme on Sustainable Livelihoods (TSL, including poverty elimination and biodiversity conservation)
- Working Group on Environment and Security (E&S)
- Theme on Economics, Markets, Trade and Investments (TEMTI)
- Theme on Culture and Conservation (TCC)
- Working Group on the Social and Environmental Accountability of the Private Sector (SEAPRISE)
- Theme on Indigenous Peoples & Local Communities, Equity, and Protected Areas (TILCEPA, joint between CEESP and the IUCN World Commission for Protected Areas)

Each issue of Policy Matters focuses on a theme of particular importance to our members and is edited by one or more of our Themes/working groups focusing on the seven thematic areas. Past issues have focused on themes such as “Poverty, Wealth and Conservation”, “Community Empowerment for Conservation”, “Collaborative Management and Sustainable Livelihoods”, “Trade and Environment”, “Environment and Security” and the Caspian Sturgeon, including issues of trade, conflict, co-management, and sustainable livelihoods for communities of the Caspian Sea (“The Sturgeon” issue). For more information about CEESP and to view or download past issues of Policy Matters, please visit our website: http://www.iucn.org/themes/ceesp.
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At the World Gathering of Nomadic Pastoralists
Segovia, Spain, September 2007

WAMIP CONGRESS

Nomadic indigenous pastoralists from every continent will gather to celebrate mobility as the foundation of tribal identity, livelihoods & nature conservation

WAMIP—World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples.
http://www.iucn.org/themes/ceesp/WAMIP/WAMIP.htm
War Related Oil Spill in Lebanon

August 2006, Israel bombs oil depot of a Lebanese power plant causing huge oil spill into the Mediterranean Sea. Lebanese NGO Green Line (an IUCN member), IUCN-CEESP and the IUCN Secretariat rush to the challenge by organizing a rapid environmental assessment by SEAPRISE member Rick Steiner that seems to suggest a willful environmental war crime.

Mining in the Philippines

SEAPRISE member Clive Wicks, on a team led by Independent Member of British Parliament Clare Short, examined environment and human rights in the Philippines in relation to the current rapid expansion of mining. Their findings reveal devastating effects including severe erosion, destruction of water catchments and marine environments, decreased food security, and over 800 related murders. SEAPRISE and their partners prepared a report that was simultaneously launched in press meetings in Manila and London in January 2007.

Oil Production in the Niger Delta

Throughout 2005 and 2006, supported by PRCM, FIBA, and WWF, SEAPRISE took Government and civil society representatives from Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Kenya, Mauritania, Mozambique, Senegal, and Tanzania to Nigeria. They saw first hand the environmental and social impacts of oil production activities and met with top officials and local residents. The visit dramatically raised the awareness of key parties about the need to prevent similar devastations in countries soon to become oil and gas producers in Africa.