



Action Templates developed during Second IPSI Global Conference (13-14 March 2012) in Nairobi, Kenya

During the Public Forum held at the Second IPSI Global Conference on 13-14 March 2012, three working groups were formed to address key areas of interest for the partnership to spur future collaboration among the members. Each working group was led by two facilitators with the assistance of two rapporteurs, and included presentations by participants. Subsequently, there was extensive discussion among the participating members. During this time, needs and challenges were identified, and strategies and potential future actions were proposed. The following templates provide a record of the outcomes of these discussions and are meant to serve as an initial foundation for further development of collaboration and action within the membership. It should be noted that these templates are being shared here for the first time with the partnership as a whole, and thus are currently a reflection of the discussions of participating members only.

Contents:

Working Group 1: Capturing and Promoting Resilience in SEPLs including Disaster Risk Management.....	Page 2
Working Group 2: Sharing Experiences of Restoring SEPLs.....	Page 6
Working Group 3: Revitalizing Local Communities through Enhancing Traditional Knowledge and Empowering Young Successors.....	Page 9
Description of Working Groups.....	Page 14

WORKING GROUP 1: Capturing and Promoting Resilience in SEPLs including Disaster Risk Management

Facilitators: Fumiko Fukuoka and Wanja Dorothy Nyingi

Rapporteurs: Friederike Mikulcak, Hydie Maspinas

List of Presenters

1. Friederike Mikulcak (Leuphana University Lueneburg, Germany)
2. Hydie R. Maspinas (Hydrology for the Environment, Life and Policy (HELP) Davao Network)
3. Pablo Eyzaguirre (Bioversity International)
4. Liu Jinlong (Centre for Resource and Forestry Policy Study (CFNRPS), Renmin University of China)
5. Sara J. Scherr (EcoAgriculture Partners)
6. Tobias Plieninger (Ecosystem Services Research Group, Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities (BBAW))
7. Boubacar Boureima (Executive Secretariat of National Environmental Council for Sustainable Development (SE/CNEDD), Niger)
8. Lou Yiping (International Network for Bamboo and Rattan (INBAR))
9. Mordecai O. Ogada (Laikipia Wildlife Forum)
10. Mohammed Abdul Baten (Unnayan Onneshan)
11. Suneetha Subramanian (United Nations University Institute of Advanced Studies)

1. Short summary of the WG Session

Over the period of two days (13-14 March 2012), the members of the working group session met for presentations, discussions and strategic planning. A total of 11 presentations were made by IPSI members during this period and served as a basis for further discussion of the needs/challenges, strategies and actions within this broad thematic area. In order to facilitate discussion and maximize the output of the working group, three sub-groups were formed to address (1) Indicators to Capture and Measure Resilience; (2) Multi-level Governance; (3) Disaster Risk Reduction, Adaptation, Restoration and Transformation. Based on the discussions during these sub-groups, a presentation broken down according to each topic was prepared for the plenary. In the following, the needs/challenges, strategies and actions are summarized. When possible, potential lead organisations are indicated and can help to guide collaboration on the various listed actions within the partnership.

2. Needs and Challenges Identified during the Working Group Session

Sub-Group 1: Indicators to Capture and Measure Resilience

- Indicators should be composed of criteria or measures that are relevant to a local community, e.g. weather extremes, shocks;
- Some indicators might be considered relevant by communities only after resilience has already been lost;
- Indicators should be able to measure long-term adaptation or transformation, to capture community innovation, and serve as basis for (new) adaptation strategies;
- Identify key actors and institutions to be integrated in a project;
- Resilience indicators should serve as bridge between science and Indigenous knowledge systems;
- Indicators as a framework to be applied across IPSI member projects in order to allow for comparative analyses over similar landscapes and to showcase the diversity of SEPL.

Sub-Group 2: Multi-level Governance

- There is a need to link local government initiatives in order to ensure their connectivity in delivering services in cross-boundary SEPLs;
- Need to enhance and promote co-management of resources with consideration of multi-user perspectives;
- Take action on the notion that resource competition/ conflict and management has a multi-scalar dimension.

Sub-Group 3: Disaster Risk Reduction, Adaptation, Restoration and Transformation

- Underestimation of role of ecosystem services in DRM;
- Gaps of understanding ecosystem processes;
- Focus has been more on engineering solutions rather than the ecosystem approach;
- Lack of (generic) data;
- Lack of proper land use planning (ignorance of ecological dynamics).

3. Strategies

Sub-Group 1: Indicators to Capture and Measure Resilience

- Develop indicators in collaboration with local communities that capture efforts of adaptation, are linked to local institutions, and ultimately lead to concrete actions;
- Indicators shall be 'owned' by communities, serve as early warning systems, and capture change relative to a previously defined baseline;
- IPSI shall support long-term collaborations between communities and local NGOs/partners for the application of resilience indicators.

Sub-Group 2: Multi-level Governance

- Develop a conceptual framework for analyzing and comparing SEPL;
- Analyses and mapping of governance systems in SEPLs, in consideration of global connectedness;
- Create connectivity of local authorities in relation to the CBD convention to report on biodiversity;
- Socio-ecological strategies – combined multi-stakeholder participation.

Sub-Group 3: Disaster Risk Reduction, Adaptation, Restoration and Transformation

- Participatory community land-use management (including monitoring and evaluation);
- More programs on public awareness regarding landscape management (land-use and ecosystem approach);
- Promotion of ecologically sustainable livelihood diversification projects (Market linkages necessary to ensure economically viable products);
- Effective community-based early warning systems;
- Incorporate IWRM;
- Participatory resource integrating Indigenous Knowledge and modern science;
- Establishment of efficient information sharing channel.

4. Actions

Sub-Group 1: Indicators to Capture and Measure Resilience

- Further testing of indicators and assessment – how useful were these indicators in analyzing and sharing experiences?
- Development of toolkit that defines resilience as informing concept for the indicators, that describes how indicators were developed, and which provides examples of how different communities adapt and use indicators;
- Develop synergies with key actors and institutions that work on resilience indicators.

Interested organisations: BI, KENWEB/LWF, UNU

Sub-Group 2: Multi-level Governance (proposal to entire IPSI)

- Approach networks of local governance on confluence of climate change, food production etc. with the aim of increasing the connectivity between local governments;
- Foster partnerships between local governments and communities to create horizontal connectivity (as opposed to the vertical hierarchy of governments);
- Linking global network with national, regional, and local networks;
- Share good practice examples to inform policy makers;

- Look for possible collaborative activities with institutions dealing with governance, such as IHDP;
- Draft paper on IPSI governance systems, including a matrix for comparison.
Interested organisations: KENWEB, Univ Cardiff (TBC)

Sub-Group 3: Disaster Risk Reduction, Adaptation, Restoration and Transformation

Short term:

- Sharing of experiences on landscape management (KENWEB);
- Web platform for sharing case studies (secretariat could facilitate);
- Exchange field visit (local, regional, IPSI - facilitated).

Medium term

- Collaborative research on developing model (Adaptation DRR) = IPSI member collaboration;
- Establish a seed fund facilitated by the IPSI membership to promote local level best practices in the form of small grants.

Long term

- Technical/Specialized workshops (knowledge, dissemination mechanisms);
- Long-term observatory data (engage universities, research organizations, citizen scientists, international organizations).

Interested organizations: KENWEB, HELP, UNNAYAN ONNESHAN, ENCSD

WORKING GROUP 2: Sharing Experiences of Restoring SEPLs

Facilitators: Yoko Watanabe and Krishna Chandra Paudel

Rapporteurs: Jady Smith and Robert Blasiak

List of Presenters

12. Yoko Watanabe (GEF Secretariat)
13. Manabu Ittou/Takashi Yamaguchi (Asahi Kasei Corporation / Nobeoka City)
14. Tsubasa Iwabuchi (Graduate School of Life Sciences, Tohoku University / CEPA Japan, Earthwatch Institute – Japan)
15. Prasert Trakansuphakon (Indigenous Knowledge and Peoples Network - IKAP)
16. Lalita Siri wattanananon (Institute of Environment Rehabilitation and Conservation – ERECON)
17. Sarjoh G.N.H. Fatajoh (Ministry of Forestry and Environment, Gambia)
18. Stella Gama (Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment and Energy, Malawi)
19. Dennis Garrity / Joseph Tanui (World Agroforestry Centre – ICRAF)
20. Chan Saruth (Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Cambodia)

5. Short summary of the WG Session

Over the period of two days (13-14 March 2012), the members of the working group session met for presentations, discussions and strategic planning. A total of 9 presentations were made by IPSI members during this period and served as a basis for further discussion of the needs/challenges, strategies and actions within this broad thematic area. In order to facilitate discussion and maximize the output of the working group, two sub-groups were formed to address the topic from the (1) Global Level; (2) Country Level. Based on the discussions during these sub-groups, a presentation broken down according to each topic was prepared for the plenary. In the following, the needs/challenges, strategies and actions are summarized. When possible, potential lead organisations are indicated and can help to guide collaboration on the various listed actions within the partnership.

6. Needs and Challenges Identified during the Working Group Session

Sub-Group 1: Global Level

- Guidelines and Simple Definitions;
- Public Awareness and Understanding;
- Multi-stakeholder Dialogue;
- Mainstreaming in Key Policies;

- Identify Targets / Indicators / Monitoring Systems for Results;
- Identify Diverse/Potential Funding Mechanisms;
- Synergies with other Rio Conventions [climate change; land degradation, etc].

Sub-Group 2: Country Level

- Capacity development of Civil Society and Local Institutions;
- Technology skills, knowledge and funding;
- Restoration of specific landscapes;
- SEPL is not clear;
- Identify and categorize SEPL Links to traditional knowledge and adaptation ;
- Awareness raising;
- Livelihoods and market;
- Support measures – management plans, by-laws;
- Move towards action plans.

7. Strategies

- Knowledge, information research;
- Mainstreaming of SEPL approaches into the national policies;
- Resources;
- Restoring SEPL actions;
- Capacity - cross-cutting;
- Promoting Resilience;
- Livelihoods and markets from SEPL;
- Monitoring.

8. Actions (potential lead organizations in parentheses)

Sub-Group 1: Global Level

Further Conceptualize/Define the Satoyama

- Strategy and Action Plan Development (*IPSI Secretariat – started*)
- Guidelines on SEPL management, including for tropical forests (*ITTO*)
- Glossary of terms (*IPSI Secretariat*)
- Certification mechanism for SEPLs

Development of a Communications Strategy (*IPSI Advisory Group on Communications/Secretariat – closely coordinate with the strategy development*)

- Satoyama Branding (*private sector members*)
- Social Media (*IPSI Secretariat*)
- Marketplace

Assessment/Study on Potential Funding Opportunities for SEPLs (IPSI Secretariat)

Development of Monitoring System

- Toolkit for monitoring implementation and results of SEPL at project, country, and global levels (*ITTO/ICRAF/SCBD/Bioversity International and other members?*)

Sub-Group 2: Country Level

- **Mainstreaming SEPL concepts**
 - Sensitization,
 - Media,
 - Policy makers (workshops),
 - NBSAP team,
 - Financing agencies,
 - Training & education,
 - Community organisations,
 - Implementation.
- **Promoting Resilience in SEPL**
 - Vulnerability and Disaster Preparedness,
 - Response & communication,
 - Local coping strategies,
 - Local level disaster plans,
 - Community mobilisation.
- **Sustainable use & benefits from SEPL**
 - Identify potential products & payment for ecosystem services,
 - Identify users & beneficiaries,
 - Resources (technology, capacity),
 - Market (certification, economies of scale etc)

5. Conclusion

Based on this exercise, each of the lead agencies will develop a collaborative activities proposal to be presented to the IPSI Steering Committee at their next meeting. As appropriate, they can also initiate the activities in coordination with the IPSI Secretariat in line with their own capacities. At the country level, the mainstreaming activities are considered a priority area, among others, and will be initiated through the CBD focal points using the NBSAP revision process as appropriate. The IPSI Secretariat and CBD Secretariat can facilitate/coordinate with national governments on the NBSAP revision process. For other country-level actions listed here, the IPSI members could pursue them through developing appropriate and relevant projects based on their capacity and existing opportunities. For the global level actions, it is expected that the lead agencies report back to the Steering Committee on their progress in executing their plans.

WORKING GROUP 3: Revitalizing local communities through enhancing traditional knowledge and empowering young successors

Facilitators: Anil Kumar and Yoji Natori

Rapporteurs: C. Isabella Bovolo, Conrad Feather

List of Presenters

21. C. Isabella Bovolo (Iwolrama International Center for Rainforest Cons & Dev; Guyana)
22. Mangal Man Shakya (Wildlife Watch Group; Nepal)
23. Tran Thi Hoa (CIRUM; Vietnam)
24. Dayuan Xue (Minzu University; China)
25. Marie Kaerlein (German Association of Landcare)
26. Inocencio E. Buot, Jr. (Univ. of the Philippines Open University)
27. Comments and additional inputs: Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana National Biodiversity Committee)
28. N. Anil Kumar (M S Swaminathan Res. Foundation; India)
29. Conrad Feather (Forest Peoples Programme)
30. William Olupot (Nature and Livelihoods; Uganda)
31. Salvatore Arico (UNESCO)
32. Kentaro Wakao (Network for Coexistence with Nature; Japan)
33. Written contribution: Koji Nakamura and Setsuko Nakayama (Kanazawa Univ.; Japan)

9. Short summary of the WG Session

Over the period of two days (13-14 March 2012), the members of the working group session met for presentations, discussions and strategic planning. A total of 12 oral presentations (and one written contribution) were made by IPSI members during this period and served as a basis for further discussion of the needs/challenges, strategies and actions within this broad thematic area. Based on discussions, a presentation was prepared for the plenary and under each heading a number of sub-headings were identified in order to facilitate discussion and action. In the following, the needs/challenges, strategies and actions are summarized. When possible, potential lead organisations were suggested, and these can help to guide collaboration on the various listed actions within the partnership.

10. Needs and Challenges Identified During the Working Group Session

During the working group, we had 12 rich presentations and one written contribution. In these and discussions following the presentations, we identified needs and challenges in following categories.

Land Use Change

1. Unsustainable practices by external actors and threats from extractive industries (mining/infrastructure/charcoal etc);
2. Rapid degradation of landscapes (e.g. forest);
3. Immediate subsistence needs of local people often force them to use resources unsustainably;
4. Lack of alternative sustainable livelihoods for income generation (e.g. tourism/agro forestry);
5. Impact of unpredictable climate events (drought, flooding etc).

Social and Cultural Changes (demography/migration, etc.)

6. Lack of Incentives for youths to stay in communities / carry on way of life / sustainable land use management practices;
7. Population increases/decreases through emigration (esp. youth), or family growth;
8. Loss of cultural heritage/practices/way of life through development, abandonment of livelihoods (evictions, shifts of livelihood modes, introduction of inappropriate technologies/systems);
9. Younger generation disproportionately affected by communicable diseases (e.g. HIV), resulting in lack of successors.

Research Needs

10. Identification of good land-management practices including understanding of processes taking place in each environment and how to replicate or bridge these local experiences;
11. Lack of assessment of ecosystem services;
12. Lack of case studies/best practice identification.

Policy / Laws

13. Incorporation of scales – local to regional/national/global levels;
14. Resolving land-conflicts related to ownership and use (unsustainable resource use from commercial pressures etc);
15. Policy development at local/national/global scale for PES schemes need to resolve underlying land-tenure conflicts;
16. Rights to natural resource management of women/marginal groups not respected.

Knowledge Inheritance / Transfer

17. Transferring program expertise to local actors (knowledge, technologies, practices, innovations, etc.);
18. Capturing traditional knowledge before being lost;
19. Need to protect and respect indigenous languages in knowledge transfer.

Finance Mechanisms

20. Lack of, and or securing funding;
21. Lack of markets for local products.

11.Strategies

Likewise, strategies to address the needs and challenges identified above were discussed.

Education / Empowerment / Capacity Building

1. Education/empowerment of youth – including natural resource management and traditional knowledge/skills complementing traditional knowledge with new scientific methods;
2. Capacity building / empowerment of youth through education / opportunities / inspiration;
3. Support for local activists and leaders for their own environmental initiatives;
4. Documentation of land use/ practices through community mapping and land use plans (to resolve land-conflicts etc.).

Policy and Rights

5. More dialogue with communities/local authorities / national government (can then make appropriate laws);
6. Treating communities as owners not stakeholders to ensure ownership of resource management;
7. Handing over/involving communities in management of protected areas to local communities and traditional resource users;
8. Legal respect and recognition of customary knowledge and land-rights (ownership and use);
9. Agreements with local communities about resource management.

Promoting Sustainable Land Use Practices

10. Development of green-management and agricultural practices, e.g. wood burning/charcoal alternatives/tree planting/agro-forestry systems and soil management practices;
11. Identification and development of sustainable land-management practices (e.g. fire) or restoration where appropriate;
12. Introduction of appropriate agricultural strategies to promote sustainable use of SEPLs.

Research Gaps

13. Monitoring environment – for communication purposes between communities and government, for scientific purposes (knowledge of systems/processes);
14. Targeted research to support all actions (e.g. best practice case studies).

Valuing Traditional Knowledge and Cultural Identity

15. Recognition of traditional knowledge by local authorities/governments can help revitalise TK and local identity (text books/health posts etc);
16. Integration of traditional knowledge/language in informal education, and where possible, in formal system of education;
17. Identification of needs and appropriate financing of these (e.g. alternative power sources/ small scale incentives for resource users);
18. Document traditional knowledge by trained youth (inside or outside of communities); e.g., Kikigaki program (also IPSI CA) and People’s Biodiversity Registers (India);
19. Develop links /networks; share experiences and replicate good practice in other areas;
20. Be open to adaptation where necessary.

Funding

21. Co-sponsorship of projects, get financing for projects, identify and provide incentives for good land management schemes;
22. Increase sustainable income generating practices/adding value to local products; e.g. marketing of local products/labelling systems/certifications, ecotourism.

12.Actions

We identified following as priority actions. We invite interested members to take the role of lead organization in any of these.

Information Synthesis and Dissemination

1. Comprehensive identification and assessment of SEPLs with strategic partners, including, but not limited to UNESCO, FAO-GIAHS
2. Targeted research to highlight good practice and key themes (e.g. what makes SEPL management successful, how to engage youth)
3. Effective dissemination of information on collaborative activities.

Policy / Strategic Approach

4. Promote these lessons in broader policy processes at local, national, regional and global levels

5. Strategic co-operation with other networks, e.g., UNESCO MAB, World Heritage, etc.
6. Multi-stakeholder cooperation to promote information sharing and advocacy on key issues (land use/extractive industries/land-rights etc.)

On-the-Ground Action

7. Promote knowledge facilitation programs that are already being practiced in different countries (e.g., UNU (existing CA#12))

IPSI-2 Public Forum Working Group Sessions

During the IPSI-2 Public Forum, participants will separate into three different working groups as described below. Following a first day of presentations, during the second day facilitators and participants will discuss and work together to address the following three issues: (1) needs and challenges identified during the working group session, (2) strategies, (3) corresponding actions. By the end of the Public Forum, each working group will prepare a draft action plan that describes specific actions (maximum of 3 per group), which can be taken to address the needs and challenges identified earlier. IPSI member organizations will then be encouraged to develop and propose collaborative activities in line with the action plans developed during the working group sessions.

Working Group 1: Capturing and promoting resilience in SEPLs including Disaster Risk Management

Facilitators: Wanja Dorothy Nyingi (KENWEB); Fumiko Fukuoka (UNDP)

Description: SEPLs are those landscapes which have been formed and maintained through long-term interaction between humans and nature. To maintain or revitalize SEPLs, it is crucial to understand communities' as well as ecosystems' resilience in the landscape using measurable indicators. Under this theme, a set of indicators on resilience in SEPLs developed through an IPSI collaborative activity will be presented and participants' input for further fine-tuning will be solicited. This session will also discuss dynamic relationships between SEPLs and natural disaster risk management. Participants will discuss how damages from natural disaster risks (e.g. droughts, floods, unpredictable weather patterns, etc.) can be reduced through fostering community and ecological resilience at SEPLs. Additional indicators to internalize disaster risk management in developing resilient SEPLs can be proposed. This group will also discuss how to promote the application of this set of indicators, consolidate the results of application, and share through IPSI networks and beyond."

Working Group 2: Sharing experiences of restoring SEPLs

Facilitators: Krishna Chandra Paudel (Government of Nepal); Yoko Watanabe (GEF SEC)

Description: Many SEPLs around the world are at risk for one reason or another. Some SEPLs are overexploited or not sustainably managed due to expanding populations. Others have been degraded due to abandonment resulting from depopulation. In other areas, SEPLs have been devastated by natural disasters and are in critical need of being restored in order to regain biodiversity and to restart the livelihoods of people living there. In this session, participants are expected to bring and share their own experiences of restoring SEPLs. Through the exercise, participants will explore what kind of contributions we could make as IPSI for the restoration of SEPLs around the world.

Working Group 3: Revitalizing local communities through enhancing traditional knowledge and empowering young successors

Facilitators: Anil Kumar (M S Swaminathan Research Foundation); Yoji Natori (CI)

Description: As a response to growing crises in today's world, there has been increasing support for transitioning to a green economy, which would require not only significant changes to urban lifestyles, but also vibrant and resource-efficient local communities. But local communities around the world are undergoing fundamental changes: some socio-ecological production landscapes (SEPLs) are being abandoned and traditional ecological knowledge is being lost due to a lack of potential successors. A variety of factors have been suggested for this lack of successors, including rural to urban migration, changing social structures, and economic stresses of an increasingly globalised world. In this session, participants will share their insight into the underlying reasons for the lack of successors and the associated implications for SEPLs in local communities as well as the larger objective of transitioning to a green economy. They will also discuss innovative ways to maintain or enhance vitality of local communities and lessons learned in ensuring that natural resources are used in a sustainable manner.