



A road map for African protected areas: act now!

As you recall, our roadmap for African Protected Areas (PA) - see the full document on www.papaco.org and NAPA newsletter n°53 - focuses on three main axes to lead us towards **healthy, efficient and sustainable protected areas**.

The previous NAPA newsletter (in May) presented briefly the three directions that are included in the first axe: **healthy PA**. The current newsletter targets the second axe: **efficient PA**. The last axe will be presented in details in the next newsletter (NAPA n°55), in July. Then in September, the NAPA n°56 will present a synthesis of all your reactions, ideas, comments, proposals... received about this roadmap and how to better implement it for more sustainable and efficient results. Please, continue to share your opinion and ideas...



Healthy =
transparent
governance
and
integrity of
the territory



Efficient =
modern
management
and
responsible
managers



Sustainable =
long-term
ambition and
the rich
biodiversity
secured forever

Second axe: efficient PA

Because modern management is based on competent, responsible managers who use effective tools to achieve measurable results

Direction 4: promote greater sense of responsibility among managers

Managers are major conservation actors and should follow realistic and pragmatic objectives (set out in the management plan) and revised on the basis of regular evaluation according to means available and the support obtained. We need to recognize the level of efficiency of their decisions and the quality of the results they produce to valorize their role in conservation or, if necessary, to correct their failure.

The mission of a protected area's manager, whatever his professional status may be, is to preserve the natural heritage he is in charge of. We could probably compare him to a museum curator, whose role is to ensure that the works of art not only remain in place, but are also well-conserved over time, and if possible, presented to the largest public. Would this curator keep his job if, later, an assessment would reveal that the number of works of art contained in the museum is

decreasing, and those remaining are in poor condition, if not deteriorated. No, for sure not. And yet, how many park managers are evaluated at the end of their mandate and, if necessary, punished or rewarded? None of them, or very exceptionally. And this happens although we know that in some parks and reserves, conservation is clearly unsuccessful, including in maintaining decent numbers of emblematic species for which, much often, significant means are devoted to. Some park managers continue their career from one site to another, with the same results and yet, no measure is taken.

This is the best way to discourage the people who do work, to demotivate those who are committed and to perpetuate failures and poor practices. Today, the manager has to be put right in the center of the management process. This function has to be redefined and standards of competence, seriousness, commitment and motivation established (adapted to each PA management category, of course). The manager should not be the one deciding on what will be done or not, obviously (see direction 1 related to boards of directors) as we know that choices have to be structured around a **management plan** developed in a participatory manner. But his work should be clearly defined in this management plan, linked to the context (of course, this context has to be taken into account for any further assessment), and regularly evaluated in order, if necessary, to be reoriented, enhanced or controlled. The manager cannot be accountable for everything, but if it is advisable to better reward him for his successes, it is logical and fair to also evaluate his weaknesses.



The fourth direction proposed by the road map therefore deals with the need to rehabilitate the function of "park director". On the basis of a clear and realistic mission (therefore the urgent priority of adapted management plans in all PA!), this function should be regularly monitored with tools enabling to evaluate management effectiveness (these tools already exist and are easy to gather). These transparent, available evaluations... should then result in decisions on management, and some of these decisions will concern managers themselves and will allow for their recognition, gratification or, if necessary and appropriate, sanction.

Direction 5: reinforce the competence of management structures

For more robust governance and more effective management, the structures in charge of PAs must identify their strengths and weaknesses then propose ways and gather means to remedy them, as necessary, (change of status, hiring new profiles and new skills, training, especially of young rural people close to the PA, share tasks with more competent partners...) and engage in a virtuous cycle of progress, measurable on the basis of delivered results.

PA management structures (working at the national level generally) are relatively diverse (ministerial departments, offices, agencies, public service delegation, partnership with other sectors including private...) and very often, they have been developed as a result of an “environmental fashion” or the wishes of donors. It is quite rare to find, in a specific situation of means, culture, and competencies... a structure built to better suit to the main PA

conservation objectives. In the absence of advantages or drawbacks analysis, a model replaces another one, and most of the time the changes are not conducted entirely (notably in terms of staff profile which remains the same, with the same attributions, with the same people...). And yet, before reforming (which implies many changes that will often take long to be put in place), it is relevant to explore how to strengthen what exists, rarely enhanced at its maximum. Lessons learnt from other countries, experience sharing, research or development of new competencies, evolution of recruitment modes, openness to local stakeholders to encourage and/or improve local acceptance of parks, improved decision-making processes and transparency of choices (with, as an absolute priority, eradication of corruption and arbitrary decisions), enhancement of professional careers, adapted rules and regulations, research of new useful partnerships, prioritization of missions and delegation of secondary tasks when relevant... there is a whole range of transformations that would enable to rapidly improve the efficiency of these structures and overcome inertia, when it is not just plain archaism.

Our approach cannot be to impose a model on States because contexts, means, stories, capacities are too different from one country to the next. Rather, we must strengthen these structures in order to improve their effectiveness, which therefore will have to be evaluated and rewarded or sanctioned (see the previous direction).

The fifth direction proposed by the road map is therefore a circumstantial evolution of the structures in charge of PAs. It will aim towards creating a change in dynamics towards more results in terms of conservation, results that will be evaluated to serve as the basis for future changes. Thus this is a process for self-maintained progress that should allow for the revolution of work habits and thinking modes for the considered structure.



Direction 6: develop the managerial capacity of all stakeholders

We need to adopt, among all partners involved, a business-like approach, aimed at conserving the values of the PA, while relying on a framework (the management plan), methods and knowledge that are robust and easily accessible and with quality standards for measurable results.

Beyond the managers and management structures, the expected improvements must target all the stakeholders involved in and around PAs (local populations, their representatives, the private sector, administrations, army and paramilitary, justice, development partners...). Focused on the conservation of the territory's resources, these

ameliorations should enable us to associate all partners in order to improve their results. This is not simply about consultation, information, experience sharing... but actually about collaboration, synergy, common objectives. The management plan should therefore meet this challenge that consists in making actors with diverging interests work together for a common purpose. Awareness raising (direction 2), decision sharing (direction 1), broad consultation (direction 3)... will all contribute to achieve this goal. However we have to go further down this road: we must first make sure that all partners have and share enough useful and usable knowledge for well-informed decision making (the research and science developed in the PA must therefore be adapted to this objective).

Second, we should propose milestones, standards and practical guidance to improve the field understanding of all stakeholders (and end the so-called management between “specialists” that excludes local actors from decisions). Finally, we eventually have to set up systems for monitoring and evaluating the impacts of the actions taken, in order to reorient them if needed, but also and mostly to develop results-oriented culture, get rid of corruption and allow successes to be known and to motivate new progresses. These monitoring and evaluation tools can easily be developed on the basis of the shared CMAP framework on management effectiveness.

The sixth direction offered by the road map is thus structured around the notions of results-oriented values, management standards, progress and accountability for all PA actors. It replaces (once again) the management plan as an essential tool for sharing objectives and methods, and as a common foundation to build better management to which all stakeholders will contribute. It reminds us of the need for adapted and relevant knowledge for decision-making and solid frames of reference to measure the impacts of our decisions and guide our choices.



The few steps proposed in this road map provide an **initial framework** to direct our **ambitions, choices, and strategies** towards **stronger and more effective protected areas, acknowledged and recognized** in the **green list**. **Build on this framework, innovate and communicate... share your experiences, ideas, and wishes or expectations...** on the following address: geoffroy.mauvais@iucn.org

The NAPA newsletter n°56 (September 2012) will publish your comments and the new website of the partnership for protected areas and conservation: www.papaco.org will continue to follow our progresses towards success, month by month.

Sensitization on environment conservation (direction 2 of the Road Map): an example in Madagascar...

Environmental Education for a Sustainable Development (EESD): the quest for a trigger for local governance of natural resources

By Morgane Deveaux-Andriananja / Séverine Berthet-Blanchais – NGO « homme et Environnement »

Internationally, the concept of environmental education was first mentioned in 1992, during the « Earth Summit » in Rio de Brazil. The EEDD was boosted in 2005 with the kick-off of the United Nation decade of Education for sustainable development by UNESCO. Human race being at the root of the massive overexploitation of resources and degradation of living habitats during the last decades, UNESCO states: « it is in human minds that environment degradation was born, therefore it has to be in human mind that Environment defense shall raise »

We are not referring any more only to environmental preservation but more widely to the interdependency among living entities. Environmental education is nowadays a major subject in social sciences and human ecology.



Training material finds its own way to reach the trainees...

In Madagascar, hotspot of global biodiversity, the NGO Man and the Environment (MATE) has been looking for almost 10 years now after several experimental reserves, with the aim to increase knowledge on habitats, protect ecosystems, and sustainably manage natural resources. Running that kind of projects, involving local communities in protected areas with many endangered species and a high level of human pressure, requires a collective

awareness of the need for protecting biodiversity, and to settle a common project.

In its missions, the staff of MATE is facing a wide diversity of stakeholders (and audiences), which need to be federated around the main objective of environmental conservation.

Therefore, setting up EESD activities and appropriated strategies of facilitation become more and more crucial in the intervention programs. Educational vocation of the NGO has been implemented from the start; however it is only over the last months that a systematic inventory of means, methods, tools and target populations of EESD was set up, alongside a specific program called "Knowledge of Biodiversity".



Reforestation is part of the program

A first internal survey (with the contribution of Malagasy partner-association 2HY-Faire Lien providing facilitators for EESD) highlighted some specific and important issues for the NGO:

- (1) The need to improve the collection and management of information, maintenance of botanical conservatories, availability and sharing of technical and scientific data
- (2) The formalization of environmental mediation tools that is simple, effective, and easily adaptable.

(3) The need for training and capacity building of stakeholders, who will need to develop skills of education in a transmission process.

(4) Taking into account the diversity of audiences, and being able to manage this diversity, various levels of involvement and ability to learn.

All these parameters should allow us to develop a model of research and actions that will help the NGO to react to ecological and social problems; this must be done using a collaborative learning approach bringing together formal education networks (particularly in terms of primary education), MATE staff, local communities, national and international visitors, to work for knowledge, protection and improvement of the environment.

The teams involved in EESD activities are therefore informing and implicating audiences using four types of mediation:

- A multidisciplinary scientific approach
- Heritage and artistic mediation (local traditions, working alongside artists)
- An interactive and practical approach
- An intercultural approach: sharing and openness towards others for a better understanding of individual and collective responsibilities

Our holistic approach in the specific field of EESD is based on traditions or artistic mediation to bring out a feeling, an emotion, that will develop personal ownership of ideas by using sensitivity, imagination, poetic expression, aesthetic ... Artists and elders are indeed guides and useful allies to move towards a new communion between man and nature, at the crossroads of tradition and innovation.

Many of our education tools are based on values or elements coming from the Malagasy culture (fihavanana / "harmony", use of Ohabolana / "proverbs" in communication materials ...). Beside their input in terms of EESD, they also contribute to give traditional practices (synonymous with wisdom, responsibility and harmony with our environment) a major position in our actions.

Planting a tree, playing a game, drawing and coloring, expressing one's creativity and sensitivity ...

all these forms of participation put us in active position.

The recent use of multimedia and IT was also successful in mobilizing and implicating the youth for educational activities.

To create and develop a sustainable change of behavior is to lead an individual to confront himself with his own perceptions and views, in order to strengthen his commitment to sustainable development. Moreover, setting up opportunities for exchange, sharing of ideas, discovery of oneself and others, awareness of the uniqueness of our perspective and our responsibility, are guarantees of success for the emergence of a new form of citizenship.



Our tools and method aim to solve specific obstacles and problems that may happen when dealing with local communities and stakeholders:

- Illiteracy, which reaches 58.9% in rural areas.
- Poverty: a vast majority of people in our intervention areas live in extreme poverty. Their actions are therefore often guided by the need to satisfy immediate survival needs.
- The relationship with occidental concept of time: the time scale is also a problem to overcome, and we need to help communities developing medium / long term

projects.

- Ignorance: some children living on the edge of the forest only go there to cut down wood for cooking their own food. They never had the opportunity to walk around and observe species that are the pride of their island and are observed every year by thousands of visitors!

- Fatalism and denial: those involved in the fight against poaching or deforestation feel sometimes helpless looking at disappearances of species. Very often, they try to convince themselves that the Malagasy proverb stating that «the eastern forests will remain forever! " is true, and that existing deforestation and erosion phenomena all over the island will not affect their forest. Paradoxically, the fact that forests in our intervention areas are still so rich in endangered species is playing against them: it's difficult to accept that this balance is fragile as the forest looks always the same, to realize the

uniqueness and rarity of what we see on every path...

- Resignation: teachers are confronted every day with great material and intellectual difficulties to accomplish their jobs, with very little support from the administration. In such a situation, it is difficult or impossible to ask them to do more. Malagasy teachers are already trying their best to be able to teach the official program, so it is impossible to ask them to set up extra activities about nature discovery.

Alongside these various problems, it is very difficult to fund actions that can take various shapes, and we also need to be careful about language or illustration issues that need to be adapted on every area. Therefore, the challenge is to produce simple tools, easily replicable and modifiable. Mobilizing staff and various educational resources also aims to limit costs of intervention, and to establish a sustainable culture of communication and sharing about preservation of landscapes and lifestyles among the staff of MATE and local communities.

All these obstacles must be overcome by one, and one can imagine we are talking here about a long and difficult process.

These fundamental issues are definitely one of the main priorities of the organization for the years to come. Our EESD project deals with learning over one's lifetime, and put us in a position of committed stakeholders for learning and acting together.



A booklet to inform people on local lemurs

More information on:
www.madagascar-environnement.com

*Towards a better governance at all levels: an illustration of the **third direction** of the Road-Map...*

What ambition for Rio+20?

(issued from the IDDRI's newsletter n°29)

To mark the 20th anniversary of the Earth Summit, the United Nations General Assembly has decided to organize the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, known as Rio +20, in Rio de Janeiro from 20 to 22 June 2012.

The cooperation initiated in 1992 in order to meet global and national challenges must be reviewed in the light of trade liberalization, the rise of the emerging countries, the multiple crises, especially in the industrialized countries, and the wider range of forms of citizen mobilization. The aim in June is to define a roadmap for the next 20 years, drawing lessons from the past and taking into account a context that has dramatically changed.

The challenge of this meeting is to reassert the shared commitment to sustainable development and to work together to develop the means to achieve this. There are many obstacles. Economic development that is as predatory as ever, coupled with population growth, has derailed the implementation of the Rio commitments. Now the very concept of sustainable development is the subject of increasingly harsh criticism.

The global governance that appeared to be taking shape in Rio now seems out of reach. The reassertion of national sovereignty, a redefinition of democratic fora at different levels, and the weakening of the multilateral system all call for a new project that will not, however, be possible in Rio.

The key outcome expected of this conference is a policy statement signed by the Heads of State setting the common framework for the transition to an economically efficient, socially equitable and environmentally sustainable society. Several specific initiatives should be launched, including the creation of a Global Sustainable Development Council within the United Nations, the reform of UNEP, the definition of sustainable development goals inspired by the Millennium Development Goals and the establishment of an agreement on the high seas.

In the last days before the summit, negotiations are still focusing on key points of the policy statement, and there are some major differences of opinion

concerning the two specific themes chosen: the “green economy” and the “institutional framework for sustainable development”. The G77, which is showing signs of breaking up, is hesitant about the subject of the green economy. It sees it as a manoeuvre to restrict growth in developing countries or to generate trade barriers. This is a concern of developing countries rather than a unifying theme for the international community. These G77 reservations are supported by a growing number of NGOs.

The debates on international governance focus first on achieving institutional coherence between the three pillars of sustainable development and, secondly, on strengthening the environmental pillar.

Indeed, the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development, established in 1992, has failed to function in an effective manner, to mobilize the institutions responsible for economic matters (World Bank, IMF, WTO) or to impose itself within the United Nations system as the strategic framework for the formulation and assessment of sustainable development policies at all levels.

Two options for reform are currently being discussed: a) the creation of a Sustainable Development Council, whose members would include not only States, but also the major groups of civil society actors; and b) strengthening ECOSOC (the Economic and Social Council), or perhaps a combination of the two.

The weakness observed due to the fragmentation of the international environmental system is now widely acknowledged. The EU, and in particular Germany and France, supports the idea of upgrading UNEP to a specialised United Nations agency, on a par with UNESCO, FAO or WHO, with universal participation, compulsory contributions and a higher budget. But several States, especially the United States, Canada, Russia, Japan and key members of the Group of 77 such as India, would be satisfied with a simple strengthening of UNEP. Africa, which is in favour of the first option, will play a decisive role in the final decision.

In addition to the two themes initially chosen, two new topics have found their place over the course of the different meetings: oceans and sustainable development goals (SDGs).

Twenty years after adoption of the Chapter 17 of the Agenda 21 on oceans, it is obvious that the state of marine environment has kept on deteriorating; land-based pollution and the long-lasting depletion of

resources constitute the most striking illustrations of this deterioration. Suffering from a governance both incomplete and fragmented, marine areas located beyond national jurisdictions (international waters for instance) have received a particular attention during the preparations of Rio +20. In this regard, one of the most significant measures of the summit could be a political agreement allowing the opening of negotiations, within the UN General Assembly, for a legal instrument dealing specifically with the protection of biodiversity in these areas which represent 64% of the total surface of seas and oceans. However, recent preparatory discussions show profound differences between states on the need for such an instrument

During the negotiations leading up to Rio+20, Colombia and Guatemala put forward the idea that the conference could be the opportunity to launch a process to adopt Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), whose objective would be to establish a path to sustainable development based on universal quantified and/or qualitative targets for the medium and long term. These SDGs should cover the three dimensions of sustainable development in a certain number of sectors in order to guide government action in accordance with the national circumstances and priorities of each country and their respective capacities.

Today, discussions focus on the articulation of these SDGs with the Millennium Development Goals, which are specific to developing countries and expire in 2015, as well as on the procedure for setting SDGs (intergovernmental according to the G77, extended to non-governmental according to the EU).

Alongside the UN negotiations, in which civil society participates indirectly, the Brazilian government has decided to mobilize all civil society actors through an on-line consultation process covering 10 topics: sustainable development to combat poverty; sustainable development as a response to the economic and financial crisis; unemployment, decent work and migration; the economics of sustainable development, including sustainable patterns of consumption and production; forests; food security and nutrition; sustainable energy for all; water; sustainable cities and innovation; and oceans. A voting system will be used to select 10 recommendations that will be discussed from 16 to 19 June in Rio. Further to these civil society consultations, three recommendations per subject will be conveyed to the Heads of State and Government during the high-level segment.

The range of subjects covered by the summit and what is signed in Rio will influence most other international negotiations.

Rio+20 is the opportunity to update the view of economic development, the recognition of the limitations of the approach to sustainable development and the deadlocks of current development. This should translate into the definition of the responsibility of States and of economic actors in the management of global affairs (climate, biodiversity, security, health, etc.) and in the establishment of a roadmap for the reform of the global governance system, including the United Nations. But a roadmap that does not specify implementation methods and tools is likely to have only a symbolic influence incapable of initiating the path change urgently needed. The real risk of Rio is one of disappointment, which would legitimate the "blind" preference for the short term and for inertia. It would vindicate the skepticism surrounding our collective ability to plan our common destiny. But what the world really needs is a spirit of invention and a belief in the power of change.

Take part in the thematic discussion led by **Laurence Tubiana** on "sustainable development as a response to the economic and financial crisis": www.riodialogues.org

More on:

<http://www.iddri.org/Publications/Collections/Lettre-de-l'Iddri/The-Newsletter-n-29>

JOBS

IUCN-ESARO (Nairobi) is recruiting a **Senior Programme Officer- Protected Areas** (2 year contract)

Based in IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office, Nairobi, Kenya, the PO will in particular coordinate and provide technical input to IUCN's protected area

projects in the region, and coordinates day-to-day implementation of projects work plans, help identify and contract technical experts to implement the projects, provide administrative and logistical support to projects implementation, etc.

He (she) should have an advanced degree in natural science related to Conservation/Protected areas or related fields, at least 5 years of relevant working experience in the eastern and southern Africa region and familiarity with established and emerging protected areas and biodiversity conservation approaches and policies in the region, project management experience, including management of donor grants and donor relations, technical and financial reporting, monitoring and evaluation, experience in capacity building activities, including training on environment-related issues, demonstrated ability to work as part of a team and communicate in a cross-cultural environment, excellent verbal and communication skills in English, with ability to communicate in French and/or Portuguese as an added advantage.

Deadline: 1st July 2012

More info and candidature on www.iucn.org/esaro

Training on PA management

IUCN-PAPACO, in partnership with the Senghor University (Alexandria, Egypt), organizes the fourth and fifth editions of its **University Diploma** on PA management in Africa. This training lasts 8 weeks and targets PA managers and their partners (NGOs, private sector...).

The course in West Africa will be organized in Ouagadougou from 8 October to 30 November 2012, while the one concerning Central Africa will be held in Gabon (with WCS) from 22 October to 14 December 2012. The course will be held in French.

You will be able to register directly on <http://continue.senghor.refer.org> from **15 June 2012**.

The deadline for inscription is 15 August 2012

NAPA – CONTACTS

geoffroy.mauvais@iucn.org
leo.niskanen@iucn.org
souleymane.konate@iucn.org
beatrice.chataigner@iucn.org
bora.masumbuko@iucn.org
youssouph.diedhiou@iucn.org
lacina.kone@iucn.org
thomas.bacha@iucn.org
arsene.sanon@iucn.org

African Protected Areas & Conservation – PACO/ESARO
Coordination - Program on Conservation Areas and Species Diversity – ESARO (CASD)
Coordination - Regional Program on Protected Areas – PACO (PAPACO)
Program Officer - Protected Areas Assessment - Trainings
Program Officer - Climat - Communication
Program Officer - World Heritage
Program Officer - Conservation Territories – Support to local NGOs
Program Officer - Small Grants for Conservation (PPI) – Support to local NGOs
Program Officer - Small Grants for Conservation (PPI) – Support to local NGOs

See www.papaco.org

The opinions expressed in this newsletter do not necessarily reflect those of IUCN