



NAPA

News from African Protected Areas



Nouvelles des Aires Protégées en Afrique

N°81
December 2014



Edito

Geoffroy MAUVAIS
PAPACO coordinator

Back from Sydney...

While the plane that takes me from Sydney to South Africa flies along the Antarctic continent under a glossy spring sun, I'm looking at the many icebergs floating on the ocean, small pristine buoys drifting towards their own end. This is the story of our world: everything has an end; ice like species, the only question is when.

The 6th World Parks Congress also has ended; it was on November the 19th in the evening. More than 6000 participants took part, coming from 170 countries, representing more or less all segments of our societies. It has been an incredible gathering of people interested in conservation. Some were there by opportunism, some by passion, some had no choice... but all gave the congress an unexpected strength and reach.

The Congress produced a statement: the promise of Sydney. Like all texts written by so many different people, speaking so many different languages and from so many different worlds, it is certainly far from perfect. But it gives us a beacon, an inspiration for the next decade in which everyone should be able to find something to guide our work now. We will come back in January to the content of this promise that you can already find online on www.iucn.org.

What interests me for the moment is the form that the congress took because this is quite indicative of current developments and will not be reflected in writings. Here after, I submit a few comments, but

they are mine and others have certainly experienced this huge meeting in other ways.

Firstly, the youth: at the conference in Durban, 10 years ago, Nelson Mandela recalled the urgency to get young people more involved in conservation, to build a better future. I have not seen much youth in Sydney. "Grey heads" continue to represent the bulk of the attendance. Lack of interest? I do not think so, but maybe this kind of formal meeting is not suited to a generation accustomed to rapid, straight and participatory exchanges. We should consider this ahead of the next edition...

Particularisms then. A conference in Australia could not fail to give a prominent place to "indigenous peoples", their rights and claims. It is good and quite legitimate, and it was done in a wonderful spirit of openness. However, I always worry when erecting the rights of some against those of others, notwithstanding the historical justification. The world is changing, it is global, even if it is imperfect and while we can't rewrite history, we can at least try to invent a better way ahead together.

"Other stakeholders": many participants were ultimately neither conservationists nor real actors of or contributors to protected areas. Coming from the industrial world, the private sector, donors, media, technology, social sciences... they participated actively (which is good) and by rebound effect, they relativized the place of conservation itself in debates (which is less good). The "species" approach for instance was almost absent, as if their current decline seemed already an accomplished fact. We should not accept that.

Note also, a major focus on extractive industries, and a good and honest participation of some of the

companies concerned. No sterile antagonisms and promising attempts at dialogue, without any naïve idealism but with a healthy dose of pragmatism.

Another issue brought to the forefront was funding for protected areas to ensure the sustainability of conservation. The Conservation Finance Alliance (CFA) had organized a pavilion that did not empty and addressed a wide variety of topics such as environmental trust funds... a topic not many of us were talking about a few years ago. Other pavilions were also incredibly extensively visited and vibrant, but it makes more sense because they were about the heart of our work, natural solutions, communities, healthy planet, Oceans... obviously our main topics of passion.



Some countries have clearly created the buzz. Australia of course who had invested heavily in the presentation of its work. Russia had an impressive stand and intends to organize the next congress in 2024. And France, who promoted extremely dynamically the original partnership it has with IUCN since 2005 and has allowed the Francophone community that visited the congress to always have a roof and a warm welcome. What about Africa? Sydney was not an easy destination: far away, expensive, a lot of red tape, the Ebola threat... Those who made the trip should be commended and ultimately, the continent was well represented in the sessions and on the stands, some like Madagascar, COMIFAC or PRCM's booths having strongly contributed to the conference's success.

Not forgetting of course our 22 "champions" (see

previous NAPA) who provided numerous presentations and transmitted to the Congress a testimony of success and hope from Africa. As it happens, this NAPA gives us the last two opuses of these inspiring stories...

The next congress is in 10 years!



Third promotion of the Master's degree on protected areas management

Direction 4 of the Road Map for African PAs

Twelve students coming from 11 African countries (Burkina Faso, Benin, Cameroon, Gabon, DRC, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, Mali, Senegal, Togo, Mauritania) are currently doing their second year at the master on PA management in Alexandria (Egypt), with the support of IUCN-Papaco. The course will end in June 2015.



The third promotion of the Master's degree on PA management, launched in 2009 by the Papaco



Twenty-two stories from Africa...

On the road to the World Park Congress!

The previous NAPA letter presented two sets of stories that our "champions" have presented during the Congress. This edition is about the two other sets: one speaks again about governance of protected areas and the other one is about results of conservation on the ground. You can read all the individual stories on www.papaco.org on the pages dedicated to the WPC.

Next month, we'll present the outcomes of the congress (the "promise of Sydney").

[More on www.papaco.org](http://www.papaco.org)

Models of shared governance in francophone Africa: how to best integrate local population for conservation?

Directions 1 to 3 of the Road Map for African PAs

By Binta BA (Senegal), Joseph ITONGWA (DRC), Alexis KABORE (Burkina Faso), Jean Bruno NGOUGNOGBIA (Centrafrique), Salatou SAMBOU (Senegal)

Introduction

In francophone Africa, many protected areas (PA) were created after independence according to a single model of repressive governance, centralized by the government. This model excluded all other stakeholders from the governance of PAs, particularly those living in and around the parks. It may have been able to protect some ecosystems but it is highly criticised for being quite inefficient and for having terrible social consequences (expropriation, prohibition to use natural resources, etc.). Continual conflicts between authorities and local communities led to a fast decrease of these countries' biodiversity and one should thus wonder about means to improve the relations between parks authorities and local communities to promote a better governance of conservation in these countries. How to bring communities living in and around PAs to become fully responsible for their environment?

To answer to these questions, one should necessarily base its reflection on lessons learnt from

the failure of the system but also on the success of innovative approaches so as to build solid foundations for a new PAs' governance and to promote both long-term conservation and local population wellbeing.

Aware of the necessity to change the management of their conservation areas, some stakeholders of African francophone countries have put in place new models of governance promoting the empowerment of local communities. The centralised management of PAs used not to take sufficient account of socio-cultural aspects (sacred and cultural sites, place of worship, etc.) and traditional knowledge of the communities in the creation and management of PAs.



Local community in DRC

Today, the quality of PA's governance mostly depends of the effective and fair involvement of all the stakeholders impacted by and impacting the management of PAs. This needs putting in place tools to involve local populations and to ensure the representativeness of all the different stakeholders into the decision-making institutions and their empowerment in the PA's management. This is what this paper tends to show by displaying stories of innovative (marine and terrestrial) PA's governance processes that integrate a new diversity of actors.

The stories

This innovative approach of PA's governance is illustrated by five examples presented by people coming from western and central Africa. The main lesson learnt from these stories is that PA's governance can be of many shape but its quality mainly depends of the processes put in place to involve local communities in decision making and of the valorisation of local knowledge.

This is the case in **DRC** (Joseph Itongwa) where ICCA (Indigenous people and Communities Conserved territories and Areas), that support local people to become fully responsible of their own natural resources, are gradually being recognised by the government. It is also the case in **Burkina Faso** (Alexis Kabore). where Controlled Hunting Zones (CHZ) have been created around villages by the Association for Wildlife and development (Association Faune et Développement au Burkina – AFAUDEB). In the **Central African Republic** (CAR), the development of tools usable by local population such as participatory mapping (Jean Bruno Ngoungobia) takes advantage of social, cultural and historical knowledge of local people and promotes the communities' right to manage their resources. Finally, in marine protected areas in **Senegal** (Salatou Sambou and Binta Ba Diaw), the involvement of local stakeholders in decision-making processes has contributed to the preservation of important coastal ecosystems.

1. Conservation in areas surrounding Burkina Faso's parks

The W-Arly-Pendjari (WAP) complex – a 3 millions hectares transfrontier park located in Burkina Faso, Benin and Niger - is highly threatened by anthropic pressure coming from the surrounding villages. The threats that it faces are the consequence of a top-down approach that does not include the local population in decision-making processes and that leads to poaching, overexploitation of natural resources, illegal grazing, etc.. In Burkina Faso, the association AFAUDEB managed to implement processes of shared governance in villages surrounding the WAP:

- **Identification and integration of all stakeholders to the co-management of Controlled Hunting Zones (CHZ)**

In addition to mobilizing technical and financial resources, AFAUDEB acts as a mediator for the inclusion of all stakeholders and organises dialogues and cooperation among them.

- **Diversification of activities in the CHZ**

Natural resources of the CHZ are directly used by the populations themselves or by private (hunting) guides authorised by these populations. One of the ways these resources are used is through harvest of non-timber forest products that are then processed and sold. Another way used by the CHZ to generate revenue is through ecotourism based on the specificities of the areas' wildlife, landscapes and culture. The CHZ all together cover an area of about

40,000 ha and represent the main source of collective revenue of the villagers (up to 1,500 USD per year and per village). These activities thus represent a strong alternative to other activities that may be destructive for the PAs.



Women are in particular in charge of commercialization of forest products

After a decade, the results of AFAUDEB's programmes are clearly visible: increase of the number and superficies of CHZ, legal recognition of its institutions, enforcement of the agreement signed between local communities and administrations, diversifications of sources of income, ecological monitoring by the villagers, etc.. These changes seem to successfully reconcile nature conservation and social and economic local development.

2. Toward legal recognition of Indigenous peoples' and community conserved territories and areas (ICCAs) in DRC

In DRC, local communities and indigenous people most of the time do not have access to PAs' resources. They are often marginalised and their participation to governance and natural resources management is almost non-existent. However, the creation of Indigenous peoples' and community conserved territories and areas (ICCAs) can circumvent this lack of empowerment of local communities and prove that collective governance based on indigenous knowledge is not only fair but also more effective. This chapter thus goes back on the steps of the process DRC went through to legally recognise ICCAs' local governance.

To support this work, a national workshop was organised in Kinshasa in November 2012. During this workshop, the concept of ICCA was discussed and explained to various representatives of indigenous people coming from the 10 provinces of

DRC, to members of the civil society and PAs' stakeholders. It was agreed that ICCAs probably represent one of the best tools of governance of natural resources and an efficient strategy of biodiversity conservation, sustainable development and peacebuilding. In the conclusion of the congress, the « Déclaration de Kinshasa », it was thus recommended to the Congolese government to acknowledge the existence of territories where indigenous people and local communities traditionally live. Moreover, the declaration suggested that actions should be taken for these territories not only at the local level but also nationally. In particular, local communities should be supported and supervised when willing to declare their lands an ICCA.



Local populations engage voluntarily in ICCAs

The recognition of the status of ICCAs in DRC had three immediate consequences:

- Three sacred sites were identified and classified as ICCAs and many others were discussed;
- The local and indigenous communities seemed to be more inclined to protect their environment after hearing of the possibility to integrate their traditions in the management of PAs;
- Thanks to the improvement of the dialogue between PAs managers and locals, the management of PAs is expected to be a lot more efficient.

The identification of possible ICCAs in DRC and the lobby for their legal recognition is a step toward the acknowledgment of indigenous and traditional knowledge and the diversification and improvement of Central African PAs' governance.

3. Marine protected areas governed by local communities in Casamance, Senegal

In response to the overfishing of the rich yet threatened ecosystem of the Casamance mangrove (Senegal), 8 villages created the community conserved area (ICCA) of Kawawana. The governance of this PA is mostly based on traditions and rules that are locally agreed. Local communities, led by the association of Mangaloukak fishermen (AMF), are indeed fully in charge of the management of resources.

The ALF worked a lot to establish the PA's rules, in agreement with local and national authorities, and was able to build a management plan and an internal zoning identifying specific rules for the use of the resources of each of them. Local communities also do their own scientific monitoring by doing control fishing three times a year as well as their own socio-economical monitoring. Results show a major recovery of fish stocks (quality and quantity), a partial recovery of the ecosystem and direct benefits for villagers.



Fishermen in Kawawana reserve

The Kawawana experience opens new perspective for the recognition of ICCAs in Senegal. By limiting the access to resources and implementing a local management of the PA, it allowed the ecosystem to recover and ensures long-term benefits from its resources. It could thus serve as an example in Senegal for successful transfer of responsibilities to a local level.

4. Participatory preparation of management Action Plans for Marine Protected Areas in Senegal: a step toward local stakeholders' integration

The government of Senegal, within its policy of conservation of marine and coastal biodiversity, created, in May 2012, the Department for Community Marine Protected Areas (DCMPA). The DCMPA's mission is to implement the Senegalese government policy in terms of creation and management of a network of marine protected areas. In this context, the DCMPA's priorities are the extension of the current network and the promotion of local conservation initiatives. To do so, its team created a methodology for the creation of new MPA based on the lessons learnt on the previous top-down approach during more than a decade.



Women are also involved in planning processes for marine PAs

This learning-by-doing process is a major opportunity for local stakeholders to understand and agree on a management action plan and their agreement is a key element for the success of PA's management in the future. Indeed, taking into account local knowledge and traditions during the first step of analysis of the PAs increases the chance of success of the PA's conservation goals and ensures that the network of protected area can be extended without any major conflict with the populations.

5. Participatory mapping as a tool to integrate local communities in conservation activities, the Central African Republic

In Central Africa, conflicts between parks managers and local communities, living in or around protected areas, have for long existed. They are mainly due to the lack of integration of the local population in the park management and to the repressive actions

taken against them by the parks management authorities. As a result, access to natural resources is a major source of conflict in Central Africa.

To address this problem, participatory mapping approaches have been developed for local communities that depend on the use of PA's natural resources. The participatory mapping approach follows the following steps:

- Information, awareness raising and consultation of communities living around the park: this step allows to establish relations based on confidence between the communities and the association's team
- Drawing by communities' members of a manuscript map of resources' use
- Training of a few members of the communities to the use of GPS and data collection techniques
- Data collection by local cartographers to locate sacred sites as well as spaces of resources use
- Mapping of the collected data and comparison between the digital map and the manuscripts in order to correct possible mistakes or omissions and validation of the final map by the communities.



GPS used by local communities

Participatory mapping in CAR helped increasing communities understanding of their rights and eased initiatives led to reinforce PA's governance at local and national level. By taking into account communities traditional use of resources and lands occupation, participatory mapping takes advantage of traditional, historical, social and cultural knowledge of these communities and promotes their right to be involved to the management of PAs. Moreover, by using it as a lobbying tool it ensures a fair dialogue between all stakeholders.

Conclusion

These concrete experiences of PAs' governance diversification illustrate the shift currently taking place in central and western Africa: from a centralised and exclusive management, PAs are moving to a more inclusive system of shared governance. These five stories illustrate the importance of local knowledge and of the integration of population surrounding the parks in the governance processes. They also show how the collaboration between the different stakeholders (local authorities, civil society, indigenous people, etc.) can positively evolve through time.

Today, these models of governance can be used as an example in Africa and could promote elsewhere the implication of all stakeholders into decision-making processes for social and conservational benefits.



Innovative ways of addressing current challenges on protected areas' management systems in Africa

Directions 4 to 6 of the Road Map on African PAs

By Motshereganyi Virat KOOTSOSITSE (Botswana), Martin MULAMA (Kenya), Mary Margaret OTIENO (Kenya), Leseho SELLO (South Africa)

Introduction

While the number and size of protected areas have been increasing, biological diversity loss continues unabated and raises the issue of conservation effectiveness nowadays. There are many factors contributing to continuous biodiversity loss despite efforts to increase the protected area network: rapid population growth, first, is causing human need to exceed resources in some areas of Africa; climatic variability and natural environmental hazards have

also added to the challenges of effective management of natural resources in Africa and, finally, several systems of natural resource management for protected areas in Africa are at stake because of uninformed and poor decisions not involving enough stakeholders and leading to ineffective policies for sustainable protected area management systems.

The stories

Work in protected areas has been done in different ways across Africa to meet contemporary challenges. This section presents four case studies from East and Southern Africa. To address the issue of local stakeholder involvement in natural resources management, work on protected areas allowing multiple land use approach has been done in the **OI Pejeta Conservancy**, in Kenya (1). In Africa education from grass root is key as shown by the **Wildlife Clubs of Kenya** (2). Creating cross broader conservation has recently been seen as an innovative way to address conservation challenges that meet regional conservation goals such as the **Lumbombo Trans-frontier Conservation Area** in South Africa, Mozambique and Swaziland (3). In addition to other initiatives, it is critical to understand how effective our models are. In Botswana a study has been conducted to investigate the extent to which **financial and management operations for protected areas** are effective and could be sustainable (4).

1. OI Pejeta Conservancy in Kenya

The OI Pejeta Conservancy in Kenya promotes the coexistence of wildlife and livestock in an area that covers 300km² within the conservancy. It is a not-for-profit organisation situated in the Laikipia County and it was, prior to 2005, used extensively for cattle ranching. Wildlife was perceived as having no economic value therefore rarely tolerated and removed at every opportunity. After 2005, the 96km² of the ranch previously set aside as rhino sanctuary was extended into the ranching area thus providing more space for biodiversity conservation. Removing the fence that was separating wildlife from livestock and allowing the two to mix freely was a deliberate move to model the previously intolerable wildlife-livestock integration concept.

Conservancy has recorded a 58% increase in total wildlife between 2006 and 2012 with the annual visitors number increasing three-fold within the same period mainly due to abundant, diverse and healthy

wildlife, a characteristic of well managed and secure protected area.



OI Pejeta manages the coexistence between wildlife and cattle and doing so has increased the land productivity

Similarly, the Conservancy has diversified its revenue streams through complimentary enterprise such as beef and wheat farming thus contributing to the much needed alternative revenue stream from tourism and helped establish an elaborate Community Development Program that focuses on health, roads, water, education, and agricultural extension, Incorporating community livestock in this model by allowing organized grazing of the community livestock in the Conservancy when there is less graze outside, the initiative demonstrates an effective and equitable model of protected area management. In return there is tolerance of wildlife outside the Conservancy and neighbouring communities are willing to participate in conservation issues.

2. Wildlife Clubs of Kenya (WCK), Kenya

The Wildlife Clubs of Kenya (WCK) implement education and awareness initiatives to meet contemporary challenges in Africa's protected areas. The original idea of building the Wildlife Club of Kenya (WCK) came from within the country, from the local youth themselves. In December 1968, the Wildlife Clubs of Kenya Association was created and registered as a charitable, Non-Governmental Organization. It was the first conservation education programme of its kind to be created in Africa. WCK mission is to provide conservation education to Kenyans and to support wildlife clubs through training, information sharing and advocacy in order to achieve the following three objectives:

- Interest and educate Kenyans about the environment, natural resources and biodiversity.
- Alert the public to the great cultural, environmental, aesthetic and economic value of biodiversity
- Develop a better understanding of the need to conserve wildlife and biodiversity.



WCK allots the implication of youth in concrete conservation campaigns

To do so, WCK currently provides conservation education in over 3,000 schools in Kenya, run Education for Sustainable Development Programmes, organizes youth groups and communities all over the country with specific interest to the communities adjacent or within the country's key ecosystems.

3. Lubombo Trans frontier Conservation Area, Southern Africa

In Africa, the current view of borderless or across boarder conservation areas has been widely accepted as the new way of landscape or ecosystem approach to biodiversity conservation and institutes Trans-frontier protected areas with shared ideas and plans for conservation across borders. The concept of trans-border protected area cooperation has grown and exceptional initiatives drawn to include not only two countries but more and diverse ecosystems such as terrestrial and marine. Covering an area of 10,029km², The Lubombo Transfrontier Conservation and Resource Area commonly referred to as Lubombo TFCA is a conservation initiative between the Governments of the Republic of Mozambique, Republic of South Africa, and Kingdom of Swaziland and aims, according to the protocol

signed by the three countries in 2000 to “*promote sustainable development and utilisation of the natural resource base, the maintenance of a healthy environment, and holistic cross-border ecosystem management*”.



Animals reintroduction is one of the activities led in the transfrontier protected area

Some of the main collaborative activities include to translocate different species of game from Reserves in KwaZulu Natal in South Africa, to restock Maputo Special Reserve in Mozambique, following its extension through proclamation of a further 24 000 Ha of the Futi Corridor in June 2011. More than 900 animals (Giraffe, Impala, Kudu, Nyala, Warthog, Wilderbeest and Zebra) have been donated and displaced over a period of three years. The donation of animals will result in enhanced game viewing contributing to increase in tourist numbers and consequent income to the reserve.

4. Strategic Partnerships to Improve the Financial and Operational Sustainability of Protected Areas in Botswana

To understand the extent to which the efficiency and sustainability of current financial and operational models are implemented in Africa, a five year study funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF)/UNDP and implemented by Birdlife Botswana was done for protected area networks in Botswana and key issues related to inability by responsible parties to associate or relate with the cost benefit of protected area management.

Two main conclusions were drawn from this study:

- Protected areas need to be financially self-sustaining, that is why economic evaluation of natural resources and of protected areas needs to be established as bases for discussion and a guide to decision making.
- Local communities should be meaningfully engaged in natural resources management and their capacity continuously developed. Creating a multi-stakeholder forum for participating in natural resources management ensures a holistic approach to management of these resources.



Conclusion

As the second largest continent in the world, Africa has one of the most diverse natural resources. With its political instability and relatively weak or poorly implemented conservation policies the ecosystem approach to conservation of nature as a strategy for the integrated management of land, water and living resources that promotes conservation and sustainable use in an equitable way - encouraged by the CBD - may not realised the way it is anticipated. With its several challenges ranging from people living with HIV/ AIDS, poverty, high death rate, high rate of internal, regional or national conflicts, nature conservation may not be of the highest priority as it should. Fortunately there are some positive and modern initiatives of conservation, as shown in this paper. Some countries create political alliances to conserve their resources over political borders, innovative initiatives of land management are implemented, new stakeholders are involved, etc.

Read the full stories and learn more about the authors on www.papaco.org



The participation of these 22 champions to the WPC was supported by the French Agency for Development (Afd), The Fondation internationale pour le Banc d'Arguin and by the BIOPAMA project (EU)



The Green List is born...long life to the Green List!

Direction 9 of the Road Map for African PAs

After a 18 month pilot phase that aimed at testing the process of evaluation and nomination of protected areas, the Green List has now been officially launched at the World Park Congress in Sydney on the 14th Nov, 2014. The pilot phase has enabled the experimentation of the process in 8 countries across the world in order to take into account the specific context of Asia, Europe, South America, Australia, Africa...

Kenya, which was the pilot country for testing the GL in Africa, has successfully brought two PAs to nomination on the Green List: Lewa Conservancy et Ol Pejeta Conservancy. This is only the starting point of the African Green List story and these two first nomination will certainly arouse interest in many other PAs across the continent to join the Green List in order to celebrate and share the good practices of management and governance of PAs....

What's next?

The development phase (2015-2017), will build up on the experience of the pilot phase to make the nomination process smoother for candidate PAs and national Reference Groups while complying with the requirement of ISEAL certification standards. In 2015, 8 other Kenyan PAs will be assisted in the preparation of their GL application...And additional countries will be involved, and mentored by the Papaco but also by the PAs already listed. The process is intended to become sustainable soon and to be fully implemented by stakeholders on the ground

IUCN will focus on building policy linkages, in particular to the CBD, to ensure that the GLPA is a useful and widely adopted tool for reporting progress against the Strategic Plan 2011-2020 framework (Aichi).

Capacity building proposal from the US Fish and Wildlife Service

Developing Capacity for Conservation of Central Africa's Wildlife

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will support the development and delivery of effective training and capacity development programs in Central Africa. Proposals should focus on strengthening the ability of Central African individuals, institutions, and networks to carry out conservation activities and techniques. Proposals should show how capacity development will address gaps in performance of personnel working on wildlife conservation and protected area management. Example activities include competency-based specialized training; strengthening or development of new academic programs; support for Central African university faculty to incorporate emerging conservation threats into their curriculum; or species conservation networks. Support for tuition for individuals will not be considered.

Geographic Eligibility: Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Republic of Congo, Rwanda, and São Tomé and Príncipe.

Funding Mechanism: Multiple, one- to two-year grants. Individual proposals requesting less than \$100,000 USD have a higher likelihood of being selected. Government agencies, non- governmental organizations, institutions of higher education, and individuals are eligible to apply.

More info on:

<http://www.fws.gov/international/pdf/notice-of-funding-availability-africa.pdf>

NAPA – CONTACTS

www.papaco.org and www.iucn.org

geoffroy.mauvais@iucn.org
beatrice.chataigner@iucn.org
marion.langrand@iucn.org

Program on African Protected Areas & Conservation – PAPACO
Program Officer – Green List and World Park Congress
Support to the WPC preparation

IUCN-ESARO (East/South Africa)

leo.niskanen@iucn.org
christine.mentzel@iucn.org
houssein.rayaleh@iucn.org

Coordination - Program on Conservation Areas and Species Diversity – CASD
Program Officer – BIOPAMA – World Heritage
IUCN project technical advisor – IGAD Biodiversity management program

IUCN-PACO (West/Central Africa)

bora.masumbuko@iucn.org
youssof.diedhiou@iucn.org
lacina.kone@iucn.org
thomas.bacha@iucn.org
arsene.sanon@iucn.org

Program Officer – Climate Change
Program Officer - World Heritage
Program Officer – Support to local NGOs and collectivities
Capacity building program coordinator (PPI) – Support to local NGOs Central Africa
Program Officer - Small Grants for Conservation (PPI) – Support to local NGOs West Africa

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