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1. Background

Great apes are iconic species that are highly valued by the international community and are a high priority for various international conservation efforts. At the same time, great ape ranges coincide with some of the poorest countries of the world.

Many ape conservation organisations have been addressing poverty issues - especially since the 2005 United Nations Kinshasa Declaration on Great Apes, which reinforced the connection between poverty alleviation and great ape conservation - but the results have been mixed, and experiences and lessons learnt are rarely shared amongst organisations.

To improve how successfully we address great ape conservation-poverty linkages we need better understanding of the issues at stake, and increased integration between all the actors involved (conservation and development organisations, research institutes, private sector and government).

In response to these concerns IIED, with funding from UK Aid and the Arcus Foundation, and in partnership with the Committee of Human Right and Development (CODHOD), organised a two day workshop in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). This workshop brought together participants working on conservation and development issues in DRC, with a focus on the conservation of great apes, providing them with the opportunity to share experiences and exchange ideas regarding the challenges and opportunities of linking conservation and poverty alleviation in DRC. The workshop was held on the 21st and 22nd May 2014 at the Centre for the Study of Social Action (CEPAS) in Kinshasa.

2. Objectives and Anticipated Outcomes

The objectives of this meeting were:

1. To provide a space to DRC based conservation and/or development organisations where they could share their practical experiences in linking ape conservation and poverty alleviation, particularly reflecting on what has worked, what hasn’t and why.

2. To understand to what extent ape conservation and poverty are linked in official DRC conservation and development policy.

3. To identify what needs to change - from specific practices to national policies - in order to maximise conservation-poverty linkages.

4. To develop practical proposals for how these changes might be brought about, and what role a network of conservation and development organisations in DRC could play (for example through information exchange, learning and joint action).

Anticipated outputs and outcomes of the meeting:

1. Improved understanding amongst different conservation organisations in DRC as to the activities being undertaken by their peers, and the lessons learned from trying to link ape conservation with poverty alleviation.

2. Agreement on the need (or not) of some kind of forum to continue the dialogue and lesson-learning amongst DRC conservation and development organisations (roles, responsibilities, way of working for the group).

3. If possible, development of practical proposals for a number of activities that the group could address to bring about the changes at local and national levels identified above.

The workshop was based on presentations made by a number of key individuals. These presentations were followed by plenary discussions in working groups and between participants. Following the presentations, next steps for a DRC based PCLG chapter were discussed, including specific activities which could be undertaken in both the short and longer term.

The workshop was structured around a number of distinct themes and topics. Day One (Wednesday 21st May) was mainly focused on participants learning from each other’s experiences in the field, with a
3. Day One: Sharing Experiences and Learning

3.1 Introduction and Opening Discussions

In order to set an informal tone for the meeting and facilitate communication between participants, an “icebreaking” game (with a prize!) was organised. The goal of this game was to give participants the opportunity to get to know each other, and learn a little about the work they do. During this session participants were rewarded with a different letter every time they introduced themselves to another person, and at the end of the game all participants were asked to form the longest possible word with the letters acquired (Figure 1). The winner was the person who not only came up with the longest word, but with a word most relevant to the objectives of the meeting. A democratic vote resulted in Mr. Omari ILUMBU from WCS winning the prize with his word “sympatric”, which means two species sharing the same space.

![Figure 1: The different words formed by the participants during the Icebreaker game](image)

This game was followed by roundtable introductions, whereby each participant introduced him or herself to the group, and gave a brief explanation of what their organisation does in terms of protecting great apes and alleviating poverty in DRC.

Participants’ expectations

Facilitated of Josephine Head and Alessandra Giuliani, participants were asked to write down one thing that they hoped to learn from the meeting or one question / issue that they would like to see addressed. It is important to note that the participants came from different backgrounds including public administration, national and international conservation NGOs, and the private sector. The following expectations were reported by participants:
- “Learning about the work of other NGOs in DRC, share field experiences, and understand the successes and failures of different NGOs and how they approach the conservation of great apes and poverty reduction, in order to improve our own work.” 11 participants answered in a similar way
- “Improving my knowledge / understanding of the links between poverty alleviation and the conservation of great apes.” 6 participants answered in a similar way
- “Learn more about the work of the PCLG.”
- “Learn more about the most sustainable alternative livelihoods options which support conservation whilst benefitting the community.”
- “Setting up a forum where all stakeholders can speak openly and in a constructive manner in order to improve the protection of great apes and the reduction of poverty in rural areas.”
- “Learn how to coordinate organisations so that the conservation of great apes can contribute to development.”
- “Create a network of NGOs working in conservation.”
- “Engage the political authorities in this kind of discussions.”

Something IIED was keen to establish before the meeting got underway, was a greater understanding of how different organisations work with communities, and to what degree great ape conservation or poverty alleviation are their primary focus. To achieve this, the following two statements were written on the wall at opposite ends of a double arrow:

a) We seek to work with communities and / or address poverty in order to improve conservation outcomes.

b) We use conservation as a tool to improve local people/s livelihoods and tackle poverty.

```
“We seek to work with communities and / or address poverty in order to improve conservation outcomes”
```

```
“We use conservation as a tool to improve local people/s livelihoods and tackle poverty”
```

Participants were asked to place stickers alongside the statements that most closely matched the objectives and activities of their respective NGOs (Figure 2). The majority (14 of 21 participants) reported that their organisation seeks to work with communities and / or address poverty in order to improve conservation outcomes, while 5 out of 21 participants reported that their organisations use conservation as a tool to improve the livelihoods of local people and tackle poverty. Two participants placed their sticker at the centre of the double arrow, because they believe their organisations use both approaches. So most of the NGOs present at the workshop have great ape conservation as their primary objective, with the fight against poverty used as a tool to achieve this goal.
3.2 Linking Conservation & Poverty Alleviation, Experiences from the Field (Part 1)

The first session consisted of the following five presentations:

3. IGCP’s experience on great ape conservation and poverty alleviation – Altor MUSEMA, IGCP
4. The revision of DRC’s NBSAP: opportunities and challenges for organisations working on great ape conservation and poverty alleviation – Mike IPANGA, DDD/MECNT
5. AWF’s experience of linking great ape conservation and poverty alleviation in DRC - Charly FACHEUX, AWF

3.2.1 Conservation and Development: The case of the Bonobo Conservation Initiative – Evelyne SAMU, BCI

Founded in 1998, the Bonobo Conservation Initiative (BCI) is the only international organisation dedicated exclusively to the protection of wild bonobos and their rainforest habitat. BCI aims to:

- Preserve great ape habitat in tropical forests
- Strengthen the awareness of local people and communities in the Congo Basin;
- Work with local communities, the Congolese population, associations, the Congolese government and international partners;
- Propose and implement innovative solutions to overcome the complex problems facing bonobo conservation;

Key lessons learned from the implementation of BCI activities in the field:
• Poverty is not synonymous with ignorance;
• Formalities and local customs are not obstacles but signs of social stability;
• Conservation projects have the potential to cause as much destruction as assistance;
• The least valuable / powerful members of a team / community must be empowered;
• Use existing infrastructure and harness local cultural values and traditional beliefs.

3.2.2 Conservation and Development in the TL2 landscape: dealing with socioeconomic constraints – John HART, Lukuru Foundation

The TL2 project of Lukuru Foundation is a community conservation project created in 2007, based in the Lomami National Park, located in Orientale and Maniema Provinces; between the cities of Kisangani and Kindu. The project area covers 17,000 km² and includes 8 sectors / communities in it conservation activities. This region is an important location for bonobos, but hunting of great apes is endemic in the area. The TL2 region has a history of low human population, very fertile soils and is difficult to access, but the forests of Lomami still contain a high diversity of wildlife.

TL2 Project Approach:
Arrangements through ICCN and provincial administration:
• TL2 project does not promise development or poverty reduction to the local population, nor does it exclude these possibilities.

Influential Factors:
• The economic basis of the project zone and surrounding area is threatened by over-exploitation and unsustainable use of natural resources
• A significant proportion of local mining is carried out by non-residents
• Activities to reduce these threats include the delineation of protected areas, and the development of regulation and enforcement through a participatory approach.

Economic Impact of the Project:
• Permanent bases established in 7 villages in the adjoining area
• Initiation of development projects
• Improved access to outside world
• Benefits available to the entire community (with conditions)
• Establishment of access roads, water sources, nurse presence, infrastructure, transport (canoes, motors)

Lessons learned in the implementation of this program:
• Great ape monitoring programmes offer good opportunities for local employment and community investment, but they are limited by the size of their study area, and cannot affect people over a very large area
• For the same reason they are also limited in terms of the number of individuals who have access to benefits provided by the presence of the project
• It is more efficient to invest in the community instead of simply giving help. The best investment is one that gives the community opportunities in the course of developing the conservation project
• Employment is the thing most appreciated by rural communities, but it is not possible to provide jobs to everyone. Therefore supporting the development of alternative means of earning money are also important
3.2.3 IGCP’s experience on great ape conservation and poverty alleviation – Altor MUSEMA, IGCP

The International Programme for the Conservation of Gorillas (IGCP) was created in 1991 by WWF, AWF and FFI in order to conserve mountain gorillas. This program works in eastern DRC (PNV and PNK8), Rwanda (PNV) and Uganda (BMCA) which are all highly populated areas with 400 inhabitants per km².

IGCP’s program works in three key areas:

- Strengthen policies and institutions in the development of national conservation policies, advocacy and revenue sharing from tourism;
- Reduce human – wildlife conflict;
- Promote conservation-related businesses such as the fabrication of local art works etc..

Some lessons learned in the implementation of this program are:

- In order to support conservation, local communities and stakeholders must understand conservation’s reasons;
- Importance of having clear entry and exit strategies;
- Difficulty of measuring the impact of community development activities on conservation;
- Need for durable and flexible interventions and a “win – win” partnership.

3.2.4 The revision of DRC’s NBSAP: opportunities and challenges for organisations working on great ape conservation and poverty alleviation – Mike IPANGA, DDD/MECNT

The Democratic Republic of Congo has been a party to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) since 1994. Article 6 of the CBD stipulates inter alia that each Party shall elaborate strategies, plans or programs for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. To implement this provision of the CBD, DRC developed its NBSAP in 1999 and conducted a review in 2002. The 2011-2020 Strategic Plan for Biodiversity was adopted in order to inspire large scale actions by all stakeholders working in support of biodiversity over the next decade. This strategic plan has 20 global objectives. Partnering countries have committed to reviewing their NBSAPs and developing their own national objectives that are in line with the objectives of the Strategic Plan. In DRC, there were two main reasons for the revision and update of the country’s NBSAP, namely:

- Compliance with the commitments made at the international level within the framework of the CBD;
- The need to update the NBSAP developed in 1999, much of which has now become largely irrelevant, in order to include newer legislation developed since regarding the management of natural resources and the emergence of new themes (REDD+, Environmental Services, etc.).

The revision of NBSAP offers several opportunities for organisations working on the conservation of great apes, including:

- Inclusion of great ape conservation issues in national priorities for biodiversity conservation;
- Demonstrate the contribution of great ape conservation in the fight against poverty;
- Potential for more secure financial support for great ape conservation once it features among national priorities;
- Linking great ape conservation to other national priorities such as REDD+.

However, challenges to the process at the national level are huge, and include:

- Ensuring collaborative efforts;
- Lack of synergy with other projects / programs;
- Limited mechanisms for information exchange;
- Absence of inclusion of great ape research results in national planning;
Difficulties in defining the “value” of great apes within the country.

Questions and Discussion - Key points arising from Session 1

1. There is the need to strengthen the capacity of local organisations working in the project area, so that they can take over management in the event of project closure and ensure the sustainability of the project.

2. It is difficult to change the culture of local communities during the implementation of project activities, but easy to live with communities according to their lifestyle, while using local knowledge to transfer “conservation culture” into their collective mentality.

3. Conservation projects generate stable jobs, providing a steady income to local communities.

4. The income from tourism is a real guarantee of conservation support from riverside communities if it is properly used and contributes to development. This money should be paid directly to local communities through local structures and non-public institutions.

3.3. Linking Conservation & Poverty Alleviation, Experiences from the Field (Part 2)

This second session consisted of the following four presentations:

1. Alternative livelihood activities: the case of Maringa / Lopori-Wamba - Jean Louis SANDJA, CEDAP


3. A One Health Approach to Great Ape Conservation - Jacques IYANYA, Gorilla Doctors

4. FFI’s experience in linking great ape conservation and poverty alleviation in DRC - Eulalie BASHIGE, FFI

3.3.1 Alternative livelihood activities: the case of Maringa / Lopori-Wamba - Jean Louis SANDJA, CEDAP

Development Centre Agro - Pastoral Djolu, (CEDAP), is a non-governmental organisation created under Congolese law in March 1998. The main objective of this NGO is sustainable development in the areas of food security and natural resource management, with an additional focus on promoting social actions.

Areas of focus:

- Food Security (Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries and related activities)
- Conservation of natural resources (Alternative activities to illegal hunting, fighting against climate change, reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation)
- Environmental awareness and education on forest legislation

CEDAP works in the Maringa / Lopori - Wamba landscape, an area which contains vast natural resources, important economic resources, and large tracts of intact forest containing large populations of endemic species such as the bonobo (Pan paniscus). In 2009, CEDAP received special consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Activities and Positive Outcomes from CEDAP’s work:

- 7 breeding stock centres developed, and farming technique training available in 7 community zones
- Education, training and conversion of 198 hunters and 44 female bushmeat vendors into farmers
- In socio-economic terms: increased income for beneficiaries enabling them to buy salt and soap, send their children to school and to access health care.
Lessons learned from the implementation of CEDAP’s activities:

- Local communities are willing to change their habits, and convert to farming rather than spending extensive time in the forest in search of hunting products;
- The project budget is limited and demand for breeding stock is greater than supply, causing animosity among communities because there are over 500 “converted” hunters and bushmeat vendors still awaiting breeding stock;
- Hunters and other community members who have converted to farming are beginning to spend more time in villages to carry out livestock related activities.

The reduction of pressure on local wildlife is tentatively evidenced by a reduced number of snares found in the forest, the scarcity of bushmeat in local markets and the gradual return of wildlife to the village peripheries.


The Gorilla Organization in DRC is involved in several different projects, the most important of which are: Mont Tshiaberimu Conservation Project, which protects a small population of gorillas living on Mont Tshiaberimu in the Virunga National Park; and the protection of gorillas in the Walikale Community reserve, where 400 eastern lowland gorillas have already been identified.

Henry Cirhuza’s presentation emphasised the approach of The Gorilla Organization in the implementation of their activities, which includes tackling illegal activities that local communities exert on the parks natural resources, which is the gorillas’ only habitat.

Human activities include illegal hunting, collection of firewood and bamboo, agricultural encroachment, mining, livestock grazing, and the collection of water, honey and medicinal plants.

By improving the socio-economic conditions of local communities and providing income generating alternatives, The Gorilla Organization aims to reduce the pressure on natural resources and thereby reduce the threats to gorillas and their habitat.

3.3.3 A One Health Approach to Great Ape Conservation - Jacques IYANYA, Gorilla Doctors

The “One Health” approach of Gorilla Doctors assumes that one of the attributes of poverty is poor health, with consequences including the prevalence of disease, mortality, and days of absence from work due to illness. Great apes are very closely related to humans, and non-human primates not only share more than 95% of their DNA with humans, they are also susceptible to many of the same diseases, including TB, Ebola, Tetanus, Measles, and respiratory illnesses.

Humans may infect great apes with these diseases, which can seriously endanger their health. Similarly, great apes may act as reservoirs for diseases which are dangerous to humans. There are many opportunities for direct and indirect interactions between apes and humans in protected areas, such as through monitoring, research and tourism.

The objectives of the health program are to improve employees’ health, reduce communicable diseases to gorillas (parasites in particular), reduce the number of sick days, and increase work performance. These objectives are based on participants’ consent, health history, testing, treatment and vaccination, and provision of confidential information.

3.3.4 FFI’s experience in linking great ape conservation and poverty alleviation in DRC - Eulalie BASHIGE, FFI

Founded in 1903, FFI is the first international non-profit conservation organisation. Involved in the creation of the Kruger and Serengeti National Parks, it works with 300 different partners in 41 countries on 125 projects.

FFI has been working for 20 years in DRC as part of the IGCP collaboration (with AWF, FFI, WWF), establishing its own DRC Programme in 2006. FFI assisted ICCN in developing the first National Strategy for Community Conservation in DRC, and to date has implemented 42 livelihood improvement...
projects (AGR and community projects) in the National Parks of Garamba, Kahuzi-Biega and Maïko, which have benefited approximately 35,000 people.

Lessons learned by FFI during the implementation of their activities in DRC include:

- The destruction of natural resources is not only a problem for poor communities, rather conservation should be a concern for everyone;
- The importance of working directly with poor communities that depend on natural resources for their daily survival through the creation of income-generating activities;
- The importance of engaging state agencies in conservation efforts;
- Projects which involve income-generating activities have a high household economic impact;
- Identifying community representatives is a challenge;
- The destroyers of natural resources, once converted, become true allies for conservation;
- The importance of resolving conflicts linked to natural resources in combination with concrete actions for development.

3.4. What Works, What Doesn’t & Why?

Following the presentations detailed above, participants were divided into two working groups to discuss and highlight the key points of the different presentations. The groups were given the following statements to discuss:

Group One was asked to address: “What works and why in linking poverty reduction and conservation?”

Group Two was asked to address: “What does not work and why linking poverty reduction and conservation?”

The results of the group work were the presented to all participants, and are summarised below.

3.4.1 What works and why in linking poverty reduction and conservation?

Use of Participative Management: Most projects already understand the importance of community participation and involvement in the implementation of conservation activities. The importance of local community involvement in protected area delimitation and the use of local people as employees during associated infrastructure development and project activities was also noted, as was the structuring and revitalisation of local communities and indigenous peoples, through participatory identification of local development needs and the development of MOU’s.

Knowledge Exchange between Scientists (NGOs) and Communities: For example, during the zoning process of protected areas in DRC, several training and capacity building workshops were held with local communities. Knowledge exchange also works the other way, with indigenous knowledge having the potential to greatly enhance conservation activities.

Revenue Sharing: Sharing income from conservation activities (i.e. tourism) with local communities in sites where tourism activity is developed (e.g. the Virungas). Using revenue to assist in the construction of social infrastructure (dams, health centre, school buildings, social centres etc.) and the development of other profitable community enterprises.

Inclusion of Great Ape Conservation Issues in National Policy: Protection of great apes is included in several national tools such as the PRSP, the NBSAP, the Strategy of Biodiversity Conservation, Nature Conservation laws etc.

Communities also derive other socio-economic benefits from conservation activities, including:

- The salaries of conservation project employees are greater than the potential earning of hunters;
- The promotion of entrepreneurship (community tourism, local crafts, GSP AGR);
- The conversion of hunters and vendors into conservationists and eco-guards;
• The advancement of local development plans with communities.

4.3.2. What does not work and why linking poverty reduction and conservation?

According to the group that discussed this issue, it is important to distinguish between three different levels: National Parks, Nature Reserves and Transversal factors. These factors can be grouped into political and socio-economic factors regardless of whether one is in a National Park or Nature Reserve.

a) Political factors include:

• Lack of political will, characterised by a shift towards investments which negatively affect communities;
• Insecurity affecting National Parks and Protected Areas;
• Laws not adapted, human-wildlife conflict, communities not compensated for land acquisition;

b) Socio-economic factors include:

• Lack of infrastructure or the high cost of existing infrastructures, resulting in reduced community benefits for the local population;
• Funding of the tourism sector is weak;
• Fuel problems which cause deforestation and encroachment in some protected areas;
• Cultural disruption, resulting in ape meat being consumed by all communities in areas where it was previously taboo;
• High population density, which increases the pressure on protected areas especially in eastern DRC.

c) Transversal Factors include:

• Limited financial resources in conservation projects, resulting in lack of results;
• Lack of coordination between organisations working in the same area or on the same issue, leading to duplication of activities between partners in the same site or geographic area.

Key Discussion Points

• Public sector funding for conservation is very low for conservation in general, and particularly in great ape conservation priority areas.
• Several tools and / or conservation strategies exist at the national level, but these tools have not been popularised, disseminated or implemented, and there is little awareness of them at provincial and rural levels.
• The intervention capacity of civil society is very weak at national and local levels. This is due to a lack of financial resources and technical capabilities.
• At the national level, there is no effective communication strategy for the conservation of great apes. As a result the conservation efforts for these species are not well known, and additionally there is often little information sharing among stakeholders.
4. Day Two: National Level Processes, Challenges to Information Sharing, Scope for PCLG DRC

In addition to reflections and discussion on the functioning of the group, the second day was marked by two presentation sessions (4.1 & 4.2) which are summarised below.

4.1 National Level Conservation & Development Processes

The third session consisted of the following three presentations:

1. Poverty-conservation policy context in DRC - to what extent are ape conservation and poverty linked in official DRC conservation and development policy? – Jean Joseph MAPILANGA, ICCN

2. REDD+: opportunities and challenges for organisations working on great ape conservation and poverty alleviation – Hassan ASSANI ONGALA, CN-REDD+

3. Basic Necessities Surveys (BNS) to monitor changes in locally-defined poverty indicators and governance monitoring - Michelle WIELAND, WCS

4.1.1 Poverty-conservation policy context in DRC - to what extent are ape conservation and poverty linked in official DRC conservation and development policy? – Jean Joseph MAPILANGA, ICCN

The link between the conservation of great apes and poverty reduction in DRC has been marked by the following important policy events:

- 2000: Millennium Declaration - "Peace, Cooperation, Recovery"
- 2006: Reducing poverty of DRC populations is considered a priority by the government.
- 2011: Sustainable Development
- Vision 2015: Reduction of poverty and other causes of development limitation

In order to achieve its objectives the DCRP_2 has four pillars principal pillars, the fourth of which is the "Protection of the Environment & Climate Change."

Conservation policy has been shown at national level by:

- The Ratification of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD): DRC has taken a series of measures for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity;
- MECNT: Production of the Strategy and National Action Plan for Biodiversity (NBSAPs);

However, the ICCN faces significant challenges to achieving its objectives including:

- Eliminating armed conflict;
- Mitigating degradation of natural habitats by zoning nationally protected areas and implementing an effective policy of restoration, afforestation and reforestation:
- Establishing a communication framework between communities, conservationists and those working in development
- Encouraging sustainable investments around the peripheries of national parks to support conservation programs, improving living conditions and increasing economic opportunities.

4.1.2 REDD+: opportunities and challenges for organisations working on great ape conservation and poverty alleviation – Hassan ASSANI ONGALA, CN-REDD+
REDD+ is the international response to the fight against climate change, with the primary objective of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by tackling the main emission sources. Industrialised countries are tasked with reducing energy consumption, industrial processes, transport, agriculture and increasing reforestation. Less economically developed countries must seek to reduce deforestation with technical and financial support from more developed countries. To date, DRC has developed a National REDD+ Framework Strategy which aims to present the main components of the preparation phase and a strategic vision for REDD+ in DRC; and a preliminary programmatic framework for a national REDD+ policy to guide the DRC towards a green economy. The framework provides a solid base for outreach and discussion and marks an important milestone to mark the entry of REDD+ in the DRC.

Challenges related to the implementation process at the national level are:

- Costs related to capacity building across DRC;
- The structuring and mobilisation of different stakeholders (community anchor);
- Development of a baseline / reference level;
- Development of a system for measuring, reporting and verifying GES emissions related to DD (MNV);
- Issues of land ownership and economic viability;
- Changing the behaviour of communities and the mechanism of benefit sharing;
- Transparency (risk of corruption).

Significant opportunities brought by the REDD+ process which contribute to wildlife conservation in DRC, and particularly great apes include:

- Increased stocks of CO₂ through afforestation and reforestation result in increased stability of ape habitats;
- The finalisation of the Framework Strategy, and National Funding for REDD+ and ER-PIN;
- The development of the FIP Investment Plan and the National REDD+ Fund.

4.1.3 Basic Necessities Surveys (BNS) to monitor changes in locally-defined poverty indicators and governance monitoring - Michelle WIELAND, WCS

As is stated in the title of the presentation, the focus of Basic Necessities Surveys (BNS) is to monitor changes in locally defined poverty indicators and governance. It is based on the following steps:

1. Participative identification of a list of primary needs (potential) using group discussions. Needs differ from wants in that they are things that everyone should have and nobody should have to live without, and they include things like social services assets and bushmeat.

2. Household questionnaires made up of four parts:
   a) For each need: is it really a necessity?
   b) For each need: does the household have it?
   c) For each need: how many does the household have, and what is its current value (how much does it cost)?
   d) Complimentary information (demographic information etc)

3. Data Analysis:
   a) Preliminary = production of a list of "validated" necessities
   b) Secondary = analysis based on the validated list.

4. Presentation of results to communities, and feedback.

Questions and Discussion - Key points arising from Session 3

1. Local communities do not always understand REDD+, and the process remains essentially restricted to intellectual elites. Since it is local communities who live close to the forest and are considered primary drivers of deforestation (excluding extractive industry), it is very important that they understand the benefits of the REDD+ process.
2. BNS is an important tool for monitoring the impact of activities on biodiversity conservation in general, and specifically for monitoring poverty levels of local populations living around PAs.

3. PCLG can capitalise on the positive results achieved by the various projects presented, by facilitating information sharing among stakeholders.

4. A legal basis for community conservation will be necessary in the future not only to secure efforts (funding) for conservation but also to enhance community knowledge and effort, in addition to promoting and encouraging the interests of local communities in conservation.

4.2 Cooperation and Information Sharing Practices: Challenges and Successes

The fourth session consisted of the following five presentations:

1. The experience of the poverty and conservation learning group in Cameroon - Antoine EYEBE USAID / Carpe

2. Measuring the success of changing attitudes and behaviour – Cynthia MOSES, INCEF

3. Issues of policy and governance to conservation in DRC, challenges to communication – Toussaint MOLENGE, IUCN Consultant

4. Governance, conservation and the fight against climate change: Challenges and opportunities for IUCN in DRC - Brigitte KAPINGA, IUCN

5. Central Africa Regional Program for the Environment (CARPE): a focus on wildlife trafficking, great ape conservation and livelihoods – Antoine EYEBE, USAID

4.2.1 The experience of the poverty and conservation learning group in Cameroon - Antoine EYEBE USAID / Carpe

The mission of PCLG Cameroon is to contribute to the improvement of social, economic and environmental benefits of natural resource management, through participative and reinforced governance, information exchange, capitalisation of acquired knowledge on the subject and implementation.

The group’s achievements to date have included:

- Study on Human Wildlife Conflict in collaboration with CARPE (April 2012);
- Contributed to the revision of Cameroons’ National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) validated in 2012;
- Study on Integrating Biodiversity Conservation into National Development Policies: A case study of Cameroon (February 2012);
- Completion of desk research mapping major Great Ape conservation Institutions and Policies in Cameroon (April 2014);
- Successfully organised a wide consultation workshop bringing together government ministries, national and international NGOs, conservationists, civil society and GREG members in April 2014 (intended to enrich the results of the great ape study mentioned above).

Challenges faced by PCLG Cameroon to date have included:

- Finalising the MoU between PCLG-Cameroon and the MINFOF (although now already in the final stages);
- Lobbying with policy and law makers to adopt and integrate the results achieved by PCLG-Cameroon into key sector policies, including:
  - Recommendations from studies;
  - Integrating PCLGs expertise into Government planned actions;
Finding potential partners with whom PCLG-Cameroon can intensify research on great ape conservation/livelihood issues in Cameroon;

Capitalising/disseminating the results of PCLG-Cameroons’ work;

Selling the image of PCLG-Cameroon and its results on the international scene.

The benefits and value of the Cameroon PCLG network:

- Influencing sectorial policy is a reality when working in a group;
- Civil society participation in forest governance has increased in Cameroon;
- Networking has provided many learning opportunities to members, and many research areas have been explored and exploited.

4.2.2 Measuring the success of changing attitudes and behaviour – Cynthia MOSES, INCEF

The International Conservation and Education Fund (INCEF) is an American non-profit organisation dedicated to the idea that the engagement of strategic communication is a prerequisite for positive changes to attitudes and behaviours in terms of the link between wildlife conservation, public health and economic development in underdeveloped and/or overexploited areas.

INCEF explores local issues and produces videos concerning these issues using first person testimony. The videos are a tool used in a methodical approach to raise discussion of these issues. The films are disseminated in rural villages (they are also given to National Television Stations to Broadcast) but education teams are trained technically and intellectually to facilitate discussions using the films as they travel from one rural village to another.

INCEF achieves this through:

- Capacity building of local professionals and emerging filmmakers to produce culturally appropriate quality digital productions in local languages;
- Capacity building of local education teams to disseminate videos and measure their impact;
- Monitoring and evaluation impact analysis to understand the effectiveness of their efforts and adapt production and distribution plans to fit the needs of the communities they serve.

INCEF DRC works in the Lopori Maringa-Wamba and Salonga-Lukeni-Sankuru Landscapes. INCEF has also worked for many years in Congo Brazzaville where they have implemented significant education campaigns, which had a clear positive impact on the behaviour of the local population living along the Ouesso Souanke Road in the northern Republic of Congo. INCEF played a central role in reducing the hunting and consumption of great apes in this area.

4.2.3 Policy and governance issues for conservation in DRC, and challenges for communication – Toussaint MOLENGE, IUCN Consultant

A study conducted by Forests Monitor (Hoare, 2010) developed the following SWOT analysis regarding sustainable forest management in DRC.

Strengths:

- Scale and diversity of forest resources;
- A large population dependent on natural resources;
- A relatively active and diverse civil society;
- The existence of traditional institutions (for decision-making, resource management, etc.) alongside legal institutions in many regions.

Weaknesses:

- A poor record in terms of governance (including corruption, lack of transparency and taking responsibility, and weak law enforcement);
- Political instability and conflict in parts of the country,
• Illegal logging and poaching by armed groups;
• An incomplete legal framework, including a lack of clarity on land tenure;
• Increasing pressure on land resulting from demands from mining, forestry and agro-industrial concessions;
• Communication problems due to the size of the country and a lack of infrastructure;
• Limited human, technical and financial capacity;
• Limited capacity of civil society and rural communities (often with weak or dysfunctional institutions).

4.2.4 Governance, conservation and the fight against climate change: Challenges and opportunities for IUCN in DRC - Brigitte KAPINGA, IUCN

IUCN’s mission in DRC is to encourage a social, political and economic environment which prioritises sustainable management of natural resources, both terrestrial and marine, in addition to conserving biodiversity for the benefit of local people. Its objective is to support the efforts of the Congolese government and its partners to improve the governance of natural resources.

IUCN’s approach has three main areas of focus:

1. Knowledge: IUCN develops and supports cutting-edge conservation science, with a particular focus on species, ecosystems and biological diversity, and their impact on human livelihoods.

2. Action: IUCN has led thousands of field projects around the world with a view to better managing natural resources.

3. Influence: IUCN supports governments, NGOs, international conventions, UN organisations, companies and communities in developing laws, policies and best practices.

In order to overcome the many challenges facing them (such as the increasing portfolio of projects in DRC, attempting to reconcile conservation and development, the substantial ambitions of this emerging country) and to help reduce pressure on biodiversity and mobilise political conservation at the national level (e.g. strengthening the interdepartmental coordination framework), IUCN in DRC has several planned activities:

• Establish a permanent consultative framework of public and private operators in the extractive sector (forestry, minerals, fishing, mining, oil, biofuels, agriculture, gas) that have an impact on natural resources, in particular in government institutions and the private sector;

• Support the country to integrate conservation objectives into both national and regional tools and development plans;

• Support the government in the development and implementation of a green economy using robust techniques to monitor biodiversity and ecosystem services;

• Develop and implement different approaches using the IUCN Programme in DRC to tackle food security.

4.2.5 Central Africa Regional Program for the Environment (CARPE): a focus on wildlife trafficking, great ape conservation and livelihoods – Antoine EYEBE, USAID

The objective of the CARPE program is to fight against forest degradation and the loss of biodiversity by strengthening the capacity of stakeholders at local, national and regional levels. In its new strategy CARPE is also involved in the fight against climate change.

CARPE achieves this in the following ways:

• Strengthen the capacity of natural resource management at local, national and regional levels;

• Improve policy and environmental regulations;

• Improve capacity for natural resource monitoring.

Major challenges to CARPE’s work include:
• Addressing issues of subsistence at the level of the problem;
• The geographical area is immense;
• The persistence of illegal killing of protected species;
• Information sharing in real time.

Questions and Discussion - Key points arising from Session 4

1. ICCN has extensive involvement in the fight against poverty around protected areas in DRC. Through its network of partners, significant steps have been taken to improve the livelihoods of the communities living in and around Protected Areas (for example the dam construction in the Virungas also brought the construction of social infrastructure such as health centres and an improved water supply).

2. The different aspects of the fight against poverty in neighbouring countries are accounted for in cross-border projects like the Mayombe initiative which includes Angola, Congo, Gabon and DRC; and the Virunga initiative which includes Rwanda, Uganda and the DRC.

3. The support of IUCN is very important for the government in terms of forest governance. As part of its mission IUCN can influence government policy and current legal framework in order to integrate the fight against poverty into national policy.

4. Well organised conservation focused communities or institutions, which are legally established and accepted by all, can participate and contribute to the sustainable management of natural resources.

4.2.6 Summary of Challenges facing great ape conservation and poverty alleviation in DRC - Josephine Head

Based on the presentations and discussions among the participants during the workshop, Josephine Head presented the following summary of the key geographic, social and political challenges which currently affect the conservation of great apes and the fight against poverty in DRC.

Geographic challenges:
• Size of the country;
• Difficulties of effective communication (due to size of country, cost of transport and lack of infrastructure);
• Difficulties of accessing and informing rural populations.

Social challenges:
• Human pressure on biodiversity;
• Food security – difficulties of supporting 80 million inhabitants;
• Difficulties of addressing the poverty issue at the level of the problem;
• Changing people’s behaviour;
• Mechanism of benefit / revenue sharing;
• Weak human and technical capacity.

Legislative and policy challenges:
• Political insecurity / conflict;
• Increasing political will around conservation;
• Lack of transparency (risk of corruption);
• Weak law enforcement, lack of natural resource governance
• Incomplete legal framework;
• Problems of economic viability;
• Costs of capacity building.

4.3 Network Function

Participants were divided into two working groups to discuss:

1. Why network? What are the objectives? Would this network fill any existing gap?
2. How would a network work in practice?

After discussion the two groups came back together and presented their results, which are summarised below.

4.3.1 Why Network? What are the Objectives? Would this Network fill any Existing Gap?

• Share experiences and exchange information regarding great apes conservation;
• Work together to influence conservation policy;
• Strengthen the capacity of each member;
• Bridge the conservation gap (protocols, field practices etc.);
• Facilitate the dissemination of PCLG members’ project results to public institutions;
• Capitalise on existing communication infrastructure (example: CCB).

However, the group also thought that to operate more effectively the following points should be clarified:

• How would PCLG manage the interface between the objectives of individual members and those of the network?
• Who would be responsible for the results?
• Should the network be an administrative structure (i.e. name, bank account etc.)?

These issues were discussed by the group as a whole after the presentation. It was suggested that the structure used for this workshop remain the same, with Mr. Toussaint MOLENGE continuing to be the focal point to facilitate the initiative at the national level, supported by provincial focal points in specific priority landscapes at the regional level. It was also suggested that the network would benefit from the ongoing administrative support of CODHOD.

4.3.2 How Would a Network Work in Practice?

Group 2 suggested that it would be necessary to designate someone to act as the focal point to facilitate the network at the national level, assisted by provincial deputies from regionally based organisations. The focal point and his/her assistants will share information via email, and the PCLG website will be called upon to publish the results coming from the DRC PCLG network.

Who could be a member?

• All those who work with great apes
• Public institutions (MECNT, ICCN, research institutions, universities);
• International, national and local organisations (civil society);
• The private sector

How would the network operate?

• The desire of the group is to have a facilitator / focal point at the national level, who would work with several regional assistants based in great ape priority areas.
• The focal point should be based in Kinshasa, and regional assistants come from landscapes including MLW East (Goma) Salonga (Lake Tumba) and Eastern Province (Ituri, Lomani).
4.4 Short & Longer Term Goals of a DRC Based PCLG Chapter

The session for developing the next steps and thinking about the shorter and longer term goals of a DRC based PCLG chapter was done as one group and facilitated by Josephine Head, as requested by the participants who believed it would be more effective. The following two questions were put to the group:

1. What could a DRC chapter of the PCLG do in the short-term (next 6 months - 1 year)?
2. What could a DRC chapter of the PCLG do in the longer term (next 3+ years)?

Participants were very interested in how to effectively communicate and exchange information regarding issues related to great apes in the DRC. There are currently no reliable / functional national bodies dealing specifically with great ape issues - the GRASP strategy established in 2005 lacks funding and its objectives have not been implemented.

Participants also discussed the opportunity for the group to use the newly developed regulations concerning nature conservation in DRC, and apply them to developing legislation specifically concerning great apes. This new law was passed in February 2014, and may never be implemented if nothing is done to support this process. A good example of such an occurrence is illustrated by the 2002 Forest Code which to date has failed to implement much of the legislation described therein. Some participants estimated that this activity would not be feasible within the next six months and is more of a long term activity, while other argued that nature conservation legislation has no connection with community development.

All other goals suggested by the participants are shown in the Table 1 below.

Table 1: Proposed work plan outlined by the participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>POLITICAL</th>
<th>PCLG DRC NETWORK</th>
<th>EDUCATION &amp; COMMUNICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Term (6 - 12 months)</td>
<td>Re-launch the process for drafting legislation regarding Nature Conservation, in particular those which impact on great apes and / or conservation &amp; development.</td>
<td>Identification of all stakeholders working on great ape conservation and poverty alleviation in DRC</td>
<td>Creation of an email list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political lobbying should be prioritised over the localised community activities</td>
<td>Develop the structure of the group, including provincial bases</td>
<td>Creation of a DRC specific page on the PCLG website which includes the logos of all network members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of an effective communication strategy for great ape conservation in DRC</td>
<td></td>
<td>General Communication: popularisation of useful tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publication : importance of linking conservation with the national development process including practical activities for community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information exchange regarding the challenges faced by projects dealing with the high migration levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data collection regarding population movements in and around protected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scientific publication relating to how to reduce hunting in DRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term (3+ years)</td>
<td>Lobbying for implementation of legislation regarding forests and local communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printing and dissemination of text relating to legislation regarding the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
protection of great apes in DRC
4.5 Next Steps

At the end of the meeting, the following next steps were agreed upon:

1. Toussaint, Josephine and Alessandra will prepare a report of the meeting and circulate to all workshop participants and other interested individuals and organisations in DRC. The report will be available to download on the PCLG website and will also be announced in the PCLG newsletter.

2. A page will be created on the PCLG website where all information and documents relating to the work done so far by PCLG DRC will be stored and made available for download.

4.6 Meeting Evaluation

Before leaving the venue participants evaluated the overall quality of the following aspects of the meeting:

**Logistic Organisation:** 15 out of 16 participants gave a score of 4/5 (very good), 1 participant gave a score of 3/5 (good);

**Facilitation:** 2 out of 17 participants gave a score of 5/5 (Excellent), 13 out of 17 participants gave a score of 4/5 (very good); and 2 out of 17 participants gave a score of 3/5 (good);

**Successful progression on the way forward:** 8 out of 15 participants gave a score of 4/5 (good) while 7 out of 15 gave a score of 3/5 (very good);

**Presentations:** 1 participant gave a score of 5/5, 8 out of 15 gave a score of 4/5, 5 out of 15 gave a score of 3/5 and 1 participant gave a score of 2/5. This suggests that the presentations were considered to be of a good quality;

**General comments expressed regarding the meeting:**

- Meetings should be held every six months in order to assess the progress of the group against their agreed objectives;
- IIED should monitor and capitalise on the achievements of this meeting;
- The follow up process needs to be clarified.
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Centre de Développement Agro – Pastoral de Djolu (CEDAP)

The Centre de Développement Agro – Pastoral de Djolu (CEDAP), is a non-governmental organization created under Congolese law in March 1998. The main objective of the NGO is sustainable development in the areas of food security and natural resource management, and CEDPA is also working to promote social actions.

Areas of focus:

- Food Security (Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries and related activities)
- Conservation of natural resources (Alternative livelihoods to reduce illegal hunting; fighting against climate change and working to reduce emissions from deforestation and degradation)
- Environmental awareness and education regarding forest legislation

CEDAP works in the Maringa / Lopori – Wamba landscape, an area containing vast natural resources and important economic resources, and exhibiting large tracts of intact forests containing large populations of endemic species such as the bonobo (Pan paniscus). In 2009 CEDAP received special consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Fauna and Flora International (FFI)

Fauna & Flora International (FFI) is a British non-profit organisation, founded in 1903 by naturalists in Great Britain. In Africa, FFI paved the way for the creation of the Kruger and Serengeti National parks, and played an important role in the development of IUCN, WWF and CITES. FFI’s mission: the conservation of threatened species and worldwide ecosystems, and the choice of solutions based on scientific principles which take into account the needs of communities.

FFI has worked in the DRC since 1979 as part of the International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP), a consortium of three conservation NGOs (AWF, FFI, WWF). In the DRC, FFI works in partnership with ICCN. FFI has worked in the Garamba National Park since 2006 where it has helped to establish a pilot community conservation initiative to support the development of ICCN’s National Strategy for Community Conservation. Since 2009, FFI has had a permanent presence in Kahuzi Biega and Maiko National Parks as part of the conservation program of the Maiko-Tayna-Kahuzi-Biega landscape.

FFI also supports the Congolese Institute for the Conservation of Nature (ICCN) with its research and monitoring activities and in particular supporting local communities in their conservation efforts and management of natural resources through:

- Strengthening cooperation between protected area managers and surrounding communities;
- Building local infrastructure for conservation;
- Balancing human needs with sound management of natural resources;
- Directly protecting rare and endangered species and their habitats;
- Protecting optimal conservation habitats;
- Responding quickly to conservation emergencies;
- Influencing policy and practice of conservation;
- Bridging the gap between economic interest and biodiversity conservation.
International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP)

Founded in 1991, IGCP is a coalition program of international conservation organisations including WWF, FFI and AWF. Its vision is “An environment where the gorilla thrives in its natural habitat in harmony with their human communities”.

IGCP works in partnership with the protected area authorities in DRC, Rwanda and Uganda. Partnership extends to the private sector, civil society, local and national government bodies, and other NGOs and actors.

To achieve its mission, IGCP operates in three strategic areas

1. Habitat management and maximization;
2. Conservation science and Policy; and
3. Gorilla tourism.

Thus several activities are carried out with local communities in order to share revenue and opportunities offered by the presence of protected areas and improve community livelihoods.

These activities can be tourism related or not.

- Beekeeping: Support beekeepers around protected areas and refine and market the well packaged honey
- Handicrafts: training and production of works of art to offer tourists mainly
- Mushroom and Potato growing projects
- Community Lodges: building high standard lodges whose benefits are shared with local communities
- Construction of water tanks: The Virunga massif is located in a water stress area. Providing clean water positively affects health, children's education and community productivity
- Providing manpower for the park: IGCP is ensuring that surrounding communities are directly involved in paid work of developing the park (various infrastructures construction, patrols, etc.).
- Community Tourism Development: Community attractions (caves, cultures, monuments ...) are identified and developed outside the parks and generate income for communities
- Revenue sharing program: IGCP accompanies this program where a portion of the fees paid by tourists visiting the gorillas is returned directly to local communities and serves the development of community projects (5 % in Rwanda , 20 % of park entry fees in Uganda and 30% in DRC).

Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature (ICCN)

The Congolese Institute for the Conservation of Nature (ICCN) is a public body under the category of public establishment, mandated by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo to ensure the conservation of biodiversity through an extensive network of protected areas (National Parks, nature reserves, hunting reserves, botanical, zoological and biosphere reserve gardens) currently covering roughly 312,139 km2 or 13.31% of the national territory (but with political ambition to reach 15% of the national territory (Act No. 14/003 of 11 February 2014 on the Conservation of Nature)). According to Prime Ministerial Decree No. 10/15 of 10 April 2010 which lays down the statute for this public institution, the mission of the ICCN is largely comprised of three components:

Ensure the protection of fauna and flora;

Value biodiversity by promoting scientific research and facilitating ecotourism in accordance with current legislation and with the fundamental principles of conservation activities;

Conduct or oversee others in carrying out research, and ensure the dissemination of scientific and educational materials in the field of conservation.
SOS Nature

The eastern part of the forest block of the Congo basin in the DRC is particularly rich in biodiversity and includes three protected areas included on the World Heritage List (Virunga and Kahuzi Biega National Parks, and the Okapi Wildlife Reserve) in which there is a high density of apes (bonobos, chimpanzees, gorillas). These very diverse forests are seriously threatened by the interaction between forestry and high human population density. SOS Nature was created in order to integrate the improvement of living conditions of local populations with the preservation of forest ecosystems that are the source of their survival. The first core activity of SOS Nature is awareness to inform people about the various environmental problems (zoonosis, deforestation, biodiversity loss, climate change, pollution). This awareness is carried out through broadcasts, conferences, etc. To address the challenges specifically linked to the loss of animal biodiversity and apes in particular, SOS Nature is popularizing wildlife laws, and has conducted studies that show the extent of the destruction of wildlife (apes) while calling for prohibiting the sale of bushmeat.

Strong Roots Congo

Strong Roots Congo is based in Kahuzi-Biega (PNKB) and aims to safeguard the populations of great apes and their habitats in the eastern DRC, particularly eastern lowland gorillas. In partnership with grassroots organisations Strong Roots also has conservation and development projects in the Itombwe Nature Reserve and in the unprotected forests with significant gorilla populations which are located between these two protected areas.

Promoting socio-economic alternatives for local communities living around great ape habitat is motivated by the impoverishing effects of armed conflict, the limited revenues these communities are able to generate in order to meet basic human needs and their almost total dependence on natural resources in protected areas. In addition to farming for food security for pygmy communities living around PNKB, at least 100,000 seedlings are planted each year around the park to reduce human pressure on gorilla habitat. Community members also receive brood stock farmyard animals and smaller livestock for breeding, in addition to small loans to members of two women’s cooperatives, who have set up a restaurant trade in the villages.

In addition, the environmental education programme includes educating local communities, twenty-one schools and two literacy centres about gorilla conservation. All these projects are associated with building the capacity of local authorities and local leaders in the governance and management of community forests containing great ape populations. www.strongrootscongo.org

The Gorilla Organization

The Gorilla Organization aims to secure the long-term future of the mountain gorillas and their habitat through a conservation programme that supports long-term poverty alleviation and conservation-education projects among the poor communities close to the gorilla habitat; providing viable alternatives to the unsustainable use of forest resources.

Since a decade, GO has implemented over 20 projects situated around 4 gorilla habitats (PNVirungas, PNVolcan, Mt tshiabirimu and Walikale Reserve). All these projects were managed through 3 Resources centre located in Goma(DRC), Ruhengeri(Rwanda), and Kisoro(Uganda). Among these projects are:

- Mount Tshiaberimu Conservation Project
- Walikale Community Gorilla Reserve - 400 eastern lowland gorillas identified
- Initiating 355 Virunga Wildlife Clubs
- Sustainable Agricultural Training Programme for over 13,000 farmers.
- Building 28 water cisterns within 2 kms of the National Park.
- Assisting 30 beekeeping associations with modern equipment and training.
- Providing arable land and training for the Batwa and Bambuti forest-dwellers
• 3 Microcredit projects, with funds amounting to over $150,000.
• 2 Livestock rearing projects - pigs, goats, chickens
• Agro-forestry project - 300,000 trees planted over a 20 x 5 km area
• 2 Media programmes - Radio Cosmos and Kivu Safari Magazine
• FONCE - Regional Environmental Network for local NGOs
• The Durban Process - solving the illegal mining crisis in the DRC
• Supporting the Wildlife Authorities of Rwanda, DRC & Uganda

The Gorilla Organization targets the illegal human activities that local communities place on the park’s natural resources - the gorilla habitat.

**World Resources Institute (WRI)**

The Congo Basin Forest Atlases are a living forest information system, merging the latest technology in remote sensing and GIS with ground-truthing to monitor and sustainably manage forests. WRI works in the following Congo Basin countries: Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, and Gabon. Through a combination of interactive mapping applications, posters, analytical reports, trainings, and outreach, the Atlases provide users with timely, accurate, and synchronized information about land use allocation (forest concessions, protected areas, mining permits etc.) within national forest estates. The goal of this work is to improve the quality and availability of information in the forest sector to support transparent and participatory decision-making across the Congo Basin. [http://www.wri.org/our-work/project/congo-basin-forest-atlases](http://www.wri.org/our-work/project/congo-basin-forest-atlases)

Global Forest Watch is an online forest monitoring and alert system that provides the most current, reliable, and actionable information about what is happening in forest worldwide. GFW unites satellite technology, open data, and human networks to show where and how forests are changing, who is using them, and how we can help sustain them for future generations. [www.globalforestwatch.org](http://www.globalforestwatch.org)
The Poverty and Conservation Learning Group (PCLG) is an international network of organisations and individuals that promotes learning on the linkages between biodiversity conservation and poverty reduction, in order to improve policy and practice.