

UK TROPICAL FOREST FORUM

BUSHMEAT WORKING GROUP

6 February 2002

at the offices of the
UK Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)
Ashdown House, Victoria Street, London
2pm - 5 p.m.

Report of the Meeting

Those attending:

Ms Penny Bienz (part of time)	Timber Trade Federation
Dr Bryan Carroll	Bristol Zoo
Ms Lauren Coad	Cambridge University
Mr Doug Crookes	Imperial College
Dr Glyn Davies (part of time)	Zoological Society of London
Ms Joanna Elliott	Dept for International Development (DFID)
Mr Nick Keylock	Imperial College
Ms Noëlle Kumpell	Institute of Zoology/Imperial College
Ms Cathy Mackenzie	Natural Resources Institute (NRI)
Ms Hannah Jaenicke	NRInternational Ltd / DFID Forestry Research Programme
Mr David Jay	GRASP Secretariat
Ms Cathy Mackenzie	Natural Resources Institute (NRI)
Mr Adam Matthews	Parliamentary researcher for Barry Gardiner MP
Mr Tunde Morakinyo	Iroko Foundation / ERM
Ms Nicolien Oudwater	Natural Resources Institute (NRI)
Mr John Palmer	NRInternational / DFID Forestry Research Programme
Mr Callum Rankine	WWF
Ms Caroline Rigg	Dept Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)
Ms Meriel Robson	Soil Association
Mr Andy Roby	Dept for International Development (DFID)
Ms Miranda Stevenson	Independent consultant
Ms Jane Thornback	Tropical Forest Forum Director
Mr Ian Watson	NR Group / Independent consultant

Welcoming Remarks and Introduction

1. The Chair, **Ms Jane Thornback**, welcomed attendees and thanked DEFRA for the use of the meeting room. Participants introduced themselves. As there were several new faces, the Chair gave a briefing on the role of the Tropical Forest Forum (TFF).

The TFF has been operational for 10 years. The 10th Anniversary meeting was held in December 2001. The TFF serves as a neutral mechanism to discuss forest issues. Membership is drawn from a wide audience, including independents, NGOs, government officials, researchers and the private sector. The TFF is not a campaigning organisation, it does not produce resolutions, sign up for lobbying letters nor take direct action. There is no TFF view on an issue. The Bushmeat Working Group has sponsorship from DEFRA and meets three times a year. The agenda of meetings varies, depending on issues of the moment and the interests of those attending.

2. **The Chair** drew attention to the following tabled literature :
- ?? Mount Cameroon Project leaflet on community wildlife management
 - ?? ETFRN Newsletters on NTFPs, and on biotechnology
 - ?? DFID Publication listing Forest Projects funded in 2001

Short news items

CITES Bushmeat Working Group

3. The CITES Group did not meet in November and is now scheduled to meet in late February/March but this is likely to again slip. A wildlife legislation review is intended to take place but there has been a delay in identifying a consultant. IUCN in Africa has the lead.

DEFRA study.

4. The DEFRA study entitled "*Assessment of the solution-orientated research needed to promote a more sustainable bushmeat trade in Central and West Africa*" has been produced by ODI, FFI and NRI. The study looked at sustainable bushmeat extraction from an ecological, sociological and economic viewpoint. The draft final report was placed on the TFF website last autumn. The final version was signed off last month - January 2002 - it is slightly different from the Autumn version, but in essence they are the same. Publication is dependant on the timing of the next CITES working group at which **Mr David Brown** from ODI will deliver a presentation on the report.

Convention on Biological Diversity

5. A proposal made to the last CBD "SBSTTA" meeting for a CBD Bushmeat Liaison Committee did not get off the ground. There is a liaison group for non-timber forest resources, but this is not bushmeat-specific.

Research Project Updates

NRI Bushmeat Survey - Ghana

Ms Cathy Mackenzie and Ms Nicolienne Oudwater, NRI

6. **Ms Cathy Mackenzie** reported. Their research is looking at livelihoods and regulation of the bushmeat trade in West Africa. It is funded by DFID. Initial fieldwork has been in Ghana. Work elsewhere (possibly Nigeria) may occur at a later stage. The work tries to piggy-back on existing initiatives to avoid duplication. Recognising that different conditions may demand different approaches to regulation, the work is taking place in two ecological zones: the southwest forest zone, and the guinea-savannah-zone in the NE of the country.

7. The work has taken a stakeholder/commodity chain approach rather than a biological one. There are three components :

- ?? Detailed interviews with all stakeholders in commodity chain - hunters, traders, institutions, chop bar owners and consumers. These will follow the trail of bushmeat to Kumasi. The interviews were completed in June 2001
- ?? Interviews at the village level to determine the importance of bushmeat to rural households in the producing areas. These were conducted in Nov/December 2001 and are still being analysed
- ?? Participatory workshops in each site involving original interviewees, to present back the research findings, discuss the implications and generate alternative ideas on how the bushmeat trade might better be regulated in order to promote sustainability. This final component of the project will be in July 2002.

Questions

8. Ms Noëlle Kümpell asked if the study only relates to bushmeat destined for Kumasi markets? **Ms Mackenzie** said the study is following bushmeat from areas of production through to the various markets, and this is involving both local and regional markets. Some Kumasi traders do come up to NE Ghana to buy bushmeat, mainly in smoked form. But the Kumasi market gets meat from many different parts of Ghana. The market has areas for both smoked and fresh bushmeat. **Ms Oudwater** added that the SW forest study site, has proved to be a net bushmeat importing area - with traders bringing in bushmeat from transition areas between forest and savannah. **Ms Kümpell** asked if population studies are being carried out?. **Ms Mackenzie** replied that wildlife population studies have been carried out in association with a large EU funded project - the Protected Areas Development Programme. It is disturbing that whilst the study site is on the edge of a national park, wildlife populations are already seriously depleted - apart from rodents and duikers.

9. Mr Andy Roby asked what evidence there is of bushmeat from the study area entering UK markets? **Ms Mackenzie** said the study was not attempting to track meat through to the UK, so whether meat obtained in the NE ends up in the UK is impossible to say.

10. Mr Callum Rankine asked how much bushmeat is going to Nigeria, adding that there is little bushmeat left for harvesting in Nigeria, so imports may be sucked in? **Ms Mackenzie** said their research had not generated any information on this.

11. Mr Nick Keylock asked to what extent local people are sensitised to bushmeat issues?. **Ms Mackenzie** said an existing project on elephant control in the upper east region had been successful in getting communities involved in elephant control, and creating some awareness about hunting issues. The project is working with this NGO and has been able to capitalise on the good relations between them and local communities and gain their trust to some degree - but bushmeat is a very sensitive issue and this has undoubtedly affected the quality of the information gathered. Other issues have also affected the project - for example as a result of recent inter-tribal violence in which more than 100 people were killed, the police have been considering trying to confiscate guns. As a result gun ownership and hunting appear to be under-reported in the survey. **Ms Oudwater** thought in the forest zone there was not much interest from local people in sustaining the bushmeat trade.

12. Mr Tunde Morakinyo (Iroko Foundation / ERM) asked if hunters were formed into associations or guilds, and if so, whether these offered a mechanism for regulation? **Ms Oudwater** said that bushmeat was a very sensitive subject in Bia and was difficult to discuss in some villages; this made it difficult to get any idea of organisations involved in hunting.

13. Ms Hannah Jaenicke (NRInternational/ DFID Forestry Research Programme) asked what kinds of animals feature in the bushmeat trade and whether the workshops will discuss possible solutions to the problem of sustainability? **Ms Mackenzie** said that there were some big animals (buffalo, kob, roan) in the upper east area, but most of the hunting is for small game (duikers etc). Ghana as a whole is at the depleted end of the wildlife spectrum. The workshops are specifically intended to generate stakeholder perspectives on how regulation may work better to promote sustainability. **The Chair** added that at the last meeting, information from Mount Cameroon suggested that hunting guilds were only viable when fines were collected from non-members who hunted.

Evaluating incentives for hunting of bushmeat: can it be sustainable? Equatorial Guinea Ms Noëlle Kümpell, Imperial College / Institute of Zoology.

14. Ms Kümpell introduced herself as a first year joint NERC/SERC funded PhD student researching incentives for hunters. While most studies focus on markets and the impact on prey populations, she hopes to build in economic factors. The aims are to determine the factors influencing

the type and volume of bushmeat hunted and traded and to identify management policies that would enable sustainable off-take.

15. The project will look at market structure, the socio-economics of hunters, hunter behaviour and choice of prey, and the effect of hunting on prey populations. This will be used to develop a bioeconomic model of bushmeat hunting which can be used to predict effects of policy interventions on sustainability of hunting. A basic model was shown.

16. The intended study area is in Equatorial Guinea in a national park on the island of Rio Muni, in an area previously studied by Dr John Fa in 1997-8 at Monte Mitra. Equatorial Guinea was chosen as it is well forested and has both hunted and non-hunted areas. Bushmeat hunting and trade are increasing and there is minimal management in the intended study area. **Mr Nick Keylock** and **Ms Lauren Coad** may also be working in the same area.

17. The methodology will include mapping of the study area to determine forest quality and use, market surveys and commodity chain analysis. In specific villages, further studies will determine how much bushmeat is consumed or sold on, the socio-economic position of hunters and their families, where hunting takes place and what technologies are used in hunting. It will also show hunter behaviour, prey choice, prey handling time and encounter rate and how these factors interact. This will be carried out by interviews with hunters and hunter families. It is hoped to accompany hunters on hunting trips, although this and other work of a sensitive nature may need to be done by local researchers as there is some question mark over the continued safety of Europeans doing such work. Prey densities in the study area will also be estimated and compared with non-hunted areas.

Market Surveys and Commodity Chain Analysis, Equatorial Guinea
Mr Nick Keylock, Imperial College

18. **Mr Keylock** hopes to look at a larger study area in Equatorial Guinea than Ms Kümpell's, examining what is being brought in to markets. He then plans to look at the commodity chain. It is currently difficult to work in markets.

Sustainability Indices for the Bushmeat Trade. Equatorial Guinea
Ms Lauren Coad, Imperial College/ University of Cambridge/

19. **Ms Coad** hopes to develop sustainability indices and to develop new, improved models, based on fishery stock assessment models. Depending on the quality of the abundance data, she hopes to be able to model dispersal from protected areas to hunted areas. This could provide a buffer for over-exploitation in hunted areas. Her work is funded by NERC from a block grant.

Questions

20. **Mr Morakinyo** referred to a DEFRA Darwin Initiative project being carried out by **Dr John Fa** in Cross River State, Nigeria and asked if there are any links to such research? He also asked if there are plans to look at lessons from other regions? **Ms Kümpell** said **Dr Fa** is not currently involved in supervising her research directly. Plans are still at an early stage so lessons and experience from other regions are yet to be built in.

21. **Ms Jaenicke** suggested that ECOFAC or other NGOs in the region might be able to assist with activities deemed unsafe for Europeans.

22. **Mr Doug Crookes** (Imperial College) reported on a Conservation International funded project looking at hunter/trader/species interactions. The study area includes Ghana where the focus is around

Kumasi and on fresh bushmeat. It is a desk study using published data and aims to examine management options. It is hoped that the study will reveal potential impacts on prey species density.

23. Mr Roby (DFID) mentioned that the Ghana Forestry Commission inventory survey will include for the first time, a wildlife survey. The results should be available in six months.

24. Mr Palmer made links between the Imperial College/Cambridge work and similar work conducted in the Central African Republic which looked at hunter/prey behaviour, but may not have included economic factors. These works are in French, he will look them out and pass on.

25. The Chair asked how the research - which was funded by academic institutions - would feed into the needs of resource managers. How could the work be packaged to make it more suitable for managers. Academic papers were often not useful to managers? **Ms Kümpell** said modelling can incorporate policy implications including those for various management bodies, mainly in government.

DFID Wildlife and Poverty Study
Ms Jo Elliott, Dept For International Development (DFID)

26. This DFID one year study looks well beyond bushmeat at the wider issues of the links between wildlife and poverty. The first objective is to determine the extent to which the poor in developing countries are dependent on wildlife. The second objective is to identify what DFID should be doing to help those dependent on wildlife. A two page summary of the findings of the first 6 months study was tabled at the meeting. DFID would like feedback on this study and contributions are welcome. The full text of Phase I can be downloaded from the TFF website (In Forum activities, Biodiversity, DFID Biodiversity Policy projects <http://www.forestforum.org.uk>) or from the DFID website <http://www.dfid.gov.uk>).

27. Phase One (April to October 2001) of the two-phase Study concentrated on desk research and analysing six DFID case studies for evidence of wildlife-poverty linkages. The six case studies were Tanzania and Namibia in detail; plus Pakistan, Cameroon, South Africa, and Bolivia. It concluded that there was sufficient evidence of wildlife-poverty linkages, and that DFID was perceived to have a comparative advantage in this type of work, and should continue investment in wildlife related interventions.

28. However it was also apparent that the potential for wildlife to be a source of long-term comparative advantage is underestimated, even where this is an explicit aim of conservation-related livelihood studies. This is costly to do and there is very little data. Some data are area specific and much is anecdotal, so more data are needed. There appear to be strong wildlife-poverty linkages, but many projects fail to establish this link.

29. There are two big dilemmas. The first is that economic benefits of wildlife are largely captured by the private sector and government rather than by those marginalised rural poor who depend on the resources. The challenge is how to find ways of harnessing the significant potential for wildlife based growth, especially tourism, to ensure that it benefits poor people. The second dilemma is the difficulty of ensuring that wild resources are not overexploited, how to manage the resource, particularly common property resources. How can the regulatory framework be adjusted so that it is pro-poor? DFID is perceived to have an advantage in this area, despite the fact that there are only two current field projects.

30. Phase Two of the study (late February to July 2002) will explore appropriate responses for DFID and other donors to reduce poverty through each of four wildlife-poverty themes:

- ?? Community wildlife management for rural development especially in marginal areas with few alternative livelihood opportunities
- ?? Addressing the threat to the poor from declining bushmeat. Need to ensure that the impact of wildlife decline on food security is minimized
- ?? Promoting pro-poor wildlife tourism. How to assist the poor to increase their share of the wildlife tourism revenues through training, employment, partnership, ownership etc
- ?? Pro-poor engagement with the conservation community, e.g. new partnerships with DFID/WWF to look at how conservation decision-making delivers on the goals of poor people.

The main vehicle for delivery of future aid projects will be through Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers

Questions and Comments

31. Ms Rigg noted that the study ties in with the CITES bushmeat work and so could feed in to the next CITES COP.

32. Mr Morakinyo asked if DFID is likely to become more interested in bushmeat issues? For example, NGOs in Nigeria had thought this was not an area of interest for DFID. **Mr Roby** said it was not possible to say, but in future, less and less project work will be funded and more funds will go into supporting governments directly. However, there may be a case to be made for Nigeria where government is very weak, but this would depend to what extent the work is perceived to be pro-poor and how exportable the findings are to areas outside the project area.

33. Mr Palmer commented on the difficulty of extrapolation from specific studies. The Forestry Research Programme had pursued this philosophy, but found it to be very difficult to extrapolate and generalise. This may be because many people have multiple livelihoods, for example bushmeat, farming, fishing, etc, so a sectoral approach is necessarily weak. He thought it was necessary to get away from a sectoral approach and conduct livelihood projects. **Mr Roby** agreed.

34. Ms Mackenzie commented that there is relevant information for Phase Two from a variety of project work already carried out - e.g. in Burkina Faso and some good work in the Francophone Sahelian area, similar to the Campfire project, and there are good examples of community wildlife management. **Mr Palmer** added that English summaries of this work may/may not be available. There are some reports in the Yaounde workshop, but it is not clear how widely these have been distributed, **Ms Alison Rosser** at IUCN may have information on this. There is a great deal of grey literature. WCS in New York is doing studies in Francophone wet areas in W Africa.

35. Mr Bryan Carrol expanded on bushmeat poverty links, adding that there are rural versus urban poverty links on top of this. There are also questions of consumption versus the value of trade. **Ms Elliott** said it is often difficult to tease these factors apart and data are often contradictory. For example, data from TRAFFIC indicated that bushmeat was important for the rich in urban areas, whereas in rural areas, it was important for the poor for subsistence, or for cash income.

UK Bushmeat Parliamentary Campaign

Mr Adam Matthews, Parliamentary Researcher to Mr Barry Gardiner MP

36. Mr Matthews distributed a handout to the meeting. The Campaign will kick off in late February, and input is requested. The Campaign arises from a political initiative, Mr Matthews is a parliamentary researcher to Mr Barry Gardiner, MP. There is now a greater political awareness of bushmeat and this would be helped if research results could be fed into the campaign. With the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) coming up in late August, there is a good opportunity to raise issues about bushmeat. Margaret Beckett, Secretary of State for DEFRA,

has written to MPs asking them what issues they would like to be raised at the WSSD. Government priorities in DFID and the livelihoods approach may result in a greater investment in DFID. The Campaign can deliver and can get some serious movement on bushmeat issues.

37. The Campaign aims to create a broad coalition, which so far includes the Ape Alliance, Zoological Society of London, Federation of Zoos, European Association of Zoos and Aquaria, IFAW, Born Free Foundation, leading scientists and Robert Evans MEP. Barry Gardiner is taking the lead in the UK Parliament. The Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) is expected to provide inputs relating to certification, etc, although it cannot campaign directly on this issue. The targets are to raise awareness in Parliament, establish an active lobby, establish a strong political lobby and to gain public awareness. The Campaign will assist in the formulation of government policy and hopes to unite all interested groups.

38. The timetable is for an late February launch, followed by a March reception at the House of Commons and lobby of MPs. A conference will be held at ZSL in May to which Claire Short, Secretary of State for International development (DFID) has been invited. The Party conferences in September/October will also be targeted.

39. There are several aims and objectives. The Campaign is currently departmentalised but may shift to themes. All inputs to this process are welcome. So, trade into UK may be a theme, looking at the potential for tax changes or import regulations to control the bushmeat trade may be another theme. The Campaign will provide support and will target MEPs to raise EU awareness. The Zoos Federation will take the front line approach and the campaign will be very public. As wildlife/bushmeat/poverty is an area of interest to DFID, DFID will be especially targeted.

Questions and Comments

40. **Ms Oudwater** wondered whether it would be better to avoid talking of bushmeat in general, but to divide it into great apes/endangered species and other groups, since many bushmeat species are either pests or are not rare? **Mr Matthews** said the campaign was not saying that all bushmeat is bad, they are putting out some positive messages. Great apes are a special issue, so they are a priority. The campaign will concentrate on sustainable use management, but this is a very difficult message to communicate.

41. **Mr Palmer**, referring to the timber certification issues in the handout, asked what could be achieved by voluntary means as opposed to compulsory? Would compulsory measures be compatible with EU and WTO rules on technical barriers to trade? Comparisons may be drawn with the illegal logging trade and lessons could be learnt from this. Also, snares are not all bad; those made from natural materials may be acceptable. **Mr Matthews** noted these comments and added that the main call for action on snares was from the Ape Alliance. The main target on timber is the logging companies.

42. **Ms Elliott** asked how effective Parliamentary questions really are? From experience!, she knew that it took a lot of work to reply to them. She queried the main goal of these questions? Was it to make DFID take more notice of the bushmeat trade or was it something else - such as a realignment of DFID/DEFRA/FCO on this topic and on wildlife? **Mr Matthews** replied that Parliamentary questions were a good way for back bench MPs to get issues raised and to get statements from Government. This would get DFID to recognise the issue of bushmeat at Ministerial level and how this fits into DFID priorities; it is not currently on the agenda at high level. **Ms Elliott** added that there was a lack of aggregate information on the role that bushmeat played in the lives of the poor. If bushmeat can be shown to be important to the livelihoods of the poor, then DFID would have no problem now in paying it more attention. **Mr Matthews** agreed that this would be of mutual benefit. Mr Hilary Benn, Minister in DFID, has expressed interest in the Bushmeat Campaign and a meeting with him is expected in two weeks time. **Mr Roby** pondered on how DFID can become more engaged in bushmeat issues and commented on why there are few field projects? Reference has been made to

the Cameroon Strategy where DFID is seen to have a comparative advantage, but not in small projects. The advantage may lie in policy dialogue. Discussions with Mr Hillary Benn should be angled to this.

43. Mr Morakinyo asked what linkages exist between the Campaign and the private sector? Working with the World Bank should also be considered as often projects apply World Bank EIA standards, e.g. to the Cameroon gas pipeline proposal. These could be targeted to include bushmeat and thus to influence the private sector. **Mr Matthews** agreed this is a good idea.

44. Ms Meriel Robson suggested contacting the FSC at their international office in Mexico in regard to the impact of WTO rules on certification. She agreed there was a link between bushmeat and illegal logging.

45. Mr Roby said that it was good to hear the campaign had a sustainable use theme. With regard to EIA, the Rainforest Foundation guidelines are applied to EU projects, but often bushmeat is not included in the assessment. **Dr Glyn Davies** challenged how good the EIA are in EU projects, especially for infrastructure upgrades, e.g. new roads. There are not in-depth EIA with often only the “A” boxes being ticked; the more in-depth “B” and “C” boxes are often not dealt with. The Rainforest Foundation found that projects go through a cursory EIA only. **Mr Roby** added that EIA procedures are often not applied due to lack of capacity in the European Commission.

46. Ms Rigg questioned two things. The first was the extent of Treasury commitment to the £10 million survival fund asked for. This is likely to get turned down straight away. The second was whether toughening UK laws was realistic now, as we have just had the Crow Act. In this situation, is another review likely?

47. Mr Callum Rankine noted that the Home Office is to increase wildlife crime monitoring. This is good, but we still need change to prevent people coming in with wildlife. **Ms Rigg** agreed that penalties should be toughened, but was not sure that the current proposal was the best way to do this.

GRASP (Great Ape Survival Programme)
Mr David Jay, Born Free Foundation

48. GRASP is a large project initiative concerning all 6 species of great apes and their 23 range countries. All great apes are listed on CITES Appendix 1 and are considered endangered or critically endangered by IUCN - The World Conservation Union. GRASP has the support of the United Nations through UNEP/UNESCO, as well as national governments, NGOs, academics and institutions, and the private sector. The strategy is to raise awareness with the public and with policy makers at the highest level. Website : <http://www.unep.org/GRASP/>

49. A Technical Support Team (TST) is provided by the Born Free Foundation (Eva Abe) and Ape Alliance (Ian Redmond). UNEP has appointed great ape envoys (Russell Mittermeier, Jane Goodall, Toshisada Nishida,) important for accessing high level government officials. Richard Leakey of Kenya has agreed to be a special adviser.

50. Currently, the GRASP partners are UNEP, African Wildlife Foundation, Ape Alliance, Born Free Foundation, Bristol Zoo Gardens, Bushmeat Crisis Task Force, Conservation International, CBD, CITES, Convention on Migratory Species, FFI, The Jane Goodall Institutes, The Orangutan Foundation, The Wild Chimpanzee Foundation, WCMC and WWF.

50. Funding for GRASP comes from UNEP/UNESCO, UN Foundation, national governments, Norway, and UK's DEFRA and FCO who have contributed £175K. Private sector funding is channelled mainly through the Born Free Foundation and comes from Britannia Airways and Dorling

Kindersley. Donations are expected from NGOs and from private sources and grants will be sought. A fundraising conference at the end of 2003 will be used to present projects for funding.

51. Initially there will be 6 pilot projects dealing with e.g. anti-poaching, education. The private sector will be involved in such matters as ecotourism and ecolabelling. GRASP will seek to feed in to the work carried out under Conventions such as CITES and CBD.

52. GRASP field projects seeking funding include : The protection of Tanjung Puting National park, East Cameroon education project, Congo Basin Project, Indonesia awareness campaign conservation of chimpanzees in Ivory Coast. It is anticipated that UNEP and WCMC will produce a great ape atlas (see further details on the website). The European Space Agency/UNESCO project will carry out monitoring of great ape habitat.

53. It is hoped to develop NGASPS – National Great Ape Survival Plans – for each country. Policy documents will be produced. Reviews and recommendations will be carried out on populations and habitats, threats, legislation and action, future requirements and budgets.. Technical support visits will facilitate NGASPS providing a focal point for consultation with government partners.

54. The GRASP database will draw information together and put it where people can get at it. It is important to be able to find out who is doing what. The database will also provide information on populations, projects, legislation, sanctuaries, etc

55. Activities will commence with a launch in Nairobi. UNEP letters will go to the range states. The Technical Support Team will provide support in 7 countries. The database design and data gathering will happen. Envoy visits will take place. In the medium term, 4 more country visits are planned, with more to follow. Population data for the database will be gathered. There will be follow up on country visits. The atlas will be produced. More envoy visits will take place and fundraising will continue. It is hoped that World Heritage Sites will be created.

Questions and Comments

56. **The Chair** noted that during a speech at a Foreign Office reception last week Margaret Beckett had spoken of GRASP, so clearly there is high level political recognition in the UK. **Ms Thornback** said there had been various data gathering exercises and action planning for the Great Apes over the last 20 years (she had been involved in some) and she hoped that the current activities would build on these rather than start from scratch. The focus of GRASP she felt should be on conservation action on the ground. Communities local to Great ape habitat need to benefit from their conservation if there is to be any lasting protection. **Mr Jay** replied that these earlier data gathering exercises were not yet known to the GRASP Secretariat which had not been up and running for long. He acknowledged that there is a big difference between statements of support and achieving something on the ground. It is hoped that GRASP will put pressure on range states to generate political will to implement great ape conservation. **The Chair** agreed that it is nice to have legislation, but that in many range states this was unenforceable. More work is needed for empowering and involving local communities. **Mr Jay** agreed there is a need to adopt more of a sustainable livelihoods approach. Political will is needed to contribute to success.

57. **Mr Roby** commented that while political statements are important, they are meaningless unless driven by internal political processes. **Mr Jay** hoped that national plans would be the focus for implementation and that these would be implemented by local NGOs. There is a need to provide pressure on governments to act. There is also a need for lobbying of European logging companies.

58. **Dr Glyn Davies** asked if the Born Free Foundation was under contract to UNEP? **Mr Jay** said yes. The aim is to visit countries, meet as many stakeholders as possible and bring them together around GRASP as a focus. Stakeholders will need to steer it; this cannot be done from outside.

Any Other Business

59. Mr Palmer announced a forthcoming call for concept notes under the DFID Forestry Research Programme, on devising and testing biodiversity field guides for forest animals. One of the intended audiences is rich ecotourists from the North. The current guides to forest animals are of limited use to non-technical people. What really interests tourists are birds, butterflies and mammals. There are plenty of guides for savannah areas, but not many for forests. Can guides be produced for animals you cannot see, based on behaviour and sounds? Local communities could sell the field guides. At least two kinds of guides are needed: one for eco-tourists and one for community resource managers; they may use different sets of characters. Keys are needed for tourist friendly animals, so that the field guides act as souvenirs as well as practical identifiers. Those wishing to be on the mailing list for calls should contact Mr Palmer on j.palmer@nrnt.co.uk

Date of Next Meeting

60. The date of next meeting was suggested as the afternoon of 12th June 2002. This will be confirmed by e-mail.