

GOVERNANCE

PROTECTED AREA

PA-RELATED

# Governance, Equity and the Green List

13-15 February 2018, Nairobi, Kenya

Event Report



# Governance, Equity and the Green List

Developing a multi-stakeholder and participatory governance assessment methodology for protected areas

## Author information

This report was written by:  
Francesca Booker and Phil Franks, IIED, UK.

## About the event

For more information please contact Phil Franks,  
[phil.franks@iied.org](mailto:phil.franks@iied.org).

## Acknowledgements

The workshop 'Governance, Equity and the Green List' was funded by the UK's Ecosystem Services for Poverty Alleviation (ESPA) programme with additional support from IUCN who funded the attendance of the Kenyan participants. The governance assessment methodology under discussion has been developed by IIED in collaboration with GIZ and IUCN over the last three years. We wish to thank all the contributors to the site-level governance assessments that have informed the development of the methodology, and all the participants of the workshop for their contributions during the event.

IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) helps the world find pragmatic solutions to our most pressing environment and development challenges. It is the world's oldest and largest global environmental organisation, with more than 1,200 government and NGO members and almost 11,000 volunteer experts in some 160 countries. IUCN works on biodiversity, climate change, energy, human livelihoods and greening the world economy, by supporting scientific research, managing field projects, and bringing governments, NGOs, the UN and companies together to develop policy, laws and best practice. [www.iucn.org](http://www.iucn.org)

IIED is a policy and action research organisation. We promote sustainable development to improve livelihoods and protect the environments on which these livelihoods are built. We specialise in linking local priorities to global challenges. IIED is based in London and works in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and the Pacific, with some of the world's most vulnerable people. We work with them to strengthen their voice in the decision-making arenas that affect them — from village councils to international conventions.

Published by IIED, March, 2018

<http://pubs.iied.org>

International Institute for Environment and Development  
80-86 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8NH, UK  
Tel: +44 (0)20 3463 7399  
Fax: +44 (0)20 3514 9055  
[www.iied.org](http://www.iied.org)  
🐦 @iied  
📘 [www.facebook.com/theIIED](https://www.facebook.com/theIIED)

Download more publications at <http://pubs.iied.org>

IIED is a charity registered in England, Charity No.800066 and in Scotland, OSCR Reg No.SC039864 and a company limited by guarantee registered in England No.2188452.



## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Background	2
1.2	Workshop overview	2
<b>2.</b>	<b>Day one: sharing the results of site-level governance assessment</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Introducing the concepts – governance, equity and social impact	4
2.2	Results of the governance assessment from sites in Bangladesh, Philippines, Kenya and Uganda	6
2.3	Introducing IUCN's Green List Certification	8
<b>3.</b>	<b>Day two: reflecting on the IIED governance assessment methodology</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1	Introducing the IIED governance assessment methodology	10
3.2	Group 1: reflections on using IIED's governance assessment methodology	10
3.3	Group 2: refining and clarifying key concepts and relationships between social impacts, governance and equity	12
<b>4.</b>	<b>Day three: governance assessment facilitator experience sharing and training</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1	Understanding the IIED good governance principles	14
4.2	Planning a governance assessment	15
<b>Annex 1</b>	<b>List of participants</b>	<b>16</b>

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background

Good governance is fundamental to effective protected area (PA) design, planning, and management operations, and the degree to which these are equitable in terms of the recognition and engagement of key actors, and the distribution of benefits and costs/burdens. Achieving both effective and equitable PA management is central to international PA policy (ie Aichi target 11).

Site-level PA governance assessment assesses the quality of the governance arrangements of a PA in relation to best practice which is defined in terms of a set of good governance principles. The goal of any governance assessment is improving governance quality and, in some situations, exploring possibilities for a change of governance type. However, different governance assessment methodologies contribute to this in different ways according to their objectives – whether they be health checking, diagnostic or for monitoring.

- A. As a **Health check**: to determine strengths and challenges of governance arrangements and thereby identify issues that need some attention.
- B. As a **Diagnostic**: to understand the underlying causes of existing challenges and thereby identify actions that could improve the situation.
- C. For **Monitoring**: to establish a baseline against which changes in governance (hopefully improvements) at a given site can be measured over time.

The workshop 'Governance, Equity and the Green List', focused specifically on the multi-stakeholder assessment methodology that is currently being developed by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) in partnership with the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). This methodology has been developed primarily for learning to support a process of governance strengthening (A), but this workshop also explored how the assessment might be strengthened and tailored for all three applications (A-C).

## 1.2 Workshop overview

'Governance, Equity and the Green List' was held at Maasai Lodge (Nairobi, Kenya) and IUCN Nairobi Headquarters from 13 -15<sup>th</sup> February 2018. Presentations and discussions over the three days focused on efforts by IIED and partners GIZ and IUCN to develop a multi-stakeholder participatory methodology to assess governance quality at individual PAs and conservation areas. The attendees also explored the relationship of governance assessment to the equity element of Aichi Target 11 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and the opportunities for the IUCN Green List Standard to strengthen governance – particularly for Kenya's growing number of wildlife conservancies.

A range of individuals were invited to the workshop including site-level support organisations who are involved in the day to day workings of a PA or conservation area and are familiar with the opportunities and challenges related to good governance. All these individuals have experience with implementing the IIED governance assessment (GA) methodology. Participants of the workshop also included national and international NGO and technical support organisations and researchers grappling with issues of governance, equity and the social impacts of PAs and conservation areas. Additionally, members of the CBD Secretariat attended the workshop to gain further understanding on how to connect experience with issues of governance and equity at the site-level to international policy, including Aichi Target 11. The full list of participants is summarised in Annex 1.

### Workshop objectives

1. Day 1: The objective of the first day was to identify and characterise key governance and equity issues emerging from experience with the IIED GA methodology at seven sites in four countries (Bangladesh, Philippines, Kenya and Uganda).
2. Day 2: The second day of the workshop had two objectives as the workshop attendees split into two groups according to their expertise and experience. The first group made up of site-level governance



assessment facilitators critiqued the IIED GA methodology and considered outstanding issues such as monitoring progress over time and contributing to improved policy and practice at site-level PAs and conservation areas. The second group of participants, with backgrounds in academia and national and international policy, focused on refining and clarifying key concepts and relationships between governance assessment of PAs, social assessment of PAs and equity.

3. Day 3: On the final day, a workshop was held for site-level governance assessment facilitators aimed at delivering focused capacity building so that the facilitators can lead a GA process in the future and train others to facilitate the GA process.



***‘Governance, Equity and the Green List’ workshop participants on days 1 and 2***

## 2. Day one: sharing the results of site-level governance assessment

### 2.1 Introducing the concepts – governance, equity and social impact

IIED Senior Researcher, Phil Franks, opened the workshop by presenting to attendees IIED's understanding of the core concepts of governance, equity and social impact in the context of PA conservation.

**Governance** of PAs and associated development activities is about *who defines the overall objectives and how, and the allocation of responsibility and accountability for delivering on these objectives*. An important distinction should be made between PA governance type and PA governance quality (commonly referred to as good governance). PA governance type concerns who has the legal authority to govern the PA, and there are four main types:

- **Governance by government**
- **Shared governance** by two or more actors working in collaboration
- **Private governance** by private organisations or individuals
- **Community governance** by Indigenous Peoples and/or local communities.

Governance quality is typically described by principles. IIED have condensed IUCN's 40 key considerations on good governance (as detailed in [Governance of Protected Areas: From understanding to action](#)) to 11 good governance principles that are relevant to site-level governance assessment. The IIED good governance principles were presented to attendees alongside IUCN's five broad good governance principles – see Table 1.

**Equity** is a core issue for PA management and governance both in terms of the ethics of conservation and in terms of the effectiveness and sustainability of conservation outcomes. Equity has three distinct dimensions – recognition, procedure, and the distribution of benefits and costs and their ultimate impact on human wellbeing (social impacts).

A **social impact** (of a protected area and associated conservation and development activities) is a good or bad thing that in some way affects human wellbeing. A positive social impact is a benefit, while a negative social impact is cost, burden or harm from the PA and associated development activities.

Phil Franks explained that IIED's governance assessment explores issues of governance and equity, which are closely related. Indeed, the first of the nine good governance principles relate to both governance and equity. However, governance assessment does not go as far as to understand the impact on human wellbeing (social impacts) – an important consideration of equity. To understand a PA's impact on human wellbeing, a social impact assessment (ie Social Assessment for Protected Areas, [SAPA](#)) is more appropriate.


**Table 1. IIED and IUCN's Good Governance Principles for PAs**

IIED PA good governance principles	IUCN good governance principles
1. <u>Recognition</u> and respect of all relevant actors and their <u>knowledge, values &amp; institutions</u>	Legitimacy and Voice
2. Effective <u>participation</u> of relevant actors in decision-making	Legitimacy and Voice
3. <u>Recognition</u> and respect for the <u>rights</u> of all relevant actors	Fairness and Rights
4. Fair and effective processes for <u>dispute resolution</u>	Fairness and Rights
5. Effective measures to <u>mitigate negative social impacts</u>	Fairness and Rights
6. <u>Fair sharing of benefits</u> according to a targeting strategy agreed by relevant actors	Fairness and Rights
7. <u>Transparency</u> supported by timely access to relevant information	Accountability
8. <u>Accountability</u> for fulfilling responsibilities, other actions and inactions	Accountability
9. Fair and effective <u>enforcement of laws</u> and regulations	Fairness and Rights / Performance
10. <u>Achievement</u> of conservation and other <u>objectives</u>	Performance
11. Effective <u>coordination and collaboration</u> between different actors, sectors and levels	Direction

## 2.2 Results of the governance assessment from sites in Bangladesh, Philippines, Kenya and Uganda

Attendees heard seven presentations detailing experience with site-level governance assessment using IIED's GA methodology.

1. Sundarbans, Bangladesh
2. Augsan Marsh, Philippines
3. Lake Mburo, Uganda
4. Mara North Conservancy, Kenya
5. Kalama Conservancy, Kenya
6. Kanamai Co-management area and Tengefu, Kenya
7. Ol Lentille Conservancy, Kenya



These sites represent a diverse range of governance types including state governance (Lake Mburo), private governance (Ol Lentille), community governance (Kalama Conservancy) and shared governance between communities and government (Sundarbans, Augsan Marsh) or the private sector and communities (Mara North Conservancy).



Lead facilitators from each of the sites shared information about the different rightsholders and stakeholders involved in the GAs, the five to six good governance principles prioritised for in depth interrogation and why, the results from the GAs – so what is working and what is not working at the PAs or conservation areas related to the good governance principles – and some of the actions taken since the GAs. Presentations are available on request (from [francesca.booker@iied.org](mailto:francesca.booker@iied.org)), though some of the key governance and equity issues at sites are summarised in Table 2.

Following the presentations, attendees had time to ask questions relevant to specific sites or make general comments and reflections about the GA methodology and site-level results. Important plenary reflections following the presentations included:

- **Reporting up – how do we use site-level GA results on governance and equity to inform system and/or international levels?** Participants highlighted that the IIED GA Methodology produces valuable insights on governance and equity for site-level PAs and conservation areas. However, questions remain about the reporting process of how this site-level information can be shared to inform system level understanding of governance and equity across PAs and conservation areas. Furthermore, questions were asked about how site-level assessment can inform on countries' international commitments. Important questions that need to be considered as part of the compilation of an IIED GA methodology manual and guidance include – who is responsible for ensuring site-level GA results are shared at different levels – site level, systems level and international level? Are these results being reported to the relevant authorities that are reporting at the international level? It was suggested that in all cases, as a very minimum, the CBD focal point should be aware of a site-level GAs, including the results and suggested action points/next steps.
- **Contribution vs attribution – how do we understand the GA's contribution to improving governance and equity at the site or systems level?** Across the seven presentations, there were many good examples of important next steps/action points that are currently being pursued to improve governance and equity. However, participants acknowledged that it is hard to understand the role of the GA in triggering such actions, or whether such action would have occurred regardless. While it may be hard to attribute any specific actions to the GA (because often there are multiple reasons for action), a lot more needs to be done to understand the contribution of the GA.



As our GIZ Bangladesh colleagues underlined, this is an important task to illustrate the value of the GA.

**Table 2. Some of the key governance and equity related challenges emerging from GAs at Bangladesh, Philippines, Kenya and Uganda**

Principle	Example challenge
1. <b>Recognition and respect of all relevant actors and their knowledge, values and institutions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IPs rights known but not fully exercised / enjoyed</li> <li>• Some community members do not know their rights</li> </ul>
2. <b>Effective participation of all relevant actors in decision-making</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resource users have been refused membership of co-management committees</li> <li>• Exclusion of women in community decision making bodies</li> <li>• Elections of community leaders are undemocratic</li> <li>• Influence on decisions is from community leaders and largely ignores local people</li> <li>• Some parts of the PAs or conservation areas have fewer representatives</li> <li>• Notice for community meetings is not timely</li> <li>• Political interference in decision-making</li> <li>• Women's involvement in decision making is very limited</li> </ul>
3. <b>Recognition and respect for the rights of all relevant actors</b>	<i>(Not assessed so far in the seven GAs)</i>
4. <b>Fair and effective processes for dispute resolution</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No mechanism to resolve over-lapping land titles issued by different agencies</li> <li>• Unresolved disputes leading to increasing resentment of Park authorities</li> <li>• Lack of forums to prevent disputes</li> <li>• No formal structures for dispute resolution between rightsholders and stakeholders</li> </ul>
5. <b>Effective measures to mitigate negative social impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negative impacts of conservation are not recognised eg no access to water for livestock</li> <li>• No support for human wildlife conflict</li> </ul>
6. <b>Fair sharing of benefits according to a strategy agreed by relevant actors</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community members do not attend community based natural resource governance related meetings as there are no benefits</li> <li>• Beneficiaries are not necessarily the intended target group</li> <li>• Alternative income projects are provided without consultation with the target groups</li> <li>• Community members do not have the opportunity to explain their development needs before interventions are brought</li> <li>• Little involvement of community members in decision-making on benefit sharing</li> <li>• Women are not consulted about the allocation of conservation related benefits</li> <li>• Nepotism or clannism affecting access to employment opportunities</li> <li>• Limited employment of women in conservancies</li> </ul>
7. <b>Transparency supported by timely access to relevant information</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private investors do not share information on bed night fees in an easily accessible format</li> <li>• Committee members do not properly inform the people they represent</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Women lack basic information on the conservancy or protected area</li> <li>• Financial expenditure related to the PA or conservation area is not always open or clear</li> </ul>
<b>8. Accountability for fulfilling responsibilities, other actions and inactions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities are not aware of the responsibilities of the co-management institutions</li> <li>• There are no mechanisms for community members to know if their leaders are performing their responsibilities</li> <li>• Loss of revenue sharing funds due to corruption</li> <li>• No/ limited follow up of community development projects</li> </ul>
<b>9. Fair and effective enforcement of laws and regulations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limitations of working with community-based volunteers</li> <li>• Community rangers find it hard to enforce law on family and friends</li> <li>• Illegal invaders are heavily armed and so it is difficult to respond</li> <li>• Rangers are bribed to ignore illegal grazing</li> <li>• People caught engaging in illegal activities escape prosecution due to political influence</li> <li>• Community members feel that there is not enough investigation before prosecution</li> <li>• Historical cases of torture and allegations of loss of life</li> </ul>
<b>10. Achievement of conservation and other objectives efficiently</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conflicting conservation and development objectives at the site-level</li> <li>• Conservation and/or social objectives are too ambitious</li> <li>• There are no indicators to know how well actors are achieving their objectives</li> <li>• Failure to control human-wildlife conflict undermines social and conservation objectives</li> </ul>
<b>11. Effective coordination and collaboration between different actors, sectors and levels</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deficiency between government and non-government line agencies in coordination of activities</li> </ul>

## 2.3 Introducing IUCN's Green List Certification

To complete day one of the workshop, IUCN's Bea Chataigner introduced the IUCN Green List Certification. The Green List is an incentive measure for PAs and conservation areas to self-assess and improve their own performance, and to learn and share successful solutions across sites. The mission of the certification is *"to recognise and globally increase the number of PAs and conservation areas that are fairly governed, effectively managed and achieving their conservation outcomes"*.

There are four main components to the Green List Standard – (1) good governance, (2) sound planning and design, (3) effective management, and (4) conservation outcomes (see Figure 1).



Figure 1: Four components of the Green List Standard

PAs and conservation areas that want to be Green List Certified are assessed against 17 criteria across these four components to understand whether they are achieving quality. Within the good governance component of the Green List Standard the focus is on:

1. Guarantee legitimacy and voice
2. Achieve transparency and accountability
3. Enable capacity to respond adaptively

The process of certification includes self-assessment with mentor support, review by an international auditor and an IUCN Green List Panel.

For the African continent there are 17 priority countries with the Green List's strategy for expansion between 2017 and 2020. The first priority countries include Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Gabon, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Namibia, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania and Uganda.

### 3. Day two: reflecting on the IIED governance assessment methodology

#### 3.1 Introducing the IIED governance assessment methodology

IIED Researcher, Francesca Booker, presented an overview of the governance assessment methodology and process.

Key points included that the methodology is primarily designed for use by key local stakeholders (eg PA managers) to strengthen PA governance and thereby the effectiveness and equity of PA conservation at that site. The methodology comprises an analytical framework of principles, a multi-stakeholder assessment process, and methods and tools for the five phases of the assessment process: (1) preparation, (2) scoping, (3) information collection (key informant interviews and focus group discussions), (4) self-assessment and (5) action planning. A governance assessment is expected to prioritize five (maximum six) of the good governance principles for further interrogation during the assessment process, and not all eleven principles. This is due to the time it takes to facilitate a meaningful discussion on the principles, and principles are prioritised according to 'hot' issues at the site – as decided by all the rightsholders and stakeholders that are involved in the process through voting or consensus decision making.

A comprehensive users' manual on governance and equity assessment will be published by IIED in April/May 2018.

#### 3.2 Group 1: reflections on using IIED's governance assessment methodology

The first group of site-level governance assessment facilitators with experience of the IIED GA methodology critiqued the approach and considered outstanding issues such as monitoring progress over time and contributing to improved policy and practice at site-level PAs and conservation areas. The group discussion revealed many insights summarised here according to the relevant phase of the GA process.

##### Phase 1 – Scoping

- Sometimes it is difficult to attract key stakeholders (particularly government actors) to participate in the GA. This may be due to reservations in engaging in an approach that challenges the status quo. Also, often attending stakeholder workshops or key informant interviews is not high on individual's priorities. Guidance should be provided on how to explain the GA in a way that shows value to different actors and secures their support and engagement.
- The translation of the principles from English to the local language is difficult but is a key step in the implementation of the GA that should not be overlooked. It is important that the team of facilitators and note-takers undertaking the GA agree on the language that should be used to translate the principles to ensure the consistency of the GA approach and the integrity of the GA results. Guidance should be provided to ensure that certain terms are not translated too narrowly, for example, benefit sharing should not be translated in a way that implies only financial benefits.
- Even with good translation practices, challenges persist with understanding the GA good governance principles. Often discussion with key informant interviewees and focus group attendees is limited to their interpretation and understanding of the concepts and terminology. It is hard to get beyond this, even when using probing questions.

##### Phase 2 – Data collection and analysis

- The challenges of facilitation should not be underestimated. Facilitators need to have a good understanding of the good governance principles and should know (or be able to appreciate) the local context and history of the assessment site. Facilitators should also be sensitive to and able to manage power dynamics at the site-level to ensure that different points of view are shared in a safe space that does not lead to conflict. They also need to be perceived as independent by the actors

participating in the GA. The IIED GA methodology should consider having minimum criteria for selecting facilitators and/or some guidance.

- The challenges of note-taking should not be underestimated. Note-takers need to be able to demonstrate some understanding of good governance and the local context. They need to be able to be sensitive to the way that people might articulate governance issues indirectly – as, at times, it may be uncomfortable (or even dangerous) for people to explicitly state contentious governance challenges. Note-takers need to be able to recognise this and capture all relevant points. They also need to be perceived as independent by the actors participating in the GA. The IIED GA methodology should consider having minimum criteria for selecting note-takers and/or some guidance.

#### **Phase 4 – Next steps**

- A lot of the gains so far from piloting sites in integrating the GA results and ideas for action into the relevant site-level planning processes have been incidental, or have occurred because of an active NGO partner that convened the GA. More guidance is needed on identifying opportunities, perhaps during the scoping phase, for integrating the GA results into relevant site and system level planning processes.
- The IIED GA methodology should consider suggesting that the GA process has an institutional home. For example, a local supporting agency could convene the GA process and commit resources up front to important next steps such as: (a) communicating the results, (b) convening an action planning meeting and (c) supporting a dialogue process should any conflict emerge from the GA process. The methodology might also consider how best to include local champions that could support next steps at various site and system levels.
- Next steps include the communication of results, but more guidance is needed on how to package and target GA results to different actors, for example, donors, national supporting agencies and NGOs, national government, local supporting agencies and NGOs and local people - including rightsholders and stakeholders. Additionally, while communication of the GA results is crucial, communicating what action is happening because of the GA process is equally important and should not be overlooked.
- An important gap in the IIED GA methodology is a clear tool or guidance on how to monitor progress on the good governance principles over time. The IIED GA methodology provides important baseline information, but much of the information is qualitative and it will be hard to track changes over time. A monitoring tool should also consider tracking actions taken as a result of the GA process. More guidance is additionally needed on how to measure contribution (rather than attribution) of the GA process to site or system level changes in governance quality.


#### **General comments**

- All the facilitators expressed that the timeline for the IIED GA methodology should be up to 15 days for larger sites. Facilitators expressed that it was useful to work on the GA methodology on a full time rather than part time basis, to avoid distractions, and allow the team to become absorbed in the learning process.
- Facilitators noted difficulties in managing community expectations. It can be difficult for facilitators to explain to community rightsholders and stakeholders what might happen next after the governance assessment, especially as next steps might be discrete in nature and not have an obvious impact on the day to day challenges of people's lives.
- An important strength of the IIED GA methodology is that it gives rightsholders and stakeholders a platform to share their voice on things that are working or not working related to governance of a PA or conservation area – often local people (especially women) have rarely (or never) had such opportunities. Facilitators noted, however, that there is a risk that local people may become frustrated or disempowered once the GA process ends if there is no follow up or identification of another platform for people to continue to voice their concerns.



### 3.3 Group 2: refining and clarifying key concepts and relationships between social impacts, governance and equity

The second group of participants, with backgrounds in academia and national and international policy, focused on refining and clarifying key concepts and relationships between governance assessment of PAs, social assessment of PAs and equity. The following diagram summarises the discussion.



Comments:

- The boundary of the PA (in green) is the boundary of PA and PA-related activities that are under the governance arrangements of the PA not the physical boundary of the PA. Extending beyond this boundary are other conservation and development activities that in some way support PA conservation but are not under governance arrangements of the PA. In other words the diagram shows the PA as an institution rather than PA as a physical entity.
- Impacts on wellbeing include the full range of impacts, social, economic, cultural etc.

- Our understanding of human wellbeing is based on the three-dimensional framework comprising an objective (or material) dimension, a relational dimension, and a subjective dimension. PA Impacts will contribute to changes in human-wellbeing in all three dimensions.
- The extent to which a specific impact of the PA will actually affect human wellbeing depends on a number of contextual factors, notably the vulnerability of those affected. Thus it is important that social assessment looks at both the impacts and changes in wellbeing.
- The CBD secretariat is looking for generic indicators of social impact, governance and equity that could be used to assess progress versus the “equitable management” element of Aichi target 11. With the “effective management” element they are simply using the number of PA sites that have completed a management effectiveness assessment and implemented some follow-up activities in response to the assessment results. A similar approach could be used for equity if a simply equity assessment tool existed. This approach assumes that conducting an assessment and responding to at least one result is a proxy for progress in PA management effectiveness – it is but sets a low bar. Setting a higher bar in terms of a minimum score from effectiveness assessment is not an option because comparison between sites is not meaning full with the self-assessment approaches that are generally used – likewise with equity.



## 4. Day three: governance assessment facilitator experience sharing and training



**Expert GA facilitators from Bangladesh, Philippines, Kenya, Uganda and Zambia**

On day three, site-level governance assessment facilitators came together at IUCN Headquarters to share experiences with understanding the good governance principles, to practice planning a GA process and to impart their top tips when undertaking a GA.

### 4.1 Understanding the IIED good governance principles

Dr Medard Twinamatsiko led a group exercise used in site-level training for the facilitators to engage with and understand the good governance principles. The 14 expert GA facilitators divided into two groups to practice this exercise – one group took six principles and the other considered five principles and noted strengths and challenges (what is working and what is not working) of the principles in practice at their PA and conservation area. The purpose of this exercise was to ensure that the facilitators felt confident leading the same exercise when repeating a GA exercise independently with their own team of facilitators and note-takers. Many of the expert facilitators noted that they enjoyed this exercise because it was interesting to hear examples of governance strengths and challenges from other PAs and conservation areas.



**Group exercise on understanding the good governance principles**



## 4.2 Planning a governance assessment

In the afternoon the expert facilitators separated into their PA or conservation areas teams to plan a GA process from the beginning scoping phase, through data collection and analysis, then the multi-stakeholder self-assessment, and finally, next steps such as communicating the results and action planning. The facilitators then rotated to look at each team's GA plan in turn and discuss the strengths of the different GA plans and make suggestions for improvement. The purpose of this exercise was to ensure that facilitators feel confident to support both the planning and implementation of the GA process in the future, in other words, feel confident to lead a complete governance assessment process.



**Participants planning and reflecting on governance assessment processes**

## Annex 1 List of participants

Name	Organisation
Alimakio Zulu	CBNRM Forum, Zambia
Barbara Lang	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
Claire Bedelian	University College London
Charles Muchunguzi	Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Uganda
Dhali Panchanon	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit, Bangladesh
Elaine Geyer-Allely	WWF Kenya
Eric Reson	Mara North Conservancy, Kenya
Edigayehu Seyoum-Edjigu	CBD Secretariat, Montreal, Canada
Francesca Booker	IIED, UK
Jenny Kelleher	IUCN, Switzerland
Jess Campese	Independent Consultant, US
Joan Kawaka	CORDIO, Kenya
Joaquim Cheupe	Independent Consultant, Kenya
Joost Van Montfort	WWF Netherlands
Joy Mirasol	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit, Philippines
Kate Schreckenber	ESPA Director and Kings College London, UK
Margret Wambua	Laikipia Wildlife Foundation, Kenya
Medard Twinamatsiko	Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Uganda
Michael Lenaimado	Northern Rangelands Trust, Kenya
Moses Muthoki	OI Pejeta Conservancy, Kenya
Neil Dawson	University of East Anglia, UK
Ochen Maiyani	Independent Consultant, Kenya
Phil Franks	IIED, UK
Richard Kasoo	Northern Rangelands Trust, Kenya
Rudolph Dela Cruz	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit, Philippines
Sarat Gidda	CBD Secretariat, Montreal, Canada
Sharif Mostofa	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit, Bangladesh
Susan Kiringo	Northern Rangelands Trust, Kenya



The workshop 'Governance, Equity and the Green List' was held in Kenya in February 2018. It focused on the multi-stakeholder, participatory methodology being developed by IIED in partnership with GIZ and IUCN to assess governance quality at individual PAs and conservation areas. The workshop objectives were to: identify and characterise key governance and equity issues emerging from experience of using the methodology in Bangladesh, Philippines, Kenya and Uganda; critique the methodology and consider outstanding issues such as monitoring progress over time and contributing to improved policy and practice; refine and clarify key concepts; and build capacity so that the facilitators present can lead a governance assessment process in the future and train others in the methodology. This report summarises the proceedings.



## Event Materials

### Biodiversity

**Keywords:**  
Governance; protected areas; conservation;  
wellbeing; equity



International Institute for Environment and Development  
80-86 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8NH, UK  
Tel: +44 (0)20 3463 7399  
Fax: +44 (0)20 3514 9055  
[www.iied.org](http://www.iied.org)

Funded by:



This workshop was part of the project 'Advancing equity in Protected Area Conservation: from theory to practice' (ESPA project number IAF-2017-18-004) funded with support from the Ecosystem Services for Poverty Alleviation (ESPA) programme. The ESPA programme is funded by the Department for International Development (DFID), the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC). The event received additional support from IUCN, who funded the attendance of Kenyan participants.