

Satoyama Dialogue: Tools, Technology and People
Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia
April 20, 2017

Dr. Yoji Natori, Manager of the GEF-Satoyama Project, welcomed the participants to the workshop and introduced the chair of the event, Ms. Kien Dang of the Social Policy Ecology Research Institute (SPERI) in Vietnam. Before introducing the first speaker, Ms. Kien referred to the video on the importance and use of the Indicators of Resilience which was shown earlier in the plenary session and received positive feedback from the participants.

The first speaker, Dr. Prasert Trakansuphakon of IMPECT, disclosed that that the three Karen communities which used the indicators were happy that they had the opportunity to analyse their own situation and that the discussions they had were well done. Because of the exercise, there was more awareness among the community members. He disclosed that they were better able to prioritize the issues that arose from those discussions and this process was used to design three workplans for their respective communities. He further explained that the involvement of elders, women and youth was essential for the success.

Ms. Li commenting on the presentation by Dr. Prasert, asked how was it possible to understand the indicators especially when speaking to the community members, how many days were required for the process and who facilitated the discussion. Dr. Prasert explained that the indicators were translated into Thai and Karen and that villagers understood the concepts more during the actual evaluation of the SEPLS. He explained that the communities were brought together and that it took three days for the process. He identified language as the main challenge that needed to be overcome. He explained that the facilitators that must be chosen, need to understand the process but in the local experience, they also learned as they went along and came from NGOs and the university but were already close to the community. Ms. Li further asked how to involve other stakeholders and to bring them together for the analysis. Dr. Prasert explained that the community members were the ones integrally involved but agreed that other stakeholders should be included and this is an aspect that will be done in the future.

Ms. Li explained that bringing many stakeholders together is very important. Ms. Kien opined that although the workshop might be a few days, the landscape approach is a process that occurs over time and should not be a standalone event such as a

workshop. Dr. Prasert also explained that it is also difficult sometimes to get persons to come and be a part of the process. Mr. Dunbar explained that the workshop in Thailand was aimed at addressing the Indo-Burma Biodiversity hotspot which was a bit complicated. He said that the recommended time for the workshop should be between 1-2 days. He mentioned that from his experience, it was always necessary to first have a session to explain concepts and terms before the actual scoring process and as a result, it may not always be possible to finish it in one day. Mr. Singay Dorji of UNDP explained that in the case where there is more than one facilitator, it is important that among the facilitators there be a consensus on the meaning of terms to avoid confusions when engaging the stakeholders in the workshop. He mentioned that in his experience he found that the discussion tended to be very dynamic and sometimes the workshops ended late as result. Dr. Natori adding to the point made by Mr. Dorji, explained that the discussion is more important than the actual scoring because it gives the reasons why the scores were given and it is an observation that he found in the trainings that he was involved in so far.

Ms. Jiliah Situn asked about the purpose of the toolkit in research and the data that is needed for the conduct of the analysis including the type of data, procedure to be used, quality control of the data and record keeping. Mr. Dunbar explained that the toolkit was meant to be used as a practical tool where they can act on the ground and not so much for research. He further said that because of this, the community members are encouraged to look at the indicators and at their landscape with the idea that it would lead them to better understand the status and make concrete decisions on what needs to be done. Dr. Natori emphasized that in this process, record keeping is important to document the discussions that are being held among the stakeholders during the evaluation process. Ms. Situn further emphasized that the importance of record keeping is to ensure that they adhere to standards so that the knowledge can be preserved for future generations. Mr. Jady Smith articulated that this is a good link to information technology because if there is a flood or fire, the archives could be destroyed and therefore information technology can serve as an ideal way of preserving tradition knowledge and culture since it would be saved in several places. Mr. Marcal Gusman explained that the indicators are used to see progress of a project or landscape and as a result it needs to be consistent

Dr. Kuang-Chung Lee of the National Dong-Hwa University presented a case study of an indigenous rice paddy cultural landscape in Taiwan where participatory evaluation using the Indicators of Resilience was done. He explained that the evaluation occurred in various stages which included planning and preparation, discussions, consensus

building, and implementation and monitoring. He shared the results obtained that came out of the process employed which include a strategy with many tasks identified for possible implementation. He finalized his presentation by indicating the successful adaptation of the landscape approach to formulate the Cihalaay Cultural Landscape Management Principles/Plan through a multi-stakeholder participation process, and an indicator system of resilience for monitoring the local area.

Because focus groups and main groups were both utilized, the question was asked if there were differences in the results obtained from the two groups. Prof. Lee assured that the outcomes were the same but because of the technical terms that were difficult to translate into local languages, focus groups were used to deal with this hurdle. Prof. Lee was asked how it was possible to have participants in so many meetings since in most cases villagers are reluctant to come to even one meeting. Prof. Lee explained that they were paid a salary for their time to compensate for loss of income. Mr. Marcal also posited that compensating though positive can be negative and it needs to be done carefully. Prof. Lee also indicated that it is important to select the participants of the focus groups strategically to ensure that maximum representation is achieved and ensure that the local government system of the area is taken into consideration.

Ms. Yi Liu, of UNDP shared how GEF SGP is supporting Indigenous and Conserved Community Areas (ICCAs). She highlighted that fact that SGP China has supported 21 ICCAs since 2009. She explained that these are divided into three priority SEPLS, namely, the Alpine Canyons in Three Parallel Rivers area; the Alpine grassland and wetland landscape in Sanjiangyuan region; and the Tropical Coastline seascape of the Beibu Gulf and mentioned the baseline assessment-selection criteria which was employed. For each of the SEPLS, she presented the geography, challenges, and the expected results and indicators of landscape management. She concluded with a plan to incorporate the Indicators of Resilience in the future for use in new project applications and by stakeholders including at the community level.

Ms. Situn lauded the efforts of China in making it mandatory for record keeping to be kept at very high standards. Mr. Yasuo Takahashi mentioned that the Indicators of Resilience is an excellent tool which allows for communities on the ground to connect with scientists and is also important for scaling up which is highly discussed within IPBES. He further expressed the hope that the tool can be updated. Mr. William Dunbar explained that it is desirable to have another phase to have the toolkit revised taking into consideration lessons learned but there are limitations in resources to get it done.

Mr. Jady Smith of Live and Learn Australia spoke on IPSI and Information Technology gave an overview of how IT can be used within the IPSI network. He explained that because we are in an environmental crisis then efficiency is needed so that local communities can be resilient and as a result IPSI can facilitate this process. Because all IPSI members are keeping records in various ways and it is not always easy to access this information. He gave an example of the fact that information technology has allowed for us for example in global illegal fishing activities which were otherwise not easily perceptible. He proffered that if we work together we will not duplicate material. He explained that the fact that Google Earth and other Google tools are useful that they can be approached but he expressed reservation in terms of intellectual copyrights. Open source platforms can be useful such as radiant earth and commercial systems such as ArcGIS.

Dr. Prasert explained that mapping done by local people was related to the rotational farming system employed by the Karen people. He reiterated that there is a need to merge local knowledge with the mapping technology. He explained that mapping is also instrumental in protecting the land of the indigenous people from being taken away from them.

Mr. Yohsuke Amano agreed that the use of GIS for the mapping of SEPLS is important within IPSI but the problem is that the definition of SEPLS has quite unclear boundaries. While there are a wide range of members in IPSI, how to collect the information will be the challenge. He further mentioned that apart from Google there are many free mapping tools available but there needs to be control of the entry of data because it is possible for false data to be inputted by persons and therefore we need to look at how to take care of this. Mr. Ghani explained that there are inexpensive satellites such as the ones developed by Hokkaido University that can collect real time data. He explained that it is important to present the data in the right spectrum. Dr. Devon Dublin pointed out that Google is currently inaccessible in China and we should also take factors such as these into consideration when choosing the mapping tool.

Dr. Yoji Natori spoke on Global mapping of Priority SEPLS under the GEF-Satoyama Project. He explained that the exercise is premised on the definition of SEPLS as contained in the IPSI charter and presented various data sets and resources that are already available for conducting the exercise.

Mr. Mangal Shakya mentioned that there is a collaborative plan to work between Nepal and Cuba for mapping. Mr. Shamik Chakraborty mentioned the importance of having security systems in place to prevent persons changing codes. He further explained

that in the field of astronomy, amateur astronomers are employed whereby the eyes and ears are increased and this method can be used as well for mapping SEPLS and its easy to do since everyone has iPhones etc. He cautioned however, that too much information can be bad where while someone may share a photo of an endangered animal but it can be informative for poachers.

Mr. Takahashi reminded everyone that it is necessary to identify the purpose and the audience at all times when developing the mapping products. He recommended the involvement of United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) in the process.

Ms. Situn recommended that the life cycle be developed and a framework be built that can be used for managing the data that is collected through the process. There is a need to develop a Jobal chart and determine what information will be made public and what information will be restricted. Mr. Smith explained that since we are in the early stages there is a need to determine what we want to do and how we want to do it. Dr. Dublin explained that the conversation will continue and the expertise available in the various fields will be tapped into in the future. Ms. Dang finalized the session by sharing some mapping livelihood sovereignty in Vietnam and Laos using Google Mind Maps.

Dr. Dublin thanked everyone for coming and the session was ended.