



STEWARD
Sustainable and thriving
Environments for
West African Regional
Development



DARWIN Nimba Transboundary Biodiversity Governance Platform

Summary report of responses from stakeholders surveys in Liberia, Guinea and Ivory Coast

November 2011

Draft 1.4

Table 1: Abbreviations

AML:	ArcelorMittal Liberia
CEGENS:	Environmental Management Authority for Mounts Nimba and Simandou
CMF:	Collaborative Management Framework
EPA:	Environmental Protection Agency
ENNR:	East Nimba Nature Reserve
FDA:	Forestry Development Authority
FFI:	Fauna and Flora International
IREB:	Environmental Research Institute of Bossou
LISGIS:	Liberia Institute of Statistics and Geo-Informational Services
MOA:	Ministry of Agriculture
MOI:	Ministry of Information
MOIA:	Ministry of Internal Affairs
MOJ:	Ministry of Justice
MOL:	Ministry of Labour
NTFPs:	Non Timber Forest Products
OIPR:	Ivorian Office of Parks and Reserves
SODEFOR:	Society for the Development of Forests
SMFG:	Societe Minerale de Fer de Guinea
SSMN:	Scientific Station of Mount Nimba

Contents

1.0 Introduction:	5
1.1 Key findings of the survey	6
2.0 Analysis of Questionnaire Responses: Liberia	8
2.10 Identified problems, potential solutions and values with respect to the Nimba Mountains (Qs. 1-2 and 12-13).....	8
2.11 Government	8
2.12 Community	9
2.13 Private Sector / Civil Society / local administrators	10
2.20 Understanding of CMF, its importance and perceived positive or negatives outcomes from a CMF for Nimba Mountains (Qs. 3-6 and 10).....	11
2.21 Government	11
2.22 Community	12
2.23 Private Sector / Civil Society / local administrators	12
2.30 Identified Roles and Contributions of stakeholders (Qs. 7-9 and 11)	13
2.31 Government	13
2.32 Community	14
2.33 Private Sector / Civil Society	14
3.0 Analysis of Questionnaire Responses: Guinea	15
3.10: Identified problems, potential solutions and values with respect to the mountains (Qs. 1-2 and 12-13).....	15
3.11 Government	15
3.12 Community	16
3.20 Understanding of CMF, its importance and perceived positive or negatives outcomes from a CMF for Nimba Mountains (Qs. 3-6 and 10).....	17
3.21 Government	17
3.22 Community	18
3.30: Identified Roles and Contributions of stakeholders (Qs. 7-9 and 11).....	18
3.31 Government	18
3.32 Community	19
4.0 Analysis of Questionnaire Responses: Ivory Coast	20
4.10 Identified problems, potential solutions and values with respect to the mountains (Qs. 1-2 and 12-13).....	20
4.11 Government	20
4.20 Understanding of CMF, its importance and perceived positive or negatives outcomes from a CMF for Nimba Mountains (Qs. 3-6 and 10).....	21

Darwin Initiative Transboundary Governance Platform stakeholder survey
report Nov 2011

4.21 Government	21
4.30 Identified Roles and Contributions of stakeholders (Qs. 7-9 and 11)	21
5.0 ANNEX	23
5.10 List of respondents and contacts from Liberia, Guinea and Ivory Coast.....	23
5.20 Questionnaire for Stakeholders relevant to a Transboundary Biodiversity Governance Platform for the Nimba Mountains.	26
5.30 Questionnaire pour les parties prenantes essentielles à la mise en place d'une Plateforme de Gouvernance de la Biodiversité pour les Monts Nimba	27

1.0 Introduction:

The FFI Darwin Nimba Project aims to reduce threats to biodiversity in the Nimba Mountains, by improving collaboration between stakeholders associated with Mount Nimba across three national boundaries to reduce threats to biodiversity from both subsistence pressures and large-scale mining operations. Development of a trans-boundary Governance Platform is seen as a key step towards aligning the biodiversity mitigation strategies of the three mining multinationals currently operating in Nimba and providing a mechanism for engagement of other stakeholders, including communities which depend on the region and its biodiversity for their livelihoods and wellbeing. The goal is to develop a Collaborative Management Framework for the Nimba Mountains which will be administered through the Governance Platform and endorsed by stakeholders in Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire and Guinea.

As part of the FFI Darwin Nimba Initiative, a questionnaire (see Annex) was designed and administered in the period April to September 2011. The surveys were completed by the Darwin project officers Mr. James Kpadehyea of the Forestry Development Authority Liberia and Mr. Gondo Gbanyangbe of Fauna and Flora International, Guinea (FFI).

The responses generated will help determine the possible roles and responsibilities that identified stakeholders would play in the formation of a Trans-boundary Biodiversity Governance Platform for the Nimba Mountains between Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, and Guinea.

A stakeholder mapping exercise was conducted in early 2010. Many of the institutions identified in the resulting report were targeted for this survey.

A total of fourteen towns (eleven in Liberia and three in Guinea) were targeted for the survey. While not comprehensive in terms of coverage (for example, there are 100 towns / villages identified in Guinea that border the Nimba mountains), the responses highlight specific areas of (localised) concern that are expected to be mirrored in the wider populations living close to the Nimba Mountains.

The survey was not administered within communities in the Ivory Coast. Given the improving security situation within the country, the survey could be administered in advance of further tri-country meetings to formalize the governance platform.

For analytical purposes, the thirteen questions have been grouped into three broad thematic areas namely:

- 1) Identified problems, potential solutions, the future of and values related to the Nimba Mountains (Qs. 1-2 and 12-13).
- 2) Understanding of CMF, its importance and perceived positive or negatives outcomes of a CMF for Nimba Mountains (Qs. 3-6 and 10).
- 3) Identified Roles and Contributions of stakeholders within the CMF (Qs. 7-9 and 11).

Responses are examined briefly by country and across three broad stakeholder groups including: Government (ministries or institutions), Community responses and private sector / civil society.

A list of respondents is included in the annex.

1.1 Key findings of the survey

- 1) Respondents from each of the three countries and across the three sectors of government, local communities and civil society / private sector recognised the importance of the Nimba Massif, its values (ecological, livelihoods, spiritual, botanical, hydrological, geological etc) and the need to manage these resources in a more cohesive, collaborative and planned way.
- 2) Respondents recognised the need to establish a tri-partite institution or mechanism(s) to respond comprehensively to the problems or issues recognised by stakeholders with interests in the mountain.
- 3) Recognising the respective national borders / boundaries of each country was highlighted as contentious by each country, though specific issues or disputes were not raised by any stakeholder.
- 4) Stakeholders' definitions and expectations of a Collaborative Management Framework varied significantly between the stakeholder groups and across the three countries. Extensive work is needed to gain a shared understanding of the ambit of a CMF.
- 5) While stakeholders are willing to commit time and expertise to the establishment of a CMF, many institutions have internal financial and logistical constraints in fulfilment of their existing mandates. This issue was raised specifically by the Ivorian Office of Parks and Reserves but is likely a concern across many other institutions that would like to collaborate within the CMF.
- 6) Communities on the Guinean and Liberian side of the massif face a number of similar livelihood constraints and opportunities. Both sides have lost access to land for farming due to mining and conservation and are greatly concerned about potential damage to water sources resulting from mining operations.
- 7) In Guinea, the affected communities have high expectations of job creation for local youth and women from Societe Minerale de Fer de Guinea (SMFG) that will compensate for the loss of farming land. This singular issue is repeated often by the three communities interviewed. However the level of job creation that can realistically be expected is unclear.
- 8) While there are common macro level livelihood issues and concerns between communities of each country (generalised poverty, low levels of social services, loss of access to land, scarcity of protein sources), specific localised issues are often considered more important by local people, such as the

challenges of co-existing with protected species (chimpanzees in Bossou for example).

- 9) Private sector responses from SFMG were outstanding at the time of writing. A detailed response was received from ArcelorMittal Liberia (see pgs 10, 12 and 14).
- 10) Responses were outstanding from the Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Liberia. Follow up engagement and consultation is needed with these institutions.

2.0 Analysis of Questionnaire Responses: Liberia

In Liberia, five line ministries at the Nimba County level (Internal Affairs (MIA), Labour (MoL), Agriculture (MoA), Information (MOI) and Justice (MOJ) and the government agency responsible for statistics, LISGIS were surveyed.

Key agencies at the national level provided responses to the survey including: the Forestry Development Authority (FDA) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Responses were outstanding from the Ministry of Land Mines and Energy (MLME) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA).

Given Liberia's highly centralized governance structures, there is a need to identify and engage with senior decision makers within these ministries and institutions at the Monrovia level where key decisions relating to policy and management of the Nimba Mountains will be taken.

Liberia will have a presidential run-off election on November 8th with a new administration expected to take office in January 2012.

2.10 Identified problems, potential solutions and values with respect to the Nimba Mountains (Qs. 1-2 and 12-13)

2.11 Government

Stakeholders were asked to identify three key problems facing biodiversity in the Nimba Mountains. A broad range of issues were raised, five institutions (FDA, EPA, MIA, MoL and MoJ) listing mining and its related impacts as a concern. The boundary demarcation between the three countries was listed by the MoA, MoI and MoL is unclear and problematic.

A wide range of livelihood and related environmental issues were raised by the ministries with the number of respondents raising these individual issues listed in parentheses. These included deforestation or collecting of wood/forest crops, (4) hunting (2), and food crops (2).

High population density or growth in population, are cited as a concern by the MIA and the EPA.

There were a number of responses which would require further explanation from the respondents including; 'Beneficiaries be properly identified', 'surrounding towns be carefully observed', and relocation and resettlement of inhabitants.

In response to these issues, respondents gave the following as potential solutions (Q.2) to the three top problems. Three respondents felt that the creation of an institution or the formulation of the CMF could help address these issues. While others listed: having a policy, holding a round table between government and locals (a

subset perhaps of a CMF?) and finally ‘*Awareness conducted through prominent sons and daughters in the region*’, as mechanisms to address the above raised matters.

In addition, the EPA suggested using community forestry as a mechanism to address local environmental issues while also advocating that a community managed protected area should be created at West Nimba (a forested area which falls within ArcelorMittal’s mining Concession and has previously been identified as a proposed protected area). The FDA meanwhile stressed the importance of supporting alternative livelihood mechanisms and the need for increased private sector employment opportunities.

In question 12, when asked to describe positive changes for the future for the Nimba Mountains that the respondent would like to see, a broad range of answers (some singular and specific, others descriptive in nature) were given and are shown in tabular form below.

Response	No. Of respondents
Reforestation or creation of forest reserves	4
Developing industrial alternatives to mining	2
Awareness raising on the value of the forest and mountains	2
Build capacity of communities for increased forest and environmental management	2
‘A genuine utilization of the Nimba Mountain where towns, clans, chiefdoms, inhabitants living around the mountain be decision makers arising from conflict on boundary issues’	1
Increase in animal raising	1
Provision of bio-digester	1
Constant negotiation with communities and partners	1
Establishment of a joint-management team	1
Establishment of a trust fund for sustainability	1
Have a Natural Resource Management policy in place that is monitored	1

The final question, (13) asks respondents to list the ‘values’ of the Nimba Mountains. Answers given were given by 7 of 8 respondents as follows: Logs (2), minerals (2), farming / land (2), water (3), herbs for medicine (2), cool climate /higher rainfall (3), tourism (1), fauna and flora (2) and Non-Timber Forest Products (1).

2.12 Community

While the government officials completed the surveys individually, the community responses resulted from focus group meetings at each of the six towns.

At the community level, the three problems associated with the Nimba Mountain relate in large part to livelihood issues (hunting and farming) and access to resources such as water. For the Gbapa community, they noted ‘*Yah and Yeti Rivers are polluted*’, and ‘*There exists water in Mt. Nimba that if continued to be mined will cause problem for us*’. While not directly discussed in the responses, the loss of land

and access rights to the East Nimba Nature Reserve (ENNR) is a key issue in a number of communities within the survey sample (Geipa, Zortapa and Yolowee)

The responses are tabulated below.

Response	No. of responses
Access to water / concern over water pollution	3
Access to land / farming / authority stopped us from farming	3
Hunting	4
Fire	1
Population Growth	1
Cross boundary incursion for NTFP collection / boundary line demarcation	2
Border security harassment	1

When asked to provide potential solutions to the above problems; the most common response (3), discussed joint collaboration or meetings between the three countries or to make laws (3) to protect the ecosystem.

Certain responses were to localised issues such as getting the ‘authority’, to stop illegal NTFP collection. This is most likely a reference to the Forestry Development Authority at the ENNR.

The communities’ hopes for the future of the Nimba Mountains (Q. 12) centred on local socio-economic development including provision of good roads, electricity, improved access to health care and education, job creation, livelihood support as well as environmental conservation.

The values provided by the Nimba Mountain (Q. 13), had some strong commonality with each of the six communities listing access to medicinal plants as central, while five communities valued access to NTFPs. Access to good water and food/ protein were noted by two communities. Ecosystems services, windbreaks and maintaining favourable climate were mentioned by individual communities.

2.13 Private Sector / Civil Society / local administrators

The private sector (solely) represented by ArcelorMittal (AML) lists; pressure from shifting cultivators; hunting and fires; and presence of ore bodies of international value as the key problems (Q.1) facing the Nimba Mountains.

The issues raised by the other respondents reflect the above issues of access to land and natural resources and the use and planning of those resources. Watershed damage or environmental degradation were mentioned by three respondents while access to farming land was raised by a further two respondents.

The demarcation of the national boundaries of the three countries was highlighted as an issue by one district commissioner.

In response to these issues (Q. 2) AML advocated ‘a country-by-country programme of better land use allocation and stabilization of agricultural practices while the remaining five respondents proposed variants of joint-solving approaches namely: consultation of transboundary affected communities (1), usage of the CMF (2), creation of an International Forest Management body (1) or more loosely stated as ‘this should be solved jointly by these three countries’ (1).

Broadly speaking, three respondents list ‘development’ as the future of the Nimba Mountains (Q. 12). For AML, this is planned development at a country level incorporating mining, agriculture and conservation. Two additional responses listed better forest management between the countries and restoration of the ecological environment as key hopes for the future. One respondent provided no answer.

In response to Q13, (values provided by the mountain), two of six respondents did not reply. Understandably for AML, the key value of the mountain is its Iron Ore. Community level responses focused on natural resources including: access to water, animals, plants, herbs and wood.

2.20 Understanding of CMF, its importance and perceived positive or negatives outcomes from a CMF for Nimba Mountains (Qs. 3-6 and 10)

2.21 Government

Question 3 asks respondents whether they understand the meaning of a CMF. One respondent replied ‘No’, while two replied ‘Yes’, without giving further details. The remaining responses contained elements of a CMF such as ‘cooperation with other institutions, joint policy formulation and sharing of information between defined stakeholders’ in the management of a particular resource.

The CMF was recognised by all parties as potentially important (Q.4), and would assist in: better management of resources between the countries, decrease in transboundary disputes, avoid conflict or resolve problems (2). For the FDA, there is a need to harmonise laws and policies so that all parties can contribute to a joint management plan.

The positive impacts deriving from a CMF for the Nimba mountains (Q.5) were identified by three respondents as ‘improved tri-partite relations or unity’. Two ministries cited job creation as a potential outflow from a CMF while one ministry did not respond to the question. Further benefits identified included; the development of one management framework for all stakeholders, sharing of research data and joint collaboration and planned action across the borders.

Potential negative impacts of the CMF (Q. 6), failed to illicit a response from four ministries. One worried about, ‘nationalism superseding’ the work of the institution while further clarity on the following concern would be beneficial ‘the failure on the part of the CMF to reason with views of affected persons, who may feel cheated’. In addition, one respondent worried whether donors would provide sufficient resources to fund projects and programmes in the area.

When asked in Q. 10, whether they considered the CMF a ‘good thing’, four respondent directly with ‘Yes’, one replied ‘somehow’ while a qualified yes was given by the remaining respondents, with one cautioning, ‘in the case of the Nimba Mountain which is bordering three countries provided key players play transparent role’.

2.22 Community

For Q.3, all six responses indicated ‘yes’, they understand what a CMF was but no further information was provided or localised definition was provided.

There was some commonality in response to Q4 i.e. the importance of the CMF, whereby, the CMF could: support conservation of the Mountain for present and future generations (1), avoid destruction or maintain the Massif (2), or natural resources to be kept intact (1). Three respondents listed deriving ‘benefit’ or ‘development’ as the importance of the CMF.

In the case of five communities, the benefit that could derive from the CMF (Q5.) focused strongly on ‘peace’ ‘unity’ and ‘understanding’. For one community, the benefit was simply that the Nimba Mountain would be protected.

All six communities considered the CMF, ‘Yes’, as a ‘good thing’, (Q.10) while providing no further analysis.

2.23 Private Sector / Civil Society / local administrators

Three respondents indicated ‘Yes’, they understood what a CMF was but provided no further detail. One respondent understood what a CMF was but did not understand the meaning of a ‘governance platform’.

In response to Q4, AML contextualised the importance of the CMF in the light of ‘the competing demands and dwindling resources’, with respect to the Nimba Mountains. For others, the CMF would help communities to ‘benefit’ from the Mountain while listening to the viewpoints of different stakeholders while another expected benefit was the ‘protection of the forests’ within the mountain range.

There was wide variation in the responses to Q. 5 (‘positive aspects of the CMF’). AML referred to answers provided to Q2, while others mentioned, ‘understanding’, ‘job creation, ‘creation of international forest management knowledge’. The sharing of information / exchange of knowledge was highlighted in one response whereby countries national management of resources could improve by learning from the approach of other countries.

When asked to list potential negative aspects of the CMF (Q.6), five of six respondents replied. One respondent worried about, ‘too much talking and not enough action’. Another cautioned against the potential violation of the framework

document. The remaining three responses would require further clarification as to their specific meaning but focus: on membership of the CMF by persons from Nimba, management of national resources without reference to management of resources in neighbouring countries and continuation of subsistence farming within the area in compliance with Government of Liberia ‘instruction’.

All six respondents considered the CMF to be a ‘good thing’, (Q. 10), with one response qualified by an additional comment, ‘if it has clear aims and objectives, and remains realistic and practical’.

2.30 Identified Roles and Contributions of stakeholders (Qs. 7-9 and 11)

2.31 Government

When asked to identify future roles (Q.7) within the CMF, the MoL did not respond. Specific roles were identified by LISGIS, the MoI and the MoJ, namely: collecting data to aid policy decisions, support awareness raising of the CMF and to review legal agreements and offer legal advice respectively.

The responses of the MoIA and MoA were open in nature; ‘leadership role’ and ‘make decisions’, respectively.

The FDA introduced the possibility of adopting a co-management approach (possibly drawing on an emerging model at the ENNR?) with the establishment of stakeholder committees that would meet regularly to discuss and common issues of concern. Also, the FDA would assist in mobilising funds to implement agreed plans and help to develop a trust fund for the sustainable management of the massif.

The EPA, in line with its statutory mandate, would ensure compliance and enforcement of policies put in place.

In terms of specific responsibilities within the CMF, (Q. 8), four ministries indicated a willingness to play a policy development role. The MIA saw a potential administrative role while the MoI saw a potential role for itself in supporting public relations. The EPA would ensure policy implementation while the FDA would provide administrative, technical and data sharing support.

In terms of concrete contributions (Q. 9), the government institutions replied as follows.

Ministry	Contribution
Min. Of Internal Affairs	Time support
Min. Of Labour	Data information sharing support
LISGIS	Technical and data information sharing support
Min. Of Agriculture	Data collection and technical support
Min. Of Information	Information sharing support
Min. Of Justice	Building capacity in the area of law; rules and procedures

Forestry Authority	Development	Technical and data management including establishing of database
Environmental Agency	Protection	Technical, information sharing and time support

In Q. 11, when asked whether they would attend meetings or forums, all responded affirmatively with one adding that an allowance would be necessary to facilitate his attendance. Another cited the importance of arranging meetings in a timely fashion.

2.32 Community

In response to their roles within the CMF (Q.7), responses range from enforcement and abiding by agreed rules, creating policy and to report violations.

In terms of specific responsibilities (Q8.), each community would play an administrative and/or policy role.

When asked to list their specific contribution to the CMF (Q.9), communities would support data information sharing and time support. All six communities would be willing to attend future meetings or fora (Q.11).

2.33 Private Sector / Civil Society

In response to Q. 7, AML indicated their willingness to participate, provide ideas and support practical actions identified by the CMF. Other responses varied from: commitment to attend meetings, to follow the law, create awareness on decisions taken, to design strategies to offer alternative livelihoods and to sit on the board created by the CMF.

For Q.8, AML reiterated its commitment to participation. Two respondents provided no response. The remaining three responses varied from: involvement in policy, law enforcement and membership of committees or boards established by the CMF.

In reply to Q.9, respondents identified the following specific contributions. Three interviewees made commitments to data sharing while capacity building and time support were listed also.

In addition, AML indicated a willingness to make some logistical support also available.

In terms of attending meetings (Q.11), five respondents indicated their willingness while AML were also willing to attend provided the meetings were in Liberia.

3.0 Analysis of Questionnaire Responses: Guinea

At the Government level, questionnaires were administered to specific institutions that manage particular natural resources in the Nimba Mountain range. The three organisations that responded to the questionnaire include: Environmental Management Authority for Mounts Nimba and Simandou (CEGENs), the Environmental Research Institute of Bossou (IREB) and the Scientific Station of Mount Nimba (SSMN).

Based on discussions with these organisations, the project officer considered that some of these institutions (CEGENs e.g.) could make binding agreements on behalf of the Government of Guinea, though in consultation with key ministries such as the Ministry of the Environment.

At the community level, focus groups were held in the towns of Tounkarata, Bossou and N'Zoo. In total, forty-one community members were interviewed. The responses to the 13 questions were grouped by the Project Officer and are presented in this report along thematic lines and not per town.

At the time of writing, a response was still awaited from a critical stakeholder, the Societe Mineral de Fer de Guinea, a mining company with a concession on the Guinean side of the Nimba Massif.

3.10: Identified problems, potential solutions and values with respect to the mountains (Qs. 1-2 and 12-13)

3.11 Government

The Government agencies listed the following as the key problems (Q.1) associated with the Nimba Mountains.

Problems	Number of responses
Mining	2
Bush Fires	1
Animal poaching	2
Forest exploitation	1
Illegal farming and exploitation of natural resources in reserve	1
Finding agreement and then respecting the boundaries between the countries	1

Potential responses (Q.2) to these identified problems were proposed by the agencies of Government. For SSMN, this would require all relevant stakeholders to participate in a rigorous manner to protect the biological diversity in the area and by respecting environmental standards applying to mining. For CEGENS, it would be appropriate

to establish a tri-partite institution for participative environmental governance and an international foundation for Mount Nimba.

For IREB, solutions lie in closer dialogue and sensitisation of local communities. This response reflects the localised work of chimpanzee conservation in the Bossou hills and the interaction with the local communities.

When asked to project forward their visions for the Nimba Mountains (Q.12), SSMN saw this as the long term conservation of the biological diversity of the reserve and the supporting ecosystems. This viewpoint was mirrored by CEGENS which included a goal of lifting local communities out of poverty as well as protecting their environment.

The principle values exemplified by the mountains (Q. 13), included timber for local use, medicinal plants, and other NTFPs, bush meat and the multiple water sources that feed into the Cavally river which irrigate the farms of surrounding communities.

3.12 Community

An extensive range of problems were noted by the three communities though no effort was made to prioritise these issues within the separate three focus groups.

Communities were concerned with: the loss of rights (title) of communities to farm land and forests due to mining and conservation activities in the zone, banning of all hunting in the Nimba Forests, need to find alternative sites for farming due to loss of land to mining activities, mismanagement of local development projects and discontent with the recruitment process of locals (women especially) within SFMG.

Separate issues raised included problems with fire management at a community level, poaching and the (over)exploitation of forest resources.

In addition, the communities were worried that their water sources were being polluted, encroachment of cattle for grazing into the forests of Mount Nimba and that there is a need to create special protected areas for the relocation of certain species such as toads and chimpanzees.

Further issues raised included: the need to protect sacred water sources and the eviction of community members from their farming lands represent a significant economic loss for the community.

The community suggested the following as methods to solve (Q.2) the aforementioned problems: creation of youth employment, drilling of new water sources, construction of schools, promotion of community development activities including agriculture, having transparency in the management of local development initiatives, replanting of trees in certain areas for future generations, the involvement of locals in the management of their environment and the creation of institutions to manage bush fires.

With respect to future benefit (Q. 12), the communities would like to see: Maintenance of the local micro-climate, local citizens of the three countries would benefit from the wealth of the mountain and socio-economic infrastructural development.

For the communities, the values provided by the mountain (Q.13) are significant and include: mountain / forests as sources of drinking water, protein, medicinal plants, cultural sites and preserving local weather conditions.

Separately, the communities claimed their right of compensation for the loss of farming land and access to other natural resources resulting from the activities of SMFG.

3.20 Understanding of CMF, its importance and perceived positive or negatives outcomes from a CMF for Nimba Mountains (Qs. 3-6 and 10)

3.21 Government

Respondents gave their understanding of a CMF (Q. 3) in the following terms; it should clearly identify the roles and recognise the mandate of all relevant stakeholders (Government, NGOS, communities) involved in the management of natural resources in the Nimba range.

The importance of establishing the CMF (Q.4) derives from the trans-boundary location of the mountains and the multitude of actors playing a role in the management of the Nimba Mountains. It could build trust between the actors and work towards the harmonisation of principles to protect the environment.

Respondents identified a number of potential benefits (Q.5) that could derive from the CMF. For SSMN these included: a clear delineation of responsibilities (respect of institutional mandates, leading to a decrease in potential for inter-institutional conflict), having one document listing the roles of stakeholders from each of the three countries. With these elements in place, it was felt that 'the follow up of monitoring and evaluation would be easier in the future'.

CEGENS identified the following potential benefits: exchange of information between the countries, having mutual respect for the management principles agreed by the three countries, the ability to attract project financing for sub-regional development and creating economic value from natural resource. Other benefits of the CMF could include: controlling of poaching, bush fires and over-exploitation of forest resources.

Meanwhile, IREB expects that the CMF can help in: taking stock of stakeholder interests, identify each partie's role, establishing agreements between all parties, building trust between stakeholders and scheduling of meetings and fora between stakeholders.

When asked about potential negative aspects (Q.6) of a CMF, respondents raised a concern that the process could become politicised and that organisational mandates might not be respected. In addition the need for adequate financing to support development activities was highlighted.

In general the CMF was viewed as a 'good thing', by SSMN, whereby tasks of individual stakeholders were clearly agreed and shared and remove any ambiguity over institutional mandates while facilitating monitoring and evaluation of tasks. CEGENS equally recognised its importance within a trans-boundary area. The clear definition of roles of stakeholders was recognised as important for IREB.

3.22 Community

When asked whether they understood the meaning of a CMF (Q.3), they replied yes but gave an indirect answer highlighting the importance of the involvement of local communities within the process.

In response to Q.4, the communities saw the CMF as important whereby if every stakeholder played their (Sic. correct) role, the communities would live in peace and secure their individual gain or benefit from local resources.

With respect to the positive aspects of a CMF (Q. 5), the communities enumerated the following points: that the CMF opened up a process of dialogue between the communities and the SFMG and opened the possibility that the process for hiring staff would be improved while women would also get opportunities for employment with the company.

The communities when asked to highlight any potential negative outcomes (Q. 6) of a CMF; they answered the question more broadly, listing: that the boundaries / limits for mining, conservation must be respected by all parties as well as the employment of local young people and the need for provision of (sic. development) of support to the communities as areas of concern.

In reply to Q.10, all communities felt that the CMF was a 'good thing'.

3.30: Identified Roles and Contributions of stakeholders (Qs. 7-9 and 11).

3.31 Government

SSMN identified its key roles (Q. 7) in the CMF in line with its institutional mandate of carrying out scientific research, studying the ecosystems of the Biosphere Reserve of Mount Nimba, collection and storage of scientific data and working with national institutions on projects as necessary.

CEGENS recognised the importance of reinforcing the financial, logistical and institutional capacity of local actors in order to have the active participation of institutions and communities in the CMF.

In terms of responsibilities, (Q.8) that the institutions would take on in a CMF, these were identified as follows:

Institution	Responsibility within the CMF
SSMN	Administrative, environmental and scientific
CEGENS	Technical support / advice
IREB	Administrative

In response to Q. 9 (actual contributions), SSMN indicated that they could provide technical assistance and some logistical support. CEGENS and IREB could provide technical support and data.

Each of the three institutions is willing to attend meetings (Q.11) or fora in the future.

3.32 Community

With respect to their specific role (Q.7) in the CMF, the community, answering indirectly, stated that they must participate fully in relevant decision making. In terms of direct responsibilities (Q.8), they would play an active role in mobilizing their people for decision taking.

The community of Bossou indicated that that they could support reach, provide technical support and help build capacity. A wider point was made that the communities could supply SMFG crops / feedstuffs to feed their local workers.

All communities expressed a willingness to attend future meetings or fora (Q.11).

4.0 Analysis of Questionnaire Responses: Ivory Coast

Given the political instability and uncertain security situation in Ivory Coast, community level focus groups were not carried out.

The responses from two government bodies, Society for the Development of Forests (SODEFOR) and the Ivorian Office of Parks and Reserves (OIPR) are outlined below.

4.10 Identified problems, potential solutions and values with respect to the mountains (Qs. 1-2 and 12-13).

4.11 Government

With respect to OIPR, the key problems (Q 1.) associated with the management of Mount Nimba relate to the destruction of local infrastructure, insufficient financial and human capacity as well as a lack of specific budget lines to manage the reserve. In addition they note that hunting and threat of large scale farming within the reserve pose significant management problems.

While SODEFOR considers: poaching, clearing of forest for farming and artisanal gold prospecting as the three most significant problems facing Mount Nimba.

Potential responses (Q. 2) to these problems include the provision of adequate financial and logistical support to the OIPR, further sensitisation of local communities and local authorities as to the importance of the reserve while creating profitable alternative livelihood options for local people.

For SODEFOR, the problems call for holding transboundary patrols, the harmonisation of forestry laws and holding regular meetings between the authorities of the three countries.

For the future of Mount Nimba (Q.12), OIPR would like to re-establish management capacity and programmes within the reserve perhaps through some project support as the reach of the state is quite limited at present. SODEFOR would like to see the development of management plans for trans-boundary classified forests, national parks and reserves and to put in place a minimum level of trans-boundary activities derived from these plans.

When asked to list the principal values of Mount Nimba, SODEFOR referred the reader to answer 1 above, while OIPR listed the protection of the fauna and flora as well as the natural resources as of prime importance.

4.20 Understanding of CMF, its importance and perceived positive or negatives outcomes from a CMF for Nimba Mountains (Qs. 3-6 and 10).

4.21 Government

In response to Q. 3, OIPR did not have a specific definition for the CMF but defined it in terms of a logical framework for a project with objectives, results and indicators while for SODEFOR its purpose, is to help agree upon trans-boundary activities based on clear objectives with agreed indicators in place for measurement of results.

A CMF is important (Q.4) for Mount Nimba as it forms the border for three countries. It is important to appreciate the problems existing and take concerted joint country action with the relevant stakeholders involved. It was felt that the CMF would help mobilise financial resources and encourage trans-boundary activities amongst the relevant stakeholders.

In response to Q. 5, the CMF would be beneficial as it would enable the interests and various problems of relevant actors into consideration for planning purposes. It could also support the rapid settlement of trans-boundary conflicts.

When asked to suggest any potential negative outcomes (Q. 6) from a CMF, it was felt that the involvement of too many actors could obscure the role of the state and care should be taken not to neglect the individual problems of each state. Additional concerns are that actors may not adhere to their agreements and that violators of rules would continue to go unpunished. Both respondents felt that CMF was a 'good thing' (Q. 10), based on responses to Q. 4.

4.30 Identified Roles and Contributions of stakeholders (Qs. 7-9 and 11)

OIPR felt their role in the CMF (Q. 7), being the local actor charged with the management of Mount Nimba, would be to sensitise and mobilise other Ivorian institutions to play their part in managing the reserve. Meanwhile, SODEFOR saw their role as implementing the recommendations of various meetings held under the CMF.

In terms of specific responsibilities (Q. 8), OIPR would support policy making as well as playing an administrative role within the CMF. SODEFOR could also play an administrative role in the management of the CMF.

In reply to Q. 9, when asked about specific contributions to the CMF, OIPR listed its potential contributions as: provision of technical support, statistics, capacity building and over time some logistical support. SODEFOR's expected contribution would be similar as well as developing management plans for the following classified forests of Goin Débé, du Cavalley et de Tiapleu.

OIPR would attend future meeting as would SODEFOR, provide such meetings were held within an agreed legal framework.

5.0 ANNEX

5.10 List of respondents and contacts from Liberia, Guinea and Ivory Coast

Liberia:

Government of Liberia

Name:	Ministry / Institution (address):	Position:	Contact details:
Government			
Joseph D. Torlon	Ministry of Internal Affairs, Sanniquellie, Nimba	Acting Dev Superintendent	06 469285
Mr. Itoka Quoi	Labour Ministry Sanniquellie, Nimba,		
Rev. Arthur M. Tarlue	Liberia Statistics and Geographical Information Systems (LISGIS)	Monitor	
Harry S.D. Lami	Ministry of Agriculture	Project Manager	
Gbanlahda Amos		County Information Officer	
William Nakawour	Ministry of Justice	Secretary	06462094/ 06552379
Community Responses			
1. Peter Slekpó 2. Alfred Geh 3. Peter Mehn and others	Geiba, Nimba		
	Gbapa, Nimba		
	Zortapa, Nimba		
	Zolowee, Nimba		
	Lugbeyee, Nimba		
	Camp 4, Nimba		
Private / Civil Society			

Darwin Initiative Transboundary Governance Platform stakeholder survey
report Nov 2011

John Howell	ArcelorMittal, Liberia	Environmental Advisor	
Saye Thomson	Community Forest Management Body (Gba / Zor communities)	Chairperson	
Stephen Suah		District Youth Chairman	
Anthony Mankuah		School Chairman	
John P. Quato	Ministry of Internal Affairs	Zor District Commissioner	
Hon. G. Dunbar Gbanlon	Ministry of Internal Affairs	Sanng Mah Administrative District	

Guinea

Zone De N'ZOO

Roger Gustave Sagno	D'UPPZ	Président	
Alfred Gbato Conde	N'zoo	Président de district	
Dogui Goumy	Groupement de N'zoolédo	Vice président	
Lila Cherif	L' EP N'zoo	Directeur	
Gono Alexis Traore	District N'zoo	Président	
Papa Mamadou Traore		Conseiller S/P de la jeunesse	
Lurette Trore	Bureau de N'zoo II	Secrétaire administratif	
Djiba Kourouma	District Nzoo	Vice président	
Laa Olivier Bamba	N'zoo	Pasteur de l'église protestante	
Whiyenlon Cherif	Jeunesse de Pora	Secrétaire administratif	
Agatte Conde	Partie RDR	Affaires sociales	
Gbato Douamou	Enseignant		

Zone De Tounkarata

Lila Saorohara	Conseillère CR		
Dokpo Beavogui	Membre du Groupement	Neanke	
Josephine Loua	Membre du Groupement	Neanke	
Yaramon Gbahara	Vice-Président du Groupement	Neanke	
Yaramon Nanahara	Conseillère du CR		
Faghan Mollo Nanahara	Sage du CR		
Seny Gbehara	Membre du Groument	Neanke	
Mathoma Bamba	Membre du Groument	Neanke	
Yaramon Haba	Membre du Groument	Neanke	
Mathoma I Bamba	Membre du Groument	Neanke	

Darwin Initiative Transboundary Governance Platform stakeholder survey
report Nov 2011

Yaramon Sorohara	Membre du Groument	Neanke	
Vassy Nanahara	Membre du Groument	Neanke	
Gbèné Nanahara	Membre du Groument	Neanke	
Vassy Lané Nanahara	Membre du Groument	Neanke	
Labila Gbahara	Membre du Groument	Neanke	
Netokoi Nanahara	Membre du Groument	Neanke	
Kemoné Nanahara	Membre du Groument	Neanke	

Zone du Bossou

Ballakoura Bonimy	Directeur de BCP/Bossou		
Gbato Gbemy	Responsable du Groupement Milèloodo		
Victor Traore	Planteur		
Lakpo Sammy	Menuisier		
Miliwhonan Zogbila	Sage		
Jean Philippe Loua	Pasteur		
Gnagnandaa Zogbila	Planteur		
Patrict Gongora Dore	Sage		
Seny Souomy	Membre du Groupement Milèloodo		
Elisabth Niale	Membre du Groupement Saponification		
Laurent Camara	Frigoriste –Smfg		
Mama Sidibe	Membre du Groupement Saponification		

Government of Guinea

Dr. Paquile Molomou	Station Scientifique Des Monts Nimba	Directeur General	
Dr. Emmanuel Soropogui	CEGENS/P.N.U.D	Directeur General Adjoint	
Iba Conde	Institut IREB	Directeur General Adjoint	
Cece Ignace Kolie		Chef de Département Primatologie	
Ouo-Ouo Delamou		Chef de Département Ressources Génétiques	

Ivory Coast

Léon Siagoue	Directeur du Centre de Gestion de Man	SODEFOR	
Moise Gbedjegbedji	Directeur de zone Ouest	OIPR	

5.20 Questionnaire for Stakeholders relevant to a Transboundary Biodiversity Governance Platform for the Nimba Mountains.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to create a Collaborative Management Framework (CMF) to determine the possible roles and responsibilities that identified stakeholders would play in the formation of a Transboundary Biodiversity Governance Platform for the Nimba Mountains between Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, and Guinea.

Interviewer name: _____ Date: _____ Title/Position: _____ Institution: _____

Sector: Government, Civil Society (including NGOs) and Private

You have been identified as playing a significant role in the activities that occur in the Nimba Mountains within Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, and Guinea through an earlier 'Stakeholder mapping exercise'. The stakeholder report is freely available on the project website (www.nimbadarwin.org) to download. We, the Nimba Darwin project, would be grateful if you could answer the following questions towards the creation of a Collaborative Management Framework for the Nimba Mountains. The results of which will be used to create a biodiversity governance platform for the Nimba mountains between the three countries.

The Nimba Mountains are important for many stakeholders in many different ways. Sometimes there are conflicts between needs for commercial activity and conservation and what communities need.

For stakeholders to agree how the Nimba Mountains should be managed, we need to know:

- a) The main values or interests that you would like to have safeguarded or managed.
- b) Where these values or interests are and whether there might be conflicts (eg areas required for both conservation and for commercial forestry or mining)
- c) If there are conflicts that might be difficult to resolve, whether you see any viable alternatives

The Collaborative Management Framework (CMF) will help balance stakeholder interests so that agreements can be reached about what should be done, how, when and by whom (Key is to identify at what levels these decisions can be taken – what autonomy do local level actors have to make decisions ?) .

The results of the CMF will be used to create a Transboundary Biodiversity Governance Platform to which stakeholders will be invited to join.

1. What are the top 3 problems associated with the Nimba Mountains?
2. How could these be solved?
3. Do you understand what a Collaborative Management Framework is?
4. Why is a Collaborative Management Framework important for the Nimba Mountains?
5. What are the positive aspects of a Collaborative Management Framework for the Nimba Mountains
6. What can you see as the negative aspects of a Collaborative Management Framework for the Nimba Mountains?
7. What role do you think you could play in such a Collaborative Management Framework?
8. What responsibilities do you think you could take on (e.g. administration, policy)?
9. What can you contribute (e.g. technical support, financial support, data information sharing support, time support, logistical support, capacity building support)?
10. Do you think a Collaborative Management Framework is a good thing?
11. Would you be prepared to attend meetings and forums?
12. What would you like to see happen in the future for the Nimba Mountains?
13. What are the main values provided to you by the Nimba Mountains (give examples, e.g. animals to hunt for bushmeat, fish, land for farming.....)

'A Collaborative Management Framework is a means of determining the roles and responsibilities of identified stakeholders for the management of the natural resources of the Nimba Mountains between Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, and Guinea'

5.30 Questionnaire pour les parties prenantes essentielles à la mise en place d'une Plateforme de Gouvernance de la Biodiversité pour les Monts Nimba

Le but de ce questionnaire est de créer un cadre logique pour la Gestion Participative pour déterminer les rôles possible et responsabilités que pourront jouer les parties prenantes identifiées dans la formation de la Plateforme de Gouvernance transfrontalière de la Biodiversité pour les Monts Nimba entre la Cote d'Ivoire, la Guinée et le Liberia.

Nom de l'interviewer: _____ Date: _____ Titre/Position: _____ Institution: _____ Secteur: _____

Vous avez été identifié comme jouant un rôle significatif dans les activités qui s'opèrent dans les Monts Nimba en Côte d'Ivoire, en Guinée et au Liberia à travers un exercice de schématisation des parties prenantes qui avait eu lieu un peu plus tôt. Le rapport sur les parties prenantes est librement accessible et peut être téléchargé sur le site web du projet (www.nimbadarwin.org). Nous, l'équipe du projet Darwin, seront reconnaissant si vous pouvez répondre les questions suivantes en vue de la création d'un Cadre Logique pour une Gestion Participative pour les Monts Nimba. Les résultats duquel seront utilisés pour créer une plateforme de gouvernance de la biodiversité pour les Monts Nimba entre les trois pays.

Les Monts Nimba sont important pour plusieurs parties prenantes de différentes manières. Quelques fois il y a des conflits entre les besoins pour les activités commerciales, la conservation et les besoins des communautés. Pour que les parties prenantes conviennent sur comment les Monts Nimba seront gérées, nous avons besoins de connaître :

- a) Les principales valeurs ou intérêts que vous aimeriez avoir sauvegardé ou gérées.
- b) Où se trouvent ces valeurs ou intérêts et où pourrait y avoir de conflits (ex : zone requis pour les activités minières, pour la conservation ou pour l'exploitation forestière)
- c) S'il y a de conflits qui pourraient être difficiles à résoudre, où voyez-vous d'alternatives viables ?

Le Cadre Logique de Gestion Participative aidera à faire le bilan des intérêts des parties prenantes, donc une convention peut être établie pour savoir ce qui pourra être fait, comment, quand et par qui. Les résultats du cadre logique CMF seront utilisés pour créer une Plateforme de Gouvernance Transfrontalière pour la Biodiversité à laquelle les parties prenantes seront invitées à joindre.

1. Quels sont les trois premiers problèmes auxquels les Monts Nimba sont confrontés ?
2. Comment ces problèmes peuvent – ils être résolus ?
3. Comprenez – vous ce qu'est un Cadre Logique d'une Gestion Participative ?
4. Pourquoi le Cadre Logique d'une Gestion Participative est – il important pour les Monts Nimba ?
5. Quels sont les aspects positifs d'un cadre logique pour une gestion participative des Monts Nimba ?
6. Que pouvez-vous voir comme aspects négatifs d'un cadre logique pour une gestion participative pour les Monts Nimba ?
7. Quel rôle pensez-vous jouer dans un tel cadre logique pour une gestion participative ?
8. Quelles responsabilités pensez-vous y prendre ? (ex : administration, politique)
9. Que pouvez-vous contribuer (ex : assistance technique, appui financier, appui au partage des données, appui au temps, appui logistique, appui au renforcement de capacités) ?
10. Pensez – vous qu'un cadre logique pour une gestion participative est une bonne chose ?
11. Seriez-vous prêt à participer à une réunion ou à un forum ?
12. Que pensez – vous voir se réaliser dans le futur pour les Monts Nimba ?
13. Quelles sont les principales valeurs pourvu chez vous par les Monts Nimba (donnez un exemple... par exemple chasse pour la viande de brousse, poisson, terre pour la culture)?

Darwin Initiative Transboundary Governance Platform stakeholder survey
report Nov 2011

“Le Cadre Logique pour une Gestion Participative est essentiel pour déterminer les responsabilités et rôles des parties prenantes identifiées pour la gestion des ressources naturelles des Monts Nimba entre la Côte D’Ivoire, la Guinée et le Libéria”