SATOYAMA INITIATIVE

IPSI Case Study Experts Workshop Yokohama 2014

Workshop Report

Organized by IPSI Secretariat and IGES
Date: 22 July (9:00-16:30) and 23 July (9:00-16:30) 2014
Venue: Room 416 & 417, PACIFICO YOKOHAMA (Yokohama, Japan)

UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY
UNU-IAS
Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability

IGES
Institute for Global Environmental Strategies

Table of Contents

List of Figures and Tables

Outline of the Workshop

Introduction

The Secretariat of the International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative (IPSI), in cooperation with IGES, has initiated in 2014 a review of all case studies (CS) under the Partnership to understand the current status of information and accumulated knowledge within IPSI. The review includes an assessment of the existing CS to develop and propose a new framework for the collection and identification of good CS from IPSI members, and to suggest mechanisms for sharing knowledge among and beyond IPSI members on the sustainable use of socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes (SEPLS).

To obtain input from experts for the improvement of the knowledge sharing on CS, the IPSI Secretariat organized a Case Study Experts Workshop from 22 – 23 July 2014, prior to the International Forum for Sustainable Asia-Pacific (ISAP) held in Yokohama, Japan.

Objective

The objective of the workshop was to obtain input from experts on:

i) ways to capture the diversity of existing case studies

ii) elements that constitute a good case study

iii) a mechanism to improve knowledge-sharing on the case studies (including the promotion of submission of case studies)

Proceedings and discussion points:

Following several presentations by selected experts on their IPSI case studies, participants formed two groups. Each group discussed the following points during the workshop, one in each of 3 group discussion sessions:

1- How can the diversity of IPSI case studies be captured?

Currently, more than 70 case studies have been submitted to the IPSI Secretariat by various organizations on diverse activities. These have been uploaded on the IPSI website and categorized by region and type of ecosystem. However, a more useful and effective organization of cases is desirable. In this workshop, participants were requested to provide input on a preliminary classification (Table 1) following some key questions, in order to capture the diversity of existing case studies.

1-1) What are your thoughts on the classification (Table 1) utilized in the presentations, in terms of its capacity to accommodate the diversity of case studies?

Table 1: Preliminary classification of CS according to basic categories

#	Classification	Main category
1	Cluster	1) knowledge facilitation, 2) policy research, 3) indicators research, 4) capacity building, 5) on-the-ground activities

2	Scale	1) Global 2) Regional, 3) National, 4) Local
3	Region	1) East Asia, 2) Southeast Asia, 3) South Asia, 4) Central Asia, 5) West Asia, 6) Oceania, 7) Europe, 8) North America, 9) Latin America and the Caribbean, 10) Africa
5	Ecosystems	1) Agricultural, 2) Forest, 3) Grassland, 4) Inland water body, 5) Coastal
6	Organization	1) National government, 2) Local government, 3) International NGO, 4) Local NGO, 5) International org., 6) University/research institute, 7) Indigenous/local community org., 8) Private sector, etc.
7	Socio-economic activity	1) Agriculture, 2) Fishery, 3) Forestry, 4) Tourism, 5) Wildlife conservation, 6) Environmental education, 7) Culture, etc.
8	Research strategy (Research cases only)	1) Type of research: a) Qualitative, b) Quantitative 2) Method: a) Literature review, b) Interview, c) Questionnaire survey, d) Statistics, e) GIS 3) Number of research papers
9	Themes[1]	1) Consolidating knowledge and promoting innovation (e.g. local traditions, culture, learning, integration of modern science and traditional knowledge) 2) Ensuring good governance and equity (e.g. interest representation, organizational responsibility, decision making, implementation) 3) Securing livelihoods and enhancing well-being (e.g. poverty reduction, community empowerment, food security, sustainable livelihood) 4) Conserving landscape/seascape diversity and ecosystems 5) Promoting sustainable use of biodiversity (including agricultural biodiversity) 6) Empowering stakeholders (building human, institutional, financial capacities)

2- What constitutes a "good" case study? :

One of the key roles of IPSI is to share good practices and useful experiences of its diverse members and non-members to help the wide-scale resolution of various issues relating to SEPLS. Considering what "good" case studies are is the first step toward the identification of such cases. To organize the outcomes and findings derived from diverse cases, six themes have been considered in Classification 9 of the preliminary classification (Table 1). Participants were asked to address the following questions during the group discussions.

2-1) What constitutes a "good" case study? (i.e. what are the key elements of a good case study?)
- How do you think the case studies can be beneficial for stakeholders within and beyond IPSI?
- How do you want your case study to be used by stakeholders?

2-2) How useful are the themes (Classification 9) in the preliminary classification (Table 1) to structure the outcome and/or findings of the case studies?

3- How can we promote knowledge-sharing on the case studies (including case study submission)?

In order to share IPSI members' activities on SEPLS, the Secretariat has uploaded case studies submitted by IPSI members onto the IPSI website. Additionally, some cases have been presented in the form of publications. The IPSI Secretariat hopes to further collect cases from

[1] Themes have been identified based on a) the IPSI Case Study Guidelines, and b) reference material (brochure of Resilience Indicators and the IPSI Strategy).

IPSI members, and to promote the use of their information by stakeholders within and outside of IPSI. The following questions were thus posed to the participants for group discussion.

3-1) What do you think can be an effective and useful way of sharing lessons learned from case studies?

- What kind of information is more useful? (e.g. specific examples / distilled lessons)
- What kind of media is preferable? In what way do you think the IPSI information channel can improve the efficiency of knowledge-sharing?

3-2) What do you think can be a good way to motivate other IPSI members to submit case studies?

3-3) What do you think would support IPSI members in preparing case study reports?

The outcome of the group discussions were presented to and further discussed in the plenary.

Agenda

	Tuesday, 22 July	**Remarks**
9:00-9:05	(1) Opening and introduction of co-chairs	IPSI Secretariat (Mr. Suzuki)
9:05-9:20	(2) Self-introduction	Co-chairs
9:20-10:00	(3) Introduction: a) Overview of IPSI case study and workshop objectives b) Discussion points, schedule c) Clarification and feedback	Presentations by IPSI Secretariat (Dr. Ichikawa)
10:00-10:15	Coffee/tea break	
10:15-11:55	(4-1)Presentations of CS by participants	5 x 20min (15 min presentations+5 min Q&A)
12:00-13:00	Lunch break	
13:00-14:20	(4-2) (Continued) Presentations of CS by participants	4 x 20min (15 min presentations+5 min Q&A)
14:20-14:35	Formation of groups and introduction of discussion point 1	Explanation by IPSI Secretariat
14:35-14:50	Coffee/tea break	
14:50-15:35	(5) Group discussions on discussion point 1 (45 min.)	Two groups (each facilitated by two participants, who will be supported by IGES and IPSI Secretariat) Facilitators: Mr. Yoshinaka, Dr. Ferrari, Ms. Daguitan, and Dr. Natori
15:35-16:30	(6) Plenary for reporting and discussion on discussion point 1 (55 min.)	Reporting back on the group discussion by the group facilitators
	Wednesday, 23 July	**Remarks**
9:00-9:10	(1) Introduction of discussion point 2	Explanation by IGES
9:10-10:15	(2-1) Group discussions on discussion point 2 (65 min.)	Each group facilitated by the same two facilitators
10:15-10:30	Coffee/tea break	

10:30-12:00	(2-2) Plenary for reporting and discussion on discussion point 2 (90 min.)	Reporting back on the group discussion
12:00-13:00	Lunch break	
13:00-13:10	(3) Introduction of discussion point 3	Explanation by IPSI Secretariat
13:10-14:10	(4-2) Group discussions on discussion point 3 (60 min)	Each group facilitated by the two facilitators
14:10-15:10	(4-3) Plenary for reporting and discussion on discussion point 3 (60 min)	Reporting back on the group discussion
15:10-15:25	Coffee/tea break	
15:25-16:15	(5) Plenary discussion and next steps (50 min)	
16:15-16:25	(6) Wrap up by the Co-chairs	
16:25-16:30	Closing	IPSI Secretariat (Mr. Suzuki)

Figure 1: Discussions in the Plenary

Meeting minutes

<DAY 1>

Opening, introduction of co-chairs and participants

In the morning of the first day of the IPSI Case Study Experts Workshop, Mr. Wataru Suzuki, Deputy Director of the IPSI Secretariat, gave a brief opening speech and introduced the Co-chairs of the meeting. The Co-chairs, Prof. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah, National Chairman of the Ghana National Biodiversity Committee, and Ms. Yoko Watanabe, Senior Biodiversity Specialist of the GEF Secretariat, invited the workshop participants to introduce themselves before beginning the day's presentations.

Introduction

Dr. Kaoru Ichikawa, United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (IPSI Secretariat)

Dr. Ichikawa gave a presentation on the background of the workshop and its objectives, as well as an overview of the existing IPSI case studies. She described the development of IPSI as a multi-stakeholder platform for knowledge-sharing on socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes (SEPLS), and explained that the current IPSI case studies are accessible from the IPSI website, and have been classified according to the major ecosystems they are targeting. To date, a total of 75 case studies have been submitted to the IPSI Secretariat, with a large portion from the Asian region. Dr. Ichikawa pointed out that although some of these case studies have been compiled into publications, a systematic review has so far not been conducted.

In order to clarify the rationale for holding the workshop, Dr. Ichikawa outlined the challenges currently faced in the collection and management of case studies, such as the low submission rate, and the difficulties in capturing the wide range of activities reported by IPSI members and in extracting useful knowledge from them. Based on this explanation, Dr. Ichikawa introduced the objectives and timeframe for the IPSI Case Study Review activities, as well as the key questions to be addressed during this workshop.

Q&A

- The IPSI Secretariat was asked if it keeps any records on the amount of access to the online information on the case studies (such as the number of hits on the IPSI website). The Secretariat responded that there is currently no record of website access, but the Secretariat is in consultation with the web team about introducing such a system.

Presentations of case studies by participants

As a basis for holding discussions on the perspectives introduced by Dr. Ichikawa, a series of presentations were delivered by nine workshop participants on each of their case studies. These presentations were structured according to the preliminary case study classification framework (Table 1) suggested by the Secretariat.

At the beginning of their presentations, each of the nine CS representatives presented the selected categories of the Preliminary Classification (Table 1) that applied to their case study.

Ms. Florence Daguitan, TEBTEBBA (Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research and Education)

Ms Daguitan delivered the first case study presentation on "Documenting Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices in Kalanguya, Tinoc, Ifugao." The research question in the study was how to implement an ecosystems-based approach in this particular landscape. The research methodologies followed a participatory approach and involved: 1) Use of secondary data and literature review; 2) Survey and census; 3) Workshops; 4) Focus group discussions; 5) Case studies; and 6) Mapping. Ms Daguitan underlined how important collective data analysis was in order to enhance critical thinking, awareness-raising, and to reach to common views. She noted that the harmonious relationship of organisms within each land use and the different land uses is maintained through a belief system, spirituality, culture, traditional knowledge. Ms. Daguitan also stressed the need to recognize the fact that today's problems are multi-faceted and complex and must be addressed through a holistic, rights-based, ecosystems-based and knowledge-based approach, which also targets inter-culturality, gender and intergenerational and sustainable livelihoods. She concluded that participation in decision-making among different stakeholders and at all levels is required.

Q&A

- In the subsequent Q&A, Ms Daguitan clarified that as an outcome of the project the traditional area has been able to maintain more forest. The project started in 2008, documenting traditional knowledge, and is now focusing on capacity building.

Dr. Maurizio Farhan Ferrari, Forest Peoples Programme

Dr. Ferrari presented on "the Wapichan people of Guyana: Customary sustainable use, community mapping and territorial management planning." The problems addressed by the case study included: lack of secure tenure/rights to the territory that has been customarily used by the Wapichan; external pressures, especially by extractive industries (mining and logging); declining use of traditional knowledge in the communities; decline in fish species; and changing weather patterns. The objectives of the case study included to: document and revitalize customary sustainable use and traditional knowledge; identify and highlight what needs to be done to ensure community wellbeing and resource sustainability; develop (and stimulate implementation of) a territorial management plan that can secure the future of the Wapichan people; and highlight the need for supportive national policies and laws. The research methodology mainly involved participatory action research, interviews, questionnaires, community workshops, focus group discussions and participatory mapping. Among a series of successful project outcomes, Dr. Ferrari pointed out that the project contributed to securing community rights to land and resources. The capacity of the Wapichan to document the title claim on their customary territory has greatly increased and they have proposed extension applications under Section 59 of the Amerindian Act. He stressed that combining traditional with modern technology can produce innovative and groundbreaking outcomes and can unite communities across generations. Dr. Ferrari also emphasized the need for good governance to address long-term community wellbeing (which may not always correspond with conventional politics). He concluded that participatory research on how people make their living and use resources should be done before making a territorial management plan. In addition, visual communication through talking maps, story-boards and participatory video can reach more community members than written documents and constitute important documentation.

Q&A

Responding to a question, Dr. Ferrari opined that "community rights to land and resources" could be part of governance. To achieve good governance, indigenous rights need to be properly acknowledged by state governance. He also pointed to possible synergies between the Resilience Indicators and Traditional Knowledge indicators under the CBD. On a question of how to deal with mining concessions, Dr. Ferrari stressed the need to build the capacity of both companies and communities to be able to secure Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC).

Dr. Yoji Natori, Conservation International

Dr. Natori presented on the Philippine Peñablanca Sustainable Reforestation Project (PPSRP). The problems in the project area included: Deforestation from subsistence logging; illegal grazing; grassfires and forest fires; limited livelihoods; low awareness of environmental issues; and weak capacity of local entities to manage ecosystems. The project had two phases and each phase had a separate objective: 1) To promote forest conservation in the Peñablanca Protected Landscape and Seascape (PPLS) and demonstrate the compatibility among multiple uses of forests for biodiversity protection, watershed management, and ecosystem services for the benefit of local communities. 2) Sustainable provision of ecosystem services to local communities' well-being through their appropriate management of forest resources. The main approach under the project was to promote a sustainable reforestation model through a "reforestation fund" for both reforestation and agroforestry. The project outcomes included: promoting good governance and equity by strengthening organizational responsibility and clarifying the roles of each stakeholder and land tenure; and securing sustainable livelihoods through community empowerment and a diversification of livelihood options.

Q&A

- In the Q&A the issue of quantifying/measuring the level of community participation and ownership of the community of the activities was raised. Dr. Natori agreed that the question of how to secure the continuation of activities is very important. He pointed to the establishment of the reforestation fund and the production of mangoes and other fruits. He explained that the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards (CCB Standards) standards were used to respond to the donor's interests, which include third-party audit and community benefits. Therefore the project addressed the concerns of the communities on 3000 ha of degraded land.

Prof. Inocencio Buot Jr, University of the Philippines Open University (UPOU)

Prof. Buot began his presentation on "Understanding biodiversity loss in selected forest ecosystems in the Philippines" by outlining two main problems common to the case study areas: 1) decreasing plant diversity; and 2) invasion of lowland plant species in higher altitudes after forest destruction. The objectives of the case study were twofold: to understand the decreasing plant diversity trends and distribution pattern in a disturbed forest landscape; and to propose measures to contribute to minimizing plant diversity loss, thereby contributing to the attainment of Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Prof. Buot then outlined the methodology, which consisted primarily of standard methods in plant diversity assessment conducted along altitudinal gradients in 4 selected mountain forests in the Philippines, in addition to cluster and ordination analyses. He illustrated the outcomes of the case study in the landscapes of Mt. Pulag, Mt. Akiki and Mt. Mayon. While patches of very dense mountain forest remain, environmental degradation is leading to habitat loss. Underlying anthropogenic disturbances of the ecosystem include the cutting of trees, unplanned swidden farming, bioinvasion,

habitat degradation, loss of biodiversity and changing beliefs and traditions. The research also found that conventional upper-elevation species (oaks in the northern Philippines) could not re-establish due to changes in microclimate, but more adapted lower elevation species colonized the vacated space in higher elevations (predominantly pine). The main case study activities have included biodiversity education, community land use planning and zoning, and biodiversity corridor establishment. The case study includes a recommendation for: strict enforcement of existing environmental laws and ordinances; local, regional and international collaboration; interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary discussions; and intergenerational cooperation.

Q&A

- It was suggested that follow-up research could address the question of whether warmer conditions as part of climate change may be responsible for the spread of pine trees at the expense of native oaks. Prof. Buot agreed but pointed out that for this the establishment of weather stations on the mountains of the case study area would be required.

Dr. Ykhandai Hijaba, Environmental and Development Association "JASIL"

Dr. Hijaba presented the use of "Indicators of Resilience in Socio-ecological Production Landscapes in pastoral ecosystems of Mongolia," First Dr. Hijaba described the challenges faced in the sustainable use of pastoral landscapes, such as policy and legal issues (lack of tenure rights), commercial pressures (e.g. mining) and climate change. He then presented the preliminary results of the use of the Indicators of Resilience, which were created through an IPSI Collaborative Activity, in Mongolia. One of the main objectives of the study has been to field-test the improved set of Indicators of Resilience in SEPLS in pastoral agricultural systems in selected sites and communities. The methodology has included literature review, participatory field testing (considering gender balance), questionnaire surveys, scoring, consensus building, and statistical analysis. SEPLS in pastoral agricultural areas are dynamic and change over time, due to climate variations and human-made pressures. The main finding was that the draft framework of the resilience indicators is a useful instrument, both for diagnostic and monitoring/evaluation purposes, but that it may need some specificity on a number of indicators (and related questions) to deal adequately with Mongolian socio-ecological conditions, such as seasonal difference of landscape and inter-seasonal mobility of nomadic herders. Other outcomes include that female and male herders have quite different views on the scoring under each indicator, and that more attention needs to be paid to the policy and legal environment of the managed landscape.

Q&A

- The question was raised of whether pastoralism can be considered an agricultural activity or if conceptually it needs to be differentiated from agriculture. Dr. Hijaba responded that pastoralism is part of agriculture, but it is very different from modern agriculture. He suggested classifying pastoral landscapes as grassland.

Dr. Pia Kieninger, Department of Japanology, Institute of East Asian Studies, University Vienna/ BOKU Satoyama Platform for Nature Conservation and Biodiversity Research, University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna (BOKU)

Dr. Kieninger gave her presentation on a case study from the Austrian Alps. Organic farming currently represents 20% of the farmland in Austria, and Austrian agriculture in general shows a trend towards fewer but larger farms. Dr Kieninger explained that, traditionally, mountain farmers

used alpine pastures and grasslands since ancient times as important grazing grounds for their cattle. The biodiversity in these pastoral landscapes is therefore very high, with rare species such as edelweiss. They also constitute an important basis for tourism, as well as the identity of the Austrian people. The traditional pastoral management is however threatened by abandonment, due to socio-economic reasons. Dr. Kieninger provided a preliminary classification of the alpine pastoral landscape according to the framework suggested by the Secretariat, and explained the issue of abandonment driven by ageing populations and declining manpower. This has caused problems such as the loss/decline of specific alpine species, but also traditions and customs, which evolved from these grazing activities. To illustrate this, Dr. Kieninger gave an example of a case study site - the Nature Park *Sölktäler* in Styria (southern Austria) - where research has been conducted by the University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences. She outlined the research objectives, methodologies, activities, and findings of the case study, and explained that the pride and passion of the local people constitute a strong driver for the management of these traditional landscapes, and that appreciation by tourists has encouraged local people to continue their efforts, showing the importance of culture in maintaining traditional landscapes.

Q&A

- In the Q&A session, Dr Kieninger clarified that the administration of Nature Park *Sölktäler* is an "intermediary" between the farmers and the noble families who own the land, or hunters. The Nature Park management and staff are also responsible for organising tourism activities. Asked about the land tenure system in these areas, Dr. Kieninger responded that a big portion of these lands belongs to noble families. Some farmers' families however have been accorded the right of pasturage, even if they do not own the land.

Dr. Kuang-Chung Lee, National Dong-Hwa University

Dr. Lee's presentation focused on "Tailoring Satoyama Initiative concepts to national and local contexts." He presented a case study of participatory action research for Rice Paddy Cultural Landscape conservation in an indigenous community of Taiwan. He outlined the challenges faced by the local community, including the tailoring of the concept of the sustainable use of SEPLS into national planning systems, and the translation of concepts into practice while engaging all stakeholders. He explained that in the case study site, the reform of the culture preservation law had been an institutional opportunity for introducing the concept of the Satoyama Initiative. In the implementation of his action research, both the top-down and bottom-up approaches to decision-making were important, and the researcher's role as a facilitator of dialogue was vital. Dr. Lee outlined the methodologies applied in the case study area, and the ecological context of the study. The first step was to launch a participatory dialogue process. The distribution of different land uses was then mapped based on communications with the local farmers. Communities, local leaders, and authorities came together to build consensus on what constitutes a cultural landscape. Through a series of dialogues, local codes of conduct were agreed upon, and a stakeholder platform was established incorporating the concept of the Satoyama Initiative. The platform has thus formulated a cultural landscape management plan including management strategies, tasks, timetables, and responsibilities.

Q&A

- Asked about one diagram which showed the district highway bureau as a member of the stakeholder platform, Dr. Lee responded that there is a highway passing through the cultural landscape. There were plans to build an extensive engineering facility in that area, threatening

the conservation of the cultural landscape. The group then negotiated with the various stakeholders and succeeded in halting these plans, but an important lesson was learnt on the need to engage not only the environmental authorities, but also the development authorities.

- Asked if the case study site was designated as a "new type of protected area" under a national law or just recognized by the stakeholders, Dr. Lee responded that the cultural landscape designation plan proposed by the local management board was officially approved by the Authority in a review meeting in 2012.

Prof. Machito Mihara, Institute of Environment Rehabilitation and Conservation (ERECON)

In his presentation, Prof. Mihara gave an example of a capacity-building activity for rice farming conducted by ERECON in Cambodia. The community members of the case study site were poor, and their agricultural practices based on heavy agrochemical inputs tended to be very dangerous, due to low awareness of their environmental and health risks. The project led by ERECON consisted in introducing eri-culture (silkworm farming) in the study site, as a means to provide an additional source of income for the local population, and as an environmental indicator due to its sensitivity to chemical substances. Prof. Mihara explained that the project was locally promoted as an income generation activity, and initially only two villagers agreed to participate. Eventually, more farmers joined the eri-culture project, but they failed to raise the eri silkworms, which often died due to the excessive levels of pesticide contamination in their fodder. Gradually, through communication and sharing of lessons amongst themselves the farmers learnt how to raise eri silkworms, and made efforts to reduce the amount of pesticide application. Through this project, the farmers were able to obtain multiple benefits from the sales of silk products and the consumption of the pupae, and also to reduce their negative environmental impacts.

Q&A

- A comment was made to the effect that this project is highly commendable, as it has successfully demonstrated a "win-win-win" outcome, with income generation for the local community, environmental conservation through reduction in the application of agricultural chemicals, and food provision through the consumption of pupae.

Dr. William Olupot, Nature and Livelihoods

Dr. Olupot gave his presentation on land use change in Uganda's drylands and opportunities for local livelihoods. As the earlier presenters he provided the preliminary classification of his activities. He then introduced the problems addressed through them, such as the lack of consolidated information on SEPLS in the target region. The study proceeded to formulate an operational definition of SEPLS and to select sample sites in order to develop methodologies to identify challenges and opportunities for its sustainable use. Dr. Olupot explained that the research activities also consisted of literature review and conducting consultations with local stakeholders. Dr. Olupot also explained that because they wanted their case study to be based on a SEPL, they needed to first identify one. The definition formulated to characterize the SEPL was "a landscape in which people are strongly dependent on indigenous biological resources, the persistence of which can to a large extent be attributed to that dependence." Using this definition, the study identified the dryland landscape (popularly known in Uganda as "the cattle corridor") as a SEPL. By conducting studies in three carefully chosen sites across the SEPL, Dr. Olupot and his team were able to identify the challenges for sustainable use faced in the SEPL, including overgrazing, de-bushing, increasing cultivation, charcoal trade, wild fires, and increasing fencing. Dr. Olupot also listed the opportunities

for activities in each of these sites, such as livestock grazing, sport hunting, game ranching, and development of food products from indigenous plants. He explained that such an approach was useful for identifying courses of action needed to attain SEPL sustainability. Finally, based on these experiences, Dr. Olupot recommended facilitating the organization of information by the case study providers through sharing a detailed case study framework. He mentioned that the description of SEPLS, and the issues faced should also be included as categories for the case study framework.

Q&A

- Asked if the definition of SEPLS under this case study was part of a multi-stakeholder process, Dr. Olupot responded that the definition was drafted by himself first, and then elaborated further based on team discussions.

Formation of groups and introduction of discussion point 1

Upon request from the Co-chairs, Dr. Ichikawa made an introductory presentation on the group discussion session, including the grouping of the participants, and the details of discussion point 1 on ways to capture the diversity of case studies under IPSI. The key question of this discussion point was, "What are your thoughts on this classification, in terms of its capacity to accommodate the diversity of case studies?" Participants then took seats in their groups to hold discussions for the next 45 minutes. Group A was facilitated by Dr. Maurizio Farhan Ferrari and Dr. Yoji Natori, and Group B by Ms. Florence Daguitan and Mr. Atsuhiro Yoshinaka.

Reporting on group discussions on discussion point 1

Dr. William Olupot reported back on the main points of the discussion from Group A. He highlighted additional categories suggested for complementing the draft framework, as well as recommendations for the revision of the main categories of Ecosystems and Socio-Economic Activities. Suggestions were also made to eliminate some of the subcategories on the research case studies. He also underlined the concern raised within the group about having too many categories, and the need to carefully consider the level of detail to be included in the overall framework. Dr. Olupot also explained that some suggestions were made during the discussions, not on the overall framework, but rather on the possible template for case study submission.

From Group B, Mr. Yasushi Hibi reported that the discussion in Group B touched upon the meaning of "case studies" and whether this terminology should be revised, as there may be too much stress towards a research perspective. Other possible names that were suggested during discussions included "cases" and "good practices", but a final decision was not reached. Mr. Hibi explained that there were other categories suggested for addition to the existing framework, such as "ecosystem services", "policy and land tenure", and "gender". Mr. Hibi highlighted Group B's recommendation to not place emphasis on who submits the case studies, but rather on who the involved stakeholders are. He thus suggested adding a category on stakeholders.

Plenary discussions on discussion point 1

Based on the reports from each of the groups, the co-chairs invited comments and questions from the floor on the suggested points for revision of the existing framework. The importance was discussed of striking a balance between developing a broad classification covering the diverse IPSI case studies, and ensuring a sufficiently detailed description of case studies. There was an overall

recognition of the need for further consideration on bundling and dismantling some of the thematic categories. Participants suggested additional classification items/categories under the Preliminary Classification (see Table 2 below)

- Communities in the landscape/seascape (as a new classification item)
- Stakeholders/beneficiaries
- Collaborators/partners (as a new classification item)
- Ecosystem services (as a new classification item, including specific categories such as lowland forest)
- Policy and land tenure
- Gender/equity
- Contribution to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets
- Issues/problems of SEPLS such as pesticide, pollution etc.

Figures 2 and 3: Discussions in the two break-out groups

Table 2: Preliminary classification according to basic categories (including input from participants highlighted in red colour or strike-through)

#	Classification	Main category
1	**Cluster**	1) knowledge facilitation, 2) policy research, 3) indicators research, 4) capacity building, 5) on-the-ground activities
2	**Scale**	1) Global 2) Regional, 3) National, 4) Local
3	**Region**	1) East Asia, 2) Southeast Asia, 3) South Asia, 4) Central Asia, 5) West Asia, 6) Oceania, 7) Europe, 8) North America, 9) Latin America and the Caribbean, 10) Africa Asia has many regional categories (follow membership category?)
5	**Ecosystems**	1) Agricultural, 2) Forest, 3) Grassland, 4) Wetland, 5) Dry land, 6) Coastal Other possible classifications include, for instance, that of GEF: 1) Arid and Semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems, 2) Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems, 3) Forest Ecosystems, 4) Mountain Ecosystems, 5) Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture[2]
6	**Stakeholder organizations**	1) National government, 2) Local government, 3) International NGO, 4) Local NGO, 5) International org., 6) University/research institute, 7) Indigenous people 8) Local communities, 9) Migrants/nomadic, 10) Private sector, etc.
7	**Socio-economic activities / sector & eco-system services**	1) Agriculture (a) Cropland, b) Animal husbandry, c) …), 2) Fishery, 3) Forestry, 4) Tourism, 5) Wildlife conservation, 6) Environmental education, 7) Culture/ arts, 8) Gathering NTFP, 9) Hunting, 10) Traditional medicine, 11) Others
8	**Research/project strategy ~~(Research cases only)~~**	1) Research / project type: a) analytical, b) action-oriented 2) Data collection and analysis method: a) Qualitative (Literature review, interviews, participatory methods, participatory mapping), b) Quantitative (Literature review, questionnaire survey, statistics, GIS), c) Interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary 3) Outcomes: a) Peer reviewed, b) Grey, c) Visual/virtual material ~~Number of research papers~~
9	**~~Themes~~ Contribution to the implementation of the IPSI Strategy and Plan of Action [→ replaced "themes" with Strategic objectives]**	1) Increasing knowledge and understanding 2) Enhancing benefits 3) Addressing the direct and underlying causes 4) Enhancing capacities [The Strategic Objectives capture the categories in the "themes": (i) Consolidating knowledge and promoting innovation (e.g. local traditions, culture, learning, integration of modern science and traditional knowledge) (ii) Ensuring good governance and equity (e.g. interest representation, organizational responsibility, land tenure, gender, decision-making, implementation) (iii) Securing livelihoods and enhancing well-being (e.g. poverty reduction, community empowerment, food security, sustainable livelihood) (iv) Conserving landscape/seascape diversity and ecosystems (v) Promoting sustainable use of biodiversity (including agricultural biodiversity) (vi) Empowering stakeholders (building human, institutional, financial capacities) Addressing emerging and relevant issues (climate change, pollution/pesticide control)

[2] Based on operational program categories for biodiversity used by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) http://www.thegef.org/gef/operational_programs

Participants also discussed whether there is too much focus on the item of research classification (number 8) and suggested exploring the possibility of simplifying the categories to some extent, although they need to remain specific enough to capture the diversity of case studies. In addition, participants suggested considering the timeline/dates of case studies as an additional classification item, and paying attention to the order of categories, as prioritizing some of categories may be important.

<Day 2>

Summary of Day 1 discussions

At the beginning of Day 2, Dr. Kaoru Ichikawa made a brief presentation summarizing the main discussion points of the previous day. She presented the overall classification framework incorporating the suggested modifications. The Co-chairs then invited the participants to make any additional comments. Comments included:

- Among the "Themes", the climate change/pollution/pesticide control category seems confusing for users. It may be better to rephrase them into "Addressing issues relevant to SEPLS".
- Within the Research category, it would be good to add "visual/virtual material" as one of the "Outcomes".

The list of possible additional classification items and categories was agreed on among the participants of the workshop. There will need to be further consideration by the Secretariat and IGES on the details of the categories within the revised classification.

Introduction of discussion point 2

Following Dr. Ichikawa's presentation, Dr. Federico Lopez-Casero gave an introduction to the topic of the next group discussion session. He explained that the two groups would consider what constitutes a "good" case study, both in terms of the structure of the report and its contents. The Co-chairs first invited the participants to consider the main questions in order to reach a common understanding before breaking out into groups. They agreed that the sub-questions of question 2-1), "What constitutes a good case study", should be addressed in the following order:

- How do you think the case study can be beneficial for stakeholders within and beyond IPSI?
- How do you want your case study to be used by stakeholders?
- What are the key elements of a good case study?

The second discussion point 2-2) was, "How useful participants found the themes provided in the preliminary classification of case studies (Table 1) to be in order to capture the diversity of CS outcomes/findings."

Reporting on group discussions on discussion point 2

Prof. Buot presented the points raised during discussions within Group A and Ms. Okayasu made a brief presentation on the discussions in Group B. The suggestions made by both groups largely coincided and are summarized below under the item "Plenary discussions on discussion point 2." The main difference was that Group A suggested using the IPSI strategic objectives as a thematic framework, while Group B suggested referring to the five IPSI perspectives. In an initial discussion there was agreement that the elements of good case studies need to be reflected in the structure of case studies. The Co-chairs suggested that the Secretariat summarise the two presentations before

further plenary discussions on point 2. The plenary then moved on to the introduction of discussion point 3.

Introduction of discussion point 3

Ms. Ayako Kawai from the IPSI Secretariat briefly explained the objectives and key questions under discussion point 3 on effective means of sharing information and promoting case study submissions. A request was made from the Co-chairs to further describe how the existing case studies are being used under IPSI. The Secretariat added that although there is currently little use of case studies, they have been made available as a database on the IPSI website, and also through occasional IPSI publications.

Before discussing point 3 in the groups there was a brief discussion in the plenary. One participant commented that sharing of case studies could be promoted not only internationally, but also at national levels. The Secretariat clarified that there are currently no specific activities on national-level sharing of knowledge, but IPSI regional workshops have been playing a similar role at the regional scale. After verifying that all participants understood the intentions of the key questions under discussion point 3, the Co-chairs requested that they break out into the two groups A and B.

Reporting on group discussions on discussion point 3

Mr. Yohsuke Amano from the IPSI Secretariat made a presentation on the main points raised in Group A. He explained that recognition and feedback from members on submitted case studies would motivate IPSI members to submit their case studies. The group had also suggested that being invited to present at IPSI events could serve as an additional incentive. Publishing the collected case studies online, or in peer-reviewed publications, would be an effective means of sharing information. Providing a template for writing case study reports was mentioned as a way to help IPSI members in preparing their reports. Finally, Mr. Amano suggested that there may be a need to distinguish between a simple case study to be submitted in the first 6 months after joining the partnership, and a more specific case study which could be submitted voluntarily and used as a basis for IPSI publications.

From Group B, Mr. Rikiya Konishi, Ministry of the Environment of Japan, presented the main points raised by the participants. He first outlined the existing challenges perceived by IPSI members in the effective use of information currently available under IPSI. In terms of the kind of information which would be useful for the members, Mr. Konishi highlighted that thematic studies on existing case studies may serve to effectively extract and disseminate lessons learnt in specific areas of the partnership. Similar to Group A, videos, albums, site visits to SEPLS alongside IPSI Regional Workshops, and the introduction of a Facebook-style system of communication between IPSI members would facilitate more active sharing of information.

Plenary discussions on discussion point 3

Based on the reports from group discussions, the Co-chairs commented that many points had overlapped between groups A and B, and that the discussions seemed to have converged towards recognition on the need to make effective use of existing mechanisms, and to enhance their appeal through the use of more visual materials. They pointed out that there would most likely be two kinds of case studies under the IPSI, detailed and research-oriented on the one hand, and concise and public-oriented on the other. Some innovative ideas were highlighted, such as establishing a

sub-committee for the review of submitted case studies (e.g. consisting of academic IPSI partners, the IPSI Secretariat and/or volunteers), as well as a suggestion to link case studies to tourism and marketing in order to showcase some private sector initiatives. It was also mentioned that a communication strategy would be required for IPSI as a whole. Further comments were then invited from the floor:

1. IPSI Publications

1-1. Comments on the publication contents and expected benefits

- There may be a possibility for publishing an IPSI journal as a niche product.
- IPSI should not over-emphasise the need for peer-reviewed scientific publications, but rather focus on its own aspirations as an international partnership.
- The publication of a journal-style product is a distinct opportunity for **promoting submission** of case studies from members who have interesting information worth sharing, but which would not necessarily be appropriate for publication in rigorous academic journals. An IPSI-specific journal would be able to give credibility through a peer-review process. Given the need for a flexible framework to **encompass the wide range of IPSI members' activities**, and the need for IPSI to continue expanding its partnership, there may not be a need to focus on developing a rigorous peer-reviewed journal under the IPSI.
- It is recommended to publish in a credible format, but not necessarily peer-reviewed. This is because on-the-ground activities do not usually undergo a peer-review process, and therefore it may be too difficult for project implementers to prepare for.
- For researchers, it is likely that having their case studies published in a recognised, qualified format would constitute a stronger **incentive** to spend time on writing than a generic case study.
- IPSI's publications should have a specific purpose, such as demonstrating the contribution of some of the activities to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.
- Submission of a research-oriented case study paper for publication does not need to be a requirement for IPSI members, but there could be a "call for papers" every year.
- There is a need for scientific validation of the benefits of SEPLS, so it may be meaningful to connect researchers' outputs with IPSI members' activities.
- The effective use of the case study and the increased visibility of the activities would be the **main incentives** for IPSI members to submit case studies.

1-2. Comments on the publication format

- The CBD Technical Series could be referred to as one possible way of compiling information from case studies in a widely acceptable format with a certain level of recognition and credibility.
- IPSI publications should focus more on making effective use of **audio-visual materials** to communicate its activities rather than developing an exclusive communication channel such as a journal. IPSI may be able to separate the types of publications according to its various interests and purposes.

2. Simple description of members' activities

3. It may be difficult for some new members to submit a case study on SEPLS activity within six months after becoming a member. So the required case study for all the IPSI members could be a simplified description of their activities that somehow relate to SEPLS.

- Bioversity International has developed a simple method for capturing local knowledge working with local school children using digital cameras as a means of collecting visual data.

The Co-chairs wrapped up the discussions of the session by clarifying that the type of publication IPSI produces, whether it is peer-reviewed or not, would be a question of the policy of IPSI as a whole. Overall, it seemed that participants would want to have both a scientific, peer-reviewed type of publication and a simpler, more general form of publication for information-sharing under IPSI.

Plenary discussions on discussion point 2

After wrapping up the discussion session on point 3, in order to bring the plenary back to a collective consideration of discussion point 2, Dr. Federico Lopez-Casero of IGES made a brief presentation summarising the points raised in the group discussions conducted in the morning of day 2. These points included:

1) Participants raised the following potential uses of good case studies:
   - To communicate the results of members' activities
   - To share more detailed information, depending on the different type of activities/information (on the website, IPSI reports collecting case studies, etc.)
   - To identify common problems of the communities
   - To encourage learning from similar approaches
   - To promote collaboration under the Partnership
   - To showcase tangible benefits resulting from IPSI members' activities within and beyond the partnership
   - As a basis for scaling-up the documented activities
   - For a systematic analysis of similar case studies to consolidate IPSI collective wisdom (e.g. CS bridging traditional knowledge and modern science)
   - To indicate progress on Aichi Biodiversity Targets
2) Participants wanted to see their case studies being used by others:
   - As a basis for a learning process for all the stakeholders concerned
   - As a basis to understand a particular problem
   - To provide new ideas for new case studies
   - To learn from CS lessons
3) Participants saw as some key elements of a good case study:
   - The CS should be beneficial to the people, to the environment, and for interaction between them
   - The CS should follow a structure, which: reflects the situation "before" and "after" implementation of the CS; clearly describes the background/problem; highlights the innovation of approaches and activities; includes measurable results and replicability; outlines lessons learned based on a set of focused questions, mentioning both successes and challenges; and includes recommendations to others (if relevant)
   - Activities should be sustainable and involve relevant stakeholders
   - The CS should also be attractive to those who are not necessarily interested in SEPLS, taking into account applicability, simplicity (of language), visual appeal (design) and storyline
   - A CS does not necessarily need to be a successful case; failures can be also worth sharing

With respect to stakeholder involvement, some participants had suggested in the groups that research and action research should be distinguished, and that access to information and communication technologies may constitute a barrier. Therefore, depending on whether partners are new members or not, the submission structure should allow for some flexibility as new members may need more than 6 months for the submission. It was also noted that when consolidating knowledge, it is important to report on the changing values of biodiversity.

After the summary presentation, the Co-chairs invited the participants to first express their thoughts on what existing framework could be used as an alternative to the "themes" suggested in the preliminary classification. Two comments were made:

- The current "themes" may not be clear for the users to understand as they are vague and have some overlaps. Rather, the existing five perspectives of IPSI would be sufficient to provide a simple and concrete set of criteria for them to consider.
- The IPSI Strategy has just been agreed upon as the way for IPSI to proceed, so it should be relevant as a framework for categorising and reporting case studies.

The Co-chairs recognised the need to add further explanation to each of the categories, even when using existing frameworks. Given the more recent establishment of the IPSI Strategy and Plan of Action compared to the five perspectives, it was recommended to use the Strategic Objectives in the Strategy and Plan of Action for developing the thematic classification of IPSI case studies. A revised table of the thematic elements was presented by the Secretariat, and participants further discussed the adequacy of categories. Finally, a general agreement was reached among the participants on the use of the IPSI Strategic Objectives as categories, provided the Secretariat adds some explanation on what each category means.

Wrap-up by the Co-chairs

As a final wrap-up of the workshop, the Co-chairs each gave a short speech thanking the participants for their active contributions during the discussion sessions, and shared their hopes for the effective generation of knowledge on the sustainable use of SEPLS through IPSI. They reminded the participants that the considerations on enhancing the use of IPSI case studies are an on-going process, and welcomed any future contributions by the IPSI members.

Closing

On behalf of the IPSI Secretariat, Mr. Wataru Suzuki thanked the Co-chairs for their excellent facilitation of the workshop, as well as the participants for having taken the time to discuss critical issues for IPSI before adjourning the meeting.

He shared the second phase of IPSI activities as follows.

1. Case study guidelines
    a. Project reports as a required report to be members
    b. Detailed/full reports
    c. Other forms materials/resources
2. Communications
    a. Website/newsletter
    b. Social media

c. Publications/reports
d. Visual materials

3. Volunteer contributions from members
    a. Workshops (participation/organization)
    b. Mentoring/supporting other members
    c. Contributions for reports
4. Meetings
    a. Public forums
    b. Regional/global/thematic workshops
    c. Case study workshop (ISAP)
5. Motivation/incentives
    a. Awards/good practice
    b. Participation in meetings/processes
    c. Funding (SDM)
6. Next step
    a. August 2014: Workshop report draft to be shared with participants
    b. October 2014: IPSI-5/COP12

    March 2015: Case study analysis report (IGES/ IPSI Secretariat)

Participants List

#		**Name**	**Organization**
1	Co-chairs	Ms. Yoko Watanabe	Secretariat of GEF
2		Prof. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah	Ghana National Biodiversity Committee
3	Facilitators	Ms. Florence Daguitan	TEBTEBBA
4		Dr. Maurizio Farhan Ferrari	Forest Peoples Programme
5		Dr. Yoji Natori	Conservation International
6		Mr. Atsuhiro Yoshinaka	Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD)
7		Prof. Inocencio Buot Jr.	University of the Philippines Open University (UPOU)
8		Dr. Ykhandai Hijaba	Environmental and Development Association "JASIL", Mongolia
9		Dr. Pia Kieninger	Department of Japanology, Institute of East Asian Studies, University Vienna/ BOKU Satoyama Platform for Nature Conservation and Biodiversity Research, University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna (BOKU)
10		Dr. Kuang-Chung Lee	National Dong-Hwa University, Taiwan
11		Prof. Machito Mihara	Institute of Environment Rehabilitation and conservation (ERECON)
12		Dr. William Olupot	Nature and Livelihoods, Uganda
13		Mr. Yasushi Hibi	Conservation International
14		Dr. Yuta Ishikawa	Institute of Environment Rehabilitation and conservation (ERECON)
15		Ms. Kumiko Kawabe	Institute of Environment Rehabilitation and conservation (ERECON)
16		Dr. Yasuyuki Morimoto	Bioversity International
17		Mr. Rikiya Konishi	Ministry of the Environment of Japan
18		Mr. Naohisa Okuda	Ministry of the Environment of Japan
19		Dr. Yoshihiko Iida	UNU-IAS, OUIK

20		Dr. Federico Lopez-Casero	IGES
21		Dr. Ikuko Matsumoto	IGES
22		Ms. Sana Okayasu	IGES
23		Mr. Yohsuke Amano	IPSI Secretariat
24		Mr. William Dunbar	IPSI Secretariat
25		Dr. Kaoru Ichikawa	IPSI Secretariat
26		Ms. Ayako Kawai	IPSI Secretariat
27		Mr. Wataru Suzuki	IPSI Secretariat

Supporting staff:

28		Ms. Ayumi Takahashi	IPSI Secretariat
29		Ms. Junko Watanabe	IGES

Figure 4: Group photo of workshop participants