Kenya is a medium-sized country (586,600 km²) by continental standards, slightly smaller than the island of Madagascar. There is tremendous topographical diversity that varies from colorful coral reefs and gorgeous coastal plains that give way to the expansive inland Nyika plateau. The plateau rises up towards the central highlands with its snow-capped peaks, moorlands and dense closed-canopy forests, some with heath and bamboo. This leads to the geologically stunning Great Rift Valley rising to the western highlands before descending to the Lake Victoria basin. The diversity of land and flora is immense, with a wide range of ecosystems from coastal sands to high-altitude montane forests.
Dear ELPers -
Many thanks to the authors of the fascinating articles contained in this newsletter on the integrated topic of conservation, protected areas, sustainable use and community livelihoods.

In this short space I need to update you on some ELP and associated Ecoagriculture Partners activities. First of all, a big welcome to our new ELP Program Representative, Elna Brunckhorst, who has been working non-stop with energy, commitment and intelligence to ensure a successful ELP 2008 summer course. We’re grateful that Leslie still comes in from time to time to help out. Also, welcome to Joy Harewood, our part-time Alumni Network coordinator, who has tirelessly edited and published this newsletter. Joy is a UC Berkeley graduate student in optometry and will be working with the ELP throughout the spring, summer and next year! This coming weekend - March 23 - 25, the ELP Advisory Board, co-directors and staff will be having an ELP Retreat in Aptos at the cabin and house of Dick and Carolyn Beahrs. We are using this occasion to review the preliminary results of the ELP evaluation being conducted by Dr. Claire Reinelt. Thanks to all of you who completed the on-line evaluation survey! We will be seriously considering your feedback during the Retreat, and planning the next few years largely based on your experiences and recommendations. In the next newsletter, if not before by email, we will share the major outcomes of our discussion.

I have been working closely with Ecoagriculture Partners to deliver several Leadership for Ecoagriculture courses. The next courses are announced elsewhere in this newsletter (Uganda in April, Costa Rica in September, Mexico in November). For our Latin American alums - think about nominating good candidates for the Central America and Mexico courses which will be held in Spanish. We are going to be featuring cases of ecoagriculture and integrated territorial development from the region, and will be placing a strong emphasis on multi-stakeholder collaborative landscape planning and management.

Finally, just two days ago I returned from intensive meetings at the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in Seattle. I am working with Dr. Sara Scherr and the Ecoagriculture Partners team in an advisory capacity to the Agriculture Program, specifically, the Agriculture Extension Strategy that will focus investments in Sub-Saharan Africa, and some areas of South Asia. We are recommending a community and farmer-based knowledge sharing approach that emphasizes farmer innovation combined with access to needed technical services in a demand-driven system. We are confident that our ideas are getting across to the Foundation. More on this in June!

Enjoy this informative and creative newsletter. Please keep in touch with your professional and personal updates!

Robin

**Protected Area:** “An area of land and/or sea especially dedicated to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity, and of natural and associated cultural resources, and managed through legal or other effective means.” (International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), 2008)

In this issue of the ELP Alumni newsletter we tackle protected areas (PAs), with articles from six countries on four continents. The IUCN has grouped PAs into 6 categories:

I. **Strict Nature Reserve/Wilderness Areas**
II. **National Park**
III. **Natural Monument**
IV. **Habitat/Species Management Area**
V. **Protected Landscape/Seascape**
VI. **Managed Resource PA**
biodiversity is facing several threats both within and without the protected areas system. In the following paragraphs I will discuss the benefits and the challenges associated with PAs in Kenya, and lay out what needs to be done to improve the situation.

THE POSITIVE SIDE OF PROTECTED AREAS FOR PEOPLE

Wildlife conservation has positively benefited the country in its ability to attract foreign exchange in the tourism sector. Several hundreds of thousands of Kenyans are either directly or indirectly employed in the tourism sector. In Amboseli National Park the Maasai community has assisted in the development of cultural centers where visitors can experience the life of the Maasai people. Additionally, the number of eco-lodges run by or on behalf of local communities is on the rise. Growth of tourism has generated funds for wildlife conservation, particularly for the state corporations responsible for Kenya’s wildlife, the Kenya Wildlife Service. Protected areas have also become an educational tool for local and international students, communities and visitors alike. Protected areas have become an educational tool for local and international students, communities and visitors alike.

With over 60 years of wildlife management and conservation in Kenya since the first National Park was established in 1945, areas have benefited from resources accrued from wildlife utilization. Water projects have been set up in the Taita Taveta district in Amboseli. Roads have also been upgraded and social infrastructure such as schools, playgrounds, churches and mosques as well as health centers have been constructed. In some areas, security has also improved.

In years past, communities living around forests were allowed to grow short-lived plants in plantations that were being used for new tree growth. The purpose of this was to have the farmers work the land and tend to tree saplings once planted. This would continue until the seedlings were big enough to prevent the survival of any crops. The farmers would then move their crops to another field, allowing the trees to mature.

This system, previously known as the shamba system, contributed to food production. In the late...
80’s, however, politics played its tricks and farmers were force-fully evicted from the forests. Families were displaced and a serious food shortage was experienced in some parts of Kenya. The system was later replaced by a non-resident cultivation system which was then also dis-banded. The argument was that it contributed to loss of indig-enous forests as corruption was rampant at that time.

In a few forests, local communi-ties have benefited from but-terfly farming. The best example is the Arabuko-Sokoke Forest on the coast. Farmers are being encouraged to rear certain spe-cies of butterfly caterpillars in greenhouse enclosures at home with the forest acting as a re-serve for the butterflies popula-tions. These are then exported as pupae to markets in Europe. The fact that butterfly farming generates income provides a real incentive for local communities to participate in forest conserva-tion.

THE NEGATIVE SIDE OF PRO-TECTED AREAS FOR PEOPLE

Numerous problems surround PAs in Kenya, revolving around wild life, wilderness and humans. The main cause of this clash is com-petition for dwindling resources such as land, water, forests and pasture. This is deemed the human-wildlife conflict.

An increase in human population has led to a decline in wildlife populations. In some regions, wildlife is being excluded from human habitats to reduce the conflict. The southern tip of Nairobi National park was once an open area for migration and dispersal of wildlife. It is now settled for human use. This is a major concern for conserva-tionists and some have suggested that all landowners should be compensated and resettled else-where in order to leave this area open for wildlife.

In Laikipia, Meru and Aberdares, elephants are a continuous nuis ance to people. They have raid-ed crops, caused injury and even killed people. As the elephant population increases in parks, elephants migrate to human-set-tled areas to find food. In some parts of Nyandarua, elephants are returning to their ancestral dispersal areas, wreaking havoc on local people. Lions, leopards and wild dogs have killed livestock, and sometimes people, in many parts of Kenya. In Laikipia for instance, lions kill cattle because they are easy prey and have soft meat. Pasto-ralists have retaliated by killing lions to prevent their return.

When people are killed by wild-life, it is a painful experience for the family when they try to seek compensation from the wildlife service. Currently, compensation for a human loss is KSh 30,000 (US$ 430) while injury is com-pensated half this rate. This is little money compared to loss of life. A number of rangers have lost their lives while protect ing wildlife from heavily armed poachers or private game ranchers. Some have suffered serious injuries from the difficult terrain they must walk through to rescue animals or track poachers, as well as from the animals that they protect. A monument of ‘conservation heroes’ has been erected at the Kenya Wildlife Service headquarters in their honor.

CONCLUSION

The protected areas in Kenya have not adequately succeeded in conserving Kenya’s biodiver-sity. Much still needs to be done and the sooner the Wildlife Act is revised and a new policy put in place that is better for our wilderness areas. It is impor-tant to remember not to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs.
To implement its policy vision “Madagascar naturally!” the country has created the Madagascar Action Plan (MAP) which covers national commitments and priorities for the country’s economic growth and sustainable development, while preserving its natural heritage. The MAP’s Commitment number 7 is to care for, cherish and protect our extraordinary environment. Madagascar has resolved to triple the surface of its protected areas from 1.7 million hectares to 6 million hectares in order to meet the recommended international norms of approximately 10% of its territory as stated in the Convention for Biological Diversity.

As such, the Madagascar Protected Areas System (SAPM) has been established and includes new categories of protected areas and new types of governance. Prior to 2004, Madagascar had only three categories of protected area (PA): I - Strict Nature Reserves, II - National Parks, and IV - Wildlife or Special Reserves using IUCN’s international classification and management was only delegated to the National Parks Agency. Currently, over 4 million hectares of critical habitat for biodiversity conservation are now under protected status through new IUCN categories: III - Natural Monuments, V - Protected landscapes, and VI - Natural Resource Reserves. The main goals of SAPM and the expansion of the protected areas system are to conserve Madagascar’s unique biodiversity, to preserve the country’s cultural heritage, and to maintain ecological goods and services while enhancing better natural resource management leading to improvements in human well-being and sustainable development.

Managing a protected area goes beyond simple protection of biodiversity. It requires a systematic approach allying overall sustainability of the protected area and the safeguarding of traditional practices among neighbouring local communities. Sustainability and safeguards are strongly linked as the long term viability of the protected area depends very heavily on the local population’s sense of its appropriateness.

Most of Malagasy rural people’s lifestyles are based on natural resources: they depend on water from uplands, they use timber products for construction, and use they non-timber products for food and medicines. It is essential to find a balance that meets human needs and maintains biodiversity.

This year is the first time that new protected areas are based upon management plans that focus on broad sustainability parameters. These plans go beyond traditional proposals for securing financial support. They consider sustainable harvesting of natural resources within the protected areas in favour of local communities, safeguards for local traditions and user rights, and the inclusion of protected areas in a broader land-use planning framework as part of a regional/national economic development.

Local communities are ultimately responsible for protected area management and thus it has been critically important to develop plans that are understandable to a wide range of users. The first section of the plan explains key aspects of the protected area, such as characterization of the importance of its biodiversity and identification of conservation targets, threat analysis, cultural, social and economic parameters, and management issues. The latter is required as community-based management is a new process in Madagascar. The second section presents an overview of goals, strategies and activities for a five-year period. The new plans set out to achieve the following objectives:

**Objective 1:** Processes leading to sustainability are identified and implemented, including long-term and adequate financ-
ing, effective management structures and systems, buy-in from regional decision-makers and local communities, and the maintenance of biodiversity viability as a means to ensure continued attraction of donor funding.

Objective 2: Biodiversity viability is ensured through control of illegal exploitation of natural resources and mitigation of other risks linked to natural resource use. To ensure biodiversity viability, it is essential to reduce threats on the conservation targets. This involves ensuring that traditional harvesting does not degrade biodiversity through overuse. For some conservation targets, a focused research program is needed to better understand natural variation within populations.

Objective 3: Sustainable use of natural resources contributes to the safeguards and improvement of human well-being as well as biodiversity conservation. The protected area should be used in order to provide significant benefits to local communities and some improved resource use techniques may be introduced that reduce threats and/or increase revenues or other benefits.

Objective 4: Protected area management is based on internationally-recognized principles of good governance while also respecting traditional practices. Protected area management effectiveness is strongly linked to good governance, including grassroots empowerment of local communities, equitable sharing of benefits, and adopting precautionary measures that help to maintain the ecological integrity of the protected area.

It is essential to find a balance that meets human needs and maintains biodiversity.

Objective 5: The protected area is included in a regional land use planning framework to ensure its integration within regional/national economic development policies. The protected area should be a key component of regional/national economic development involving multi-stakeholder planning for the entire region to take into account conservation, forest production, mining, petroleum, agriculture and fisheries, and internal zoning. This ensures complete protection for biodiversity in sensitive areas while protecting traditional user rights.

With this innovative protected area planning process, the Government of Madagascar will further strengthen its commitment to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of natural resources through the direct participation of local communities and the private sector. Additionally, in other areas outside of the protected area system, the country will promote sustainable use of forest lands and other natural resources with a view toward capitalizing their potential for the well-being of the Malagasy people and their economic growth.
Sustainable Development: Protecting Forests for Diversity or Economic Growth?
By Happy Tarumadevyanto (ELP 2007)

Protected areas (PAs) in Indonesia are under attack by a new Indonesian government regulation: PP no 2/2008. This regulation was created to determine non-tax government revenue for non-forestry activities on state forest lands. This allows for the rental of state mining operations. Most of the mining sites are in forested land. In fact, once PP no 2/2008 is introduced there will be more than 17 new mining operations across the country.

Policy PP no 2/2008 has captured the attention of people on both sides of the PA debate. An alliance has been established to contest the release of this policy. The alliance issued a statement in reaction to regulation PP no 2/2008 expressing concern with the type of tariffs on non-taxable income that Indonesia derives from using forested areas for non-forest related operation development.

The policy was created without consultation with key stakeholders.

There are a number of reasons why PP no 2/2008 is poor decision making:

1. Regulation PP no 2/2008 does not reflect a good governance policy, and the alliance suspects that the policy was created without consultation with key stakeholders. Certain elements of PP no 2/2008 do not match the issues raised by the implementing actors. The ministry of forestry stated that the policy is only meant to manage a number mining companies. However, the policy’s content outlines the use of forest area for roads, telecommunication, gas and oil infrastructure, renewable energy and other infrastructure that supports the creation of mining operations. This is a direct contradiction between the initial proposal and the content of the policy.
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the community, municipal and private forest located in this zone because of its importance to the water supply for large cities as Guatemala City (the nation’s capital), Antigua Guatemala (a major tourist centre) and Chimaltenango. But by 2005 the economic incentives were no longer available. Concerned with the future of the area, Project Parpa contacted the National Council of Protected Areas (CONAP). The goal was to declare the municipal forests as Regional Municipal Parks, a category recognized in the Protected Areas Law. Thus the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources in this region was created. This effort has the support of Parpa Project of the Agriculture Ministry, The Nature Conservancy, Guatemalan Natural Private Reserve Association (ARNPG), the local NGO Sotzil and CONAP.

The main outputs are the inclusion of two new municipal protected areas, three new private protected areas and the development of four management plans in municipal forests. Many challenges remain, specifically the inclusion of other local actors in the initiative, the strengthening of local leadership and and holistic territorial planning, a huge environmental education program and a continuous workshop program which promotes the sustainable use of private land in the long term. Therefore the city will come to consider conservation of natural resources as an important policy issue. The majority are concerned with the maintenance of the municipal forests as a way to ensure environmental services
Nestled in the Eastern Himalaya, the State of Sikkim in India is home to immense biological diversity and a rich cultural heritage. For centuries people have been drawn to Sikkim with stories of Shangri-La and hidden valleys near Kanchendzonga, the world’s third highest peak (8,586m), and a mountain held sacred by the region’s inhabitants. The Kanchendzonga region in the Eastern Himalaya is listed among the world’s ten most critical centers for biodiversity and endemism. The Kanchendzonga National Park (KNP) was established by the Sikkim Government in August 1977. The park borders with Nepal and occupies about 25% of the total geographical area of Sikkim. Lying along the extensive forest areas with many pristine patches, its diverse tropical mix of broad-leaved forests, cascading streams, wide variety of birds and panoramic view of Mt. Kanchendzonga are amongst the sights that delight tourists.

Tourism activity in the Kanchendzonga National Park is confined mostly to the western region in the Dzongri-Goechala area. Activities include trekking and mountaineering. The impact of the increasing number of tourists became apparent soon after the park was established.

The high altitude areas of the KNP are very cold and therefore burning of pristine Rhododendron and Juniper forests was very common for cooking and warmth. This led to severe habitat fragmentation and the degradation of forests and biodiversity. Tourists and some guides were involved in the smuggling of medicinal plants and other forest products. Outsiders gobbled up the lion’s share of tourism income, while the local community got only leftovers.

To address these issues, conservation education was adopted as a major tool. The proposal of conservation education was initiated with ‘Sikkim Biodiversity and Ecotourism Project’ which is a joint effort of The Mountain Institute and the G.B. Pant Institute of Himalayan Environment and Development in Sikkim in India. Project collaborators included the Travel Agents Association of Sikkim (TAAS), local organizations, and communities at the sites.

Although the rich forests harbor abundant wildlife, the increased movement of people resulted in wildlife sightings becoming less frequent. Pressure on surrounding resources rose and increased infrastructure demand led to the depletion of surrounding forests. Garbage and litter began to be a problem in the trekking trails and campsites. Water sources were also polluted by garbage mismanagement. Additionally, pack animals used for transportation were left to graze in the forest, leading to habitat degradation.

The conservation education for ecotourism was aimed at all the relevant stakeholders. Subsequently, a Code of Conduct for Ecotourism was developed based on the three year process of
stakeholder education and feedback from local communities. The Code of Conduct is based on the following principles of ecotourism:

1. Conserve Sikkim’s natural and cultural heritage:
   • Do not trample high altitude vegetation; do not pick any flowers or medicinal plants.
   • Do not disturb wildlife or its habitats.
   • Do not allow clients to buy endangered animal parts or antique cultural artifacts.
   • Support local conservation efforts and income generation activities.

2. Avoid use of fuel wood. Use alternative fuels:
   • Use kerosene, L.P.G. (or other non-wood fuel) for all cooking, heating, lighting including that by staff and porters.
   • Discourage campfires, encourage camp fun.
   • Follow safely rules when carrying, storing and using kerosene and gas.

3. Leave all camps and trails clean:
   • Separate and properly dispose of litter, burn burnable, bury biodegradable, and carry out all other non-biodegradable materials for deposit at designated trash site or for recycling.
   • Use toilet tents on all treks. Set up and use toilets tents in an environmentally sound manner so as to avoid pollution of water sources (at least 100m away).
   • Use established campsites and kitchen sites. Avoid trenching around tents.

4. Practice Conservation:
   • Avoid fuel-consumptive menu items, e.g. baked foods and large menu selections.
   • Re-package food into reusable plastic containers to reduce waste.
   • Reduce waste by recycling.

5. Practice proper hygiene and sanitation:
   • Teach all staff about personal hygiene, sanitary, kitchen and camp routines.
   • Properly treat the drinking water and uncooked vegetables for clients.
   • Dispose of washing and bathing water well away from streams, use biodegradable soaps.

6. Take Responsibility for staff and porter welfare:
   • Provide adequate warm clothing, sleeping cover, shoes, snow gear, food for cooking, stoves and fuel, and take care of hired staff.
   • Periodically train staff in first aid, guide responsibilities, sanitation etc.

7. Properly brief clients before leaving on a trek:
   • Address cultural “do’s” and “don’ts”, environmentally friendly behavior, safety precautions, proper dress and respect for local beliefs, peoples and religious sites.

The Code of Conduct for Ecotourism enabled the Travel Agents Association to obtain increased supplies of fuel wood alternatives, and provided the basis for an eco-tourism marketing strategy. The Code gave way to the Sikkim Forests Trekking Regulation Rules 2005 by the Department of Forests, Environment and Wildlife Management, Government of Sikkim.

The informal Code now has legal backing. Each trekking service provider has to register at the forest check post before entering a forest area. They bury the biodegradable materials responsibly in designated sites while in a forest area. The yaks and dzos of the porters which used to go to graze in the forests are now kept in control allowing for the regeneration of the alpine meadows, which were heavily overgrazed. It is now illegal to leave any non-biodegradable material in forest areas during a trek.

This reflects the power of education to empower communities and its consequent chain reaction to take the issues to the highest echelons of decision making.

Photo: courtesy of P. Kumar

This reflects the power of education to empower communities
The Importance of Including Youth in the Creation and Stewardship of Protected Areas in Canada
By Soni Craik (ELP 2007)

In the discussions and topics that arise within the theme of “Protected Areas”, I would like to take us back momentarily to an ELP session we had about the concept of Stakeholder.

The discussion centered on how we can achieve success by involving all stakeholders of an environment to converse about an ecosystem or feature in need of protection.

This brought up a question in my mind: How often do we consult youth as stakeholders?

In the context of environmental management, the youth voice is the input young people provide in developing and implementing projects, plans, and policies to guide the stewardship and care of protected area efforts.

Research has illustrated that children are most likely to stay attentive and engaged in the interests of their natural surroundings when they receive immediate pleasurable feedback about the effects of their actions (Heft and Chawla, 2006). In this way they learn simultaneously about properties of the ecosystems and their own capabilities and competence by understanding the environment they are interacting with. Involving youth in the establishment of the protection and management of ecosystem health is one of the most progressive ways to complement this research.

How often do we consult youth as stakeholders?

When the architect Hanne Wilhjelm led Growing Up in Cities (GUIC) research in Mollenberg in 1996-97, she found that surviving patches of wildflowers and trees were highly valued by local children. In GUIC project sites around the world, children identify safe, accessible natural areas as one of the most important components of a good place to grow up. Our experience has been that to provide these children and youth with appropriate and substantial ways of becoming involved in the protection of these valued places is not only rewarding, but a successful management practice.

EcoSource, an environmental education organization in Canada, worked with a middle school (students aged 11-13) whose students became very passionate about saving a wetland that was attached to their school yard. In their 3-year campaign, the students were able to educate not only their classmates about this special ecosystem, but were also successful in spreading the message in their community about the ecological significance of the wetland. It was their actions in classrooms and neighborhoods that inspired a community meeting and had city planners actually revisit the development proposals for the area.

These students are now in a process of re-designing the plans for this area, and will be the main stewardship partners for the wetland.

By recognizing and involving the next generation as important stakeholders in environmental concerns, we are expanding their role in the planning of new projects and empowering them in knowing that their voices are valued and important.

Photos: courtesy of S. Craik
Data from the National System of Protected Areas of Nicaragua (SINAP) exists for 76 protected areas, but SINAP concentrates its efforts and resources on the management of 15 protected areas that have legal status. Many of these protected areas created since the 1960s have been promoted by the central government, often not taking into consideration the interests of the population living within or nearby these areas. Referring to this situation, an indigenous person from the Miskitu Bosawas Biosphere Reserve, commented, “...one day I woke up and my house was now in a protected reserve...nobody asked me whether I wanted to live in a protected area”. This comment summarizes the lack of participation and involvement of local communities have in the process of designing protected areas in the country.

There exist other protected areas that have resulted from consensual processes with the local population, and are managed by these populations. The paradigm establishing clear separation between protected areas and local communities is a current topic of discussion within the State. At the same time local communities are advocating and claiming rights for local ecosystem management of the protected areas, in view of the fact that the government lacks capacity for real control and protection of these areas.

When local communities are charged with managing the protected areas, their forms of organization and social dynamics can facilitate or thwart full participation. For instance, when the traditional structures determine the management rules, and if these structures include only certain groups (e.g., traditional leaders and their allies), the management decisions made under these schemes can also be exclusive of the population.

When we speak of real protection of protected areas, we find that in Nicaragua the government institutions charged with management of natural resources are greatly deficient in human and financial resources, and that weakens the potential for a process of effective control. In the case of the Biological Reserve Indio-Maiz, there is more constant protection and control, linked to the availability of support from international organizations, whereas in the Biosphere Reserve BOSAWAS, they lack this support and the protection systems are less efficient and constant. Another instance of institutional weakness is the lack of “communication bridges” between government agencies and local communities.

“...nobody asked me whether I wanted to live in a protected area”

It’s important to note that in Nicaragua many of the technicians in charge of monitoring, protection and control of protected areas have a strong social base within the communities living near to or within the areas, which leads to flexibility and modifications in the application of established management norms. For instance, breaking of certain environmental rules that should be referred to the justice system, are only treated with “warnings” or restoration/reparation actions such as reforesting the areas

Some preliminary conclusions:
Protection of protected areas has overall been limited

Continued on Page 12
forestry aspects (“don’t cut trees”), lacking regulations in relationship to use of agrochemicals and other soil-related measures.

• It is vital to introduce economic incentives for conservation (such as “ecologically produced” labeling), in order to create effective protected areas. The legal designation is not sufficient, rather, a consensus is needed on what the local population requires to adopt conservation-friendly practices. It is simply a fact that if the local population does not have alternatives, they will use the resources at their disposal for survival.

There are many laws currently on the books in Nicaragua for the control of access and use to natural resources (Law 559 - Special Law on Crimes against Natural Resources and the Environment, Law against Deforestation, etc.), and there is lack of clarity on the types of activities allowed in the designated protected areas, especially in cases where areas are designated “compatible” with human activities. The management of protected areas faces many challenges in Nicaragua that will never be resolved if a centralized management policy is maintained that excludes the local population from the real control and protection of these areas.

Tarumadevyanto, continued from page 7

2. PP no 2/2008 ignores the nature of socio-anthropological elements of forestry development. Forests and their surrounding environments are global assets in the maintenance of water supply, tree growth and plant diversity among other benefits. Proper forestry management results in poverty alleviation while mining exploitation causes the marginalization of the traditional community. This should factor into the cost benefit analysis for sustainable development.

3. Indonesia has pledged to play a role in slowing the rate of global warming. The issuance of PP no 2/2008 seems to negate the commitment by prioritizing the economic development instead of sound environmental management.

Most of the organizations in the alliance against the regulation (Ailinst, Amphal, CAPPA, Lembar, Gita Buana, Gita Sada Himapastik, Pinse, SETARA, WALHI Jambi, KKI Warsi, YKR and YLBHL) are based in Sumatra, Jambi province, and the NGO Forestry Sector Partnership has been interacting with some of them. This regulation is a major concern within the general population and experts alike. PP no 2/2008 is a stark reminder that we need to be vigilant to maintain the integrity of Indonesian PAs.

Exciting news for Haas Business School and ELP faculty member Bill Sonnenschein: the President of Madagascar has asked Bill to be his Special Advisor on Leadership and Communication. Bill was invited to Madagascar by alum Joelisoa Ratsirarson (ELP 2005) to discuss Madagascar’s national program for building leadership skills for sustainable development. Bill will be returning to Madagascar for 6 months each year for two years to work with the country’s regional and local commune leaders in “training of trainer” courses, and with the President’s office to organize a new business school focused on “sustainable enterprises” and “leadership skills”. Bill will also be focusing on gender issues/women’s equality, and, of course, effective communication!

Meanwhile, Joel has his own news to celebrate: the President has just appointed him Manager of the President’s Office, where he moves from his position as Secretary General of the Ministry of Environment. Congratulations, Joel! Joel and Bill are positioned to make major contributions to furthering Madagascar’s sustainable development, and we look forward to their future reports. More details on this story - and photos of Bill’s reunion with Madagascar ELP alums - will be on the Beahrs ELP web site soon.

Tarumadevyanto, continued from Page 11
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**ELP Alumni News**

Norma Chan-Pongan (ELP 2006)

“I will receive on March 14, in behalf of the Save the Children, the prestigious Rafael Salas Award on population and development. The project referred here is the PHE project we are doing in the Philippines.”

Mutuso Dhliwayo (ELP 2003)

“I am still in Manchester, and will be submitting my dissertation in January. At least, after that I will be able to live a ‘normal’ life. As a matter of fact, I am looking for post doctoral opportunities in the US. I am developing some ideas on Water Governance and Poverty in Southern Africa, with a sub-theme that explores the complex link with climate change.”

Tahir Rasheed (ELP 2007)

“Greetings from Pakistan: I recently introduced Beahrs ELP in a workshop organized by IUCN-Pakistan. It was a quite successful event where people knew about the program. Warmest Regards”

---

Nguyen Van Tri Tin (ELP 2004)

“I have just been accepted to study at Clark University (Massachusetts, USA) in Environmental Science and Policy. This course will begin in middle May.”

---

**ELP Advisory Board Retreat**

On March 24-25 the Beahrs ELP Advisory Board, staff and other stakeholders met in Aptos, California to discuss preliminary results of an independent evaluation of the program by Dr. Claire Reinelt from The Leadership Learning Community, fund raising and the future of ELP. Drawing upon a high survey participation rate from alumni, telephone interviews, and on-site observations, Claire’s presentation generated much discussion. We reviewed the evaluation’s results, discussed the strengths of the program and parts of the program that can be refocused. ELP alums’ insights were cited numerous times, as well as gratitude for the thought and time that went into every response. Claire will be presenting a final report to the Advisory Board in early June. Please contact Elna (elnab@nature.berkeley.edu) for further information about the evaluation.

---

**Farewell to Leslie Correll!**

Leslie Correll’s retirement party was a resounding success! A good crowd, good food, and good cheer prevailed. Many staff from the College, professors from across campus, representatives from several funding foundations who support ELP participants were here, as well as other staff and graduate students who have worked with her over the past seven years. Keith Gilless, Dean of the College of Natural Resources, made an appreciative toast that had Leslie blushing. Robin Marsh warmly praised Leslie’s seven years with the ELP, her organizational and artistic talents and her caring dedication to the ELP alumni. Finally, David Zilberman made a heartfelt toast that brought tears to quite a few eyes. He pointed out that Leslie not only did a great job, but was the warm soul of the program. Leslie is retired but will be coming in to the office from time to time to pass her experience along. Her caring nature combined with a vast institutional memory makes her an invaluable asset to not only the program’s past, but also its future. Thank you, Leslie!

*Note from Leslie: “I’m too attached to the program and to you alums to disappear! Elna is terrific and I know she will be a great support to Robin and the ELP. I look forward to continuing to contribute to our mutual efforts to build a sustainable world --lots of work to do! Its ‘au revoir’ not ‘farewell.’”*
Ronny Roma (ELP 2006)  
Guatemala

“I’m still working at the National Council of Protected Areas (Conap) in Guatemala, with so many work and this year I’m developing a project granted by the SGI of the UC Berkeley focused on “Strengthening local leadership and capacities to enhance territorial planning and environmental management in three cities located in the Central Volcanic Chain, Guatemala”, which we as institution are going to carry out with the support of local partners as the Parpa Project of the Agriculture Ministry and the local NGO Sotzil.”

Nemat Hajeebhoy (ELP 2006)  
Tanzania

“I will be leaving the Aga Khan Foundation in Tanzania at the end of June this year. I plan to take a break the rest of the year, travel to Egypt, Morocco and Algeria. I will also work on my PhD applications to the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine - where I hope to enroll sometime in 2009. In the meantime, I will work on some short term consultancies to earn my bed and board!”

Arona Soumare (ELP 2007)  
Senegal

“I’m back in West Africa and have been appointed as Conservation Director for our West African Marine Programme.”

Celia Harvey (ELP 2006) has recently co-edited a book, “Evaluación y Conservación de Biodiversidad en Paisajes Fragmentados de Mesoamérica”, with Joel C. Saenz. This book is a major milestone as it is the first of its kind written in Spanish. With contributions from 50 different experts, it incorporates fieldwork data as well as theoretical concepts of conservation biology, ecology, sociology, economics and management and conservation of the Mesoamerican landscape.

ELP UNFCCC BALI REUNION!

Because of the climate change schedule Sunday was the only day for the participants to rest/see Bali. We were limited to five and we said that it is not “just five” it is “us five” that is how we characterized our reunion. We had a lot of fun and meeting people from actually all different cohorts of ELP. We all discussed environmental matters and routine stuff and I think we all a great time. We did miss our friends who couldn’t make it but once-again thanks to ELP for providing us this networking platform to meet people from various walks of life. (Imran Habib Ahmed)
Announcing SGI Project Awardees 2008

Congratulations to the following small grant recipients!

Roslyn R. Arayata (ELP 2007)
UCB Collaborator: Professor Daniel M. Kammen, ERC
Country: Philippines
Promoting renewable energy resources and energy generation in Philippine upland communities

Valdemar Diaz Hinojosa (ELP 2004)
UCB Collaborator: Professor Isha Ray, ERG
Country: Guatemala
Management in three cities located in the Central Volcanic Chain, Guatemala

Nani Saptariani (ELP 2004)
UCB Collaborator: Professor Vincent H. Resh, ESPM
Country: Indonesia
Capacity building in sustainable watershed management using the Caringin sub-district - Bogor district in Indonesia as a country-based model

Mac Tuyet Nga (ELP 2005)
UCB Collaborator: Dr. Sebastian Teunissen, Hass School of Business
Country: Vietnam
Building capacity of ecotourism marketing for protected areas in the Central Provinces, Vietnam

Ronny Roma (ELP 2006)
UCB Collaborator: Dr. Robin Marsh, CSRD
Country: Guatemala
Strengthening local leadership and capacities to enhance territorial planning and environmental management in three cities located in the Central Volcanic Chain, Guatemala

Introducing Three Ecoagriculture Courses

All courses are co-sponsored and co-organized by Ecoagriculture Partners and the CSRD at the University of California, Berkeley.

- Leadership for Ecoagriculture in East Africa
  Location: Uganda
  Date: April 15-22nd, 2008
  Co-sponsor: ECOTRUST

- Leadership for Ecoagriculture: Integrated Management of Rural Territories in Central America
  Location: Costa Rica
  Date: September 19 - 27th, 2008
  Co-sponsor: IUCN, IICA

- Leadership for Ecoagriculture: Agriculture, Socieity, and Traditional Mayan Knowledge in the Yucatán Peninsula
  Location: Mexico
  Date: November 3-8th, 2008