## APPENDIX II RECOMMENDATIONS

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Stages of the Framework | Key topic | Recommendation |
| Planning stage | People involvement | 1. Developing communication channels and mechanisms with local communities, government and NGOs from an early stage, which include a forum where local people may voice their concerns about project plans. 2. Developing collaborative and trans-disciplinary approaches to build trust and lead to long term coexistence solutions that withstand changes in the population size of reintroduced species; combining collaborative approaches and law enforcement to protect reintroduced populations, while objecting to militarised conservation. 3. Developing a participatory process that creates opportunities for local people to discuss their concerns, addressing both eco-biological and socio-economic issues.  This allows project leaders and interest groups to move into the next stage of decision-making together. 4. Building evaluation mechanisms into the process to allow for groups to identify their desired degree of involvement and how satisfied they are with their involvement, and to avoid conflicts and mistrust amongst interest groups and with project management. 5. These mechanisms should address residents' concerns effectively, consistently and transparently; Ensuring such processes are known to local people and diverse interest groups 6. Listening to and including women, from local communities and in management roles, in conversations about reintroduction plans, and the decision making process through all stages of the project. Women bring in unique, proximate HWIs perspectives that may be excluded in patriarchal societies, and are often at the center of HWC. |
| Ethical obligations | Practitioners planning to work with local communities need an ethics protocol and/or ethics approval from their institutions , and this should be factored in from the early stages of the project. |
| Culturally appropriate communication | The foundations of people’s concerns about the potential danger of having certain animal species in the landscape must be identified and addressed by the project. |
| Values in different groups | 1. Talking to local people to understand the positive and negative dimensions of coexisting with the focal species; learning from successful mitigation stories. For example, talking with key informants of each of the stakeholder groups to learn of past HWIs. 2. Researching and confronting the effects of colonial history and its continuing influence on the places involved in the translocation 3. Working with local community members and trusted individuals to clearly assess the positive and negative consequences of local cultural attitudes towards reintroduced species should be; recognising the cultural foundations for local community attitudes and understanding the basis for resistance to species restoration; using this information to working towards changing negative opinions by addressing specific concerns and experiences and; integrating positive attitudes into the restoration plan design to highlight its holistic benefits. |
|  | Building trust | 1. Ensuring the involvement of indigenous and local knowledge holders in all stages of the project, from inception to reporting, to promote trust and equitability; consider how knowledge features in the project and making sure that diverse knowledge systems are considered fairly and equally. 2. Fostering self-reflection about ourselves as social actors, evaluating our own actions, values, and preferences and perhaps revising them; promoting opportunities to listen and learn from underrepresented groups. 3. Combining quantitative and qualitative data collection can contribute to a richer understanding of the full picture and better understanding of relevant interest groups. 4. Considering the local cultural context and particularities of the relationship between people and the focal species when attempting to transpose methodologies. One solution does not fit all contexts. |
| Political and Jurisdictional Issues | 1. Developing an understanding of political and jurisdictional issues; ensuring that the planning stage includes representatives of all the groups who may be affected by the planned translocation; developing culturally appropriate communications between these groups and the wider public. |
| Costs and Benefits | 1. Developing measures of wellbeing together with the local community allows for meaningful and relevant assessment of the costs and benefits of the project; building trust and informing management decisions on the most effective material and non-material trade-offs of conservation objectives, in line with local social values and cultural identity. 2. Assessing both positive and negative economic impacts on the local communities; teasing out solutions that are both politically and culturally acceptable, while optimizing gains that are most beneficial to the local economy. 3. Considering the foreseeable needs of animals with large home ranges, as planning has to take the larger scale into account; factoring financial, NGO and professional support to work on such a large scale. |
| Impact of domestic and feral dogs | 1. Including dog presence and threat potential in release site selection assessment criteria 2. Sharing management and control responsibilities between dog owners, project and government 3. Identifying village and owned dogs 4. Reducing the number of free-ranging dogs by using non-lethal and lethal control 5. Controlling dog populations and disease vectors 6. Building an understanding of the social context of the relationship between local people, reintroduced species, and dogs to collaboratively find alternative solutions to utilitarian needs filled by dogs 7. Addressing beliefs and attitudes associated with cultural constructs, to change behaviours |
| Initiation stage | Building Trust and Inclusion | 1. Collaborating closely with local and indigenous groups to seek ways to avoid and reduce conflict and identify how the project can benefit them. 2. Listening and learning before introducing information; finding out what people already know before introducing the project to them; identifying the gaps in knowledge and the areas that must be targeted for change through communication and education. 3. Communicating the message that researchers are there to listen and document people’s views; assuring that the concerns and viewpoints of interest groups are respected and incorporated into decision-making; making clear that although research may or may not inform or dictate policy. 4. Trying to understand the motivations behind negative attitudes and/or illegal activities is a first step towards finding solutions; not relying on knowledge gathered from previous experiences but collecting context specific data. 5. Focusing on coexistence and on bringing people together to find solutions, rather than focusing on conflict; promoting the perception that there is some common ground to strive for; listening to solutions proposed by various interest groups; valuing local solutions as they can be better for the context than solutions devised from the outside. |
| Education and Engagement | Building a relationship with local leaders; developing an understanding of how attitudes towards individual animals and the focal species may support the project goals; investigating associations between attitudes towards the focal species and people’s affiliations, and to their proximity to release sites. |
| Zoos and Aquariums | Developing partnership with local zoos, aquarium and botanical parks to promote positive attitudes towards the focal species, and support towards the project. |
|  | Behaviour change | 1. Developing cooperation between natural, social or behavioural scientists and management to embed people's behaviours and practices that favour reintroduced species, and to select and target human behaviour change that could increase negative HWIs. 2. Developing information based on well-informed assessments of the ecological, social and personal costs and benefits associated with the reintroduction and ensure it is available early on in the planning phase |
| Addressing issues related to dogs and dog owners | 1. Gaining the support of local people 2. A better understanding of people’s behaviours in relation to managing their dogs would help identify which areas need to be addressed (knowledge, attitudes, norms, etc…) and the best ways to address them (education, compensation, regulation…) 3. Listening to local leaders, interest groups and people in general to understand the role of dogs in the community, etc… 4. Understanding how dog owners and other people in the community relate to local wildlife and to the reintroduction project. A lack of engagement and care may affect people’s behaviours towards the effect their dogs may have on wildlife. 5. Project may need to take the initiative on action, to lead local people towards changing their behaviour by for example providing services such as: a programme of inoculation or neutering of free roaming dogs, vaccination campaign, dog collars, microchipping, sterilization, control/relocation/pounding of dogs found within protected areas, free or subsidized breeding/providing/training of livestock guardian dogs/territory guarding dogs, who have been vaccinated and spayed/neutered, to local people (e.g. wolves in Europe and USA (WL); trading dogs for another species that may benefit local people but do not affect reintroduced animals; alternative guard animals, e.g. geese. |
| Implementation stage | Trust and perception of risk over time | 1. Budgeting adequate resources to plan, execute, and monitor relevant socio-cultural aspects of your project, and allow for rapid adjustments as the program, it’s members, and their relationships may change throughout the duration. 2. Developinglongitudinal studies of human dimensions to be undertaken at key stages of the project to provide a picture of changes of attitudes over time, in a way that mirrors the monitoring of wildlife populations. 3. Developing structures and processes to maintain good communication and transparency with local people and stakeholders throughout the project cycle. 4. Obtaining a deep nuanced understanding of local people’s behaviors towards- and perceptions of the species proposed for reintroduction, and of how these may change over time. 5. Informing communities continually throughout the process in locally and culturally relevant methods, even when the project is locally owned and managed, as projects can be seen as an intrusion (e.g. the golden lion tamarin reintroduction project has been locally managed for 35 years but issues around communication remain). 6. Developing clear and consistent communication between the project and diverse local groups; recruiting the help of trusted members of the community to convey trusted information from the project; consulting local people and leadership of interest groups to listen to their beliefs, concerns, as well as knowledge, as these change over time. |
|  | Active involving communities | 1. Ensuring social significance, and consequently increasing local support, active participation and local ownership of the project. 2. Allocating resources for the intensive and time demanding work of engagement with local communities and stakeholders. 3. Discussing the use of invasive biological data collection methods  before release to identify the most appropriate for the social context. |
| Exit stage |  | 1. Building Exit Strategies into the project´s strategy in connection with its goals 2. Plotting the role and expectations of funding partners against the goals of the project 3. Analysing the positive contribution a funder can make and the negative impacts of its unplanned exit in relation to the goals of the project 4. Discussing strategies regarding: a minimum time duration of their commitment to funding the project (including a transition period in case of unexpected changes in their circumstances); an exit strategy, with funding partners as part of the planning process. These may be part of a contract or a pledge. 5. Considering other stakeholders when planning Exit Strategies, as the reintroduction and its exit may affect each one differently. |
|  | Public perceptions | 1. Securing long term sustainability for new career opportunities created by the project (which are transferable) and for infra-structures that are more environmentally friendly’ ; ´weaning´ people off the project infrastructure. 2. Investing on long term strategies to prevent the return of livelihoods/practices that create impact on focal species/biodiversity (e.g. poaching); preventing the development of negative attitudes towards the project that may impact pro-environmental practices and affect the long term conservation of focal species. |
| Community-based monitoring | Taking a holistic approach to the conservation translocation to focus on wider overarching goals rather than on benefits to individual species; monitoring efforts may be aided by the local community; funding monitoring to ensure stability and long-term success of the conservation translocation. |
| Post-exit stage | Ensuring sustainability | 1. Considering the positive and negative consequences of a project beyond its immediate goals, in relation to how it affects the conservation of biodiversity in general. 2. Maintaining clear communication with interest groups, to avoid making unrealistic promises that cannot be kept. 3. Enabling and enhancing traditional practices that are already in place may be the most effective way to promote biodiversity conservation and to benefit the focal species, in certain cases. |