



**Minimizing
Conflicts**

**Finding
Solutions**

**Case studies for coexistence:
examples of good practice in sup-
porting coexistence between people
and large carnivores**

**Tasos Hovardas and Katrina Marsden, EU LC Platform
Secretariat (Callisto and adelphi consult)**

Assumptions and rationale

- Examine both **benefit and cost**, which are associated with large carnivore conservation and management
- Examine **in-group and inter-group** characteristics of stakeholders in their interaction
- Identify the specific elements that make up good practice, including **relationship between stakeholders**

Methods

Sampling good practice; online questionnaire addressed to Platform Members and experts (35 case studies)

Screening good practice; reviewer scoring of all case studies across the following criteria: (1) impact on stakeholder relations; (2) socio-economic benefits for local residents; (3) funding source, amount and durability; (4) location; (5) species (shortlist of 10 case studies)

Deeper analysis of shortlisted case studies; semi-structured interviews with at least three respondents, focused on: (1) stakeholder interactions (2) conditions for transfer; (3) the longevity of the action and likelihood of its continuation

Minimizing
Conflicts

Finding
Solutions

Shortlist of case studies

#	Title	MS
1	Damage Prevention Measures (e.g. fences) through the RD programme	B Greece
2	Developing a network of Livestock Guarding Dogs	B Greece
3	Livestock Protection Measures through the LIFE project Medwolf	M Italy
4	Practical support under the Slovenian Rural Development Programme	B Slovenia
5	PastoraLoup Volunteer Programme for shepherding	C France
6	Conservation performance payments (CPP) for wolverine	N Sweden
7	Transfer and Communication Project – Baden-Württemberg	C Germany
8	Cooperation of Stakeholders in the Cantabrian Mountains	M Spain
9	Core Group Wolf	C Switzerland
10	TASSU monitoring-system and volunteers-based large carnivore contact network	N Finland

Data analyses

- **Production of a fiche for each case:** Background; overview of impact (impact on conflict, consensus, common vision, conservation and socio-economic aspects); what has worked well and what needs to be improved; conditions for transfer; further information and references
- **Mixed motive perspective analysis:** (1) Benefits and gains of participation; added value (2) Costs of participation; unanticipated side-effects
- **Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis:** “global” overview over all case studies shortlisted; focus on in-group and inter-groups aspects of stakeholders involved

Minimizing
Conflicts

Finding
Solutions

Results; mixed-motive perspective in the Swedish case study (Conservation performance payments for wolverine)

Main focus of stakeholders interest	Benefits and gains of participation; added value	Costs of participation; unanticipated side-effects
Large carnivore conservation	<p>An increase in the wolverine population has been observed and documented through monitoring which can be directly attributed to the CPP.</p> <p>A corresponding reduction of human-wildlife conflict can be observed. This has set the stage for an improvement in stakeholder relations.</p>	<p>Pressure is put on people working with monitoring (the field personnel or the methodology are blamed for any inconsistencies).</p> <p>The monitoring system may disturb females, since inspection needs to approach quite close to the den so that reproduction can be documented. Conflict among stakeholder groups may re-surface. For instance, local people do not agree on the criteria used to document reproductions.</p> <p>The CPP may not always align with other large carnivore management measures. Specifically there is a 10% tolerated damage threshold for all large carnivore species. If damage is above this level, lethal action may be taken. It may be difficult to attribute damage to a specific species.</p> <p>Illegal killing of wolverines does still exist as a type of free-riding (e.g. specimen shot after documentation of reproduction has been undertaken).</p>
Agricultural production, livestock, primary sector activities	<p>Payments in the form of CPP encourage efficient herding (i.e. prevention of depredation) and do not penalize with a lower compensation.</p> <p>They are certainly an improvement over the compensation systems based on documentation of livestock depredation for a variety of reasons (many depredated animals may be never found, significant effort is required to look for them).</p> <p>Involvement in monitoring increases belief in the system and can provide an additional source of income (some is paid)</p>	<p>Weather conditions may not always allow for a reliable assessment of monitoring indices, which may lead to an underestimation of CPP (dependence of monitoring on snow).</p> <p>Reindeer herders underlined that CPP cannot fairly balance livestock losses and request an increase. They also highlight that the system has not been updated since 2002 and would like a higher fee/subsidy for local people involved in monitoring.</p> <p>CPP payments are dependent on the number of reproductions from a location as well as the location of the den in relation to the border of the focal district. A herder may not get compensation even though they are as close to the site, if they are located on the wrong side of the focal district border.</p>

Minimizing Conflicts

Finding Solutions

Results; SWOT analysis

Hunters and hunters' associations

Strengths (In-group aspects which might promote coexistence)

Participation in monitoring schemes may help to **reduce uncertainty** and change risk perception

Weaknesses (In-group aspects which might hinder coexistence)

Trust and understanding gained among stakeholders through participatory procedures is **not always diffused** within in-group members who have not been directly involved in the process

Opportunities (Inter-group aspects which might promote coexistence)

For participative processes to be successful, an **unbiased moderator** is crucial so valid points of discussion are selected and trust among stakeholders and commitment to the collaboration is developed

Threats (Inter-group aspects which might hinder coexistence)

Deliberation and consultation, as well as the collection of additional data can in some cases **fuel inter-group disagreement** and antagonism if the data is interpreted differently by different groups

State actors; federal and local governments; managing authorities (including protected areas)

Successful organisation involves striking the right balance between inclusion of all interests and perspectives, on the one hand, and maintaining the **operational and functional character** of the group, on the other
In-group or context-dependent

heterogeneity may present substantial barriers to transferring good practice to different contextual settings

Inclusionary deliberation and consultation procedures may result in **agreement** among stakeholder without the need for a full consensus over all issues being reached

Participants involved in deliberation and consultation procedures may not always have the necessary knowledge and skills or be familiar with the **local context**

Minimizing Conflicts

Finding Solutions

Implications for LC management and recommendations

- **Integrating** coexistence measures (gaps; funding streams; synergies vs. conflicts)
- Understanding **economic, social and cultural** considerations (gains and diffusion of gains; free-riding; fear; socio-cultural aspects)
- **Adapting** good practice over time and to the local context (uniqueness of the local context vs. transfer)
- Understanding the **variety** of stakeholder interaction (representatives; moderator; working relationships, trust; involvement vs. dissemination; in-group and inter-group dynamics)
- Using **good relationships** between stakeholders to the full (press; local networks of social actors, funding; partial agreement; participatory scenario development, co-creation)

Minimizing
Conflicts

Finding
Solutions

Methodological toolkit

- Individual fiches describing the case studies
 - ✓ what has worked well
 - ✓ what needs to be improved
- Mixed-motive analysis
 - ✓ gains of participation; added value
 - ✓ costs of participation; unanticipated side-effects
 - ✓ structured negotiation process among stakeholders
- SWOT analysis
 - ✓ build on strengths and opportunities
 - ✓ address weaknesses and threats
- Social learning
 - ✓ E.g., participatory scenario development (not implemented in the report but compatible with the toolkit)

Minimizing
Conflicts

Finding
Solutions