



Department
for Environment
Food & Rural Affairs



Funded by
UK Government

Darwin Initiative Main Project Annual Report

Submission Deadline: 30th April 2019



DARWIN PROJECT INFORMATION

Project reference	24017
Project title	Access and Benefit Sharing in Practice: Community, Science and Policy
Host country	South Africa
Contract holder institution	The University of Cape Town
Partner institutions	People and Plants International (PPI); Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC); The Environmental Monitoring Group (EMG); Forests, Resources and People (FOREP); and Leeds University.
Darwin grant value	£325,250
Start/end dates of project	1 April 2017 – 31 March 2020
Reporting period	April 2018 – March 2019, Annual Report 2
Project Leader name	Associate Professor Rachel Wynberg
Project website/Facebook Group	https://www.voices4biojustice.org/ https://www.facebook.com/Voices4BioJust/
Report authors and date	Jaci van Niekerk, Rachel Wynberg, Sarah Laird, Anna Davis, Karen Nott, Noel Oetllé, and Graham Dutfield. 30 April 2019

1. PROJECT RATIONALE

Governments have struggled over the last few decades to translate the ambitious objectives of the CBD into practice. Limited benefits have emerged for local communities, only weak connections have been made with biodiversity conservation, and policy-makers have found it difficult to keep up with rapid advances in science, technologies and markets. Despite increased attention to ABS capacity development, local voices of producer communities have not been adequately incorporated into policy

and law, in part due to limited awareness about needs on the ground and the realities of natural product commercialisation. At the same time, conceptual understandings of ABS have also not evolved fast enough to provide an underlying framework for effective ABS policy development. Moreover, despite the fact that ABS is intended to create economic incentives for biodiversity conservation, slowing biodiversity loss driven by the need for income by providing sustainable alternatives that embrace rather than destroy biodiversity, there is little evidence of this result.

ABS policy has not realised these goals in part due to the inherent complexity of the objectives it serves, but also because policy makers, researchers, the private sector, NGOs, conservation managers, and indigenous and local communities need on-going support in the form of accessible and useful information, technical tools and advice, and communication facilitation between stakeholders. Although often at the 'front lines' of ABS partnerships, many local actors lack hands-on, practical guidance and assistance over time. At a broader level, there is a profound need for more meaningful reflections of ABS, including an adaptive, conceptual re-framing of underlying assumptions in response to changed markets, technologies and demand for access to biodiversity which, in turn, feeds into policy processes.

2. PROJECT PARTNERSHIPS

Collaboration between the lead institution – the University of Cape Town (UCT) - and project partners based in Namibia, Cameroon, the UK and USA have strengthened throughout the second year of the project, largely as a result of an intensive 3-day team meeting held in London in June 2018 (see [Annex UCT-A](#) for the report of this meeting). Unfortunately, due to unforeseen circumstances, our Cameroonian partner could not attend the meeting. Continued regular Skype meetings between partners have helped to ensure that all partners are on board with progress, planning and decision-making (see [Annexures UCT-B](#) and [UCT-C](#) for the minutes of these meetings). In addition, fortnightly Skype meetings occur between project leaders Rachel Wynberg and Sarah Laird.

UCT continues to convene most of the partner meetings and to take overall responsibility for project management. In addition to the formal partnership with the Environmental Monitoring Group (EMG), the UCT team also includes researcher Jaci van Niekerk, two postgraduate students (Masters student Michelle Nott and PhD student Sthembile Ndwandwe), videographer Vuyiswa Lupuwana, and a range of associated researchers. Within government, the team engages actively with ABS focal points in South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe, as well as with the South African National Biodiversity Institute; Cape Nature; and the Western Cape provincial Department of Environment and Development Planning. Strong links have been forged between the Voices for BioJustice project and "Co-creating Wild Food Livelihoods", a transdisciplinary project taking place in the Cederberg range, involving UCT as well as several community groups and entrepreneurs. A formal agreement is also under development between UCT and the NGO Living Lands to support work on ABS and honeybush tea in the Langkloof mountains of the Eastern Cape.

People and Plants International (PPI) have continued to support the management of the project and to be responsible for liaison with Cameroonian project partner, Forests, Resources and People (FOREP). Skype meetings with project partners are undertaken monthly, with the range of project team members now including 2 FOREP staff; 2 students at the University of Buea and 4 students at the University of Yaounde; 2



medicinal plant and wild foods researchers; 6 village representatives; 2 video and filmmaking teams in the capital Yaounde, and the town of Limbe; and government partners, including the CBD and ABS Focal Points.

In South Africa the long-term partnership between UCT and EMG, was strengthened through their co-hosting in the Cederberg region of a two-day workshop on establishing an ABS community of practice around indigenous plants, in April 2018 (see **Annex UCT-D** for the workshop report).

Collaboration with the Namibian project partner, Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC), was strengthened through their attendance of the London meeting in June 2018, as well as co-supervision of Michelle Nott's Master's thesis on resurrection bush (see **Annex UCT-E** for the thesis). IRDNC works with a range of partners under this project. At the community level IRDNC formally engages with legally constituted community-based organisations (CBOs) – community forests and communal conservancies. The project also supports the Kunene Conservancies Indigenous Natural Products Trust (KCINPT) an umbrella organisation representing five conservancies and community forests that own the indigenous natural product processing plant in Opuwo. In addition, IRDNC works closely with the Ministry of Environment and Tourism's (MET) ABS Focal Point, and regional staff of the MET and GIZ.

Collaboration with Leeds University primarily takes place through the Resource Group, which meets at least once every two months via Skype, and through ongoing email exchanges.

The programmatic identity "Voices for BioJustice" has been formalised through the launch of its website (<https://www.voices4biojustice.org>), the June 2018 London meeting, and regular meetings via Skype and where possible, in person, between co-directors Rachel Wynberg (UCT) and Sarah Laird (PPI).

Partnerships are working well to date, and the issues with contracting and disbursements of funds experienced in Year 1 have been ironed out. It remains challenging to link up the entire Resource Group via Skype due to its members' geographic dispersal, but we have addressed this where needed by splitting our Skype meetings into two geographical zones.

3. PROJECT PROGRESS

3.1 Progress in carrying out project Activities

Activities are listed and numbered per output according to the "activities" section in the project logframe.

OUTPUT 1: A set of conceptual and practical tools and approaches that supports ABS role players (local people, community groups, traditional leaders, researchers, NGOs, government and private sector) to more effectively engage with ABS developed and tested.

1.1. Hold introductory/scoping meetings with key stakeholders

During Year 1, all the projects sites held introductory and scoping meetings with a range of key stakeholders, appropriate to each country study. In South Africa, potential

tools include conservation interventions as well as bureaucratic and legislative changes.

1.2. Compile a baseline review of potential tools and approaches that are required to support each case study

Completed during Year 1 in all project sites.

1.3. Develop appropriate materials to support ABS information sharing and capacity building

In **Cameroon**, the business and market studies launched in Year 1 continued into Year 2 and included a range of medicinal and aromatic species in export markets, including for botanicals, functional food, and cosmetics industries. The project team was expanded to include experts on these topics, who will extend their analysis of the export sector into the early months of Year 3. The results of this work have been incorporated into the Irvingia case study, and 2 policy briefs to be released in June 2019, and will be included in articles and extension activities in Year 3.

In **South Africa**, materials were developed and described in Year 1 and captured in the policy brief on rooibos. Additionally, a second policy brief, based on ABS in the resurrection bush (*Myrothamnus flabellifolius*) trade in South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe was developed in Year 2 (see **Annex UCT-F**). This brief is based on research undertaken by Masters student Michelle Nott.

1.4. Use materials to support identified stakeholders and processes

In **Cameroon**, update and consultation meetings were held with a range of stakeholders, including village and producer groups around Mt Cameroon and Center Province (10-15 participants at each); meetings of project team members took place in Limbe at the botanical garden, and included project staff, students, village representatives, and researchers. More extensive workshops and meetings with government officials will be held in Year 3, as planned.

In **Namibia**, project staff and consultant John Hazam conducted 5 ABS awareness raising workshops with stakeholders in the Zambezi region, similar to those conducted in Year 1 in Kunene. The purpose of the workshops was to explain and build understanding of the new ABS Act, thereby enabling stakeholders to understand their rights and the protection the new act provides. The 5 workshops were attended by 75 (40 men and 35 women) participants, including traditional authority representatives, conservancy and community forest committee representatives (including staff), harvesters and buying point committee members (see **Annex IRDNC-A to IRDNC-E**). The main purpose of the meetings was to introduce the Darwin funded project and to explain and build understanding of the new ABS legislation; allowing participants to understand their rights and how the new act provides extra protection (copies were distributed to participant groups). The illustrated booklet (draft awaiting promulgation of regulations) developed in year one was used during training sessions.

In **Namibia**, the project (IRDNC) provides technical inputs re ABS to the KCINPT. The eighth annual trustees meeting of the KCINPT was held in Onjuva (Orupembe Conservancy) in July 2018 (see **Annex IRDNC-F**). Following discussions and decisions taken at the 7th meeting of the KCINPT Trust in October 2017 on revising the Benefit Distribution Plan (BDP) a revised BDP was completed and presented to the Trustees at the meeting (see **Annex IRDNC-D**). The BDP was explained in detail and was approved at this meeting.



In **South Africa**, the project engaged indigenous knowledge holders around ABS in the rooibos industry during Year 1 in March 2018 at the ABS training day (as reported in the Year 1 Annual Report). This continued in Year 2 on 17 and 18 April 2018 at the Clanwilliam workshop, also expanding to address ABS and biodiversity conservation issues more broadly in the biodiversity-rich Cederberg region of the Western Cape.

Noel Oetlé of EMG provided on-going support to Ms Alida Strauss, representing small-scale rooibos producers of the Heiveld Cooperative, for her role in ABS negotiations with the rooibos industry and the San and National Khoi-San Councils. These negotiations have been facilitated by the National Department of Environmental Affairs, as ABS Focal Point, but, until the Clanwilliam April Community of Practice workshop, had largely excluded small-scale rooibos producers of the so-called “Cederberg Belt”. The Community of Practice brought together lawyers representing the San, as well as industry representatives, stimulating discussions with excluded communities and leading to the stronger inclusion of Cederberg and especially Heiveld rooibos producers in the negotiation process. Following this intervention (previously reported on) full access was granted to the Heiveld Cooperative for the consultative meetings and negotiations that subsequently took place in the latter part of 2018 and early 2019.

EMG received and provided feedback to the Heiveld Cooperative on the 10 November 2018 draft of the "Rooibos Bio-cultural Community Protocol of the National Khoi and San Council & Cedarburg (sic) Belt (Wupperthal, Nieuwoudtville and Suid Bokkeveld) Rooibos Farming Communities” that had been prepared by the NGO Natural Justice for the negotiating parties.

On 25 March 2019 the "Benefit Sharing Agreement between the San and Khoi-Khoi Peoples of South Africa (as represented by the San Council of South Africa and the National Khoi-San Council) and the Rooibos Industry of South Africa (as represented by the Processors and the South African Rooibos Council in relation to its specific administrative obligations)" was reportedly signed. This agreement describes the contribution, through an annual levy, that will be made by the rooibos industry to a "Bioprospecting Trust Fund” as required by South African legislation. The contribution is due to be paid by the South African Rooibos Council "in equal parts to the trust funds of the San Council and the National Khoi-San Council”, with small-scale rooibos farming communities included as junior partners to the Khoi-Khoi ABS Trust established by the National Khoi-San Council. The agreement has not yet been publicly announced.

In **South Africa**, a forum and Community of Practice on ABS was initiated at the two-day workshop held in Clanwilliam on 17 and 18 April 2018 (see **Annex UCT-D** for the workshop report, and **Annex UCT-G** for the programme), with its initial focus centred on the Western Cape’s Cederberg region. The workshop was attended by 42 people on Day 1 (20 women and 22 men) and 38 people (19 women and 19 men) on Day 2 (see **Annex UCT-H** for the attendance register of the workshop). The participants were from different constituencies, including government representatives, NGOs, conservation agencies, traditional knowledge holders, rooibos producer communities, and industry. An informal working group of researchers emerged from this meeting and has continued to collaborate in diverse ways.

Budgetary limitations prevented a second forum on ABS being convened in Year 2, and we have chosen instead to work on a one-to-one basis with specific communities, government agencies and entrepreneurs and with existing initiatives. This has included:



- the initiation of a research initiative focused on conservation benefits of ABS (in collaboration with Prof Neil Crouch of the South African National Biodiversity Institute);
- ongoing work to build ABS awareness with Tracy du Plessis of the community initiative FynbosMengsels, which aims to explore the production of cosmetic, medicinal and food-based products based on traditional knowledge and indigenous plants;
- work through the government-convened Honeybush Community of Practice (COP) to help integrate ABS in the industry. This has involved several presentations to the COP by PhD candidate Sthembile Ndwandwe, and ongoing meetings with NGOs, communities, industry and government representatives involved in the trade. The research, which is supervised by A/Prof Rachel Wynberg, focuses on how marginalised communities engage in the harvesting and cultivation of honeybush tea, and implications for benefit sharing (see [Annex UCT-K](#) for Sthembile's PhD research proposal).

On 20 April 2018, Dr Sarah Ives from Stanford University was invited to deliver a talk to students and staff at the University of Cape Town on her research which examined issues of knowledge and identity in the rooibos industry. Her talk was titled 'Steeped in Heritage: The Racial Politics of Rooibos Tea' (see [Annex UCT-I](#) for the pamphlet advertising her talk).

Meetings have also been held with potential film-makers to prepare a case study documentary about rooibos and ABS. This will however require additional fund-raising.

1.5. Revise and adapt materials

In **Namibia**, following the workshops held in the Kunene region during Year 1, the information booklet on the recently promulgated Namibian legislation "Access to Biological and Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge Bill" was revised and updated. The draft booklet includes a summary of the legislation and, once available, the associated regulations. The final production of the materials will be delayed until the regulations are promulgated and available.

1.6. Reproduce and disseminate material to relevant stakeholder groups

Scheduled for Year 3.

1.7. Produce a case study on the status, development achievements and challenges of selected resource value chain in each country

Initial case studies for South Africa, Namibia and Cameroon were produced in Year 1.

In **Cameroon**, a series of literature reviews were produced on Non-timber Forest Product (NTFP) law and policy in Central Africa; ABS law and policy; and a third on NTFPs in Central Africa (see [Annex PPI-D](#)). These, alongside a wide range of interviews with key stakeholders, and market studies, contributed to production of the case study document, completed in Year 2 by the project team, including input from four students, two project researchers, and project coordinator (see [Annex PPI-B](#) for the case study and [Annex PPI-C](#) for the literature review which informed the case study on Irvingia in French).



In **Namibia**, building on a baseline document, the *Myrothamnus* case study was compiled and includes new information and developments submitted to the project management unit. The case study captures the context (biological, ecological, social, historical, value chains, stakeholders) within which *Myrothamnus flabellifolius* occurs in Namibia. It then provides an analysis of the key issues surrounding *Myrothamnus* and the responses being undertaken to address them (See **Annex IRDNC-H**).

In **South Africa**, three case studies have emerged focused on (a) rooibos (see **Annex UCT-J** for the policy brief); (b) honeybush (see **Annex UCT-K** for the PhD proposal); and to a lesser extent (c) *Myrothamnus* (see **Annex UCT-E** for Michelle Nott's thesis and **Annex UCT-F** for the policy brief). Much of the *Myrothamnus* work is regional, especially with regard to ABS policy implications, and thus it is common to both the South African and Namibian work.

OUTPUT 2: Local needs and interests communicated to policy-makers to enable better-informed ABS policy in Cameroon, Namibia and South Africa.

2.1. Compile video interviews with harvesters, producers, and communities on ABS and the wider policy context

In **Cameroon**, partnerships with filmmakers were developed in Year 1, and this continued in Year 2, with adjustments to accommodate social unrest in Southwest Cameroon, and changes to filming and field sites as a result. A Southwest film crew will continue with filming in that region, and a Yaoundé crew is undertaking government interviews.

In **Namibia**, IRDNC project staff participated in and gave support to the filming of activities in Zambezi for key project outputs under this activity.

In **South Africa**, documentary film maker and PhD student Vuyiswa Lupuwana was contracted to film small-scale rooibos producers and other communities using indigenous plants, traditional knowledge holders, local landowners, representatives of the natural products industry, and academics about the impact of ABS, its regulation, and the value of traditional knowledge. She conducted 9 interviews which were transcribed and translated and sent for editing to the team in New York.

2.2. Production of videos and policy briefs on key ABS and related policy topics, representing community voices

In **Cameroon**, two policy briefs were drafted and are under review: 'Irvingia and ABS: An illustrative case study', and 'The Scope of ABS: Relevance for the Laws and Policies Regulating Genetic and Biological Resources in Cameroon'. The ABS policy landscape is undergoing changes as government officials, donor support, political context, and ABS issues evolve, and the program has adapted its efforts to reflect changing local needs. Changes in government officials include new Ministers and ABS and CBD Focal Points; changes in donor support include the ebb and flow of ABS funding, which determines the extent of government engagement in these issues; and political context changes include civil unrest and conflict in Southwest and Northwest Cameroon, with repercussions on anything relating to government and policy.

Collaborations with filmmakers in **South Africa, Namibia, and Cameroon** were further developed in Year 2, and filming was undertaken in all three countries between August 2018 and March 2019. Products include an overview (see



<https://vimeo.com/332243831> pw=vbj), a background video; a series of stand-alone interviews on key topics (currently totalling 20, with the number expanding in Year 3); and overview synthesis videos on ABS challenges. A Vimeo site is housing videos, which will be incorporated into the project website in the first half of Year 3.

An ethics packet and guidance for collaborators, and more broadly filmmakers working on biodiversity and social justice, was also produced (see [Annex PPI-A](#)), and the expansion and ‘crowd-sourcing’ of materials will continue through Year 3.

In [Namibia](#), a policy brief on the impact of fragmented legislation with regard to Community Based Natural Research Management (CBNRM) on the development of an ABS compliant value chain was completed in Year 1.

An important step towards the establishment of the regulations for the Namibian ABS legislation was taken during the ABS Expert Stakeholders Workshop held from 11-14 June 2018. Two project associate consultants (John Hazam and Dave Cole) attended the workshop during which Dave Cole gave a presentation on *Myrothamnus* (see [Annex IRDNC-I](#)). The proposed regulations were reviewed and discussed but several factors remain unresolved, including that many participants are new to the process and unfamiliar with the legislation; a lack of clarity on key issues including the difference between biotrade and bioprospecting; a lack of clarity on what constitutes “research”; and trends such as permit-heavy processes for different actions. A key outcome of the workshop was a recognition that materials (clear guidelines and check lists) will be needed to give guidance around processes and procedures.

It was reflected after the ABS expert workshop that it is still unclear as to what the process or timeline is for the approval of the ABS regulations. This will hamper the finalisation of the materials that provide guidance and guidelines on the legislation and its implementation. This will cause a delay in the production of the materials, part of which can be planned and produced, but without content relating to the regulations, they will not be comprehensive.

A second policy brief, based on ABS in the resurrection bush (*Myrothamnus flabellifolius*) trade in [South Africa](#), [Namibia](#) and Zimbabwe was produced in Year 2 (see [Annex UCT-F](#)). This brief is based on research undertaken by Masters student Michelle Nott.

2.3. Disseminate videos and policy briefs to policy-makers, shared at national and international policy events

In [Namibia](#), the revised version of the first policy document “Namibia’s Progress on Access and Benefit Sharing Legislation and Policy” was submitted to the Namibian ABS focal point in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. Initial feedback has been provided and responded to. The brief will be distributed more widely and a distribution plan is in place including the Ministry of Environment (including the Directorate of Environmental Affairs), the Ministry of Agriculture Water and Forestry (including the Directorate of Forestry) as well as the Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organization (NACSO) members (see [Annex IRDNC-J](#)).

During Year 2, a second policy brief entitled “Namibia’s Progress on Access and Benefit Sharing Legislation and Policy (March 2019)” was developed and submitted (see [Annex IRDNC-K](#)).



In all sites, this activity will take place in Year 3, alongside more extensive outreach of program products, in partnership with government, including ABS and CBD focal points.

2.4. Post videos on project website

The overview video was posted to the project website in Year 2 (<https://vimeo.com/332243831> pw=vbj). Stand-alone and overview videos will be posted as a tranche from this phase of filming. We have realised that videos will provide more effective, and comprehensive, advice and context if posted at one time, within a coherent framework. All videos will thus be posted in the first half of Year 3.

OUTPUT 3: ABS support tools, approaches and lessons learned documented and shared across countries.

3.1. Develop preparatory webinar material, and background briefing documents.

The project developed core themes to be addressed in webinars and videos, following consultation with stakeholders in all three countries and the Resource Group, and the themes for the first 3 webinars were selected. Research was also done to explore the formats of different webinar options and the pros and cons of different approaches.

The timing on webinars was shifted fully to Year 3 to better complement outreach workshops, meetings and other programs with governments officials, and others, and to coincide with the release of videos which will provide in-depth background on the webinar topics. One webinar will be held in the first half of Year 3, and two webinars early in the second half. Consolidating outreach materials and efforts, including workshops, webinars, and videos will be more effective and have more impact, reaching more groups at once and more comprehensively, than if spread out.

Country case studies will inform the webinar material, as well as video material that explores different themes, gathered through the filming process. Members of the Resource Group will also be used to lead the webinars and explain different issues.

3.2. Develop webinars on key ABS and related policy issues.

Research on technical issues related to webinars was captured in a background document (see **Annex UCT-L**). The first three webinar topics (traditional knowledge and the law; laws and policies that impact biodiversity use and its commercialisation; and benefit sharing) were discussed in detail at the London meeting (see **Annex UCT-A**).

3.3. Edit all webinars and other materials into instructive videos, placed on project website.

The webinar material is still under development, once complete it will be made available on the website (for more, see 3.1 above)

3.4. Draft a journal article.

The project team in Cameroon has met and begun research, and early drafting, of an article on 'ABS and the case of Cameroon', highlighting the cases of Irvingia, Echinops, Prunus and Ancistrocladus as part of an exploration of ABS in Cameroon.

Michelle Nott, Rachel Wynberg and Karen Nott have begun to draft a journal article titled "Benefit sharing and environmental sustainability in policy and practice: The



commercialisation of the resurrection bush (*Myrothamnus flabellifolia*) in Southern Africa”. There has been a slight delay in the article due to the fact that the thesis was under examination. However, we have now received positive feedback from examiners on the thesis and are thus in a position to proceed with its publication.

3.5. Produce compilation videos from across countries.

Scheduled for Year 3 as planned.

3.6. Produce synthesis policy brief from case studies for national and international policymakers.

Scheduled for Year 3 as planned.

3.7. Policy brief distributed to CBD secretariat, ABS clearing house, national governments, producer groups, industry groups.

Scheduled for Year 3 as planned.

3.8. Share video at national and international policy events and on project website.

Scheduled for Year 3 as planned.

3.9. Draft a synthesis/lessons journal article that combines findings across regions¹.

The project Resource Group and other collaborators have had several meetings to discuss the elements of a journal article, allocate responsibilities for research and drafting, and to explore publication options. Building upon this process, drafting of the final article will take place primarily in Year 3.

OUTPUT 4: A high-level Strategy and Advisory Group of ABS experts, practitioners and researchers (The Resource Group) established to explore, document and disseminate lessons learned, best practice and revised approaches for ABS, and to provide support to case study communities.

4.1. Inception meeting held.

Held in Year 1.

4.2. Project website launched.

The website was finalised and launched in Year 2 (see www.voices4biojustice.org).

4.3. Team meetings held (virtual)

In year 2 a total of 4 team meetings were held via Skype (see [Annex RG-A](#)).

4.4. Special edition project launched by team.

This was discussed at length at the London meeting. A provisional list of contributors was drawn up, together with an outline of the different contributing articles. While work has started on some of the articles, we have also realised that many will require a substantial research effort and that we will need to fund-raise to ensure that the research process is properly supported. This conversation is ongoing, but in the interim the Resource Group is working collectively on an article that provides a contemporary

¹ This is an additional activity and has been added to the logframe accordingly.



analysis of ABS, drawing on the respective skills and experiences of its members. This will be submitted within the first half of Year 3.

4.5. Meeting of Strategy and Advisory Group to discuss conceptual papers and practical tools.

The Steering Committee of the Strategy and Advisory Group – Rachel Wynberg, Sarah Laird, Graham Duffield, and Manuel Ruiz Muller – met in person in London in June 2018, and four times virtually, by Skype (see [Annex RG-A](#)).

At the London meeting it was decided to change the name of the group from ‘Strategy and Advisory Group’ to ‘Resource Group’. In London the terms of reference for the Resource Group was discussed and a small group of people who can be brought together to help the group strategize was identified and approached, including Susan Bragdon (formerly of the Quaker Centre), Neth Dano (ETC Group, Philippines) and Ping Peria (Philippines government).

4.6. Produce collaborative, peer-reviewed paper drawing together lessons from case studies and other work by the Group.

Scheduled for Year 3.

3.2 Progress towards project Outputs

OUTPUT 1: A set of conceptual and practical tools and approaches that supports ABS role players (local people, community groups, traditional leaders, researchers, NGOs, government and private sector) to more effectively engage with ABS developed and tested.

By the end of Year 2, this output continues on track and steady progress towards the output has been achieved. Toolkit material continued to be developed and tested with producer communities in Namibia and South Africa. An ABS Cederberg Community of Practice has been initiated in South Africa along with an informal working group of researchers. ABS training for small-scale rooibos producers is scheduled in Niewoudtville for July 2019.

In **Namibia**, a further 75 (40 men and 35 women) local-level stakeholders (harvesters, traditional authority representatives, relevant CBO representatives) were provided with ABS-related training (see [Annex IRDNC-A](#) to [IRDNC-E](#)) bringing the end of Year 2 total to 225 (142 men and 83 women).

Of those trained in year 2, a short pre and post survey of the non-harvester stakeholders (traditional authorities and conservancy/forest committee representatives and buying point managers) showed that four reported knowing about ABS before the training and 23 reported having increased their understanding as a result of the training (see [Annex IRDNC-L](#) for evidence).

In **South Africa**, a Cederberg Community of Practice on ABS was initiated during a workshop where 80 participants (39 women and 41 men) from government, NGOs, conservation agencies, traditional knowledge holders, rooibos producer communities, and industry) met to work on establishing a community of practice for ABS around rooibos and other indigenous plants (see [Annex UCT-D](#), [UCT-G](#) and [UCT-H](#)). This led directly to stronger involvement of small-scale rooibos producers in negotiations to develop a benefit-sharing agreement with the rooibos industry for holders of traditional knowledge.



Country case-studies have been produced for Namibia (*Myrothamnus flabellifolius*), South Africa (honeybush (*Cyclopia* spp), resurrection (*Myrothamnus flabellifolius*) and rooibos (*Aspalathus linearis*)) and Cameroon (*Irvingia gabonensis*). Evidence provided in **Annexures IRDNC-H, UCT-J** and **PPI-B**.

In **Namibia**, support to the KCINPT has resulted in a revision to their BDP that corresponds to the new ABS legislation and supports the implementation of their ABS contract signed in 2017. This change can be attributed to support under this project. See **IRDNC -F** and **IRDNC-G** for evidence.

OUTPUT 2: Local needs and interests communicated to policy-makers to enable better-informed ABS policy in Cameroon, Namibia and South Africa.

Good progress has been made toward this output in Year 2.

Filming was undertaken at sites in **South Africa, Namibia, and Cameroon** between August 2018 and March 2019. Three products have resulted including 1) an overview/background video; 2) a series of 20 stand-alone interviews on key topics; and 3) an overview synthesis video on ABS challenges. For evidence please see project Vimeo site <https://vimeo.com/332243831> pw=vbj). The overview video was posted to the project website in Year 2. Stand-alone and overview videos will be posted as a tranche from this phase of filming early in year 3. An ethics packet and guidance for collaborators, and more broadly filmmakers working on biodiversity and social justice, was also produced (see **Annex PPI-A**).

By the end of year 2, six policy briefs had been produced to various stages of draft and approval. In **Cameroon**, two policy briefs were drafted and are under review: 'Irvingia and ABS: An illustrative case study', and 'The Scope of ABS: Relevance for the Laws and Policies Regulating Genetic and Biological Resources in Cameroon' (see **Annex PPI-E** and **Annex PPI-F**). In **Namibia** two policy briefs (February 2018 and March 2019) on the impact of fragmented legislation with regard to CBNRM on the development of an ABS compliant value chain have been completed and submitted to the Namibian ABS focal point in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. See **Annex IRDNC-J** and **IRDNC-K** for evidence. In **South Africa**, a first policy brief on rooibos was produced (see **Annex UCT-J**), as well as a collaborative brief on *Myrothamnus*.

OUTPUT 3: ABS support tools, approaches and lessons learned documented and shared across countries.

A key component of this output is the production and delivery of three webinars. Topics have been identified and it has been decided to shift the webinars to Year 3 (see **Annex UCT-A**). This will better coincide with the release of the videos and concerted outreach efforts. Research on technical issues related to webinars was captured in a background document (see **Annex UCT-L**).

Work on country journal articles has begun and an early draft produced on 'ABS and the case of Cameroon'. The further two journal articles and synthesis will be produced in year three. Similarly, the synthesis policy brief will be produce and disseminated in year three.

An additional output, a special issue of a scientific journal is being explored and final drafting planned to be undertaken in Year 3.



OUTPUT 4: A high-level Strategy and Advisory Group of ABS experts, practitioners and researchers established to explore, document and disseminate lessons learned, best practice and revised approaches for ABS, and to provide support to case study communities.

The Strategy and Advisory Group, now known as the ABS Resource Group met 5 times during the reporting period, 4 times via Skype and once in person – at the steering committee meeting in person in London in June 2018 (see [Annex RG-A](#) for dates, participants and the agendas of these meetings).

3.3 Progress towards the project Outcome

The anticipated outcome for the project is “An active ABS Community of Practice uses tools that enables government, researchers, industry and local communities to ensure access and sharing of benefits with producer communities and thus support biodiversity conservation.”

Broadly the project is on track to achieve the outcome and a series of activities planned for Year 3 (release of videos and webinars, further support to producers in Cameroon) is anticipated to lead to achieving the outcome.

Indicator 0.1 – during Year 2 a significant achievement was the invitation for project consultants (involved in key support activities at producer level) to give inputs at the Namibia ABS Expert Stakeholders workshop in June 2018 (see [Annex IRDNC-I](#)) which was working on the establishment of the regulations for the Namibian ABS legislation.

Indicator 0.2 - at the end of Year 2, a clear community of practice is emerging constituted at a number of levels (platforms and through partnerships), including local forums, such as support to harvesters and KCINPT in Namibia ([Annex IRDNC-A to IRDNC-F](#)), work with the rooibos producers and stakeholders ([Annex UCT-D](#)), establishing an ABS Forum in South Africa with initial focus on the Cederberg, and the overarching ABS Resource Group (formerly called the ABS Strategic and Advisory Group). Tools have been developed and are being used at local (ABS pamphlets), national (policy briefs) and international levels (video briefs).

Indicator 0.3 – progress has been tracked in post-workshop surveys where participants have reported an increase in awareness about ABS through workshop processes (see Annual Report 1 and [Annex IRDNC-M](#)). Tracking this indicator will still require further work and this will be explored during Year 3 and methods discussed with the project support team at Darwin.

3.4 Monitoring of assumptions

Outcome level assumptions:

1. Government interest in implementing the Nagoya Protocol continues to grow.
2. Governments remain open to receiving the input of diverse stakeholders, and building their ABS capacity.
3. Stakeholders involved in ABS maintain an interest in learning and sharing experiences.

At this stage of the project the Outcome Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 are holding to be true. Our evidence for this is based on activities under Output 1 and 2 where at government and community level only positive interest was experienced at the introduction of the project and key activities. It should be noted however, that gaps and delays do exist (and were reflected in Year 1) between government staff at field/middle management and senior levels.

Output level assumptions:

1. Government interest in implementing the Nagoya Protocol persists, and policy-makers are open to new views and voices. Workshops held with government attendance provide evidence that this assumption remains valid (see [Annex IRDNC-I](#) and [UCT-D](#), [UCT-G](#) and [UCT-H](#) for evidence).
2. Governments remain open to receiving the input of diverse stakeholders and building their ABS capacity. Willingness to review and given inputs (although delays occurred) to draft policy briefs (see [Annex IRDNC-J](#) and [IRDNC-K](#)) provide evidence that this assumption continues to hold true although there are government sensitivities with regard to benefit-sharing agreements ([Annex UCT-D](#)).
3. Stakeholders involved in ABS maintain an interest in learning and sharing experiences.
The participation and expansion of the ABS Resource Group (formerly Strategy and Advisory group) is seen as evidence of this assumption in action.

3.5 Impact: achievement of positive impact on biodiversity and poverty alleviation

As a policy project, the benefits on biodiversity and poverty alleviation are indirect, but have the potential in the long-term to yield important monetary and non-monetary benefits for marginalised communities, as well as benefits for conservation. As an example, for the South African case study, ABS awareness raising among small-scale rooibos producer communities has enhanced understanding of the potential of other indigenous plant resources for commercial application. Emphasising the value of traditional knowledge associated with the biodiversity of the Cederberg mountains has been strongly affirming, evidenced for example by a well-articulated need from communities to document and record their knowledge in the form of a locally accessible book. For rooibos specifically, the project has helped deepen understanding about the implications of ABS and has begun to work with producer communities to explore ways in which benefits can be fairly and equitably shared and used. With an agreement already on the table, the financial flows from industry are likely to be lucrative, and it is vital that communities are adequately prepared to manage this. Important opportunities exist to link ABS to conservation and this is especially pertinent for the rooibos industry which is known to have profound negative environmental impacts, Conversations are now beginning to unfold as to the way in which ABS can be viewed holistically in the rooibos sector. The honeybush sector is somewhat different in that most material is wild-sourced, with several new community-based cultivation initiatives underway. Although conservation attention in this sector is more strongly advanced than that of rooibos, the ABS issues have not yet been tackled, and the project offers a valuable



platform to service this gap. The forefronting of conservation benefits through ABS has emerged through a collaboration with the South African National Biodiversity Institute which will explore these questions in more detail in the final year of the project. Helping to support the potential (positive and negative) impacts of a large influx of rooibos funding to poorly resourced communities will also form a focus in Year 3 of the project, and in all likelihood, beyond the project life.

For **Namibia**, there is positive impact as a whole on biotrade and for ABS there are anticipated benefits for Year 2, specifically through a joint venture agreement between the KCINPT and Esse Organic Skincare, a company in South Africa. There are various beneficiaries at different levels. At grassroots, harvesters and member of communal conservancies and community forests in Namibia. In turn organisations that represent them, such as the KCINPT are also considered to be beneficiaries.

In **Cameroon**, as elsewhere, the project is working to create a healthier ecosystem of laws that will promote sustainability and equity in the use of genetic and biological resources. At present, small-scale rural producers, traders, and others must work within a regulatory framework that undermines their livelihoods. Collaboration with government on the development of more effective ABS measures will alleviate some of the pressure on local groups resulting from poor policy. Given the rising interest in some regions in Irvingia as a commercial product, the project will also work to ensure the trade is not only sustainable but harvesters, communities, and local traders benefit from it.

4. CONTRIBUTION TO THE GLOBAL GOALS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (SDGS)

This project continues to support a number of the SDGs through bringing the voices of producer and harvester communities to the ABS discourse. In particular, the goals of reducing poverty (SDG 1) and inequality (SDG 10) are integral to our work. By working towards better conservation of indigenous biodiversity, this project aims to improve the lives of producer communities and traditional knowledge holders (SDG 15); and through identifying equitable ways of encouraging high growth industries based on emerging technologies, innovation and economic growth will be stimulated (SDG 8 and 9). By collaborating closely with national and provincial governments involved in ABS implementation, particularly through the Resource Group, the project aims to build strong institutions (SDG 16) in the three countries it is active in. Project members will work towards gender equality (SDG 5) through a conscious focus on power and inequality – integral to our project – as well as through involvement of women’s groups and ongoing support to local producers, many of whom are female.

5. PROJECT SUPPORT TO THE CONVENTIONS, TREATIES OR AGREEMENTS

In **Namibia**, IRDNC is working closely with the Namibia Focal Point for ABS, Henry Ndengejeho. His office is located within the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (see Section 2.3 under Namibia above).

In **South Africa**, collaboration with the ABS Focal Point around rooibos has been hindered by the sensitivity of benefit-sharing negotiations but there is ongoing contact between the focal point and members of the team. For example, PhD candidate



Sthembile Nwandwe has attended government-convened meetings to discuss upscaling the biodiversity economy, and has attended and made presentations to the honeybush Community of Practice - on 8 May 2018 and 6 November 2018. She attended the Biodiversity Economy Indaba from 7 - 10 March 2018, as well as the Mass Cultivation Working Group hosted by the Department of Environmental Affairs in Pretoria on 26 March 2019. Within government, the team also engages actively the South African National Biodiversity Institute; Cape Nature; and the Western Cape provincial Department of Environment and Development Planning.

In **Cameroon**, the project team is working with a range of stakeholders engaged in ABS issues under the Convention on Biological Diversity, and is building capacity in local groups to engage in policy-making. The project is also undertaking research on medicinal plant, wild food, and cosmetic exports in order to inform ABS and Forestry policy and law. In Year 3, the project will build upon these activities to extend the results of Year 1 and 2 work, including policy recommendations, to government, including CBD and ABS Focal Points, and a range of officials within the Ministry of the Environment, Protection of Nature, and Sustainable Development.

6. PROJECT SUPPORT TO POVERTY ALLEVIATION

For **Namibia**, there is positive impact as a whole on biotrade but specifically re ABS there are anticipated benefits for Year 2 through a joint venture agreement between the KCINPT and Esse Organic Skincare, a company based in South Africa. There are various beneficiaries at different levels. At grassroots, harvesters and members of communal conservancies and community forests in Namibia are set to benefit from the agreement. In turn, organisations that represent them, such as the KCINPT are also considered to be beneficiaries.

In **South Africa**, the work has helped to stimulate and support the inclusion of small-scale rooibos farming communities as negotiating parties and beneficiaries in the benefit sharing agreement with industry, and build the capacity of such groups to engage on ABS issues. However, although substantial monies will be realised through this agreement, it is too early to say whether this will have a positive impact on poverty relief. Significant work will be needed at a political and community level to ensure that resource distribution is fair and equitable.

In **Cameroon**, as elsewhere, the project is working to create a healthier ecosystem of laws that will promote sustainability and equity in the use of genetic and biological resources. At present, small-scale rural producers, traders, and others must work within a regulatory framework that undermines their livelihoods. Collaboration with government on the development of more effective ABS measures will alleviate some of the pressure on local groups resulting from poor policy. Given the rising interest in some regions in Irvingia as a commercial product, the project will also work to ensure the trade is not only sustainable but harvesters, communities, and local traders benefit from it.

7. PROJECT SUPPORT TO GENDER EQUALITY ISSUES

As described in our Year 1 Annual Report, gender is not explicitly addressed in the project, but rather as a multifaceted, nuanced, complex, and integral part to both our practice and our approach. This ties in with our recognition that there are fundamental concerns around power and inequality in the natural products sector generally, and in

ABS in particular; the involvement of women's groups and ongoing support to local producers, many of whom are female, is a central component to our project.

In terms of numbers, 2 of the 4 small-scale rooibos producer cooperatives in **South Africa** are led by women, and the majority of the Heiveld Cooperative members are female - of the 34 members, 18 are women and 16 are men. The Clanwilliam workshop was attended by close to 50% women, of the 80 participants, 39 were female. In **Cameroon**, the project team is more than half women, women are a core part of the interviewing and consultation process, and in the long run will be significant beneficiaries of more effective law and policy. In Year 2 in **Namibia**, 35 (47%) of the 75 awareness workshop participants were women.

8. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The M&E of this project is incorporated into the quarterly team calls and a good process has been established for tracking events and outputs for evidence of project achievements. During the final part of Year 1, input was provided (by Beniot Rivard of LTS) towards improving the project logframe. These were finalised in early Year 2. As the changes did not make significant changes to the outcome or outputs, formal approval was not sought. The changes were based on recommendations explored with LTS that involved the insertion of key words that helped refine the outcome and output language but did not in any sense alter the outcome or outputs per se. These changes are made clear through highlighted text in the logframe (**Annex 2**).

As noted in the Annual Report 1 review document, the project consists of three "mini" logframes and every effort is being made to track progress and provide evidence of these. All project components are submitting reports against detailed country plans and providing documentary evidence (evidenced by the long list of Annexes attached). Ways of pulling this together in a more coherent manner for the end of project reporting are being explored.

What still remains a challenge is to track the changes reflected in indicators 0.3 and 1.2 and 1.4. A proposed approach is to further refine (and implement) ways to survey training participants to establish the change in awareness and understanding of ABS brought about by project interventions. We are particularly interested in M&E approaches that are meaningful, rather than box-ticking. For example, we have learnt that asking participants post-training whether they have learnt anything yields fairly predictable and, we would argue, not very helpful answers, as few would report in the negative. It is hoped that further support from LTS can be sought as to how to go about this considering the project's geographic range and limited M&E budget.

9. LESSONS LEARNT

In Year 2, an important lesson was learned in **Namibia**. During the ABS awareness workshops conducted with harvesters, it was pleasing to note that harvesters were comfortable with the ABS principles presented and commented on the fact that several of these principles were already in practice with the current process that IRDNC has supported. However, with further discussion about the legislation and the awaited regulations it became evident that most interest was on what the implications of the regulations would be on the biotrade contracts that already exist and concerns raised about whether the regulations might in fact have a detrimental effect rather than giving harvesters additional benefits. The lesson learnt is that while government and support

organisations might be engaging with ABS concepts and possible long-term benefits, for a poor harvester living in a remote area, their biggest concern is whether their current means of earning additional income is going to be impacted.

This is also a lesson with resonance in South Africa and Cameroon. ABS is often peripheral to many marginalised or vulnerable communities living in biodiversity rich areas. Industrial agriculture and logging in Cameroon, for instance, are an immediate threat to people's livelihoods, while the fires that have devastated parts of the Cederberg rooibos production areas have had overwhelming consequences for many farmers, alongside ongoing drought and the over-abstraction of water for industrial agriculture. At the same time, requirements for Nagoya signatory governments to comply with ABS laws have led to an influx of international funding to develop ABS laws and to build capacity to enable their implementation. We are increasingly realising the importance of ensuring that externally-driven ABS agendas do not detract from local priorities and needs, do not create a cumbersome set of unimplementable or inappropriate laws, and do not lead to the "tail wagging the dog" – with poverty, conservation and social justice issues left behind.

10. ACTIONS TAKEN IN RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS REVIEWS

In the section below we respond to some of the general comments made by the reviewer of our Year 1 Annual Report. Thereafter we respond directly to the questions we were asked to specifically address in this report (A to D).

1. How do the activities from all three sites come together at a higher level and coherent way?

The linking of activities in Year 2 have included the production of a series of videos which present responses to a range of issues related to ABS from all three partner countries, as well as partners in other countries linked to the programmatic project, Voices for BioJustice. The videos are based on a set of themes (see the Voices for BioJustice website for a detailed description of the themes <https://www.voices4biojustice.org/themes/>) which will feed into a series of webinars. Once completed, these videos and webinars will be made available to a wide audience through the website, providing up-to-date information and presenting a diversity of views on the complexities of ABS. They will also be used as the basis for engagement with national and international policy processes, including ABS policy under the CBD and national legal reforms.

Lessons in policy-making have also been shared throughout the life of the project through virtual team meetings, and will continue to be shared in Year 3. In Year 2 the project team had an in-person 3-day meeting in London where there was extensive discussion of the different components of country-level work and how each team's efforts would complement and build upon those in other countries. In Year 3 we plan another in-person strategy and policy meeting between the teams to continue the dialogue and build lessons and outputs across regions.

Two planned Year 3 outputs, a synthesis policy brief and a synthesis paper, will combine key messages derived from the activities undertaken in the three countries, thereby delivering a coherent message addressing multiple ABS-related concerns and opportunities to national and international policy-makers, including the Nagoya Protocol



policy process within the CBD, and broader ABS research and policy in other international fora.

2. How are your activities under the project contributing to poverty alleviation and gender equality issues in a meaningful and verifiable way?

This project is largely focused at a policy level, and beneficiaries at household level are therefore difficult to identify. However, the wider policy implications of the project could have far-reaching impacts on poor people in low-income countries.

Commercial interest in the region's biological diversity is significant, but researchers and companies are reluctant to work in countries with ambiguous ABS measures. Presently, commercial use of genetic resources is a small and marginal activity, much operating outside of ABS frameworks and thus not generating significant economic benefits. Laws often poorly reflect the experiences of local producers, harvesters and traders, including many women, and there is accumulating evidence of ABS triggering over-regulation among producer communities, leading to reduced economic opportunities, gender inequalities and elite capture.

This project will support improved, evidence-based ABS policy regimes that reflect local priorities, and help to raise awareness among government, NGO, industry and community actors involved in ABS implementation. This in turn can help biodiversity-based research and industry grow, can build capacity in research institutions, can strengthen arguments for biodiversity conservation, and can generate benefits for the rural poor by supporting local trade and biodiversity-based marketing.

The countries involved represent a mix from Lower Middle Income (Cameroon) to Upper Middle Income (Namibia and South Africa). Our work in all host countries is focused in regions which remain isolated, extremely poor and highly dependent on biodiversity for livelihoods. Strengthening local voices, developing appropriate tools to support biodiversity-based livelihoods, and making appropriate ABS policy interventions will have high significance in these areas.

At a wider level, emerging lessons will also support neighbouring low-income countries that share biological resources (e.g. the resurrection bush has wide geographic coverage in southern Africa and bush mango is used and traded throughout the Central African region).

In South Africa, an intervention supported by the project team might translate into financial benefits for rooibos producing communities, although it is too soon to confirm this; moreover, improved financial benefits may not necessarily translate into poverty alleviation if these resources are not distributed fairly and equitably, and if appropriate governance arrangements are not properly developed and supported.

3. Can we indicate our attribution toward policy change at this stage – or a trajectory towards it? And how would we verify this?

As a team, we believe that, although it may be possible for a project to make a contribution to policy change, it is not possible to attribute policy change to a single project. We do, however, believe that the outputs generated by this project, will bring the direct, substantive and authentic contributions of local groups in an accessible format to policy makers.



Our view is that by providing local groups with the means to participate effectively in policy, for their voices to be heard, and by providing policy-makers with in-depth analysis and resources that help with more informed decision-making, and by developing specific recommendations for governments, we can create change in policy-making.

Through such interventions we intend governments to see that ABS implementation is in practice interwoven with other areas of law and policy, including those regulating the harvest and trade of medicinal, food, and other resources; forestry; taxation; science and technology; and land tenure and resource rights. As noted, policy change is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to attribute to a particular project or action but we would expect the project to contribute towards governments and others weighing up the costs and benefits of different regulatory approaches, and supporting the development of policies for genetic and biological resources that reflect the complexities and nuance of actual practice. ABS regulatory reform processes that are underway in Namibia, South Africa and to a lesser extent Cameroon, present opportunities for doing this, and the project's direct involvement with such processes will undoubtedly have an influence.

4. Can you make any comments or insights about the Community of Practice the project is nurturing and how it is using the tools we are producing – or how its members will during Year 3?

We see the Community/ies of Practice as a diverse, dynamic and evolving set of relationships taking place in different ways and at different levels. This has continued to grow over the last two years, on a number of fronts:

- Increasing numbers of partners in video production and collaboration, including in Mexico, Peru, and The Philippines. In Year 3 we will expand into Brazil and British Columbia. Our local partners are civil society organisations, researchers, and government officials, all collaborating in different and complementary ways.
- In Year 2 we created an expanded Resource Group to reflect greater geographic range and experiences with ABS issues.
- A focused outreach and dissemination effort in Year 3 which includes the launch of a media platform, videos, a series of webinars, and a social media campaign which will strengthen our global reach further.
- Within each country, a growing range of partnerships have developed with new organizations or have strengthened with existing partners, working with different species around ABS questions. These are articulated in Section 2 above (“Project Partnerships”).
- In South Africa a meeting was held in April 2018 to develop an ABS Community of Practice which has since consolidated around the Cederberg range and indigenous plants associated with that area. This has involved a range of partnerships and ABS questions. Project activities have also informed the existing Honeybush Community of Practice, and will continue to do so through ongoing research on this group of plant species.

Responses to comments made by the reviewer of the Year 1 Annual Report

A. Comment further on how the activities in the three countries tie together, i.e. whole is greater than sum of parts? It would be good to provide more detail on what a functional ‘Community of Practice’ is, in practice, as well as tangible examples (if any) of interactions between South Africa, Cameroon and Namibian beneficiaries.

See our response under points 1 and 4 above.

B. Comment further on the format for the case studies and how such a great amount of research and information will be presented and tailored to its intended audiences (communities, practitioners).

The case studies are being packaged in multiple ways for different audiences – viz policy briefs for decision-makers, regulators, NGOs, funders; videos for a similar audience, but especially for government officials who may respond better to visual rather than written material; academic articles for the research community and those wishing to obtain a more in-depth perspective. Thus we don’t envisage a single “format” for the case studies, but rather diverse formats, prepared for different groups.

C. Comment further on whether all three case studies will follow the same structure, style, presentation. At the moment the baseline documents look and read very differently (e.g. Cameroon seems complex, Namibia simple and South Africa focused on ABS tools).

As described above, we do not envisage a uniform set of case studies. All case studies take place in different contexts, with different actors, different forms of commercialisation and trade, and different sets of issues. Moreover, the development of legal frameworks for implementing ABS in each partner country is at very different stages. Although the project’s aim provides an overarching umbrella for all case studies, based on the thematic issues that have been jointly identified, we have not set out to use a prescribed format around which the research should be presented. We do not envisage this to be a constraint to the analysis but rather that it will encourage the contextualisation, specificity and depth of analysis that is required.

D. Outputs in Section 3 are sub-divided by country, but the activities do not seem to match up with the logical framework, thus making it more difficult to assess progress against the initial plan, indicators, etc. Please try to use the logical framework as the basis for reporting against progress.

This has been modified in this report, and the activities reported against in the narrative section match the numbering and order of the activities listed in the logframe. The reporting against the indicators is contained in the logframe only, as per the reporting guidelines.

11. OTHER COMMENTS ON PROGRESS NOT COVERED ELSEWHERE

Nothing to report.



12. SUSTAINABILITY AND LEGACY

Multiple interventions at national and local levels have aimed to introduce different stakeholders in partner countries to the project, evidenced by its presentation at various fora, by the workshops convened, and by ongoing interactions with those involved in ABS implementation. The active participation of the Resource Group members have acted as further points of reference and leverage. We believe that the different project components will develop into an active hub that becomes a “go-to” space for new ABS thinking, and a resource for those wishing to learn more.

Since all partners have long-standing involvement in the ABS policy process, and will continue to work with many of the same communities, governments, industry, and NGO partners, the “exit strategy” comprises a plan for strengthening collaborations rather than winding down a project. The sustainability of the work will be further enhanced by the establishment of the programmatic “Voices for BioJustice” identity which is based on the intention and realisation that the work will continue well beyond the current three year project duration. The team has already developed a proposal for fundraising, with certain aspects already submitted to different funders. Our view has always been a programmatic one, seeing this project as part of a cluster of ongoing activities, rather than as a stand-alone activity that will cease after three years.

13. DARWIN IDENTITY

The Darwin Initiative was acknowledged as the main funder of the project, throughout the second project year. The Darwin logo was used on public documents such as the policy briefs which are available on the Voices for BioJustice website as well as programmes, flyers or other materials handed out at workshops. In terms of social media, the Darwin Initiative was tagged in a number of the project’s Facebook posts (see <https://www.facebook.com/Voices4BioJust/>). Despite the adoption of a more programmatic identity, Voices for BioJustice, the Darwin Initiative is still identified as the central funder, and the project remains distinct.

14. PROJECT EXPENDITURE

Table 1: Draft Project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2018 – 31 March 2019). Please note that these are only estimates. The final version will be as submitted in the Q4 claim.

Project spend (indicative) since last annual report for UCT	2018/19 Grant (£)	2018/19 Total Darwin Costs (£)	Variance	Comments
Staff costs (see below)				
Consultancy costs				
Overhead costs				

Travel and subsistence				
Operating costs				
Capital items (see below)				
Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)				
Others (see below)				
PARTNERS				
IRDNC				
EMG				
PPI				
Leeds				
TOTAL				

Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year 2018-2019

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2018 - March 2019	Actions required/planned for next period
<p>Impact</p> <p>ABS laws, policies, agreements and approaches shift to become more responsive and inclusive of local needs, enabling economic development and equitable benefit sharing whilst reducing poverty and conserving biological diversity.</p>			
<p>Outcome</p> <p>An active ABS Community of Practice uses tools that enables government, researchers, industry and local communities to ensure access and sharing of benefits with producer communities and thus support biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>0.1. Number of meetings where project team members are on agenda to give inputs to policy or legislation decision-makers by end of project. (Target = 6; 3 in Year 2 and 3 in Year 3)</p> <p>0.2. Number of ABS-related knowledge-exchange platforms and ABS role-player partnerships created and operational by end of project. (Target = 3 webinars with 1 000 viewers per webinar; 1 website; 6 Strategic and Advisory group meetings)</p>	<p><i>One meeting in Namibia (see Annex IRDNC -I)</i></p> <p><i>One meeting in South Africa (see Annex UCT-D)</i></p> <p><i>Website established</i></p> <p><i>5 Strategy and Advisory Group (Resource Group) meetings held (see Annex RG-A)</i></p>	<p><i>Design and refine process to track uptake of project supported tools and processes (0.3 and 1.2 for training undertaken in year 3 and end of project)</i></p> <p><i>Production of video briefs; policy briefs and webinars uploaded to the project website.</i></p> <p><i>Support ABS knowledge-exchange reviews and both existing and emerging ABS partnerships.</i></p>

	<p>0.3. At least 240 project participants (50 Cameroon of which 35% women, 90 Namibia of which 67% women, 100 South Africa of which 30% women) including local community members, that report using project-supported ABS engagement tools and approaches in different settings and countries by end of project.</p>		
<p>Output 1</p> <p>1. A set of conceptual and practical tools and approaches developed, tested and disseminated amongst ABS role players (local people, community groups, traditional leaders, researchers, NGOs, government and private sector) and tailored to each target country.</p>	<p>1.1. Three country-specific ABS toolkits developed, tested and refined by end Year 3.</p> <p>1.2. Number of local ABS actors from project sites (50 Cameroon of which 35% women, 90 Namibia of which 67% women, 100 South Africa of which 30% women) that report increased awareness as a result of direct, project-led training and awareness interventions by end of project.</p>	<p><i>1.1 Toolkit material has been developed and tested with producer communities in Namibia, South Africa and Cameroon in both Year 1 and 2. An ABS Cederberg Forum and Working Group has been initiated in South Africa and continues to work together in different ways.</i></p> <p><i>1.2 In Namibia, a further 75 (40 men and 35 women) local-level stakeholders received ABS-related training (see Annex IRDNC-A to IRDNC-E) bringing the end of Year 2 total to 225 (142 men and 83 women). Of those trained in Year 2, a short pre and post survey of the non-harvester stakeholders (traditional authorities and conservancy/forest committee representatives and buying point managers) showed that four reported knowing about ABS before the training and 23 reported having increased their understanding as a result of the training (see Annex IRDNC-L).</i></p> <p><i>In South Africa, a forum on ABS was initiated during a workshop where 80 participants (39 women and 41 men) from government, NGOs, conservation agencies, traditional knowledge holders, rooibos producer communities, and industry) met to work on establishing a community of practice for ABS around rooibos and other indigenous plants (see Annex UCT-D, UCT-G and UCT-H).</i></p>	

	<p>1.3. Three country-specific ABS case studies compiled documenting status, issues and strategies for ABS implementation (Namibia on <i>Myrothamnus</i>; South Africa on rooibos; Cameroon on <i>Irvingia gabonensis</i>).</p> <p>1.4. Three feedback workshops (one in each project country during last quarter of Year 3) to raise awareness of project results and uptake of the project findings by relevant stakeholders (local people, community groups, traditional leaders, researchers, NGOs, government and private sector).</p>	<p><i>1.3 Country case-studies have been produced for Namibia (<i>Myrothamnus flabellifolius</i>), South Africa (Rooibos and <i>Myrothamnus</i>) and Cameroon (<i>Irvingia gabonensis</i>). Work is ongoing to support a honeybush case study See Annex IRDNC-H, UCT-K and PPI-B.</i></p> <p><i>1.4 Due Year 3.</i></p>
<p>1.1. Hold introductory/scoping meetings with key stakeholders.</p>	<p><i>Completed and reported on in AR1.</i></p>	
<p>1.2. Compile a baseline review of potential tools and approaches that are required to support each case study.</p>	<p><i>Baselines completed for Namibia (<i>Myrothamnus flabellifolius</i>) and Cameroon (<i>Irvingia gabonensis</i>) during Year 1. South Africa produced a rooibos policy brief (Year 1) that contained all the relevant baseline information for the review and it was decided that this served the purpose of a baseline document.</i></p>	
<p>1.3. Develop appropriate materials to support ABS information sharing and capacity building.</p>	<p><i>Namibia produced an illustrated (draft) information booklet that provides a summary of the new ABS legislation (Y1); Cameroon has continued work on business and market studies on the range of medicinal and aromatic species in export markets (Y1 and Y2); South Africa produced an ABS information booklet on ABS and translated into Afrikaans.</i></p>	

1.4. Use materials to support identified stakeholders and processes.	<i>Workshops held and support to producer groups continue in Namibia, Cameroon and South Africa using materials produced. Detail in narrative report (Section 3.1 – 1.4).</i>
1.5. Revise and adapt materials.	<i>In Namibia, the information booklet on the recently promulgated Namibian legislation “Access to Biological and Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge Bill” was revised and updated based on feedback from initial use.</i>
1.6. Reproduce and disseminate material to relevant stakeholder groups.	<i>Not yet started – due Year 3.</i>
1.7. Produce a case study on the status, development achievements and challenges of selected resource value chain in each country.	<i>Country case-studies have been produced for Namibia (<i>Myrothamnus flabellifolius</i>), Cameroon (<i>Irvingia gabonensis</i>), and South Africa (<i>Rooibos</i> and <i>Myrothamnus</i>). Work is ongoing to support a honeybush case study. (see Annex IRDNC-H, UCT-K and PPI-B).</i>
<p>Output 2</p> <p>Local needs and interests communicated to policy-makers via videos and policy briefs to enable better-informed ABS policy in Cameroon, Namibia and South Africa.</p>	<p>2.1. Three thematic video briefs on key ABS topics featuring local-level perspectives developed and produced by end of Year 3 (2 in Year 2 and 1 in Year 3)</p> <p>2.2. Three videos and other materials (policy briefs, case studies) are loaded on project websites and linked to other websites by end project.</p> <p>2.3. Five country-specific policy briefs produced for use and distribution to relevant government meetings or fora (2 for Cameroon, 2 for Namibia and 1 for South Africa).</p> <p>2.1 Three products completed 1) an overview/background video; 2) a series of 20 stand-alone interviews on key topics; and 3) an overview synthesis video on ABS challenges (see overview video here https://vimeo.com/332243831 pw=vbj).</p> <p>2.2 One video (project overview) was posted to the project website in Year 2. www.voices4biojustice.org</p> <p>2.3 Six policy briefs had been produced to various stages of draft and approval (end of Year 2). In Cameroon, two policy briefs were drafted and are under review (Annex PPI-E and Annex-PPI-F); In Namibia two policy briefs (February 2018 and March 2019) were produced and submitted to the Namibian ABS focal point in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. (Annex IRDNC-J and IRDNC-K). In South Africa, two policy briefs produced (on</p>

	<p>2.4 Six policy-related forums (2 per country by end project) organized that target policy-makers with key messages in videos and policy briefs²</p>	<p><i>rooibos</i> in Year 1 (Annex UCT-J) and <i>M. flabellifolius</i> (Annex UCT-F) in Year 2.</p> <p>2.4 Due Year 3</p>
<p>2.1. Compile video interviews with harvesters, producers, and communities on ABS and the wider policy context.</p>	<p><i>Filming was undertaken at sites in South Africa, Namibia, and Cameroon between August 2018 and March 2019.</i></p>	
<p>2.2. Production of videos and policy briefs on key ABS and related policy topics, representing community voices.</p>	<p><i>Three video products completed 1) an overview/background video; 2) a series of 20 stand-alone interviews on key topics; and 3) an overview synthesis video on ABS challenges (https://vimeo.com/332243831 pw=vfb). An ethics packet and guidance for collaborators, and more broadly filmmakers working on biodiversity and social justice, was also produced (Annex PPI-A).</i></p> <p><i>Six policy briefs were produced to various stages of draft and approval (end of Year 2). In Cameroon, two policy briefs were drafted and are under review (Annex PPI-E and PPI-F); in Namibia two policy briefs (February 2018 and March 2019) produced and submitted to the Namibian ABS focal point in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. (Annex IRDNC-J and IRDNC-K). In South Africa, two policy briefs produced (on <i>rooibos</i> in Year 1 (Annex UCT-J) and <i>M. flabellifolius</i> (Annex UCT-F) in Year 2.</i></p>	
<p>2.3. Disseminate videos to policy-makers, shared at national and international policy events.</p>	<p><i>Not yet started – due Year 2 and 3.</i></p>	

² Original wording of indicator 2.4 “Six policy-related forums where project implementers on agenda to provide in and feedback (2 per country by end project)”

<p>2.4. Post videos on project website.</p>		<p><i>The overview video was posted to the project website in Year 2 (see https://vimeo.com/332243831 pw=vbj). Stand-alone and overview videos will be posted as a tranche early in Year 3.</i></p>
<p>3. ABS lessons learned through country case studies, video documentary and policy briefs shared across the three target countries and disseminated to wider ABS community via webinars, peer-reviewed journal article and synthesis³.</p>	<p>3.1. Three webinars (1 per year) on challenging ABS topics, with supporting background resources including videos and policy briefs, are produced and hosted on project website by end Year 3.</p> <p>3.2. Project produced, ABS specific webinars viewed by 3 000 viewers (1 000 per webinar) by end Year 3.</p> <p>3.3. Three peer-reviewed, country specific journal articles published by end Year 3.</p> <p>3.4. One peer-reviewed journal article synthesising lessons learned across three project countries and case studies produced by end Year 3.</p> <p>3.5. One synthesis policy brief on ABS lessons learned across three project case studies produced by end Year 3.</p> <p>3.6. Synthesis policy brief on ABS lessons learned across three project</p>	<p><i>Work under this output has begun but no target deliverables achieved yet – these are planned for Year 3.</i></p>

³ Original wording of output 3 “ABS support tools, approach and lessons learned documented and shared across countries”.

	case studies, distributed to 5 000 stakeholders by end Year 3.	
3.1. Develop preparatory webinar material, and background briefing documents.		<i>Webinar topics have been identified and decided to shift the webinars to Year 3 (see Annex UCT-A to coincide with the release of the videos. Research on technical issues related to webinars undertaken (see Annex UCT-L). An additional output, a special issue of a scientific journal is being explored and final drafting planned to be undertaken in Year 3.</i>
3.2. Develop webinars on key ABS and related policy issues.		<i>Not yet started – due Year 3</i>
3.3. Edit all webinars and other materials into instructive videos, placed on project website.		<i>Not yet started – due Year 3</i>
3.4. Draft a journal article (each country team).		<i>Work on country journal articles has begun and an early draft produced on ‘ABS and the case of Cameroon’ as well as a draft prepared on Myrothamnus. The further two journal articles and synthesis will be produced in Year 3.</i>
3.5. Produce synthesis policy brief from case studies for national and international policy-makers.		<i>Similarly, the synthesis policy brief will be produce and disseminated in Year 3</i>
3.6. Policy brief distributed to CBD secretariat, ABS clearing house, national governments, producer groups, industry groups.		<i>Scheduled for Year 3</i>
3.7. <i>Draft a synthesis/lessons journal article that combines findings across regions⁴.</i>		<i>Not yet started – due Year 3</i>
Output 4 A high-level Strategy and Advisory Group of ABS experts, practitioners and researchers established to explore, document and disseminate lessons learned,	4.1. An ABS Strategy and Advisory group consisting of 10 global ABS practitioners and experts, exists and meets at least 2 times per year (virtually or in person).	<i>ABS Advisory Group now called ABS Resource Group was established. The Steering Committee (four members) has met 4 times in Year 1 (virtually) 5 times in Year 2 (once in person). The expanded group includes 7 people. (see Annex RG-A).</i>

⁴ This is an additional activity and has been added to the log frame accordingly.

best practice and revised approaches for ABS, and to provide support to case study communities.	4.2. Production of an ABS review by end of Year 3.	
4.1. Inception meeting held. (Year 1)		<i>Completed in Year 1.</i>
4.2. Project website launched. (Year 1)		<i>The website was finalised and launched in Year 2 (see www.voices4biojustice.org).</i>
4.3. Quarterly meeting of team virtually – 4 x per year. (Year 1, 2, 3)		<i>Four virtual team meetings were held in Year 2 and one in-person meeting (see Annex UCT-C and Annex UCT-D).</i>
4.4. Special edition launched by team (interest matched to themes). (Year 1)		<i>A set of titles has been prepared, and writing of specific pieces has commenced.</i>
4.5. Meeting of Strategic and Advisory team to discuss conceptual papers and practical tools. (Year 2 and 3)		<i>The Steering Committee of the Resource Group (formerly Strategy and Advisory Group) met in person in London in June 2018, and 4 times virtually, by Skype.</i>
4.6. Produce collaborative, peer-reviewed paper drawing together lessons from case studies and other work by the group. (Year 3)		<i>Scheduled for Year 3.</i>
4.7. Special edition manuscript completed. (Year 3)		<i>Scheduled for Year 3.</i>

Annex 2: Project’s full current logframe as presented in the application form (unless changes have been agreed)

Project summary	Measurable indicators	Means of verification	Important assumptions
<p>Impact (max 30 words): ABS laws, policies, agreements and approaches shift to become more responsive and inclusive of local needs, enabling economic development and equitable benefit sharing whilst reducing poverty and conserving biological diversity.</p>			
<p>Outcome (max 30 words): An active ABS Community of Practice uses tools that enables government, researchers, industry and local communities to ensure access and sharing of benefits with producer communities and thus support biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>0.1 Number of meetings where project team members are on agenda to give inputs to policy or legislation decision-makers by end of project (target = 6; 3 in Year 2 and 3 in Year 3)</p> <p>0.2 Number of ABS-related knowledge-exchange platforms and ABS role-player partnerships created and operational by end of project (Target = 3 webinars with 1000 viewers per webinar; 1 website; 6 strategic and advisory group meetings)</p> <p>0.3 At least 240 project participants (50 Cameroon of which 35% women, 90 Namibia of which 67% women, 100 South Africa of which 30% women) including local community members, that report using project-supported ABS engagement tools and approaches in different settings and countries by end of project.</p>	<p>0.1 Agendas or minutes of meetings and workshops, parliamentary notes, participant lists</p> <p>0.2 Webinars convened; minutes of Strategic and Advisory Group meetings; project website established and populated</p> <p>0.3 Technical reports produced that reflect local community needs; reviews of existing tools and the development of new tools; M&E data on uptake and use of tools and approaches</p>	<p>Government interest in implementing the Nagoya Protocol continues to grow</p> <p>Governments remain open to receiving the input of diverse stakeholders, and building their ABS capacity</p> <p>Stakeholders involved in ABS maintain an interest in learning and sharing experiences.</p>
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>1. A set of conceptual and practical tools and approaches developed, tested and disseminated amongst ABS role players (local people, community groups, traditional leaders, researchers, NGOs, government and private</p>	<p>1.1 Three country-specific ABS toolkits developed, tested and refined by end Year 3</p> <p>1.2 # of local ABS actors from project sites (50 Cameroon of which 35% women, 90 Namibia of which 67% women, 100 South Africa of which 30% women) that report increased awareness as a result of direct,</p>	<p>1.1 Toolkit documents; workshop & project reports</p> <p>1.2 Workshop/meeting reports and attendance lists; M&E database on baseline and post workshop meeting</p>	<p>For all outputs:</p> <p>Government interest in implementing the Nagoya Protocol persists, and policy-makers are open to new views and voices</p> <p>Governments remain open to receiving the input of diverse</p>

<p>sector) and tailored to each target country</p>	<p>project-led training and awareness interventions by end of project.</p> <p>1.3 Country-specific ABS case studies compiled documenting status, issues and strategies for ABS implementation (Namibia on <i>Myrothamnus</i>; South Africa on rooibos, <i>Myrothamnus</i> and honeybush; Cameroon on <i>Irvingia gabonensis</i>)</p> <p>1.4 Three feedback workshops (one in each project country during last quarter of Year 3) to raise awareness of project results and uptake of the project findings by relevant stakeholders (local people, community groups, traditional leaders, researchers, NGOs, government and private sector)</p>	<p>evaluations⁵;</p> <p>1.3 Case study documents, project reports</p> <p>1.4 Workshop reports, meetings of minutes and records of discussions with relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>stakeholders, and building their ABS capacity</p> <p>Stakeholders involved in ABS maintain an interest in learning and sharing experiences.</p>
<p>2. Local needs and interests communicated to policy-makers via videos and policy briefs to enable better-informed ABS policy in Cameroon, Namibia and South Africa</p>	<p>2.1 Three thematic video briefs on key ABS topics featuring local-level perspectives developed and produced by end of Year 3 (2 in Year 2 and 1 in Year 3)</p> <p>2.2 Three videos and other materials (policy briefs, case studies) are loaded on project websites and linked to other websites by end project</p> <p>2.3 Five country-specific policy briefs produced for use and distribution to relevant government meetings or fora (2 for Cameroon, 2 for Namibia and 2 for South Africa)</p> <p>2.4 Six policy-related forums (2 per country by end project) organized that target</p>	<p>2.1 Videos and written documents available on project website</p> <p>2.2 Videos and written documents available on linked or related websites</p> <p>2.3 Policy brief documents; minutes of ABS related government meetings</p> <p>2.4 Minutes or agenda of policy-related forum meetings, M&E database</p>	

⁵ The project will need to explore further ways to assess the uptake of tools as per this indicator and 1.4.

	policy-makers with key messages in videos and policy briefs ⁶		
3. ABS lessons learned through country case studies, video documentary and policy briefs shared across the three target countries and disseminated to wider ABS community via webinars, peer-reviewed journal article and synthesis ⁷	<p>3.1. Three webinars (1 per year) on challenging ABS topics, with supporting background resources including videos and policy briefs, are produced and hosted on project website by end Year 3</p> <p>3.2. Project produced, ABS specific webinars viewed by 3000 viewers (1000 per webinar) by end Year 3</p> <p>3.3. Three peer-reviewed, country specific journal articles published by end Year 3</p> <p>3.4. One peer-reviewed journal article synthesising lessons learned across three project countries and case studies produced by end Year 3</p> <p>3.5. One synthesis policy brief on ABS lessons learned across three project case studies produced by end Year 3</p> <p>3.6. Synthesis policy brief on ABS lessons learned across three project case studies, distributed to 5000 stakeholders by end Year 3</p>	<p>3.1 Webinars hosted on website;</p> <p>3.2 Webinar viewing records.; M&E database</p> <p>3.3 Journal publications; project reports</p> <p>3.4 Journal publication; project reports</p> <p>3.5 Policy brief document, project reports</p> <p>3.6 Documents lodged in CBD clearing house</p>	
4. A high-level Strategy and Advisory Group of ABS experts, practitioners and researchers established to explore, document and disseminate lessons learned,	4.1. An ABS strategy and Advisory group consisting of 10 global ABS practitioners and experts, exists and meets at least 2 times per year (virtually or in person)	4.1 Meeting attendance records, project reports	

⁶ Original wording of indicator 2.4 “Six policy-related forums where project implementers on agenda to provide in and feedback (2 per country by end project)”

⁷ Original wording of output 3 “ABS support tools, approach and lessons learned documented and shared across countries”.

best practice and revised approaches for ABS, and to provide support to case study communities	4.2. Production of a special edition report on “ABS in the 21 st Century” by end of Year 3	4.2 Special edition publication	
Activities (each activity is numbered according to the output that it will contribute towards, for example 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are contributing to Output 1)			
<p>Activities for Output 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.8. Hold introductory/scoping meetings with key stakeholders 1.9. Compile a baseline review of potential tools and approaches that are required to support each case study 1.10. Develop appropriate materials to support ABS information sharing and capacity building 1.11. Use materials to support identified stakeholders and processes 1.12. Revise and adapt materials 1.13. Reproduce and disseminate material to relevant stakeholder groups 1.14. Produce a case study on the status, development achievements and challenges of selected resource value chain in each country 			
<p>Activities for Output 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.5. Compile video interviews with harvesters, producers, and communities on ABS and the wider policy context 2.6. Production of videos on key ABS and related policy topics, representing community voices 2.7. Disseminate videos to policy-makers, shared at national and international policy events 2.8. Post videos on project website 			
<p>Activities for Output 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1. Develop preparatory webinar material, and background briefing documents 3.2. Develop webinars on key ABS and related policy issues 3.3. Edit all webinars and other materials into instructive videos, placed on project website 3.4. Draft a journal article (each country team) 3.5. Produce synthesis policy brief from case studies for national and international policy-makers 3.6. Policy brief distributed to CBD secretariat, ABS clearing house, national governments, producer groups, industry groups 3.7. Draft a synthesis/lessons journal article that combines findings across regions⁸. 			

⁸ This is an additional activity and has been added to the log frame accordingly.

Activities for Output 4

- 4.1. Inception meeting held (Year 1)
- 4.2. Project website launched (Year 1)
- 4.3. Quarterly Meeting of team virtually – 4 x per year (Year 1, 2, 3)
- 4.4. Special Edition launched by team (interest matched to themes) (Year 1)
- 4.5. Meeting of strategic and advisory team to discuss conceptual papers and practical tools (Year 2 and 3)
- 4.6. Produce collaborative, peer-reviewed paper drawing together lessons from case studies and other work by the Group (Year 2)
- 4.7. Special edition manuscript completed (Year 3)

Annex 3: Standard Measures

Table 1. Project Standard Output Measures

Code No.	Description	Gender of people	Nationality of people	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Total to date	Total planned during the project
2	Masters Degree PhD Degree	F (2)	South African	1	2	1	2	2
4C	Post-graduate student training	M (3) F (3)	Cameroonian South African	4	4	4		4
4D	Number of training weeks							
7	Number of (e.g., different types - not volume - of material produced) training materials to be produced for use by host country	NA	NA	2	3	4	5	9
11B	Number of papers to be submitted to peer reviewed journals					4	0	4
14A	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops to be organised to present/disseminate findings			2	2	6	4	10
14B	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops attended at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated			6	6	9	12	21
23	Value of resources raised from other sources (e.g. in addition to Darwin funding) for project work							0

[Please note that our project partners have not specifically reported against the standard measures as this was not required in the AR-Y1 report, thus these figures are broad brush approximations.]

Table 2. Publications

Title (see below)	Type	Detail	Gender - Lead author	Nationality - Lead author	Available from
1	Policy Brief	John Hazam 2018	M	Namibian	https://www.voices4biojustice.org/
2	Policy Brief	John Hazam 2019	M	Namibian	https://www.voices4biojustice.org/
3	Policy Brief	Rachel Wynberg 2018	F	South African	https://www.voices4biojustice.org/
4	Policy Brief	Michelle Nott 2019	F	South African	https://www.voices4biojustice.org/

1. Namibia's progress on access and benefit-sharing legislation and policy [1]
2. Namibia's progress on access and benefit-sharing legislation and policy [2]
3. Rooibos: A testing ground for ABS in South Africa
4. Benefit sharing and environmental sustainability in policy and practice: Commercialisation of the resurrection bush (*Myrothamnus flabellifolius*) in Southern Africa



Checklist for submission

	Check
Is the report less than 10MB? If so, please email to Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk putting the project number in the Subject line.	Yes
Is your report more than 10MB? If so, please discuss with Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	No
Have you included means of verification? You need not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	Yes
Do you have hard copies of material you want to submit with the report? If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number.	NA
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	Yes
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	Yes
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	