



**GREAT APES SURVIVAL**  
P A R T N E R S H I P

# **Great Apes Survival Partnership**

## **Strategic Review**

**Final report**  
**April 2012**



**The Environment and Development Group**



## Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents.....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>List of tables.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>List of acronyms .....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>1. The strategic review process .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 GRASP.....	5
1.2 Scope of the review .....	5
1.3 Approach to the review and work accomplished .....	6
1.4 The term ‘GRASP’ .....	7
<b>2. The global conservation status of great apes .....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Accuracy of information.....	8
2.2 Identification of possible threats .....	9
2.3 Identification of vulnerable regions.....	9
2.4 Population trends .....	9
2.5 Direct human causes of ape loss.....	10
<b>3. Origins and ambitions of GRASP.....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 Origins of GRASP.....	11
3.2 Original objectives.....	12
3.3 Programme of Action (PoA) .....	15
3.3.1 Level of attainment of the objectives.....	16
3.3.2 5-year indicators.....	17
<b>4. The effectiveness of the Partnership .....</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1 Defining the Partnership .....	18
4.2 Who are the partners? .....	18
4.3 How well has the Partnership worked? .....	22
4.3.1 What do partners think of the Partnership? .....	23
4.3.2 Efficiency of the Partnership .....	26
4.3.3 Summary .....	27
<b>5. The effectiveness of GRASP’s organs.....</b>	<b>28</b>
5.1 Executive Committee .....	28
5.1.1 Structure.....	28
5.1.2 Performance.....	29
5.2 The Secretariat.....	29
5.2.1 Managing field projects.....	33
5.2.2 Communication.....	36
5.3 The UN sponsors .....	37
5.3.1 The role of UNEP .....	37
5.3.2 The role of UNESCO.....	39
5.4 Focal points.....	40
5.5 Scientific Commission.....	41
5.5.1 Functions .....	41
5.5.2 Performance .....	42
5.6 Technical Support Team.....	43
5.6.1 Functions .....	43
5.6.2 Performance .....	43
5.7 GRASP Patrons and Envoy .....	44
5.7.1 Patrons .....	44
5.7.2 GRASP Envoy.....	45
5.8 Council.....	46
5.8.1 Function.....	46
5.8.2 Commentary .....	46

5.9	Summary of the effectiveness of GRASP's organs .....	47
<b>6.</b>	<b>Recommendations for the future.....</b>	<b>49</b>
6.1	A future shape for GRASP.....	49
6.2	Recommendations .....	50
6.2.1	Recommendation 1: Focus on forests .....	50
6.2.2	Recommendation 2: Simplify the structure .....	51
6.2.3	Recommendation 3: Communicate convincingly .....	53
6.2.4	Recommendation 4: Perform on a higher political plane .....	54
6.2.5	Recommendation 5: Strengthen the science .....	55
6.2.6	Recommendation 6: Lobby for better legislation and law enforcement.....	55
<b>Annexe A.</b>	<b>GRASP-funded projects from 2005-2011.....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>Annexe B.</b>	<b>List of documents consulted.....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Annexe C.</b>	<b>List of people consulted .....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Annexe D.</b>	<b>Survey English version.....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>Annexe E.</b>	<b>Survey French version .....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Annexe F.</b>	<b>Evaluation overview .....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Annexe G.</b>	<b>Terms of reference.....</b>	<b>75</b>

## List of tables

Table 1. People interviewed and surveyed throughout the Strategic Review .....	7
Table 2. Timeline of key events in the history of GRASP .....	12
Table 3. Five-year objectives and indicators of the GRASP PoA.....	16
Table 4. GRASP partners within each partner category .....	21
Table 5. Strengths and weaknesses of GRASP identified by individuals surveyed and interviewed	26
Table 6. Assessment of the functions of the Secretariat .....	30
Table 7. Staff members of GRASP's UNEP Secretariat from 2005 to 2011 .....	31
Table 8. List of GRASP projects between 2010 and 2011 .....	34
Table 9. Evaluation of GRASP organs.....	48

## List of acronyms

ACB	ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity
APES	Ape Populations, Environments and Surveys
ASEAN	Association of South-East Asian Nations
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBFP	Congo Basin Forest Partnership
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
CMS	Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals
CoP	Conference of the Parties
DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo
EC	European Commission
EDG	The Environment and Development Group
EU	The European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GRASP	Great Ape Survival Partnership
IISD	International Institute for Sustainable Development
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
LAGA	Last Great Ape Organisation
MAB	Man and the Biosphere Programme, UNESCO
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
MIKE	Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGASP	National Great Ape Survival Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NP	National Park
OFAC	Observatoire des Forêts en Afrique Centrale
PoA	Programme of Action
PSG	Primate Specialist Group, IUCN SSC
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
SEC	Suitable Environmental Conditions
SGA	Section on Great Apes of the PSG
SSC	IUCN Species Survival Commission
TOR	Terms of Reference
TST	Technical Support Team
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNON	United Nations Office in Nairobi
UNV	United Nations Volunteer
WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society
WHC	World Heritage Centre
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
YoG	Year of the Gorilla

# 1. The strategic review process

## 1.1 GRASP

In May 2001, the Great Apes Survival Project (GRASP) was created under the UNEP umbrella, in order to respond to the conservation crisis facing great apes (chimpanzees, gorillas, orang-utans and bonobos) and lift the threat of imminent extinction. It was recognised at the outset that there were many small organisations and diffuse projects working in Africa and South-east Asia to conserve great apes, but that their collective efforts were too scattered to be as effective as they might be. From this grew one of the central ideas of GRASP: that it should be a coalition of like-minded organisations, collaborating to achieve together something bigger than any of them could alone. In September 2002, GRASP became an operational World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) Type II Partnership, when UNESCO joined. The 1<sup>st</sup> Intergovernmental Meeting on Great Apes in Kinshasa in 2005 finally saw the signing of the Kinshasa Declaration and the blueprint of a framework for GRASP.

Since its creation, GRASP has aspired to provide the platform on which numerous, disparate organisations and interest groups can unite, to make common cause in pursuit of great ape conservation. The GRASP Executive Committee established an ambitious five-year plan that included five Programme Objectives and a Programme of Action (PoA) when it met in 2006. These targets proved difficult to measure, despite attempts to do so by the Scientific Commission. These were amongst the difficulties which rendered the targets unrealistic. As GRASP (since renamed the Great Apes Survival *Partnership*) marks its 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 2011, a strategic review was judged necessary to evaluate the institutional aspects and activities of the Partnership, and advise on its future direction.

## 1.2 Scope of the review

The need for a review of GRASP had been under discussion for almost two years and a contract for the institutional aspects of this was issued in early November 2011. The work was carried out by Stephen Cobb in collaboration with Chloé Joyeux and Yulia Stange, all three of The Environment and Development Group (EDG) in Oxford.

The TOR for the Review charge it with evaluating the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and impact of GRASP, both as a functioning coalition of stakeholders coordinated by the GRASP secretariat and through its interventions carried out in the name of GRASP.

The original intention was to divide the review into three strategic components:

1. The Effectiveness of GRASP as a partnership;
2. GRASP Project Management & Impact;
3. The Global Conservation Status of Great Apes.

The first strategic component, which constitutes the bulk of this report, is an institutional review, and is required to gauge the effectiveness of GRASP, through

analysing and assessing key components of the GRASP Partnership, through activities such as:

- Reviewing the GRASP organs (Secretariat, Scientific Commission, Technical Support Teams);
- Reviewing the roles and impact of GRASP patrons;
- Reviewing the role and impact of the GRASP great ape envoy;
- Reviewing whether the GRASP committees have functioned effectively;
- Analysing GRASP's record in securing funding;
- Comparing GRASP Partnership to similar models;
- Analysing the GRASP "Partnership" and the projects undertaken as "Partnership" projects.

The second component was to be achieved by means of two separate short-term consultancies, visiting field programmes in Côte d'Ivoire and Indonesia. Unfortunately, difficulties in the contracting processes in UNEP and UNON (the UN Office in Nairobi) have led to these being cancelled. Thus an important part of the understanding of the achievements of GRASP has been lost from the review process, inasmuch as the authors of this present report are not in a position to comment on the degree of success of GRASP-funded projects in the field, in relation to the five overall GRASP Objectives, and the activities set out in the Programme of Action.

The third component was contracted to the Max Planck Institute in Leipzig. A draft report on this work is already complete. A more substantial paper covering essentially the same ground is currently in preparation, authored by many of the same people<sup>1</sup>.

### 1.3 Approach to the review and work accomplished

The first component of the strategic review, the Institutional Strategic Review, consisted of the following:

- Reviewing all relevant GRASP documents (over 100 made available);
- A visit to Nairobi, interviewing staff members of the GRASP Secretariat and UNEP;
- Telephone and on-line interviews with as many people central to GRASP as possible, past and present;
- A survey circulated to over 100 people on the GRASP address list; and
- Attending the 6<sup>th</sup> Executive Committee meeting in Bergen in November 2011.

---

<sup>1</sup> Junker, J., Barakabuye, N., Bergl, R., Blake, S., Boesch, C., Campbell, G., Dunn, A., du Toit, L., Duvall, C., Ekobo, A., Etoga, G., Galat-Luong, A., Gamys, J., Gatti, S., Giurghi, A., Granier, N., Gray, M., Herlinger, I., Hart, J., Head, J., Hicks, C.T., Huijbregts, B., Kahiba, L., Kuempel, N., Lahm, S., Lauginie, F., Maisels, F., McLennan, M., Morgan, B., Mundry, R., N'Goran, P., Normand, E., Ntongho, A., Oates, J., Petre, C.A., Plumptre, A., Rainey, H., Regnaut, S., Stokes, E., Sunderland-Groves, J., Walsh, P., Warren, Y., Williamson, L. and H. Kuehl, (In prep.) *Recent decline in suitable great ape habitat across Africa*.



**Table 1. People interviewed and surveyed throughout the Strategic Review**

Links to GRASP	Number of individuals interviewed/surveyed	Method of contact
Patrons and envoys	4 interviews	phone
Executive Committee members	5 interviews	phone
Scientific Committee members	3 interviews 3 surveys	phone email
Partner NGOs	7 interviews 11 surveys	phone email
Range State focal points	1 interview 4 surveys	phone email
UNEP staff	9 interviews	in-person (8) phone (1)
UNESCO staff	3 interview 2 surveys	phone email
Donors	1 interview 1 survey	phone email
Others	1 interview (interested party) 1 interview (former UNEP staff) 1 survey (TST)	phone phone email

Overall, 28 people close to the affairs of GRASP were interviewed (face-to-face, telephone or skype), and a further 22 responded to the survey<sup>2</sup>. Their affiliation to GRASP is detailed in Table 1. The number of respondents for the survey was low. This is in itself representative of the level of engagement within the partnership for GRASP activities. While there seems to be a core group of very engaged and committed partners, the majority of partners remain on the periphery of GRASP and are hardly engaged at all. This will be discussed again later in the report.

Upon submission of the draft report in February 2012, comments were received from 18 people. Their views, and corrections of facts, have been incorporated to the best of our ability into this final report. Any remaining errors of omission or fact, however, remain those of EDG.

## 1.4 The term ‘GRASP’

Throughout the review process we encountered confusion amongst respondents as to how the term ‘GRASP’ was used, including GRASP Partners who referred to GRASP as an entity separate from themselves. Often “GRASP” was used in reference to the UNEP GRASP Secretariat. Throughout the report we will use the term GRASP to describe the Partnership as a whole, in its current form, including all GRASP organs. When necessary, we will identify particular components of the Partnership such as “GRASP Scientific Commission” or “GRASP Secretariat.”

---

<sup>2</sup> Twenty-eight people were interviewed in total. As some individuals contacted have multiple links to GRASP (i.e. as an NGO Partner, but also as a member of the GRASP Executive Committee) there is some overlap in the table.

## 2. The global conservation status of great apes

The Max Planck Institute, as part of the GRASP strategic review, was asked to provide a report summarising information on ape population status.<sup>3</sup> Overall, the following questions were addressed:

1. What is the trend in great ape habitats and populations over the past 20 years?
2. What are the trends by species and regions?
3. Are there differences between protected and non-protected areas?
4. What are the major drivers in population decline and habitat loss?

Below is a summary of the report, including the accuracy of the information presented, the possible threats facing ape populations and the regions vulnerable to these threats. While this summary was originally based on a draft version of the report, the final version of the *Global A.P.E.S. Status Report* has recently been released (March 2012) and is available from either The Max Planck Institute or GRASP. This section of the GRASP strategic review was modified following input from reviewers during the comment phase.

### 2.1 Accuracy of information

The majority of the information presented was taken from the A.P.E.S. (Ape Populations, Environments and Surveys)<sup>4</sup> database and a manuscript in preparation.<sup>5</sup> The report relies heavily on the concept of suitable environmental conditions (SEC)<sup>6</sup>, which describes the probability of ape occurrence as a function of environmental and human impact factors.

Several limitations to the presented information were identified:

- The results of the analyses need to be considered as an approximation of the true ape population status, because of the limited time available for writing the report, the resolution at which the analyses were conducted, and the limited data availability for certain species in the A.P.E.S database (particularly the orang-utan).
- Although SEC extent and decline rates generally reflect correctly relative differences between species and regions, care should be taken not to over-interpret presented results as absolute values.
- True decline rates in SEC are likely to be higher as estimates of decline rates are conservative due to methodological and data constraints, i.e., in Central Africa the impact of Ebola was not considered.

---

<sup>3</sup> Campbell, G., Kühl, H. and Boesch, C. (2011) *Global A.P.E.S. status report*. A report with information from the A.P.E.S. Project.

<sup>4</sup> <http://apes.eva.mpg.de>

<sup>5</sup> Junker, op. cit.

<sup>6</sup> While the draft report used the term 'Suitable Habitat,' there was a sense by some members of the GRASP Scientific Commission that it should be replaced by 'Suitable environmental conditions' to better reflect the fact that habitat loss, while a very important cause of ape loss, does not encompass the very real direct causes of ape loss such as hunting for bushmeat, and loss to diseases.

## 2.2 Identification of possible threats

The majority of species suffered from human impact, with the eastern gorilla showing the strongest response, followed by the bonobo and the Western gorilla<sup>7</sup>. Of all the factors evaluated and their influence of SEC distribution, these species also showed stronger responses for hunting and certain environmental variables, suggesting that these species have more fragmented distributions across their range than chimpanzees. Of the chimpanzee species, *Pan troglodytes ellioti* has the highest median values for all components of the human impact factor, followed by *Gorilla beringei graueri*; *P.t. verus*, on the other hand, showed the least response to all human impact and environmental variables evaluated. For the former two species, it suggests that these species experience very strong pressure and live in areas with high human population density with low socio-economic status; whilst for the latter, it suggests the most uniform distribution of SEC across its range relative to other species. This in turn suggests that all locations of *P.t.verus* occurrence are considerably affected by human impact, where population density is high, and the habitat is disturbed.

## 2.3 Identification of vulnerable regions

Ape populations can be divided between Africa and Asia.

In Africa, the overall SEC available for all African ape species (excluding *P.t. ellioti*, *G.b. beringei*, and *Gorilla gorilla diehli*) is 1,559,650 km<sup>2</sup> (although the total “theoretical” estimated SEC available is 1,879,825 km<sup>2</sup> when not considering species overlap). About 22% of this area occurs in protected areas.<sup>8</sup> East Africa has the lowest proportion of SEC that is protected (19%), which is explained by the large proportion of total SEC available for eastern chimpanzees in this region, which also has a low percentage of protection (18.39%).

For Asia, SEC information was only available for the Sumatran orang-utan (*Pongo abelii*), therefore the extent of SEC available for the Bornean orang-utan (*P. pygmaeus*) was not calculated (instead, the total extent of assumed current range, and its proportion included within protected areas is presented). Overall, both species encompass a total area of 128 616 km<sup>2</sup>, of which 25.41% is protected. The Bornean orang-utan occurs over a larger area than the Sumatran orang-utan (119,991 km<sup>2</sup> compared to 8,825km<sup>2</sup> respectively) and the former is commonly found outside protected areas.

## 2.4 Population trends

The Max Planck Institute reported the percentage decrease in SEC of ape species within and outside protected areas over approximately 10 years (one generation for

<sup>7</sup> As data was lacking for the Asian ape species, it should be noted that, while not specifically listed here, the Sumatran orangutan is also known to be suffering quite a bit from human impact.

<sup>8</sup> The term protected area refers to category level I to VI of IUCN protected area management classification system.

an ape species is approximately 20 years<sup>9</sup>). In Africa, the potential SEC has decreased by 11.37% over approximately 10 years, totalling a loss of 274 275km<sup>2</sup>, with the highest loss in Central Africa (-21.91%). For all regions and species there was a larger decrease outside protected areas. It should be noted that these values are likely to be underestimates for the methodological constraints explained in section 2.1. It should also be noted that this methodology produces a much faster rate of decline (of SEC, as opposed to forest canopy itself) than the estimates published for Central Africa in the State of the Forest Report (2010)<sup>10</sup> by the Congo Basin Forest Partnership.

The SEC maps for all three subspecies of the Bornean orang-utan were still in preparation at the time of writing. For the Sumatran orang-utan, they were able to present the contribution of the different predictor variables included in the SEC modelling analyses, which affected SEC distribution: Sumatran orang-utan SEC distribution is primarily influenced by land cover, which represents the different habitat classes and rainfall.

The analyses in these reports are hedged with appropriate scientific caution. But the clear message is that forest is being cleared to make way for other forms of land-use and other economic activities, and that the consequent loss of habitat is putting unprecedented pressures on great apes throughout their range.

## 2.5 Direct human causes of ape loss

During the review period of the draft GRASP Strategic Report the reviewers received many comments on the level of emphasis we had placed on habitat loss as a cause of ape loss. We accept and agree with the comments; that other threats such as infectious diseases and hunting of apes for bushmeat also present great threats to apes. *Suitable habitat*<sup>11</sup> in and of itself, does not guarantee the presence of apes, when Ebola or hunting can lead to 'empty forest syndrome.' Increasing access into otherwise intact forest exacerbates pressures such as hunting.

---

<sup>9</sup> Boesch, C. and H. Boesch-Achermann (2000) *The Chimpanzees of the Tai Forest*. Published for the Paleoanthropology Society. Penn Press, University of Pennsylvania.

<sup>10</sup> Les forêts du bassin du Congo - Etat des Forêts 2010. Eds : de Wasseige C., de Marcken P., Bayol N., Hiol Hiol F., Mayaux Ph., Desclée B., Nasi R., Billand A., Defourny P et Eba'a R.-2012. Office des publications de l'Union Européenne. Luxembourg. 276 p. ISBN : 978-92-79-22717-2 doi : 10.2788/48830

<sup>11</sup> Now renamed SEC in this version of the report

### 3. Origins and ambitions of GRASP

#### 3.1 Origins of GRASP

The idea of GRASP as a form of association to unite organisations and entities working towards the conservation of great apes - grew out of a conversation over ten years ago between Ian Redmond, Chairman of the Ape Alliance, and Klaus Toepfer, then the Executive Director of UNEP. The originally suggested purpose was to raise awareness among high-level decision-makers of the critical threats facing great apes through the use of UN Special Envoys<sup>12</sup> for Great Apes<sup>13</sup>. GRASP ambitions expanded rapidly from there.

Initially, GRASP undertook a growth period of partnership consolidation, which included some quick-win smaller field projects, and providing advisory support to great ape range states. In January 2003 a GRASP brainstorming meeting was held with about 20 partners. This initial meeting gave rise to the idea of a further brainstorming meeting in November 2003, and eventually the Intergovernmental Meeting in September 2005.

Some of the key events in the history of GRASP are summarized in Table 2. In addition to these key events, GRASP has published a number of influential documents, including:

- *The World Atlas of Great Apes and their Conservation* (2005);
- *The Last Stand of the Orangutan, State of Emergency: Illegal Logging, Fire and Palm oil in Indonesia's National Parks* (2007);
- *The Last Stand of the Gorilla, Environmental Crime and Conflict in the Congo Basin* (2010); and
- *Orangutans and the economics of Sustainable Forest management in Sumatra* (2011)

---

<sup>12</sup> Following the precedent of the UN Envoy for Rhino Conservation

<sup>13</sup> Special Envoys were later renamed 'GRASP Patrons.' The original group of Special Envoys included: Dr. Russell Mittermeier, primatologist and President of Conservation International; Dr. Jane Goodall, primatologist and founder of the Jane Goodall Institute; the late Dr. Toshisada Nishida, primatologist and founder of the GRASP Japan Committee; Dr. Richard Leakey, Kenyan palaeoanthrologist and wildlife conservation expert; and Prof. Richard Wrangham, primatologist and Professor of Anthropology, Harvard University.

**Table 2. Timeline of key events in the history of GRASP**

Date	Key event
2000	Ian Redmond approaches UNEP Executive Director about a UN Special Envoy on Great Apes
2001	Great Ape Survival Project launched by UNEP
2001	Five UNEP Special Envoys for Great Apes are named
Sept. 2002	GRASP listed as a World Summit on Sustainable Development Type II Partnership
Sept. 2002	UNEP joined by UNESCO to co-host the GRASP Secretariat
2001-2005	Initial growth phase of partnership consolidation, advisory support to national planning for great ape conservation by individual range states, and funding of smaller field projects
Nov. 2003	GRASP intergovernmental preparatory meeting is held in Paris, to prepare for the First Intergovernmental Meeting on Great Apes, attracting considerable global attention
May 2005	First major grant to GRASP: 3.1 Million Euros from the European Commission for 4-year project “Preservation of forest resources and improved livelihoods of forest peoples through conservation of Great Apes as flagship species”
Sept. 2005	The First Intergovernmental Meeting on Great Apes and GRASP, and the First Meeting of the GRASP Council are held in Kinshasa, culminating in the delegates signing the <i>Kinshasa Declaration on Great Apes</i>
Sept. 2005	Publication of the <i>World Atlas of Great Apes and their Conservation</i> in English.
April 2006	Finalization of the GRASP Programme of Action, defining five 5-year objectives with indicators
May 2007	GRASP Brainstorming meeting on ‘Big Ideas’, resulting eventually in the development of ‘GRASP Priority Areas’
May 2009 - June 2011	GRASP Coordinator position vacant – period of reduced Partnership and Secretariat activity
Sept. 2010	Second major grant to GRASP: Spain-UNEP Partnership for LifeWeb – GRASP is implementer for 6 of the 11 projects.
2010	GRASP is a partner for the <i>UN International Year of the Gorilla</i>

### 3.2 Original objectives

Launched in 2001, GRASP intended to take advantage of its unique position as “a truly international alliance among relevant stakeholders” and become greater than the sum of its parts, exerting more influence than the work of all of the individual partners combined by bringing together all groups working to conserve great apes under a common structure.

From the outset, GRASP sought to halt the decline in great ape populations and ensure their long-term survival in their natural habitat, while integrating this with the development objectives of the range states.

As part of this overall aim, specific GRASP goals from the early stages included:

- creating the necessary high level political will for great ape conservation
- generating worldwide publicity on great ape issues
- assessing legislation in range states covering great ape habitat and assisting in revising if necessary
- addressing law enforcement for great ape conservation
- working to decrease the impact on great apes of the extractive industries

- generating and developing support for a UN Declaration on Great Apes
- developing National Great Ape Survival Plans that would be adopted as government policy for decisions relating to great apes and their habitat

There are several different documents that contain variations of the above wording on the objectives of GRASP. The *Global Strategy for the survival of great apes and their habitat*, drafted in 2003 and adopted in 2005, sets out specific goals for lifting the threat of imminent extinction great apes. The overall goal of the *Global Strategy* is similar, but not identical, to the goal for the GRASP Partnership which was elucidated more clearly in the *Rules for the Organization and Management of the GRASP Partnership*, also adopted in Kinshasa in 2005:

*The GRASP Partnership has, as an immediate challenge, to lift the threat of imminent extinction facing most populations of great apes. Its mission is to work as a coherent partnership to conserve in their natural habitats wherever they exist wild populations of every kind of great ape and to make sure that where apes and people interact, their interactions are mutually positive and sustainable. GRASP also seeks to exemplify and relieve the threats faced by other kinds of animals, birds and plants sharing the forests where apes survive and to illustrate what can be achieved through a genuine partnership between all stakeholders in fragile ecosystems.*

This same *Rules* document specified several immediate and long term objectives in sections 4.1 and 4.2 respectively:

#### **4.1 Immediate objectives**

*The immediate objectives of the GRASP Partnership shall be:*

- (i) *To promote the Global Strategy for the Survival of Great Apes and Their Habitat;*
- (ii) *To determine the potential of sites, monitor populations of great apes and establish a database of great ape population information;*
- (iii) *To collate and analyse existing projects and initiatives at different levels, in order to identify gaps and set priorities in action and to encourage coordination and cooperation;*
- (iv) *To encourage range states to prepare and implement national action plans for the survival of great ape populations and their habitat and ensure that they have the necessary resources to do so;*
- (v) *To prioritize the use of resources for optimum effectiveness and identify funding areas that are currently neglected and underfunded;*
- (vi) *To promote and enforce a legal framework for the survival of great apes and their habitat in the countries concerned;*
- (vii) *To identify and support income-generating initiatives for the benefit of communities living in and around great ape habitat and protected areas, with due consideration for indigenous communities and to ensure, where it becomes imperative to resettle indigenous people in conformity with United Nations guidelines, that compensation is paid with international support;*
- (viii) *To educate and raise awareness among local populations;*
- (ix) *To help generate new and additional funds for the survival of great apes and their habitat and to ensure that the international community in the widest sense (donor States, international organisations and institutions, non-governmental organisations and representatives of private business and industry) provides effective and coherent support to the efforts being made by the great ape range states.*

#### **4.2 Longer-term objectives**

*The Partnership's longer-term objectives shall be:*

- (i) *To carry out scientific research to generate information necessary for the survival of great apes and their habitat and to disseminate such information in an easy and accessible manner;*

- (ii) To encourage countries to enter into or enforce relevant conventions and agreements for the conservation of great apes and elimination of their illegal trade;
- (iii) To work with relevant international networks of intelligence on great apes aimed at eliminating illegal transboundary traffic;
- (iv) To promote the development and transfer among range states, partners and other interested parties of appropriate technologies, training programmes and best practices for planning, finance, monitoring and delivery of outcomes;
- (v) To promote the inclusion of information highlighting the importance of great apes and their habitats in national education curricula and the dissemination of such information through the media.

GRASP received high-level support through the Intergovernmental Meeting in Kinshasa in 2005 which culminated in the adoption of the *Kinshasa Declaration*. It has now been signed by 21 range states, including 12 ministerial level signatories. In the Declaration, signatories:

- confirm their support for the Global Strategy for the Survival of Great Apes, urge support for range states in the implementation of great ape survival plans;
- encourage the provision of long-term ecologically sustainable economic benefits to local communities;
- reaffirm commitment to work together to ensure that GRASP has the capacity to realize its full potential as a key component of the international effort to save great apes; and
- resolve to set a target of securing a constant and significant reduction in the current rate of loss of great ape populations and their habitats

It is difficult to know to what exact extent the commitments made in Kinshasa in 2005 have been properly followed-up, since partners' activities have not been followed very closely. One good example of follow up however, is Indonesia's National Orangutan Strategy, which was cited by the President of Indonesia during the launch of the Bali UNFCCC CoP 2007 as being part of Indonesia's commitment to the Kinshasa Declaration (amongst other international commitments). Even if some such policies, such as those in Sabah and Sarawak, were developed independently without assistance from the GRASP Secretariat, the development of these policies is exactly what GRASP was calling for. As a whole however, the respondents to the surveys believe that the Kinshasa commitments were not met overall, despite effort

The level of ambition of GRASP, especially in the period leading up to the Kinshasa meetings in September 2005, was somewhat utopic. Not only were the goals and objectives far-reaching, it was also assumed that all partners would participate in all aspects of the Partnership's work. This is particularly revealed in the Partner Involvement section of the 2006 Programme of Action<sup>14</sup>, in which detailed objectives and indicators are described for GRASP. One of the main difficulties with the GRASP Programme of Action, other than the high level of ambition, is that it was never adopted officially by the GRASP Council, and thereby all partners. When the GRASP Council met (for the first and only time) in 2005, it tasked the Executive Committee and Scientific Commission to finalize the 2006-07 PoA on its behalf, in a *Decision of*

---

<sup>14</sup> Refer to section 3.3 of this report for more details on the Programme of Action



the GRASP Council.<sup>15</sup> While the PoA was finalized in April 2006, it was never put before Council as the Council did not meet again. Yet, the PoA remains the main reference document within GRASP for objectives and indicators (see section 3.3).

While at the beginning it seemed as though GRASP attempted to ‘do everything,’ in more recent years there has been a shift of focus, if fairly informal<sup>16</sup>, to ‘priority added-value’ areas. Current GRASP priorities include:

- Great Apes and Climate Change - REDD and Economic Incentives
- Great Apes and Peacebuilding – Trans-boundary collaboration and conflict resolution
- The Green Frontline – Monitoring and law enforcement, and livelihoods and community development

The concept of the ‘added-value’ of GRASP is not new, however, as outlined in the 2005 *Distinctive Approach* document. Whereas in early years the phrase ‘added-value’ was used as an argument for the *existence* of GRASP, in more recent years it has been used to help define areas of *focus* for GRASP – what can GRASP do, that individual partners are less able to do?

### 3.3 Programme of Action (PoA)

The Programme of Action was first developed in 2006, in the aftermath of the Kinshasa meeting of September 2005. Its 5-year objectives and indicators are presented in Table 3.

---

<sup>15</sup> Appendix 8, *Report of the IGM and First GRASP Council Meeting*

<sup>16</sup> GRASP ‘Big Ideas’ were discussed for the first time officially at the 2007 Executive Committee Meeting. At this time, 4 big ideas were listed: 1) Great apes and global change, 2) UN global fund for great ape conservation, 3) GRASP fortifies the green frontline of Conservation, and 4) Guardians of the great apes. Of these, 2 are listed online as current priorities.

**Table 3. Five-year objectives and indicators of the GRASP PoA**

Objectives	5-year indicators
<b>Objective 1</b> To prevent habitat loss and population decline in 50% of priority populations and habitats of each taxon of great apes, and to reduce the rate of loss or decline in 95% of the other populations	50% of priority great ape populations are demonstrably secure
	Rate of loss of other populations (95%) significantly reduced
<b>Objective 2</b> To increase great ape habitat in protected areas by 20% and eliminate habitat loss and population decline within protected areas	Protected areas in great ape habitats expanded and security improved
	Rate of loss of great apes reduced relative to 2005
<b>Objective 3</b> To identify and promote, in cooperation with local communities, economic activities compatible with great ape conservation and mitigate development activities detrimental to great ape populations and habitat	New models implemented that combine great ape conservation with development benefits
	Selected development activities impacting great apes now contain mitigation strategies
<b>Objective 4</b> To use a habitat and population monitoring and evaluation system to inform conservation decision-making	Monitoring and evaluation system established
	Outputs of monitoring and evaluation utilised by decision-makers to benefit great apes
<b>Objective 5</b> To provide the enabling conditions for the GRASP Partnership to achieve its objectives	GRASP accepted as the authoritative advisor on policies affecting the survival of great apes and their habitat
	Funding secured to achieve objectives
	GRASP rules observed and internal functions maintained

### 3.3.1 Level of attainment of the objectives

Looking at objectives 1 to 3, it is generally felt that the PoA failed on several counts. Many interviewed stakeholders thus felt that the objectives of the PoA were somewhat overambitious and that it had not been successful in guiding the GRASP strategy nor in involving partners. The objectives are thought to be outside GRASP's reach in terms of what it can realistically do for great ape conservation. It was also felt that the outcomes are too weak, and would not, even if completed, have fulfilled the overall objectives.

Actions were described in the partner involvement document which accompanies the PoA, defining the involvement and roles of partners needed to achieve the outcomes. Although these actions seem reasonable in themselves, they are not realistic about the level of partner involvement within GRASP; many of the partners have apparently not been fully committed to GRASP, despite their signature of the Kinshasa Declaration. This has in turn has affected the transparency and

collaboration that would have been needed to achieve the outcomes of the PoA. Another criticism of these actions is that they all seem very abstract, and impossible to evaluate the success of. Many of those interviewed and surveyed were not in favour of another PoA, which needs the buy-in from all the partners.

Some progress has been made on Objective 4 since the beginning of the partnership, through the combined work of the Scientific Commission, the Secretariat and the Max Planck Institute. Objective 5 links back to objectives 1 to 3 and would have needed the full commitment of all the partners, which seems to have been one of GRASP's main shortcomings.

### **3.3.2 5-year indicators**

According to most of the partners surveyed, the following 5-year indicator "Protected areas in great ape habitats expanded and security improved" has not been achieved, with some saying that the situation has in fact got worse, although there had been some (limited) expansion of protected areas in some countries. Most also felt that any improvements in the situation had mainly been due to organisations other than GRASP, with GRASP's role in the matter difficult to pinpoint. The other respondents were somewhat more divided, depending on the countries they were representing or working in.

Although the focal points surveyed thought the rate of loss of great apes had reduced since 2005, partners agreed that it had not reduced and members from the Scientific Commission remained unsure.

Regarding the "New models implemented that combine great ape conservation with development benefits" 5-year indicator, partners and members of the Scientific Commission either believe that this had not been achieved, or that these models could not necessarily be attributed to GRASP, although GRASP might have helped reinforce those models. From the Range states' point of view, models including ecotourism and REDD+ have been developed, although the role of GRASP in their development and implementation remains unclear.

Relating to the indicator on "Selected development activities impacting great apes now contain mitigation strategies", mitigation strategies exist as part of certain projects mentioned by the respondents, although all agreed that these were not attributable to GRASP and that their implementation was still far behind.

The original intention of the PoA, which was as a framework for GRASP as a whole, not just for the actions of GRASP organs. Many of the "organisations other than GRASP" were probably GRASP Partners, but it is true that the PoA was never properly rolled out and so the link between that plan and the activities of Partners was never properly established. Many partners have done things useful for GRASP objectives but not in the name of GRASP. As pointed out elsewhere, there has been fundamental confusion all along about the very nature of GRASP, and in particular about the distinction between actions undertaken a) in the name of the Partnership by the organs of GRASP and b) by the Partners individually.

## 4. The effectiveness of the Partnership

### 4.1 Defining the Partnership

From an official stand-point, GRASP is a WSSD Type II Partnership led by UNEP and UNESCO. GRASP is governed by a Council consisting of representatives of all the Partners, assisted by an elected Executive Committee and a Scientific Commission comprised of experts in great ape ecology and conservation. The GRASP Secretariat as the administrative and operational arm of the Partnership is provided jointly by UNEP and UNESCO.

GRASP is therefore a unique partnership involving UN agencies, biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements, great ape range states and donor governments, non-governmental organisations and scientists.

The key principles underlying the Partnership are, according to the Rules<sup>17</sup>, as follows:

- Becoming a GRASP partner is voluntary, on the basis of supporting the GRASP mission, goal and objectives;
- GRASP seeks to include all the main actors involved, either directly or indirectly, in the field of great ape conservation;
- GRASP does not seek to be prescriptive; GRASP actions should be supportive of and complementary to existing initiatives; it should nonetheless define the rules of work which would constitute the basis of the engagement of each country;
- At the level of the range states, key GRASP partners will be Governments, working closely wherever possible with non-governmental organisations, the academic community and the private sector;
- GRASP should monitor progress towards its goals, at both the international and national levels.

While conceived with a partnership structure, GRASP was initially labelled a project. This caused considerable confusion both within UNEP and with potential donors. It subsequently rebranded itself as a Partnership. It does indeed have partners, though many may only be dimly aware of their status. Partnership requires commitment and shared responsibility by partners, borne out of a sense of mutual advantage. These ingredients at present seem lacking.

### 4.2 Who are the partners?

There are approximately 80 GRASP partners; many more could legitimately be at the table, if all interested parties were to be represented. Some of the major organisations involved in great ape conservation efforts are, indeed, not partners: finding out why this is so surely has to be in the 'do' list of the Secretariat. For example, it is perhaps noteworthy that the biggest funders of great ape conservation, the Arcus Foundation and US Fish & Wildlife are not GRASP partners.

---

<sup>17</sup> Rules for the organization and management of the GRASP Partnership, GRASP.

One idea under consideration is to make an active attempt to bring the zoo and captive primate community into the GRASP fold, not least because of their substantial fund-raising capacity and their already large involvement in field primate projects. There are already zoos amongst the Partnership, but those on the list are at best only a subset of those zoos worldwide with a substantial interest in great ape conservation.

As we will see later in the Recommendations, this might have the effect of making GRASP an entity that is even more heavily focussed on great apes, whereas it is the view of this reviewer, that GRASP needs to concentrate more of its energies on those phenomena that are so threatening to the survival of the great apes, in particular deforestation, but including also great ape health issues and hunting for bushmeat. If this recommendation is followed, GRASP may need to be recruiting partners that have hitherto had little or nothing to do with great ape conservation, but much to do with arresting the causes of great ape decline.

All the current GRASP partners are presented in Table 4, according to their partnership category. The range states are automatically partners of GRASP, according to the Rules. Of the 23 range states 11 have no active focal point and are not engaged. Partners in other categories have also not been engaged with GRASP: some of the survey respondents were indeed surprised that their organisation was considered a partner of GRASP, and a few felt that they were so detached from it that they could not answer the survey.

Initially institutions or organisations wishing to become GRASP partners were accepted by the secretariat. Since 2005, their requests have been channelled through the Secretariat to the Executive Committee for a final decision. The GRASP Secretariat has hitherto welcomed as many partners as possible, and is now inviting more. This has resulted, according to some of our interviewees, in a weak partnership that is too dilute to be effective.

Another proposal that would extend the Partnership, and possibly also therefore dilute it, is the expansion of the scope of GRASP to include the gibbons. This was discussed at the Executive Committee meeting in Bergen in November 2011. This would increase the number of Asian range states from two to nine, thus creating more of a political centre of gravity in Asia. It would also allow the entrance of the regional association ASEAN (Association of South-East Asian Nations), which has a strong record in biodiversity conservation, and is effective at generating regional unity. On the other hand, it would represent more for the Secretariat to do and more dilution of its efforts.

This reviewer would not actively discourage the further expansion of GRASP into the zoo and captive primate community (so long as such new partners were involved in field conservation activities and so long as GRASP funds were not spent on captive animals), but would not invest in a recruitment drive, either. On the other hand, on balance the positive advantages of expansion in south and south-east Asia seem to outweigh the negatives, and should therefore be pursued with energy. To summarize, the positive advantages are that it would create a serious alliance of south-east Asians with a common interest in ape conservation, which together would

have more political weight than the existing involvement of only two<sup>18</sup> (albeit economically powerful and politically influential ones). The negative consequence of expanding GRASP to gibbons is that GRASP is already financially small and frail with limited capacity and this expansion would inevitably dilute its efforts, at least in the first instance.

---

<sup>18</sup> Malaysia and Indonesia

**Table 4. GRASP partners within each partner category**

<b>Category A Range States</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Angola</li> <li>• Burundi</li> <li>• Cameroon</li> <li>• Central African Republic</li> <li>• Congo</li> <li>• Côte d'Ivoire</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Democratic Rep. of Congo</li> <li>• Equatorial Guinea</li> <li>• Gabon</li> <li>• Ghana</li> <li>• Guinea</li> <li>• Guinea-Bissau</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indonesia</li> <li>• Liberia</li> <li>• Malaysia</li> <li>• Mali</li> <li>• Nigeria</li> <li>• Rwanda</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Senegal</li> <li>• Sierra Leone</li> <li>• Sudan</li> <li>• Tanzania</li> <li>• Uganda</li> </ul>
<b>Category B Non-Range States</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belgium</li> <li>• Denmark</li> <li>• European Commission</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• France</li> <li>• Germany</li> <li>• Ireland</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monaco</li> <li>• Norway</li> <li>• Spain</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• United Kingdom</li> <li>• United States</li> </ul>
<b>Category C Sponsoring Agencies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNEP</li> <li>• UNESCO</li> </ul>			
<b>Category D Multilateral Environment Agmt's</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CITES</li> <li>• CBD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CMS</li> <li>• WHC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ramsar Convention on Wetlands</li> </ul>	
<b>Category E Non-Governmental Organisations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• African Wildlife Foundation</li> <li>• Ape Alliance</li> <li>• Aspinall Foundation</li> <li>• Australian Orangutan Project</li> <li>• Berggorilla&amp;Regenwald</li> <li>• Bonobo Conservation Initiative</li> <li>• Born Free Foundation</li> <li>• Bristol Zoo</li> <li>• Budongo Cons. Field Stn.</li> <li>• Care for the Wild International</li> <li>• Chester Zoo</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation International</li> <li>• Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund International</li> <li>• Fauna and Flora International</li> <li>• Great Ape Trust</li> <li>• Great Ape World Heritage Species Project</li> <li>• Hutan</li> <li>• Humane Society Int.Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation</li> <li>• International Fund for Animal Welfare</li> <li>• International Gorilla Conservation Programme</li> <li>• Jane Goodall Institute</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Last Great Ape Organization</li> <li>• Lukuru Wildlife Research Project</li> <li>• Orangutan Conservancy</li> <li>• Orangutan Foundation</li> <li>• Pan African Sanctuary Alliance</li> <li>• PanEco</li> <li>• Pole Pole Foundation</li> <li>• Sumatran Orangutan Conservation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Gorilla Organisation</li> <li>• TRAFFIC</li> <li>• Tusk Trust</li> <li>• Wildlife Conservation Society</li> <li>• Wildlife Direct</li> <li>• World Wide Fund for Nature</li> <li>• Zoological Society of London</li> <li>• Redo Rural , Rwanda</li> </ul>
<b>Category F, G, H Supporting Partners</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volcanoes Safaris</li> </ul>			

### 4.3 How well has the Partnership worked?

What value does GRASP add to the numerous existing organisations and initiatives working on great apes? What are the ingredients of the Partnership?

So far, the Partnership as a whole (there is a small number of notable exceptions, of organisations participating in the Executive Committee) has been rather inert, and what has been done by GRASP has been largely done in the name of, or by, the Secretariat. In other words, quite the reverse of what one might expect in a partnership.

One ingredient of partnership that appears to be lacking, is a proper database of the partners. This blurring of the identity of the partners must surely have an impact on the sense of mutual engagement which needs to exist. This is a problem that would be relatively simple to resolve.

Another ingredient of partnership is that of improved communication. With an improved website (see section 5.2.2), the one-way communication from the Secretariat to the Partners is assured. But for a two-way flow to be a fruitful part of the dynamic, different channels need to be in place. One attempt at this has been the introduction of RSS feeds, but despite this Partners complain of not knowing what is going on with GRASP. One thing that has not worked as a communication medium with the Partnership was that of the six-monthly newsletters, publication of which lapsed some years ago. Although it was reported by the Secretariat that online newsletters were sent out until 2010, there was no record available to the consultants to clarify who the recipients of these newsletters were. It is reported that there was no feedback to these newsletters, so they were presumably not an effective means of communication. This needs attention.

One route to understanding why GRASP has not attracted a more loyal following amongst its partners is to examine what GRASP is able to spend on great ape conservation programmes, in comparison with the rest of the conservation community. It is not easy to get at a figure for annual expenditure on great ape conservation (either direct or indirect), but we do know that GRASP itself spends about \$2 million per year. This is probably not more than 4-5% of the total global spend on the conservation of great apes and their habitats. So, GRASP's efforts are dwarfed by the efforts of its partners (and other non-partners).

Being a small player with big ambitions, while many of the far bigger players are themselves GRASP partners, does not make a very tempting prospect, or a good dynamic. What are the attractions that would have enticed staff of one of the bigger players, to invest time and programme resources in the collaborative effort that is GRASP? Most of the bigger players are hard at work implementing substantial programmes of their own in the field. It is not therefore in the field that Partners are ever likely to see any comparative advantages in contributing to GRASP activities.

Such comparative advantage is more likely to be at a political level, particularly if the political dialogue is informed by more authoritative voices than can normally be heard elsewhere.



An examination of the projects undertaken in the name of the GRASP Plan of Action (see Annexe A) reveals that there was, at least in concept, an attempt to have a year-by-year, objective-by-objective approach to the partners contributing actively to the attainment of the overall five programme objectives of GRASP. But as far as can be understood from discussion with the partners now, this table was filled in following a logic of “what are you already doing and where does it best fit?” rather than “what needs to be done and which partner is in a position to do it?”

The strategy was at best piecemeal, and as far as we can judge, it scarcely influenced what the partners did at all. This represents a missed opportunity.

The Partnership needs to understand far better what it is that GRASP should be doing, and what elements of that can, realistically, be done by partners, in the name of GRASP. Finding this out, by several iterations of a dialogue with the partners, could be a useful, even a major piece of work leading up to the Council meeting in November.

#### **4.3.1 What do partners think of the Partnership?**

##### *GRASP's role as an authoritative advisor*

Although the surveyed range state partners mostly agreed that GRASP has achieved a role as the authoritative advisor on policies affecting the survival of great apes and their habitats, the NGO partners had a contrasting opinion. A few thought that some of the policy agreements and decisions taken had not been implemented or enforced, with GRASP's role remaining unclear regarding many “key” developments in the field. More than one respondent mentioned that the IUCN SSC-SGA had produced some high quality reports and guidelines in recent years and that those would probably be seen as the “authority”.

Conservation policy is a broad field, requiring the input and consultation of many stakeholders, so others thought that GRASP could be considered as **one** of the authoritative advisors on policies, although not necessarily as “the” authoritative advisor. It was stressed that if GRASP's objective was to be the authoritative advisor on policies, this might be risky due to the likelihood of failure in gaining credibility. Members of the Scientific Commission thought GRASP was somewhat authoritative, particularly in terms of its publications, but felt that they could have been better consulted in the editing of GRASP publications.

##### *On GRASP as a part of the UN system*

GRASP is one of the very few UN body dealing with species specific issues; it has a potential for policy and fundraising. It is potentially able to work with other units of UNEP, which would be essential to tackle great ape threats. There is an opportunity for GRASP to use its UN remit to elevate the profile of the fight against wildlife crime. This could be done through increased collaboration with the UNEP Post-conflict branch. It already does this but could make use of this link even more.

If GRASP's UN influence is too weak to make a high level political impact, then it should be more streamlined with its efforts: focus on 2-3 high impact strategies (such as law enforcement).

One patron felt strongly that GRASP's greatest strength is its ability to intervene in the most delicate of political situations by virtue of its UN status. This needs to be exploited to the full

GRASP needs to be doing what NGOs/partners cannot do – be the driving force to address the reasons why great ape conservation is not working [i.e. filling gaps in great ape conservation]. GRASP's responsibility should be to great apes conservation rather than to partners.

### *On GRASP in relation to big international NGO partners*

The big international NGOs set their own priorities which focus their energy on the most powerful engagements – GRASP therefore may not be a priority. Such NGOs are doing a lot of great ape conservation in the field (sometimes jointly with other NGOs), but not necessarily reporting back to GRASP.

In WWF's strategy for central Africa, for example, GRASP is not now considered at all. The biggest problem in central Africa is the lack of political support for law enforcement efforts (corruption and weak enforcement), therefore GRASP could bring the UN backing so that governments might actually listen. There is a need to look at the judiciary systems, up to the highest levels (the work that LAGA is doing is very good).

### *The energy behind the GRASP idea*

The partners generally agreed that there had been a lot of energy and enthusiasm at the start of GRASP, but that both had decreased in recent years. With new leadership now in place, there is a positive sense that things are changing for the better. They were more divided however on the reasons why the tailing-off had happened:

- Lack of engagement or communication with partners on implementation of projects
- Lack of strategic planning and follow-up on GRASP's early successes;
- Poor project management in some cases and failure to support local projects in partner countries<sup>19</sup>;
- The expectations were unrealistic at the outset and had not had a reality-check at the time of the Kinshasa meeting, five years later;
- Lack of use of its political leverage to influence great ape range states to adhere to national wildlife law and the various international agreements aimed at protecting great apes.

From the Scientific Commission's point of view, this slowing down in energy could be attributable to the disconnection between the Secretariat and the field based

---

<sup>19</sup> In fact, this perception is incorrect as GRASP project management was recently ranked highly by the UNEP oversight unit

projects. GRASP has seemed to be struggling with fundraising and its organs like the Scientific Commission have not been utilized to their full extent. It bears careful consideration, however, as to how GRASP organs can be best be utilized to this effect, as to avoid potential conflicts of interest between their members representing both GRASP and their own Partner organisations.

### *Role of partners*

The majority of partners surveyed did not have a clear idea about GRASP's expectations and about their role within the Partnership. This was particularly true amongst NGO partners. The majority of those questioned acknowledged that most partners had not met their responsibilities and that GRASP as a whole had not been able to hold partners accountable for promised contributions to the overall GRASP programme, in terms of funding, projects or otherwise. From the survey responses and interviews, it was understood that GRASP has been seen by many partners as a fundraising agency, able to access more readily funds for which NGOs or smaller organisations are not eligible. They have therefore been interested in it more as a potential funder of their own activities than as a coordinator and catalyst of their collective activities conducted as part of a partnership effort.

### *Partner engagement*

At the recent Executive Committee meeting in Bergen, it was agreed that GRASP needed to re-engage the partners to transform it into a more active Partnership. Although it may be that some partners would not be returning to the GRASP fold, it seemed more important during this discussion for GRASP to rebuild trust among a dedicated group first.

Some of the key elements to partner engagement that emerged from that discussion are:

- That GRASP should aspire to be a key contact point on great ape conservation for range states. GRASP has grown considerably biased towards an NGO consortium, with little leadership or activity among governments. Maintaining effective two way communication with range states has proved to be, and remains, a key challenge for the GRASP Secretariat. Recommendations for improving relationships with GRASP focal points are discussed further in Section 5.4.
- That reporting and monitoring and national monitoring workshops are an important element of revitalising the Partnership.
- That there are several ways in which partners can get more engaged, for example by seconding staff to the secretariat, or take on some of its responsibilities for specific technical areas.

### *Strengths and weaknesses*

Table 5 provides a list of the strengths and weaknesses mentioned by individuals surveyed and interviewed. From a quick glance, it seems obvious that more weaknesses were mentioned than strengths.

**Table 5. Strengths and weaknesses of GRASP identified by individuals surveyed and interviewed**

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scientific knowledge and expertise</li> <li>• UN linkages, providing potential political weight and credibility</li> <li>• Access to operational funding</li> <li>• Access to other UN or international agencies</li> <li>• Potential to influence policy</li> <li>• Role in awareness-raising and fundraising</li> <li>• Multi-stakeholder platform</li> <li>• Partner dedication and diversity, available to be tapped</li> <li>• Flagship species approach, unusual for a UN programme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor communication in the past</li> <li>• Dilution of scarce resources between two continents and the dichotomy between orang-utans and African apes</li> <li>• Lack of international reputation or weight</li> <li>• Working within an organisation (UNEP) that has little knowledge of managing field conservation projects involving a number of partners</li> <li>• Executive Committee inert when most needed in absence of Coordinator</li> <li>• Lack of transparency and accountability in decision-making in the past</li> <li>• Lack of vision, strategy and understanding of the capacity building needed</li> <li>• Lack of widespread involvement of range state nationals</li> <li>• Lack of engagement with and clear presence within range states</li> <li>• Bureaucratic slowness on the part of UNEP</li> <li>• Difficulties in defining GRASP</li> <li>• Lack of effective coordination among partners</li> </ul>

#### **4.3.2 Efficiency of the Partnership**

The primary concern amongst the surveyed NGO partners was the lack of communication: there was a general feeling that GRASP had not communicated adequately either with its partners or with the conservation community as a whole, and that GRASP has been unaware of its partners' activities.

Another concern was the management of GRASP and the absence of a clear strategy with indicators, which would then have enabled GRASP's effectiveness to be measured. GRASP was also thought by some to have been inefficient in terms of following-up reports and initiatives, of using its political capital, and of building support for range state partners.

On the other hand, GRASP was generally thought to have produced some good reports on great apes (though members of the Scientific Commission are uneasy in some cases about, what some members felt were, poor checking of facts in these

reports) and demonstrated its ability to mobilise resources through a number of projects (for example with LAGA and Hutan).

Range state partners were generally more positive about the Partnership's efficiency through the support given to some of the range states, particularly relating to the development of action plans and the sharing of knowledge and experience. However, one concern was that no further assemblies or meetings had occurred after the signing of the Kinshasa Declaration. Limitations in funding to support projects at the national level, limitations in training opportunities and a lack of support for focal points were also mentioned.

UNESCO staff members surveyed thought that GRASP had failed to establish itself a solid niche and that it had acted as a "big NGO" rather than a coordination mechanism. Although it has failed to establish a reporting mechanism from partners, GRASP has been able to raise some awareness towards great ape conservation among the international policy community, integrating the flagship species approach with the ecosystem approach in its operations. This is a positive achievement.

According to the Scientific Commission members surveyed, a general lack of transparency and poor communication, a heavy administration structure and the lack of a vision that could be implemented in the field have been mainly responsible for GRASP's ineffectiveness. GRASP has, however, been effective in raising international awareness on the plight of Great Apes, mobilizing resources for great ape conservation (to a limited extent), facilitating international cooperation in great ape conservation, and committing range states and donor countries to protect populations of great ape (through the Kinshasa Declaration). On the other hand, it has not been in a position to follow up on the declaration, to monitor whether or not the engagements made by range states and others have been honoured.

#### 4.3.3 Summary

In summary, the following can be said about the Partnership:

- It has not reached the original goal of achieving more together than any of the partners could expect to do alone
- The partners are generally preoccupied with their own programmes, and either forget about GRASP or relegate its priority in their thinking
- The partners have not found it easy to contribute to a commonly defined programme of collective actions
- The partners feel that the Secretariat, over the years, has not communicated well with them, while the Secretariat feels that the partners are not responsive to its communications
- The present set of partners is not necessarily the best group of organisations to influence the threats to the conservation of great apes
- Major work is needed to create a coherent form of partnership, to which partners will feel committed

## 5. The effectiveness of GRASP's organs

As GRASP was growing, it evolved into a multi-dimensional structure, whose coherence was dependent on a number of assumptions:

- That there would be enough funds to finance all components of the structure;
- That the signatories to the Kinshasa Declaration, the partners, would participate fully in the Partnership's work;
- That exposure to its work and its successes would reinforce its legitimacy in the eyes of others and hence the need for its basic structure.

This has not turned out to be the case.

A few comments follow, about each of the components of the structure.

### 5.1 Executive Committee

#### 5.1.1 Structure

The GRASP Executive Committee, according to the Rules<sup>20</sup> is composed of:

- Four range state partners (category A), to be elected on a sub-regional basis (three from Africa and one from South-East Asia);
- Two non-range state partners (category B);
- One member nominated by UNESCO and one nominated by UNEP (category C partners);
- One member from Multilateral Agreements partners (category D);
- Two NGO partners (category E).

Also according to the Rules, the functions of the Executive Committee are to undertake the following:

- Monitor the implementation of GRASP policies;
- Oversee attainment of GRASP objectives and to decide on the funding of GRASP projects;
- Commission and oversee implementation of the GRASP's role in the Global Strategy for the Survival of Great Apes and Their Habitat;
- Decide on the admission, suspension, expulsion, or limitation of the rights of full partners and supporting partners;
- Seek the advice of the Scientific Commission on any issues included in the Commission's terms of reference;
- Approve the annual budgets and work plans of the secretariat, Scientific Commission and the technical support teams;
- Oversee the activities of GRASP patrons and to approve secretariat recommendations regarding appointments; and
- Assume such other functions as are deemed necessary by the GRASP Council.

---

<sup>20</sup> Rules for the organization and management of the GRASP Partnership, GRASP.

These functions are not very *executive* and the language in which they are couched allows the Committee to be very hands-off. For a partnership, this is not the most constructive way of doing business. In fact, however, the Executive Committee has sensibly interpreted its remit more widely than this and has been pragmatic in giving the Secretariat broader support

### **5.1.2 Performance**

Since, as we shall see below, the Council has proved to be a non-existent structure, the burden of both supervision and of orientation of GRASP has, in effect, been borne alone by the Executive Committee. Since GRASP has remained a relatively small enterprise, this has been perfectly appropriate.

The Committee has met six times.

Curiously, the Executive Committee did not meet at all for two years between November 2009 and November 2011, coinciding with the very time that GRASP was without a Coordinator. It is at times like this that supervisory Committees need to rally around and fill the void created by the absence of senior professional staff. Considering the fact that GRASP is a partnership, it is testimony to the frailty of the partnership as a governing concept that the partners did not see fit to organise meetings, even in the absence of the Coordinator. Nor did UNEP, the Secretariat's host body. The Executive Committee, UNEP, and earlier UNESCO, have all claimed to have the 'final word' on GRASP issues. It does seem, however, that this is only the case when setting limits on GRASP, and not when it comes to taking risks or permitting GRASP to stretch. In these areas senior leadership has been lacking.

## **5.2 The Secretariat**

The two sponsoring agencies, UNESCO and UNEP, are expected to provide the staff for the Secretariat. In reality, UNEP has taken most of this responsibility (with the help of other donor agencies) and the GRASP offices are based at the UNEP headquarters in Nairobi. UNEP funds one full time coordinator, and funded one full time support person from 2005 -2009. UNESCO provides no staff currently.

**Table 6. Assessment of the functions of the Secretariat**

<b>Functions of the Secretariat as detailed in the Rules<sup>21</sup></b>	<b>Extent to which the Secretariat has achieved this function</b>
To promote the work of GRASP	The Partnership has not functioned effectively, partly for want of promotion
To monitor the performance of GRASP-funded activities	The Secretariat has reported reasonably regularly on its activities
To define a two-year cycle of project funding, within which each range state would be able to submit a project for funding by GRASP	This does not seem to have happened
To solicit and if necessary help prepare projects for funding	This has worked, though the scale of funding falls way short of the needs
To request advice from the Scientific Commission on project priorities and other issues included in the Commission's terms of reference	The Sci. Comm. feels underused as a resource
To provide information on GRASP to interested parties, including through the GRASP website	Until very recently the website was poor; now solved
To determine the composition and activities of the technical support teams, including the development of their terms of reference, taking into consideration the advice of the Scientific Commission, and oversee the work of those teams	While the one TST was initially a very flexible form of bypassing obstacles to efficiency, its work does not seem well enough articulated into that of the Secretariat
To appoint GRASP patrons, with the approval of the Executive Committee	This was done; though beyond their appointment, they have not been very well used
To raise funds for GRASP activities	In that two medium-sized grants were won, this has been achieved
To facilitate communication between GRASP partners and the Executive Committee	This seems always to have been a struggle, largely due to inertia on the part of the Partners
To liaise with existing donors and keep them regularly updated	Regular reports have been produced; the reporting on the EC grant was very favourably reviewed
To be responsible for the finances and accounting of GRASP and to report to the GRASP Council on such matters	This has been achieved, except in the matter of reporting to the Council, at least in live session
To be responsible for the day-to-day functioning of the Partnership	The Secretariat has generally been efficient; yet the Partnership has not functioned in an effective way

<sup>21</sup> Rules for the organization and management of the GRASP Partnership, GRASP.



Without the Secretariat, GRASP would not have had the momentum to exist. It has been, and is, the pivot around which GRASP has revolved. Most staff members however, with the exception of the coordinator, are on 6-month non-permanent contracts. This therefore limits the Secretariat's capacity. The number of individuals working in the Secretariat at any time has never been greater than 11 (see Table 7).

**Table 7. Staff members of GRASP's UNEP Secretariat from 2005 to 2011**

Secretariat staff	Category	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Sapna Mulki	Intern							
Claudia Reitmaier	Intern							
Dominique Auger *	Intern then consultant							
Daniel Malonza	UNV							
Melanie Virtue	UNEP staff							
GRASP Secretary	UNEP staff							
Matthew Woods	Consultant							
Johannes Refisch	UNEP contract							
Finance assistant for EC project	Assistant							
Yulia Stange *	Intern then consultant							
Audrey Wandera	UNV, since July consultant						65%	65%
Armanda Filippo *	Intern							
Katarina Maschner	Intern							
Olivier Boussier	Intern							
Eleonore Hellard	Intern							
Jason Jabbour	Consultant							
Johann Jenson	Consultant				80%	80%	70%	80%
Sarah Cheroben	UNV						50%	50%
Julie Belmont	Intern							
Douglas Cress	UNEP staff							
<b>Total</b>		<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>&lt;4</b>	<b>&lt;4</b>

It is to be noted that five of the interns/consultants (marked with an \*) have been provided with partial funding from the Canadian government and IISD, for the first six months of their time at UNEP.

A number of observations can be made about this Table. For example:

- At its peak of activity, in 2007-2008, the number of people working in the secretariat was relatively high, for a programme with such limited financial resources
- Because of reliance on interns and consultants, the turnover of staff (whether they were staff in legal terms, does not matter in this context) has been very high. While high staff turnover can, in and of itself, be an issue as institutional knowledge is lost with individuals who leave, and new staff must be trained, an accompanying problem is that of the large amount of time that needed to be spent preparing and issuing new contracts several times each year.
- The present complement, at just under 4 full-time-equivalents, is as low as it has been for 6 or more years
- The ephemeral nature of the staff highlights the fact that GRASP lives on the threads of project funding and has not been able to build the enduring human capacity that would be the natural accompaniment to a more enduring programme
- However many people have worked at any one time in the GRASP Secretariat, there has never been more than one professional post funded through UNEP's own funds

This tells an eloquent story about UNEP's priorities up till now. Two short-term grants, from the EC and the Spanish Government respectively, have permitted the temporary enrolment of a critical mass of people working on GRASP. But UNEP has apparently not felt that GRASP was a high enough priority to justify the allocation of any more central programme funds to the initiative, beyond the costs associated with the post of Coordinator. This is something which works both ways: UNEP, through its two-yearly work-planning process which is approved by the Governing Council, may not have seen fit to support GRASP more than it has. On the other hand, GRASP, through its Secretariat, may not have lobbied hard enough for greater support.

Some of the blame for this should be placed, in a non-specific way, at the feet of the GRASP partners, who are, in many ways, freer to lobby whomsoever they will both in UNEP and on its Governing Council, than are the staff of the Secretariat, who are constrained by the hierarchical nature of the management structures within UNEP.

If UNEP wishes GRASP to prosper, there will be no simpler way to show this than to reinforce its core staff and the degree of authority of the head of the Secretariat (currently called the Coordinator), to enable them to drive forward the strategic vision of the GRASP enterprise.

UNEP's slow performance, taking almost two years to replace the Coordinator, did nothing for the momentum of GRASP, though the remaining staff clearly did all in their power to keep things going. To enable GRASP to be effective, it seems clear that the Secretariat needs to be given greater authority, both by UNEP and by the Council.

### 5.2.1 Managing field projects

What GRASP does with most of its money is spend it (mainly, but not exclusively) in the field and mainly through the agency of its partners. Table 8 shows this to be the case. The usefulness of the GRASP Secretariat in this needs to be examined in more detail: there is little doubt of the value of the individual projects themselves. If the only means of gaining access to the funds (currently, the Spanish LifeWeb programme being the largest donor) made available to GRASP, was through the intermediary of UNEP, then the role played by the GRASP Secretariat was valuable. However, obtaining funds and channelling them to great apes conservation could also potentially have been achieved with a close collaboration of a partner and UNEP, without the need for a partnership. In the case of the EC grant, one commentator on the draft report noted, it almost certainly came about because the EU liked the idea of NGOs working together in a partnership rather than applying individually. The existence of the partnership probably did unlock funding as that was attractive idea but that does not in and of itself mean that collaborating in overseeing the management of field programs is an appropriate domain for the GRASP Secretariat. Many NGO partners do, however, view GRASP's access, via the UN system, to funding sources that would not normally be accessible to individual NGO partners as an important advantage of GRASP.

Although some of the respondents surveyed were aware of a variety of field projects funded or managed by GRASP, many could not name any. Respondents able to name GRASP field-based projects generally thought that GRASP had enhanced these projects, but principally in providing additional funding to the projects rather than direct involvement. There seems to be a lack of coordination between GRASP and other organisations working on great apes in range states, which results in a lack of clarity in the direction and vision of GRASP.

It is not clear that this is the role that the Partnership wishes the Secretariat to play. Many respondents felt that GRASP should not be a project manager, but more an interface between science and policy, and a communicator and advocate for change.

Perhaps more important than acting purely as a source of funds, is the collaboration that GRASP has already undertaken with partners on the design of certain cross-cutting project such as transboundary initiatives in both Mayombe and Tai-Sapo. The Secretariat designed projects and approached funders on these issues and both projects would not have happened without GRASP support.

Table 8, below, shows recent GRASP projects. It is interesting to note that the Garamba project through LifeWeb / African Parks Network does not include *any* great apes or great ape habitat. It is a savannah national park that was forced on GRASP as part of the LifeWeb funding package, yet it is a high-maintenance project that currently draws a disproportionate amount of time and resources. This is a perfect example of the type of projects that GRASP should avoid.

**Table 8. List of GRASP projects between 2010 and 2011**

<b>Project title</b>	<b>Funding (USD)</b>	<b>Period</b>	<b>Implementer</b>	<b>Is the implementer a partner?</b>
Support to conservation activities in Garamba NP, DRC	463,956 (Spain UNEP LifeWeb Initiative)	10/2010 – 10/2011	Africa Parks Network	no
Protecting critical orang-utan habitat through strengthening protected areas in northern Sumatra	375,000 (Spain – UNEP LifeWeb Initiative)	09/2011 – 08/2013	UNESCO	yes
Strengthening the management and protection of Protected Areas in Northern Congo	789,620 (Spain UNEP LifeWeb Initiative)	03/2011 – 02/2013	WCS	yes
Monitoring, conflict resolution and rehabilitation in Kahuzi-Biega NP, DRC	168,080	06/2011 – 09/2012	WCS	yes
Piloting a landscape-scale approach to Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD), to protect Cross River Gorilla habitat as part of the Takamanda-Mone Landscape Project and the WCS Cameroon Biodiversity Program	96,000 (Spain-UNEP LifeWeb Initiative)	10/2010 – 11/2011	WCS	yes
Transboundary collaboration in the Tai-Sapo Landscape (Cote d'Ivoire & Liberia)	90,000 (Norway)	10/2011 – 04/2012	Wild Chimpanzee Foundation	yes
Orang-utans and Economics of sustainable forest management	171,180 (Norway and Monaco)	04/2010 – 09/2011	PanEco and Grid Arendal	yes and no respectively
The Last Stand of the Gorilla	150,000 (UNEP Environment Fund, France, and GRID Arendal)	10/2009 – 04/2010	Grid Arendal	no
High conservation value forest approach in Indonesia	34,495 (France)	08/2011 – 02/2012	Great Ape World Heritage Species Project	yes
Road Map for the creation of a Transboundary Protected Area Complex in the Mayombe Landscape	285,677 (Norway)	04/2011 – 01/2011	IUCN	yes

### *Projects - GRASP's role*

Most of the partners surveyed agreed that GRASP's role towards its projects should remain chiefly related to accessing funds which would otherwise not be accessible to NGOs or other partners; many thought that the management and implementation aspects of the projects should therefore remain the responsibility of the partners themselves. If GRASP is awarded the funding, however, of course it must administer it, and follow guidelines set by UNEP. This mismatch of expectations needs to be addressed going forward. This type of misinformed expectation was also revealed in a respondent expressing the opinion that GRASP should be clearer on the identity of the original donor and that it should not take a commission out of these funds for managing them. It needs to be clarified to partners that GRASP does not take a commission – UNEP as host agency does. The rate varies between 7 – 13 % and is set by the governments that comprise UNEP. GRASP does not receive this commission other than perhaps indirectly through funding supplied to GRASP. Other potential roles for GRASP included:

- The coordination of multiple organisations to work towards a common goal/conservation problem;
- The funding of an emergency grant for great apes in general (rather than be a fundraiser for individual projects and programmes)<sup>22</sup>;
- Monitoring and evaluation of projects<sup>23</sup>;
- Provide consultative support on the implementation and management of projects, with clear long-term, Partnership-wide objectives and work plans in place to maintain momentum in a constructive, strategic manner under the GRASP banner;
- The assessment of priority areas and effective projects;<sup>24</sup>
- Use its political influence to back projects in issues of political will and corruption;
- Encourage results-based conservation and highlighting where tangible results are achieved and where better accountability is built;
- engage government support for projects, both national and local, and enhance media coverage and interest, in order to garner a feeling of greater role and responsibility (and hence support) for projects from government;
- Capacity building of project members through materials and training to provide continuity

Members of the Scientific Commission had similar views as the partners surveyed, believing that GRASP's primary responsibilities should be to secure funding, help identify and design important initiatives, promote these with governments and other agencies, and help design and promote policies that use results of these projects.

---

<sup>22</sup> The GRASP Secretariat has previously looked into setting up such a fund, but the UNEP administrative structure proved prohibitive. This should be revisited.

<sup>23</sup> While NGOs might not look kindly on GRASP monitoring their individual projects, overall monitoring of the success or failure of great ape conservation efforts would be valuable. Refer to the *GRASP Monitoring Tool* for an attempt to do exactly this. This could be better used.

<sup>24</sup> This was a driver behind the GRASP 'Big Ideas': to design projects, contribute technical expertise, and include UN networks in projects, rather than just providing additional funds to NGOs

These respondents were more open to the idea of GRASP implementing projects, or at least having a management role.

Members of the Executive Committee, in their most recent meeting, agreed that GRASP needs to carefully review projects in terms of message, audience, possible outcomes and benefits, using the GRASP Secretariat as the hub for all communication, and including the Executive Committee in the review process. The “Act Now for Orangutans” was cited as an example of a campaign that was extremely rushed. Future campaigns would benefit from a more consultative process involving the Executive Committee, but should still be undertaken as projects such as this help to maintain public profile, garner media attention, and capture imagination.

### **5.2.2 Communication**

More communication is needed between the GRASP Secretariat and its partners as GRASP communications have not been effective to date. Newsletters and Partnership updates have been sporadic and information-heavy. While Partnership updates were conceived as a monthly idea originally, in reality only eight have been sent to date. The last hardcopy newsletter was published in 2007. Digital newsletters were reported to have been sent sporadically until 2010, but the reviewer received mixed reports of how widely these were received. More frequent, more engaging updates to the Partnership are needed on a monthly basis.

A GRASP communication strategy going forward was discussed at the most recent Executive Committee meeting in November 2011, and will focus on “having a good story to tell,” based on the work being done by the Partnership. Since its inception, GRASP has struggled to get the word out about its own work. The new communication strategy aims to focus both on internal communication within the Partnership, as well as external communication with stakeholders, new supporters and donors. A new logo was also introduced, and was supported, though it has met opposition outside the Committee, subsequently.

### ***Publications***

GRASP publications such as the *World Atlas for Great Apes and their Conservation* and the *State of Emergency* reports for orangutans and gorillas are seen to have a powerful impact coming from a UN body. Members of the Scientific Commission have expressed concern about their factual accuracy, which raises questions about the process by which publications are reviewed and approved. The reviewer received mixed reports on whether the Scientific Commission was given sufficient opportunity to review GRASP publications. The Secretariat maintains that the Scientific Commission was consulted and given as much time as possible to comment in each case, while some members of the Commission feel differently. One case is that of the report *Orangutans and Economics of Sustainable Forest Management*, which was sent to the Scientific commission twice for review, each with generous review deadlines, whereas the *Last Stand of the Gorilla* was given for review to the Scientific Commission with a much tighter deadline for comments. In order to address the issue of ensuring adequate review of GRASP publications, it seems that is might

simply be a matter of better communication between the Secretariat and the Scientific Commission, and allowances as far as is feasible for the fact that many members of the Scientific Commission spend time in the field away from internet connections.

### ***Reporting***

Suggestions for a GRASP reporting format to improve communication between GRASP partners include following either the format recently adopted by the CMS Gorilla Agreement or UNESCO's current format. This format was suggested at the Executive Committee meeting in Bergen, November 2011 as a potential method of improving communication with partners.

### ***Website***

In earlier years, the UNEP GRASP website was difficult to find and hard to navigate. The current website is hosted outside of UNEP and is much clearer and user friendly. Survey respondents generally felt that the new website looks great, but one felt that it was targeted a bit too much at people already involved in great ape conservation, rather than the lay person. It was also suggested by a respondent that the website could provide more up-to-date scientific information and literature on great ape conservation, for example through Primate Lit<sup>25</sup> or in collaboration with the International Primatological Society (IPS).

## **5.3 The UN sponsors**

### **5.3.1 The role of UNEP**

From the outset, UNEP has played a pivotal role in the creation of and support to GRASP. But it has not all been straightforward.

Both interviewees and questionnaire respondents have drawn attention to the frustrations they have experienced at the hands of UNEP's slow and cumbersome administrative procedures. We have heard too many accounts of funding opportunities lost, initiatives stifled and activities delayed because of UNEP's procedures, for these to be lightly shrugged off. These problems constitute a genuine down-side for GRASP. If GRASP is to connect with a wider public, and harness the enormous fund-raising potential that UNEP's leadership believes it to possess, it needs to confront these issues with UNEP's senior management, and work out how to overcome them. Several of our interviewees believe that much could be achieved by elevating the status of the GRASP Coordinator, in order to vest that person with greater autonomy and authority.

The GRASP Secretariat might do well to study how it is that other UN agencies, such as UNICEF, market themselves and fundraise as NGOs rather than as typical UN agencies

---

<sup>25</sup> See <http://primatelit.library.wisc.edu>

The majority of individuals surveyed and interviewed felt that UNEP and UNESCO are appropriate sponsoring agencies for GRASP: being part of UN bodies was therefore thought to increase GRASP's credibility, its political weight and its links with other agencies. Despite this positive rating, however, some reserves were voiced regarding the lack of collaboration between UNEP and UNESCO, and the lack of use of their combined influence at a sufficiently senior political level. Some respondents expressed the wish to see an increase in collaboration with other agencies, both within and outside the UN.

The support for UNEP, coming perhaps most strongly in this review from those who are least close to it day by day, conveys a prevailing sense that UNEP is felt to confer potential convening power as well as political gravitas on GRASP. These are commodities which might elude GRASP elsewhere. Respondents are more ambivalent about the role of UNESCO. But these same commentators feel that UNEP's potential cannot be met without strong and visible support, and willingness to solve problems,, from its top executives.

One problem for GRASP within UNEP is that it is all-but invisible in UNEP's principal planning tool, the biennial Programme of Work, which is approved by the Governing Council. This needs careful exploration, both by the management of DEPI, the Division of UNEP within which the GRASP Secretariat is housed, and by the GRASP's own Secretariat staff.

If GRASP itself is to act as a coordinator of great apes conservation projects, and add value to other conservation efforts, then it needs to be resourced properly. Since its inception, it has been given little in the way of central support from UNEP – certainly not to the level that great ape conservation needs. UNEP needs to decide whether it wants to continue with the GRASP initiative – and resource it properly – or not (and close GRASP). Its absence hitherto from the Programme of Work has suggested that it has had but lowly status: its potential inclusion would make a big difference to the elevation of its status and importance in the array of priority UNEP activities.

There are not many alternatives to UNEP for hosting the GRASP Secretariat. The big international NGOs are too preoccupied with their own affairs and have mainly not been strong supporters of GRASP (WCS being the most obvious exception). WCMC is a possibility, but its mandate really only covers a part of what GRASP needs to be doing. The conventions (WHC, CBD and CMS) are a possibility, but they are based on partnerships of range states (the Parties to each Convention) and do not have formal space for the NGOs. IUCN and the SGA of the Primate Specialist Group is the body offering the most obvious potential fit.

In reviewing these alternatives, we are well aware that it would be extremely disruptive to move the Secretariat elsewhere and there would have to be compelling reasons to do so. At the moment, we are not persuaded that those compelling reasons exist (although some of our interviewees certainly do so).

The fact is that the UN still has great leverage and GRASP still has the capacity to capture attention, though it is probable that it is easier to capture that attention with audiences in the industrialised world, than in the great ape range states themselves.



UNEP has the still unmet potential to add value to the ongoing work of partners for the conservation of great apes and their habitats.

### 5.3.2 The role of UNESCO

During the 6<sup>th</sup> Executive Committee meeting in November 2011, UNESCO's commitment to GRASP was reiterated by its representative (Noéline Raondry-Rakotaorisoa). Recent UNESCO activities pertaining to GRASP therefore included:

- Publication in 2009 of the French version of the « *l'Atlas Mondial des Grands Singes et la Conservation de leurs Habitats* », UNESCO/MAB – UNEP/WCMC – MNHN and other Partners.
- A publication on the results of the UNESCO-GRASP award programme from 2006-2009 is in preparation.
- The extension of work in Central Africa to promote environmental education materials to sensitise children to great apes<sup>26</sup>.

UNESCO staff would like to see the exploitation of all potential links between GRASP's programme and the networks of World Heritage natural sites and of Biosphere Reserves which they coordinate. This makes perfectly good sense. There is a potential opportunity here that could perhaps be better exploited: use the World Heritage networks and Man and Biosphere (MAB) National Committees as entry points to strengthen GRASP's relationship with range state governments. According to UNESCO, 70% of GRASP range states have MAB Committees. The UNESCO GRASP representative plans to invite GRASP focal points to sit on these committees.

Two specific MAB –GRASP connections to be made better use of include:

1. Indonesia is reported to have a strong MAB national committee that could potentially act as a key advocate for GRASP in the country
2. Malaysia has a large Biosphere Reserve Project in Sabah that is reportedly fairly far along in the nomination process. As the area comprises key orangutan habitat, a good case could potentially be made for getting Malaysia more involved in GRASP through this project.

Despite this apparently positive report, the general feeling amongst our interviewees was that UNESCO's role within GRASP has been quite weak, and that the organisation's involvement has actually been declining. It is possible that this is due, at least in part, to the recent withdrawal of US funding to UNESCO, although it seems that the decline in UNESCO's involvement in GRASP began prior to this. UNESCO's contributions to the GRASP programme have certainly been greater, and more explicit, than those of many of the GRASP partners, but more was expected of the two UN sponsors.

It is fair to say that it would be greatly appreciated by the Partnership as a whole, and possibly by UNEP in particular, if UNESCO were able to commit more resources to GRASP. But if the reality continues to be that it has none to commit, GRASP is probably still better with the joint imprimatur of two UN agencies, instead of just one.

---

<sup>26</sup> The material has been used in two sample project sites so far in Central Africa.

UNESCO is keen to continue as joint GRASP UN host agency, and to contribute in so far as possible given the realities of their current funding situation. UNESCO will unlikely ever be able to commit a full time staff member to the Secretariat, but hopes to continue providing technical expertise. UNESCO is also set to host the next GRASP Council Meeting in Paris, to help send a signal to partners that it takes GRASP seriously.

## 5.4 Focal points

According to the Rules<sup>27</sup>, all range states are automatically full partners. Although Malaysia never signed the Kinshasa Declaration, it is still considered a partner under the Rules. Range state governments are supposed to nominate a focal point, who will be the point of contact between GRASP and any relevant administrations of the range state.

Although this structure was designed to keep the range states appropriately involved, (and closely resembles the way in which the Conventions maintain contact with their Parties) GRASP does not seem to have had a very fruitful relationship with its focal points, nor do they, according to our interviewees, have very active relations with GRASP partners in their countries. Reasons for this may include the high turnover amongst Focal Points and at times the absence of technical knowledge (about great apes, in particular). Within the range states, there is also a sense of expectations raised, but unmet.

There was a West African regional workshop in December 2009 which was intended to promote cooperation and communication among GRASP regional representatives. A lack of communication between focal points and the Secretariat had already been flagged by some of the focal points during that 2009 workshop. This was accompanied by requests to improve the communication capacity of some of them.

Amongst our interviewees and respondents, there has been a general feeling that focal points have not been proactive on the whole; indeed we noticed that the response rate of focal points to the survey was very low. Amongst those interviewed, there was a general sense that the GRASP focal points lacked direction; in order to become truly useful to the Partnership, it may be that the focal points need to be held more accountable for their position.

One way of improving their performance would be if they were nominated by a neutral professional body, such as IUCN, on the basis of known competence and engagement in the matter in hand, rather than being appointed by their Administrations, for reasons that are sometimes obscure. In this case, however, their ability to speak on behalf of the range state government might be compromised.

This form of representation can work: the MIKE programme, housed next door to GRASP in the UNEP headquarters, but dependent on the CITES Convention, has a network of focal points in the elephant range states, upon whom it absolutely

---

<sup>27</sup> Rules for the organization and management of the GRASP Partnership, GRASP.

depends as intermediaries. The difference, of course, is that they are focal points for a programme that is a formal part of a Convention, to which their States are parties. There is no other membership structure. Another difference is that MIKE has funding to spend in each country on capacity building activities, whereas GRASP has not had this.

The problem for GRASP and its focal points is that there is no binding agreement, no formal reciprocal obligation. GRASP aspires to a formality that only exists through the Kinshasa declaration; and all the evidence so far suggests that the Declaration has not proved to be a very powerful or enduring tool. As GRASP will likely never have the engagement that CITES has, for example, through its powerful non-compliance procedures and requirements for domestic legislation, it might do well to consider the opposite approach – how to entice focal points and range state governments to become more engaged. Perhaps through funding opportunities.

Although all great ape range states are GRASP partners, it is worth noting that many of the decisions that are most threatening to the interests of great apes emanate, at least in part, from decisions taken by those same range states governments (on land-use, for example). The involvement of these authorities is thus even more important for the Partnership.

## 5.5 Scientific Commission

### 5.5.1 Functions

The functions of the Scientific Commission are the following:

- Provide independent and scientifically sound advice to the Partnership, including to the technical support teams;
- Advise the Secretariat on the composition and activities of the technical support teams;
- Provide advice relating to the development of the Partnership's strategic goals and objectives and activities to achieve them;
- Monitor the status of great ape populations and evaluate the status and trajectory of populations relative to the GRASP goal and overall objectives;
- Conduct studies of alternative conservation strategies and investments, make recommendations to improve the effectiveness of conservation funding and efforts and provide advice on measures significant to regional and international great ape conservation;
- Provide advice on great ape conservation issues within range states, liaise with other experts within those states and advise on national plans for great ape conservation;
- Where there are donor funds available, to review and provide advice on the funding of project proposals submitted to the GRASP and referred by the Secretariat. A conflict of interest may arise if a Commission member seeks funding from GRASP. In such a case, the Commission member will not participate in the Commission's discussions about the funding request;
- Provide advice and comment on official GRASP literature, reports and other documents;

- Provide advice on the design and programming of GRASP thematic workshops focusing on industry and the conservation of great apes (e.g., timber, eco-tourism, mineral extraction, etc).

### 5.5.2 Performance

After an apparently faltering start, characterised by unproductive internal bickering, the Scientific Commission appears to have settled into an efficient and authoritative body, able to provide the Secretariat with good information and sound opinions.

Although the Scientific Commission is now able to do this, a number of Commission members feel that their advice is not often enough heeded, and that its advice is also not often enough sought. One result of this has been that a number of GRASP's publications have not been well enough peer-reviewed, allowing incorrect facts and interpretations to get into print in documents bearing GRASP's and UNEP's logos. This is a source of some concern. As discussed earlier, the Secretariat does feel that it provided as much review time as possible in each case. It is a perhaps a matter of more clear communication and procedures for the review of publications.

This being so, there is a clear need for the protocols between the Commission and the Secretariat to be tightened up, and for the Secretariat to be more energetic and punctilious in seeking the Scientific Commission's advice

There is a strong sense from many quarters that one of the functions of GRASP should be to act as intermediary between authoritative science and policy. Certain individuals interviewed also expressed the concern that there had not been enough science in GRASP publications so far, and that more collaboration with scientists in the field was needed. The Scientific Commission seems to have positioned itself to do that, in collaboration with a number of other initiatives (such as IUCN/ SGA's APES Database). The Scientific Commission is closely linked with the IUCN-SSC/SGA as this institution nominates 6 of the Scientific Commission's members. Despite this proximity, the Scientific Commission seems to have found an effective way of differentiating its work from that of IUCN's Section on Great Apes of the Primate Specialist Group. Commission members seem perfectly comfortable about the distinction.

However, there has been a sense from Scientific Commission members that they have not been systematically consulted about decisions, beyond the content of publications, taken by the Executive Committee and the Secretariat. In order to obtain the scientific credibility of the wider great ape conservation community, these three organs need to have a much closer relationship, with the Scientific Commission involved in its own right.

Opinions, voiced at the 6<sup>th</sup> Executive Committee meeting by the Scientific Commission itself, are generally in favour of the Commission having more influence within GRASP by being better implicated in the decision-making processes of the Executive Committee and the Secretariat.

If GRASP were to reposition itself closer to the company of those agencies working to stabilise climate change through reducing forest loss and forest degradation (REDD+ and others), there would need to be a shift in the fields of expertise covered by the Commission, which consists at present almost exclusively of primatologists.

## 5.6 Technical Support Team

### 5.6.1 Functions

The TST has been working with the GRASP Secretariat more or less since the start of GRASP. The TSTs were originally described in the plural, presumably to give the latitude to have more than one Team operating concurrently. They are defined by the Rules to have the following functions:

- Promote and assist the development and implementation of national action plans for the survival of great ape populations and their habitat, including the organisation and coordination of workshops on the issue, as requested;
- Provide technical capacity or information to the GRASP Council, Executive Committee and range states on specific range state great ape conservation issues, including assistance with the preparation of project proposals;
- Assist, as requested, in the evaluation of great ape conservation activities;
- Undertake other tasks as deemed necessary by the Executive Committee.

In point of fact, there has only been one organisation fulfilling the role of TST, namely the Born Free Foundation, which is a GRASP partner. The work of the TST has been divided into three main components:

- Logistic support (including consultancy contracts);
- Technical support (e.g. targeted studies and workshops);
- Paying and supporting the GRASP Envoy.

### 5.6.2 Performance

The TST's role has mainly been to help and provide added capacity to the GRASP Secretariat. Its first task, to help create the national action plans (NGASPs), was phased out after about 5 years as stakeholders involved in the Partnership realised that most range states and NGOs had or were already working on this sort of planning, in other contexts or through other channels. The TST also participated in the writing of many of GRASP's official documents and helped organise many of the necessary meetings. From 2006 to 2009, the TST was financed via the EU project, for which it had helped prepare the funding application.

Another contract was drawn up and financed by the LifeWeb initiative for the period from January 2010 to January 2011. During the period in which GRASP had no permanent coordinator, the TST therefore provided added capacity to the Secretariat, as well as supporting the implementation of relevant areas of LifeWeb activity.

Since the termination of the TST's most recent contract in January 2011, no discussions, as far as the reviewer is aware, have been carried out to renew it. It is worth noting that the TST worked in close collaboration with the GRASP Secretariat for years, yet this opportunity was never offered to other partners. While this is not the fault of the organisation that comprised the TST, as the tasks were carried out as requested by GRASP, it is worth considering issues of fairness and transparency if GRASP were to enter into another similar agreement in future. Members of the TST have reported having had positive feedback for the TST's work, particularly in terms of adding capacity to the GRASP Secretariat. The TST has been beneficial to the GRASP Secretariat by providing the flexibility sometimes needed to achieve timely results. This, however, was observed in a broader audit of UNEP's activities, in which auditors expressed some concern at the subcontracting of core functions to third parties. This misses the point: GRASP is a Partnership and as many partners as possible should be contributing to the core functions of the Partnership. Comments of this sort need to be countered by the Secretariat and supported by UNEP's structures, including the DEPI.

Members of the TST feel that they could be useful for the future of GRASP, although only if the TST has a clear role in GRASP's strategy and direction. That the TST would need a clear mandate for any future operations is echoed by many of the individuals surveyed and interviewed. A number of partners have also expressed the view that the work of the TST has not been effectively communicated, making it difficult sometimes to justify its existence.

It was suggested during the 6<sup>th</sup> Executive Committee meeting that the lack of renewal of the TST's contract since February 2011 has placed an increased administrative burden on the Secretariat. There does not seem to be an easy way to revive this program with current funding constraints. On this occasion, some members suggested that they could potentially raise additional funds for the TST; this was welcomed by the Secretariat, although with the proviso that the TST's work plan would still need to be approved by the Executive Committee, if it were to be a part of the overall GRASP workplan.

In conclusion, there is a welter of opinion about the suitability or otherwise of the TST, and the performance of the Secretariat and TST together, in delivering parts of the GRASP programme. If the Secretariat is strengthened by UNEP, there will be less need for a TST; and if the Partnership can become more effective, there is no reason why Partners (such as the BFF) should not be implementing particular components of the broader GRASP programme.

## **5.7 GRASP Patrons and Envoy**

### **5.7.1 Patrons**

GRASP appointed five patrons, all recognised for their contribution to great ape conservation or related activities: Jane Goodall, Richard Leakey, Richard Wrangham, Russ Mittermeier; and the late Toshisada Nishida.

It was set out in the Rules that these individuals would:

- Promote GRASP at the political level;
- Promote GRASP to the general public at international meetings, conventions and symposiums;
- Seek opportunities to raise funds for GRASP.

The involvement of the patrons, promoting GRASP at high political levels, has not been as intensive as was first expected. The lack of clarity of the patrons' role (and also perhaps the lack of contractual arrangements) and their commitment to their own programmes and organisations have contributed to a missed opportunity to improve GRASP's visibility. Indeed, the Secretariat, the partners and some of the patrons themselves all agree that their role has not been fully exploited.

One of the surprising features of the Patrons is that, professionally, they are all rather similar to one another: four of the five gained their reputations through field research on primates (three on chimpanzees in Tanzania; one on howler monkeys in Suriname), while the fifth gained his for field research on palaeoanthropology. These are extremely eminent people, but talking from very much the same platform, even if that was not the original reasoning behind the choices. Although some of the current patrons do have good access to high political levels, GRASP has not managed to utilize these attributes effectively.

It seems that not enough thought was given at the outset to what the Patrons might really do for GRASP, nor what GRASP would have to do for the Patrons to get the most out of them. They were a valuable resource, not put to very good use. One of the difficulties of appointing Patrons who are not then much used, is that it is potentially embarrassing to retire them. If Patrons are to have a role in the future of GRASP, they should have a clear mandate to fill, and be well-placed to fill it,

### **5.7.2 GRASP Envoy**

The role of the GRASP Envoy has been controversial both amongst partners and the Secretariat. Over the years, the Envoy has been closely linked with the TST (having been employed by them as Envoy), and was indeed one of the original catalysts bringing GRASP into being in the first place. The GRASP Secretariat therefore made use of this role opportunistically, asking the Envoy to represent the Partnership at international events; one of the advantages of having an Envoy separate from the UNEP system has been its flexibility, both in terms of cost and timing. The events at which GRASP has been thus represented have ranged from meetings of Conventions to gatherings of the tropical timber industry. Being present at these meetings is not, in itself, a bad thing. But the representation has not been well woven into GRASP's broader programme of work.

The Envoy argues, with some justification, that he has been able to have numerous meetings with Ministers and other senior administrators responsible for forestry and wildlife issues in many great ape range states. This has surely kept great ape issues higher up the political agenda than they would otherwise have been. A number of our interviewees have pointed out, however, that since there is normally neither a

programme nor money to follow such meetings, they leave a vacuum behind them, which may be counter-productive.

Several interviewees raised the issue of the Envoy having too many closely linked, but conflicting interests in other great ape charities, which obscure his identity and role in relation to GRASP. It may be that GRASP's inability to define its own voice and message over the years could be partly to blame for this lack of clarity. GRASP therefore needs to clarify who can speak on behalf of the Partnership and in what context.

No further funds have currently been allocated to the role of Envoy. If one were starting with a blank sheet of paper, it is far from clear that the function of Envoy would appear on that sheet, as one designed an appropriate structure for GRASP. The Secretariat should probably be getting on with designing and delivering its own messages, in relation to what it has the capacity to control itself. The Partnership more broadly, may feel in a position to extend the reach, but it seems unlikely that it would make a collective decision to do this through an Envoy, rather than through the existing structures of the different partners.

Now that GRASP has as its Coordinator a professional communicator, it seems that a formal communication strategy can become a part of the working environment of GRASP, and that this will define the messages to be delivered and the media through which they will be delivered. It seems improbable that the function of Envoy would feature in this.

## **5.8 Council**

### **5.8.1 Function**

Each full partner of GRASP has one seat on the Council, and supporting partners may participate as observers. The Council's purpose was to assist the Executive Committee and the secretariat with matters such as fundraising strategy and great ape conservation priorities. Its specific functions include:

- The election of a Chair of the Council;
- The selection of Executive Committee members;
- The determination of the general policy and strategy of GRASP;
- The approval of multi-annual work plans;
- The identification of priorities; and
- The provision of financial guidance for the preparation of the budget by the secretariat.

### **5.8.2 Commentary**

The Council gives GRASP measures of political authority, legitimacy and transparency. These attributes do not seem to have been sufficiently exploited in the past. In the 6 years since it was created, it has only met once on the occasion of the 1<sup>st</sup>



Intergovernmental Meeting on great apes in September 2005, owing in large part to the high cost of such meetings.

A planned meeting in November 2012 was identified as a clear priority for fundraising and for the Secretariat work plan in 2012.

As GRASP is currently constituted, there is no option but to use the Council as the highest decision-making body. Its advantages are its potential high-level engagement and its relatively high potential visibility. But its disadvantages are that to organise Council meetings every two or three years (to “approve multi-year work-plans”) represent an enormous burden in terms of staff-time and a disproportionately high actual cost, in relation to the overall financial means of GRASP.

As currently arranged, the Council does not seem to add great value to GRASP that could not be added in more direct and cheaper ways. One of the items that should be on the Agenda for the meeting in November 2012, is whether or not to dissolve the Council and replace it with a more effective Executive Committee. The two-tier governance structure, for an organisation as small as GRASP, seems an unnecessary burden. The election of partner representatives to sit on the GRASP Executive Committee could be undertaken through a partnership-wide nomination and voting process, instead of through the GRASP Council. Partners would not need to meet for this. Membership on the Executive Committee could be on a rotating basis so that not all positions are vacated at the same time, with some new members joining older, more veteran members every few years.

## **5.9 Summary of the effectiveness of GRASP’s organs**

The main message in summary is that GRASP is a very small entity, that contributes probably less than 4% of the manpower and resources expended annually by conservation agencies around the world, to the conservation of great apes and their habitats. It is not appropriate for such a small organisation, with such limited means, to be burdened with such a complex structure, which, as the table below reminds us, has at least ten aspects to it.

Each of these costs money and staff time to administer, while it is far from obvious that each of them adds something new to the conservation of great apes.

We have used the table below to suggest, on the basis of the arguments that have been outlined in the previous pages, parts of the structure which we feel could usefully be retired from the picture, to enable GRASP, through its principle structures, to concentrate more effectively on what it can do well

**Table 9. Evaluation of GRASP organs**

<b>GRASP organs</b>	<b>Retain ( or suppress)</b>	<b>Main areas of concern</b>
Executive Committee	Yes	Essential means of binding the Partnership to the Secretariat
Council	No	Limited added value
Secretariat	Yes	Essential
UNEP	Yes	Must confer greater political and financial support
UNESCO	A qualified Yes	Should make a greater contribution
Focal Points	Yes	Necessary link with range states
Scientific Commission	Yes	Essential for GRASP's credibility
Technical Support Team	No, unless the Partnership will make the effort to support them	Provides capacity and flexibility, which could be achieved in other ways
Patrons	Not as presently constituted	Have not been used effectively; goodwill now expended
Envoy	No	Transmission of confusing messages; not well controlled by GRASP

## 6. Recommendations for the future

### 6.1 A future shape for GRASP

The general consensus is that GRASP has neither lived up to its ambitions, nor to expectations; but that it is certainly worth persevering. For it to do so, a number of conditions need to be met, which will of course change the shape and the work of the partnership.

The general messages in relation to these conditions are:

1. that it must aspire to do less, but to do it much better<sup>28</sup>;
2. that the Secretariat must engage more effectively with the partners;
3. that the Secretariat must work harder to coordinate the efforts of its partners and facilitate communication between them to help them to achieve common goals together;
4. that the profile of the Partnership must change, weeding out non-performers and introducing new ones, with a dynamic and different contribution to make;
5. that its unwieldy structure needs to be streamlined;
6. that the partnership must be redefined, along with the roles and responsibilities of the partners;
7. that the entire partnership must engage even more with the political and economic realities of the causes of forest loss, and less with the biology of the great apes themselves;
8. that the Secretariat must not dilute its energies supervising small scale field projects subcontracted to partners, that individual partners are better equipped to manage themselves<sup>29</sup>;
9. that it must channel energies into monitoring the impacts and results of the conservation efforts of the Partnership as a whole;
10. that it must strengthen the scientific underpinning of what it does, and says;
11. that UNEP must exploit its potential influence and authority and elevate the profile of GRASP, both within the UN system and at large.

---

<sup>28</sup> A concept that is not new to GRASP, as initiated during the inception of GRASP 'Big Ideas'

<sup>29</sup> Keeping in mind, of course, that for any money coming through UNEP, UNEP has a legal responsibility to manage it.

## 6.2 Recommendations

In the sections which follow, we outline six strategic areas which we believe should be followed by GRASP, as it tries to build on its past, but find an effective position for itself in the future. Each of the six strategic areas requires a great deal of work, but we believe that together, these areas form a coherent whole. We introduce each of the areas with a shorthand, imperative Recommendation, designed to convey a sense of urgency.

### 6.2.1 Recommendation 1: Focus on forests

The Kinshasa Declaration, in the very first line of its qualifying statement, attributes the threat of extinction faced by the great apes, above all other causes, to the destruction of forests and other habitats. Other causes were of course recognised, including health and the transmission of viral and other infections between humans and great apes, particularly gorillas in central Africa; large numbers of them are killed and captured illegally, for meat, trophies and the live animal trade. But surely the greatest threat is the loss of their forest habitat to agriculture, both smallholders and planned agro-industrial enterprises. Demand (for land and the agricultural products it can produce) is increasing. Political will to curb the rate of forest conversion is generally hard to discern. This is the central problem that GRASP needs to be confronting.

Our understanding of the definition of forests is not just one about the trees, but includes the processes that take place within the forest just as listed above, including the transmission of disease and the pursuit of great apes as part of the bushmeat trade.

The problem is one of land-use and the conversion of forests to agricultural land (either by design or by negligence). GRASP therefore needs to get even better at its dialogue with the political and commercial proponents of the agro-industrial sector, extending its work firmly into these areas rather than working mainly with professional primatologists and conservation biologists. One good example of GRASP having an influence on this sector is the *Last Stand of the Orangutan* Report. This report was cited extensively in the UK House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee 2008. *Are Biofuels Sustainable?*

Discussions so far reveal that a number of influential stakeholders in GRASP believe that it should move in that direction, recognising also that the fate of the great apes is intricately bound up in the fate of the forests, and that the great apes' decline is a potent symbol, perhaps the most potent, of the challenge of reducing forest loss.

There is another aspect to this, of equal strategic importance to GRASP: it is that the rate of forest loss has been far greater over the last quarter century in southeast Asia, than in Africa. One of the major causes of this forest loss has been the conversion of forest land to oil-palm plantations, particularly in Indonesia and Malaysia, the only orang-utan range states. The very same companies that have been so influential in driving processes of forest loss in south-east Asia are now increasingly present in

Africa, starting up operations in the ranges of all of Africa's great apes except the mountain gorilla.

There is therefore a compelling argument for GRASP to be more involved, both in south-east Asia and in the processes of forest loss that increasingly link south-east Asia to Africa..

There is strong support amongst those interviewed for this review, for GRASP to align itself around the preoccupations of development in tropical countries, notably concerning climate change and the role of forests in the global carbon arithmetic. While this is already one of the so-called Big Ideas to which GRASP has been working since 2009, it needs more focused attention.

If GRASP is to move more firmly to become an indispensable part of the global programmes in the forest and climate sector (which are extremely anxious to have evidence of biodiversity co-benefits), it needs to plan how to do this with some care. The proximity of the leadership of UNEP's component of the UN-REDD programme, to the GRASP offices, is a real bonus. Additionally, GRASP can benefit from closer, or perhaps simply more formal, links to the UN-REDD programme. As this reviewer is aware, the UNEP UN-REDD coordinator is housed directly next to the GRASP Coordinator in UNEP Nairobi offices.

With their help, the priority will be to develop a coherent engagement strategy, to include:

- The factual and scientific evidence
- Market trends
- REDD+ and biodiversity co-benefits
- Perfecting messages
- Targeting interlocutors
- Fund-raising strategy

## **6.2.2 Recommendation 2: Simplify the structure**

We have already hinted in section 5 that we believe the structure of GRASP to be far too cumbersome and bureaucratic for an organisation of its modest means. One consequence of unwieldy structures in general is that a disproportionate amount of time and money is devoted to servicing the structure itself, rather than achieving real results that advance the attainment of the mission. GRASP has only held one Council meeting to date, and far fewer meetings of the Executive Committee than provided for in the Rules, yet a large portion of the Secretariat's time was still taken up in servicing the structures.

Some parts of the structure need to be strengthened, such as the Secretariat and the Scientific Commission. Others could be removed altogether, or have their powers reduced so that they are not an obstacle.

There are at least three candidates for *removal*, which include:

1. the TST (whose functions can be achieved by strengthening the Secretariat, or by devolving tasks to Partners);
2. the envoy (the passing of messages needs to be at a higher geopolitical level);
3. the patrons (in their present form, and with their uniformly strong academic background, they do not point GRASP in the direction it needs to go).

If the patrons are kept, the reviewer makes detailed recommendations for this below.

There are three areas in which the *alteration and clarification of powers* is necessary:

1. the Council, which has not met for six years, but which, when it does, will be vastly and disproportionately expensive.
2. the Executive Committee must meet more often, hold the Secretariat to tighter account, set the partnership's programme and budget and monitor its performance effectively; consider maximum terms of 3 years, renewable once only;
3. focal points.

Specific recommendations are described below for the Council and focal points:

### ***Recommendations for the Patrons***

- All four patrons were approached as part of this review process and three were directly interviewed. All four have indicated a (renewed) interest and enthusiasm for promoting GRASP issues
- In order to better utilize the patrons, they must be provided with a clear, coherent message to 'sell' and must be approached to take on specific GRASP issues. Two of the patrons interviewed stated that they had *never* been requested to undertake work specifically on behalf of GRASP. Yes, they all wear many hats, but they had not been requested to take off the other hats, so to speak.
- Seek to add additional patrons that represent the wider political and geographical interests of GRASP.  
There is no particular reason why patrons should not be invited Executive Committee meetings: the work of the Committee would not be hampered by their absence but it would certainly be enriched by their presence. At least one of the patrons expressed a desire to be invited.

### ***Recommendations for Council***

- It must agree to devolve its authority to the Executive Committee and become a purely advisory body, acting more as a Partners Forum than a decision-making body; getting Council to agree to this at its forthcoming meeting in November 2012 might be a challenge in itself;
- An alternative to this is to keep the Council for the sake of GRASP's perceived legitimacy both within UNEP and the wider world, for the purposes of electing the Executive Committee, and for transparency as a partnership, but only under the following conditions:
  - Only if the Council is able to meet regularly every two years

- Only if the cost of holding the meeting does not exceed 3% of GRASP's regular budget

### *Recommendations for the focal points*

- Work with GRASP partners to identify those individuals in range states that are potentially the most useful to act as focal point for GRASP
- Interact with range states to canvass possibility that they might accept potential candidates for focal points (proposed by Secretariat, in consultation with the Executive Committee). This would need to be done in a way that does not damage the national government buy-in to GRASP, and the final decision would need to come from the range state
- Re-examine expectations of contributions to be made by focal points
- Develop a simple and manageable programmes for interacting with focal points
- Develop an information package for focal points that can serve as a distance learning module
- Suggest that a mandate (timeframe) for which a focal point may serve needs to be defined. This would be helpful for ensuring that focal points who have been inactive for recent years be replaced
- to distinguish themselves from the focal points of Conventions, the focal points should be re-titled Country Representatives

### **6.2.3 Recommendation 3: Communicate convincingly**

GRASP needs to be clear about who it is most important to communicate with. This reviewer's answer is: the agents of forest loss. Viewed another way, those whose decisions and economic activities represent the greatest threat to great ape survival, are the ones to whom GRASP should be addressing its communications strategy. This means, amongst others, engaging in a consistent and sustained programme of dialogue with political and agro-industrial leaders, in Africa and south-east Asia. This also means leaving the comfort zone of communications aimed primarily at the conservation community and distributed at conferences of like-minded organisations.

The implication of this is that the focus of GRASP should be in communication, dissemination and influence, which should seek to find new audiences not previously reached by GRASP.

The Recommendation itself starts with the development of a coherent Communication Strategy, which will identify the target audiences and the type and appropriate media for the delivery of the messages. With the present leadership of GRASP in place, the review has every confidence that this will be done professionally (indeed, it is already underway).

While the thrust of this will be focussed on external communications, it is worth repeating that a frequent concern of GRASP partners (and patrons) is the past record of relatively poor communications between the Secretariat and the partners. The communication strategy must propose workable solutions to this problem, in order to elevate the efficacy of the relations between these two components of GRASP.

#### **6.2.4 Recommendation 4: Perform on a higher political plane**

We would contend that the major source of the loss of Suitable Habitat for great apes is to be found in decisions made, both within and without the frameworks of official government policies, by people at the highest levels of political authority in many countries. This can be interpreted to mean that land allocations (of forested land), land classification and the award of concessions for various purposes, are not transfers which happen by accident or chance. This being so, only carefully managed dialogue at the highest levels is going to have real impact; and even that is by no means a foregone conclusion.

As one Patron put it, private conversations with heads of state are the only level at which a real impact on the rates of forest loss can be expected. This is one area where GRASP has to raise its game to a significantly higher level, in a systematic and properly planned fashion. In order for these conversations to be fruitful, however, GRASP will need to have a coherent message to sell.

The kind of dialogues that this implies, and the people who might be effective in having those dialogues, take us way beyond the operating level of the present Envoy, and even the Patrons. New voices<sup>30</sup> are needed to speak on behalf of GRASP and to pass highly sensitive messages, carefully orchestrated and planned in advance by the Secretariat. This is not the domain of opportunistic encounters, though sometimes these will no doubt have their place.

#### ***Role of UN agencies***

Clearly, the Executive Director of UNEP (and the Director General of UNESCO) have their role to play in getting GRASP to this 'higher level.' The status of GRASP within UNEP needs to be elevated, including its role in the biennial planning cycle. The Executive Director, if he is serious about GRASP, needs to speak out on behalf of GRASP. The status of the GRASP Coordinator within the UN hierarchy also needs to be re-examined. As in the early years, GRASP again needs someone at the helm in at least a Director (D)-level position.

In terms of the roles of GRASP's two host UN agencies, there needs to be a formal agreement between UNESCO and UNEP which clarifies the respective roles and contributions to GRASP. Ideally, UNESCO should increase its budgetary and staff commitment, and play its fair share in the management of the Secretariat, or perhaps accept a different role within the Partnership.

---

<sup>30</sup> An example of a person with the type of connections and stature to speak on behalf of GRASP, that this reviewer would recommend, is Kofi Annan. Whether he would be prepared to take on this role would be another matter. Other suggestions include the ex-Minister of Environments of Costa Rica and Brazil, and the ex-President of Guyana, Bharrat Jagdeo



### 6.2.5 Recommendation 5: Strengthen the science

A constant refrain throughout the work of this review has been the need to make fuller and proper use of the Scientific Commission. We fully endorse this. While there are other scientific bodies at work on the great apes, notably under the aegis of IUCN's Primate Specialist Group, there is a clear provider-customer relationship that needs to be satisfied, if GRASP is to make public (and private) statements based on the best and unimpeachable science. Only the Scientific Commission can do this, with the appropriate level of authority. But do it it must, if GRASP is to retain its appropriate authority.

For this to work effectively, new protocols will have to be established between the Secretariat and the Commission, in order to vet the content of documents in a way that ensures their accuracy, without compromising the efficiency of the operations as a whole. In order for this to work, however, UNEP will have to be able to accept that it is not the only, and perhaps not the final, arbiter of GRASP content.

There is a lot of support for the idea that GRASP should act as an interface between science (and data collected in the field) and policy makers. This notion extends that a bit further, guiding GRASP into dialogue with agro-industry and Agencies responsible for land-use, but conducting that dialogue armed with the best and most convincing data.

The Secretariat has one staff member with a scientific training (a PhD) in great ape science; he is currently working principally in the management of the Spanish-funded field projects. It might be a better use of his skills to act as the permanent interface with the Scientific Commission, in the marshalling of scientific facts and their interpretation and also with the partners, as they draw on the expertise of the Commission, in the design and implementation of their own programmes.

The composition and the work of the Scientific Commission needs to be re-examined, if the focus of the Partnership as a whole is redesigned towards the processes of change in the forest sector. This in turn may raise the need to extend the scope of collaborating scientific institutions, such as OFAC (Observatoire des Forêts en Afrique Centrale) based in Kinshasa and the ACB (ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity) based in Manila. Both have substantial remote sensing capabilities (developed with EU funding).

### 6.2.6 Recommendation 6: Lobby for better legislation and law enforcement

A repeated refrain from our interviewees (particularly those closest to field programmes) is that they struggle to persuade states to put appropriate laws in place; they struggle to have laws properly interpreted by the judiciary; and they struggle, at both local and national levels to have existing laws properly enforced. They have all suggested that this is a domain where GRASP, with the force of the UN behind it, would be very well placed to act.

In the forestry sector, this is the domain of the FLEGT process, Voluntary Partnership Agreements for the implementation of which have recently been signed by a number

of GRASP range states, and which is looking like being a transformational process. There is scope for GRASP to associate closely with this process.

We have already said that there is a need to reduce its involvement in the management of small, scattered field projects, for which many GRASP partners are better equipped than is GRASP itself. This is a thorny issue, since programme management has absorbed a great deal of management time by the Secretariat, and the field projects seem to be both urgently needed, and a tangible sign of activity on GRASP's part. But most interviewees feel that they are a distraction and that this is not what the Secretariat should be doing.

On the other hand, there is strong support for the idea of GRASP, and its Secretariat in particular, being focussed, as far as field projects are concerned, purely on improving legislation and law enforcement. Not only do our interviewees support this approach, but we do too. The criteria need to be carefully thought through, so as not to dilute this effort. Doing this, alongside initiatives such as FLEGT, will also serve to bring GRASP closer to the forest sector (see also Recommendation 1, above).

A closely related suggestion is the potential creation of a hub on law enforcement at the secretariat in Nairobi, or better still that GRASP should work more closely with the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (CITES, INTERPOL, UN Drugs and Crime, World Customs Organisation, World Bank). We've not had the opportunity to discuss this with the organisations concerned, but believe that collaboration of this sort would be nothing but beneficial.

Whichever of these partners is chosen, Recommendation 6 will have the enthusiastic support of many GRASP partners, and will build nicely on existing GRASP initiatives<sup>31</sup>. The planning of this part of the strategy needs considerable technical input, which could be arranged in the context of a small Expert Group.

---

<sup>31</sup> Such as, for example, the joint technical missions with CITES to Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia and Cambodia to address illegal trade in orangutans, and projects working towards trans-boundary collaboration.

## Annexe A. GRASP-funded projects from 2005-2011

		PoA 1	PoA 2	PoA 3	PoA 4	PoA 5		
2005	<b>Title</b>	Construction of a nursery facility and quarantine centre	Emergency Construction of boundary wall in Virunga National Park	Engaging the rural poor in participatory environmental management	Scientific Assistance to GRASP through Identification of Priority Ape populations	Great Apes Atlas Range	GRASP support to IUCN West Central Africa regional Workshop and action plan	National plans for pro-poor great ape conservation
	<b>Country</b>	Indonesia	DRC and Rwanda	Uganda	Great Ape Range States	global	Central Africa	Great Ape Range States
	<b>Implementer</b>	Orang-utan Foundation (UK)		WWF/Nature Uganda	The Great Ape World Heritage Species Project	WCMC	Conservation International	Born Free Foundation
	<b>Donor</b>	Hilton/Intercontinental	UNEP Reserve Fund	UK FCO	UK DEFRA	UNEP FP & UK (FCO & DEFRA)	UK FCO	UNEP FP
	<b>Budget (\$)</b>	15,000	50,000	20,000	65,000	28,892	14,511	60,000
2006	<b>Title</b>	Organization of the African primate reintroduction workshop Netherlands	-	-	-		Support to Tayna Center for Conservation Biology	
	<b>Country</b>	Pan African Sanctuary Alliance	-	-	-		DR Congo	
	<b>Implementer</b>		-	-	-		Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund International	
	<b>Donor</b>	Italy	-	-	-		Irish Trust Fund	
	<b>Budget (\$)</b>	59,500	-	-	-		30,000	

		PoA 1	PoA 2	PoA 3	PoA 4	PoA 5
2007	<b>Title</b>	Strengthening wildlife law enforcement	Indigenous people participation in mapping of traditional forest resources	Conservation micro-credit and Enterprise Project	Last Stand of the orang-utan, Indonesia	Awareness raising film on Petit Loango
	<b>Country</b>	Cameroon	Cameroon	DR Congo	Indonesia	Gabon
	<b>Implementer</b>	Last Great Ape Organization	World Wide Fund for Nature and Forest Peoples Programme	Bonobo Conservation Initiative	GRID Arendal	
	<b>Donor</b>	DEFRA	UNEP Stakeholder Branch	Irish Trust Fund	DEFRA	UNEP FP (co-funding RAMSAR)
	<b>Budget (\$)</b>	35,000	95,000	27,000	30,000	15,000
2008	<b>Title</b>	Direct support to PAAs in Garamba and Kahuzi-Biega		Ecotourism development in Cyamudongo forest, Nyungwe National Park	-	-
	<b>Country</b>	DR Congo		Rwanda	-	-
	<b>Implementer</b>	Africa Parks Network, WCS, WWF		Wildlife Conservation Society	-	-
	<b>Donor</b>	Spain		Irish Trust Fund	-	-
	<b>Budget (\$)</b>	286,000 in 2008 300,000 in 2009		25,500	-	-

		PoA 1	PoA 2	PoA 3	PoA 4	PoA 5
2006-2009	<b>Title</b>	-	Transboundary collaboration and corridor establishment	Economic incentives to conserve great ape habitat	Development and implementation of national monitoring programme	Partnership work (Council, ExCom, SciCom) incl. support to focal points
	<b>Country</b>	-	Ivory and Liberia	DR Congo, Indonesia, Cameroun	Ivory Coast	global
	<b>Implementer</b>	-	GRASP sec and Wild Chimpanzee Foundation (WCF)	Gorilla Organization, Orang-utan Foundation, Bristol Zoo	Wild Chimpanzee Foundation	UNEP and Born Free
	<b>Donor</b>	-	EC and USAID-STEWARD	EC	EC	EC
	<b>Budget (\$)</b>	-	100,000	-	-	-
2010	<b>Title</b>	-	-	Economic incentives incl.REDD in Tripa and Batang Toru	State of the gorilla	-
	<b>Country</b>	-	-	Indonesia	Gorilla Range States	-
	<b>Implementer</b>	-	-	PanEco/ICRAF	GRID Arendal	-
	<b>Donor</b>	-	-	Norway, Monaco	France, UNEP	-
	<b>Budget (\$)</b>	-	-	171,100	100,000	-
2007-2010	<b>Title</b>	-	-	High conservation value Forest approach	-	-
	<b>Country</b>	-	-	Indonesia	-	-
	<b>Implementer</b>	-	-	GAWHSP	-	-

		PoA 1	PoA 2	PoA 3	PoA 4	PoA 5
	<b>Donor</b>	-	-	France, DEFRA, UNEP	-	-
	<b>Budget (\$)</b>	-	-	76,300	-	-
2010-2011	<b>Title</b>	Strengthening of PAs in Nouabale Ndoki, Lossi and Garamba in ecotourism, monitoring and health	Strengthening of PAs in Kahuzi-Biega in management planning, health, monitoring	Economic incentives to conserve great ape habitat incl. REDD	Development of A.P.E.S. database and GRASP reporting and monitoring tool	GRASP Partnership work incl. council, ExCom, SciCom, review of the Partnership
	<b>Country</b>	Congo, DR Congo	DR Congo	Cameroon	Global	Global
	<b>Implementer</b>	WCS, Africa Parks Network	WWF, WCS, COOPERA, MGVP	WCS	Max-Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology	
	<b>Donor</b>	Spain LifeWeb	Spain-LifeWeb	Spain-LifeWeb	Spain LifeWeb	Spain LifeWeb, UNEP
	<b>Indicative Budget (\$)</b>	750,000	335,000	100,000	Un-funded	500,000

## **Annexe B. List of documents consulted**

### Official Partnership documents

- Kinshasa Declaration on Great Apes
- GRASP Programme of Action
- Global Strategy for the survival of great apes and their habitat
- Rules for the organisation and management of GRASP Partnership
- Report of the first Intergovernmental Meeting on great apes and GRASP

### Other GRASP documents

- GRASP Finance and Activity Plan
- Report of the UNEP evaluation on GRASP project management
- GRASP reporting and monitoring tools
- GRASP reports to the European Commission
- GRASP newsletters
- GRASP Partnership updates
- GRASP MOUs with the Born Free Foundation
- The four big ideas document
- Breakdown of the Partnership membership
- Life Web project documents
- Weekly reports from Ian Redmond, GRASP envoy
- Mission reports from Ian Redmond, GRASP envoy
- TST activity plans

### UNEP documents

- UNEP Programme of Work 2010-11
- Audit of UNEP project delivery arrangements via partnerships

### GRASP publications

- World Atlas of Great Apes and their Conservation
- Last Stand of the Orangutan, State of Emergency: Illegal logging, fire and palm oil in Indonesia's National Parks
- Last Stand of the Gorilla: Environmental crime and conflict in the Congo Basin
- Orangutans and the Economics of Sustainable Forest Management in Sumatra

### Meeting reports and publications

- Reports of GRASP Executive Committee meetings
- Reports of GRASP Scientific Commission meetings
- Participant lists of meetings

### Other Documents

- Ingrid Vlisseren PhD thesis
- Draft Report: Preliminary results of T21-K
- Monitoring Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE) – various documents
- GRASP-ing for survival
- More than trees (YoG)

## Annexe C. List of people consulted

Role	Name	Position	Method of contact	Answer
UNEP	Achim Steiner	Executive Director	in person	interviewed 10/11/11
GRASP	Doug Cress	Coordinator	in person	interviewed 10/11/11
UNEP	Ibrahim Thiaw	Director DEPI	in person	interviewed 09/11/11
GRASP	Johann Jenson	Consultant	in person	interviewed 08/11/11
GRASP	Johannes Refisch	Programme Manager	in person	interviewed 08/11/11
UNEP	Mario Boccucci	Chief, Terrestrial Ecosystems Unit	in person	interviewed 09/11/11
UNEP Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE)	Tom De Meulenaer	Coordinator	in person	interviewed 08/11/11
GRASP	Audrey Wandera	GRASP Projects Manager	in person	interviewed 09/11/11
Advisors / Interested Parties	Annette Lanjouw	Arcus Foundation, Director, Great Apes Programme	phone	interviewed 10/01/11
GRASP Committee member	Ashley Leiman	Orangutan Foundation and NGO representative at GRASP ExCom	phone	interviewed 21/11/11
Advisors / Interested Parties	Eric Blencowe	International Biodiversity Policy Unit/ Defra, former UK focal point	phone	didn't feel up to date with issues
GRASP Committee member	Liz Williamson	Chair IUCN Primate Specialist Group/Section Great Apes, and GRASP Scientific Commission	phone	interviewed 18/11/11
Former UNEP / GRASP staff member	Rob Hepworth	Former GRASP Director	phone	interviewed 23/03/12
GRASP Committee member	Serge Wich	Chair of GRASP Scientific Commission	phone	interviewed 17/11/11
Former UNEP / GRASP staff member	Melanie Virtue	CMS Interagency Officer /former GRASP Coordinator	phone	interviewed 01/11/11
Advisors / Interested Parties	Ian Redmond	GRASP Envoy	phone	interviewed 15/11/11
UNEP	Neville Ash	Coordinator, Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Branch	phone	interviewed 15/11/11
Former GRASP Committee member	Moses Mapesa	Uganda Range State Representative / former Chair of GRASP ExCom/ former Ugandan wildlife director / GRASP liaison	phone	interviewed 16/11/11
GRASP Committee member	Matthew Hatchwell	WCS and NGO representative at GRASP ExCom	phone	interviewed 17/11/11
GRASP Patron	Jane Goodall		phone	Contacted
GRASP Patron	Richard Leakey		phone	interviewed 11/01/12



GRASP Patron	Richard Wrangham	Ruth Moore Professor of Biological Anthropology, Department of Anthropology, UK	phone	interviewed 29/01/12 & 27/03/12
GRASP Patron	Russ Mittermeier	Conservation International – NGO	phone	interviewed 04/04/12
World Wildlife Fund (WWF) - NGO	Wendy Elliot	Manager, Species Programme	phone	Interviewed 06/01/12
Former GRASP Committee member	Christoph Boesch	Director, Dept. of Primatology, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology	phone	interviewed 06/11/11
UNESCO World Heritage Centre	Guy Debonnet	Chief Of Unit	phone	interviewed 06/11/11
Advisors / Interested Parties	David Jay	Born Free Foundation, Head of Technical Support Teams / GRASP liaison	phone	interviewed 22/11/11
Advisors / Interested Parties	Leonie Gordon	Conducted PhD research on GRASP	phone	interviewed 12/01/12
Range State Contacts	S. Suci Utami Atmoko	Indonesia / GRASP Scientific Commission member	phone	Contacted
Former UNEP / GRASP staff member	Tim Kasten	Former Deputy Director DEPI	phone	Contacted
Wildlife Conservation Society - NGO	Fiona (Boo) Maisels	Monitoring Coordinator for field programs in Cameroon, Republic of the Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Gabon	phone	interviewed 12/01/12
UNESCO	Noeline Raondry Rakotoarisoa	Chief of Section, Biosphere Networks and Capacity Building Section, UNESCO Natural Sciences Division	Phone	interviewed 19/04/12
The Nature Conservancy (TNC) - NGO	Erik Meijaard	Senior Science Advisor - Indonesia's Tropical Forest Initiative	phone	Declined, but provided comments on draft report
GRASP Focal point - Uganda	Aggrey Rwetsiba	Senior Monitoring and Research Coordinator, Uganda Wildlife Authority	survey	answered
Berggorilla & Regenwald Direkthilfe - NGO	Angela Meder		survey	answered
Consejero del Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Medio Rural y Marino ante el PNUMA	Antonio Fernández de Tejada García	Permanent Representative to UNEP	survey	answered
UNESCO	Arantzazu Acha	Project Officer for Environmental Sciences	survey	answered
Zoological Society of London (ZSL) - NGO	Chris Ransom	West and North Africa Programme Manager	survey	answered
Born Free Foundation (BFF) - NGO	Chris Wright	Senior Programmes Officer	survey	answered
Rural Environment and Development	Damascène R.Gashumba	Executive Director	survey	answered

Organisation (REDO Rwanda) - NGO				
World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Central Africa Regional Programme Office (CARPO) - NGO	David Greer	Coordinator, African Great Apes Programme	survey	answered
Last Great Ape Organisation (LAGA) - NGO	Ofir Drori		survey	answered
PanEco Foundation for Sustainable Development and Intercultural Exchange - NGO	Ian Singleton	Director of Conservation	survey	answered
GRASP Focal Point - Liberia	Joseph N. Toah	Manager, Wildlife Management, Forestry Development Authority	survey	answered
Advisors / Interested Parties	Kay Farmer	Consultant	survey	answered
Former GRASP staff, UNESCO	Lucilla Spini	Executive Officer, Global Environmental Change and Human Health (GECHH)	survey	answered
Hutan--NGO	Marc Ancrenaz	Director of the Kinabatangan Orang-utan Conservation Project	survey	answered
Great Ape World Heritage Species Project Inc. (GAWHSP)- NGO	Mark Leighton	Executive Director	survey	answered
Bristol Zoo Gardens (BZG)- NGO	Neil Maddison	Development Manager	survey	answered
Southern California Primate Research Forum	Norman Rosen	Orangutan Conservancy president	survey	answered
Disney's Animal Kingdom	Tammie Bettinger	Conservation coordinator	survey	answered
Ministry of Environment and Rural and Marine Affairs (MARM), Spain	Juan Jose Areces Maqueda	Technical Chief	survey	answered
TRAFFIC - NGO	Stephen Broad	Executive Director	survey	answered
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA-UK)	Mark Baxter	CITES & International Species Policy Branch/Wildlife Species Conservation Division	survey	Doesn't feel he can answer
TRAFFIC / World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) - NGO	Roland Melisch	Senior Programme Director, Africa and Europe	survey	in Sabri Zain group
Bristol Zoo - NGO	Bryan Carroll	Curator / conservation	survey	answered
Pan African Sanctuary Alliance (PASA) - NGO	Anne Warner	Executive Director	survey	answered
The Walt Disney Company	Claire Martin	Manager, Corporate Citizenship: Environment & Conservation	survey	same org as Tammie Bettinger

Disney's Animal Kingdom	Jackie Ogden	VP	survey	same org as Tammie Bettinger
The Walt Disney Company	Kim Sams	Director Walt Disney Parks and Resorts	survey	same org as Tammie Bettinger

## Annexe D. Survey English version

### Evaluation of the Great Apes Survival Partnership (GRASP) SURVEY

EDG on behalf of the GRASP Secretariat

#### Introduction

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) created the Great Apes Survival Project (GRASP) in May 2001 to respond to the global conservation crisis facing chimpanzees, gorillas, orangutans and bonobos, and lift the threat of imminent extinction. GRASP was joined by UNESCO in September 2002, when GRASP became a fully operational World Summit on Sustainable Development Type II Partnership. Three years later, the Kinshasa Declaration was signed at the 1<sup>st</sup> Intergovernmental Meeting on Great Apes, which laid out a Programme of Action for GRASP to achieve the objectives of the Declaration.

As GRASP – since renamed the Great Apes Survival *Partnership* – marks its 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 2011, deforestation, emerging infectious diseases, human encroachment, illegal hunting, climate change and a host of other factors have combined to take a devastating toll, and place great apes in greater peril than ever before. Although the GRASP Executive Committee established an ambitious five-year plan in 2006 that included five Programme Objectives and a Programme of Action, those targets proved unrealistic and difficult to measure.

To take stock of progress after 10 years, and to help plan the future, the GRASP Secretariat has commissioned a review, under the leadership of Dr Stephen Cobb of EDG (The Environment and Development Group), in the United Kingdom. The reviewer is tasked with evaluating the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and impact of GRASP, both as a functioning coalition of stakeholders coordinated by the GRASP Secretariat and through its interventions carried out in the name of GRASP.

One of the review's main components is to solicit the views of stakeholders in great ape conservation from around the world, which this present survey is attempting to achieve. Your response to this survey will therefore be greatly appreciated. Please answer as many of the questions as are relevant to your level of knowledge/field; feel free to leave blank those that do not apply to you.

Your answers will be treated in confidence: none of your opinions will be attributable to you in the subsequent report. For more information, feel free to refer to the GRASP website: [www.un-grasp.org](http://www.un-grasp.org)

Name	
Organisation/ department/ country	
Position	

**Your situation**

1. Have you, your organisation, your department, or your country ever been involved or engaged with GRASP?

a) If yes, how?

--

b) If not, was there ever an attempt or an approach from either side?

--

**GRASP's situation**

2. In your opinion, what are the **TOP 3** reasons why GRASP has proved effective/ineffective for the coordination of great ape conservation efforts?

--

3. Do you feel that the commitments made in the Kinshasa Declaration in 2005 have been properly followed up by the partners?

--

4. In your opinion, has GRASP achieved the following:

a) Protected areas in great ape habitats have been expanded and the security improved.

--

b) The rate of loss of great apes has been reduced relative to 2005.

--

c) There is now a new model of implementation that combines great ape conservation with development benefits.

--

d) Selected development activities impacting great apes now contain mitigation strategies.

--

5. In the first few years of its existence, there appeared to be enormous energy in the GRASP idea which seems to have dwindled. Do you share this view and if so, why do you suppose this is?

--

6. Are you aware of any GRASP-funded field project?

a) If yes, which one(s)?

--

b) Has the GRASP partnership enhanced these projects?

--

- c) What do you think GRASP's role should be towards these projects: finding funds, direct implementation, management role, other?

**GRASP as an organisation**

7. Do you think GRASP has achieved a role as the authoritative advisor on policies affecting the survival of great apes and their habitats?

8. In your opinion what are GRASP's TOP 3 strengths and/or weaknesses?

9. UNEP and UNESCO are GRASP's sponsoring agencies. Please comment on whether or not you feel these are appropriate.

10. GRASP has rebranded itself as a partnership. In this context, do you feel that partners have properly met their responsibilities?

**Vision**

11. What contributions, if any, do you feel GRASP could make in the future?

12. Should GRASP be reformed and restructured? If so, what would work best?

13. Do you have any other points not covered by these questions?



## Annexe E. Survey French version

### Evaluation du Partenariat pour la Survie des Grands Singes (GRASP)

#### ENQUETE

EDG au nom du Secrétariat du GRASP

##### Introduction

Le Programme des Nations Unies (PNUE) a créé le Projet pour la Survie des Grands Singes (GRASP) en mai 2001 pour répondre à la crise mondiale faisant face aux chimpanzés, gorilles, orangs-outans et bonobos, et pour lever la menace de leur extinction imminente. GRASP a été rejoint par l'UNESCO en Septembre 2002, lorsque GRASP est devenu un Partenariat de Type II dans le cadre du Sommet Mondial pour le Développement Durable. Trois ans plus tard, la Déclaration de Kinshasa a été signée lors de la 1<sup>ère</sup> réunion intergouvernementale sur les grands singes, qui a défini un Plan d'Actions pour que GRASP atteigne les objectifs de la Déclaration.

Alors que GRASP - rebaptisé Partenariat pour la Survie des Grands Singes - fête son 10<sup>ème</sup> anniversaire en 2011, la déforestation, les maladies infectieuses émergentes, l'empiètement humain, la chasse illégale, le changement climatique et une foule d'autres facteurs se sont combinés en un effet dévastateur, et les grands singes sont plus en danger que jamais. Bien que le Comité Exécutif de GRASP ait établi un plan quinquennal ambitieux en 2006 comprenant cinq Objectifs et un Programme d'Action, ces objectifs se sont avérés irréalistes et difficiles à mesurer.

Pour faire le point des progrès accomplis après 10 ans, et pour aider à planifier l'avenir, le Secrétariat du GRASP a mandaté une revue, sous la direction du Dr Stephen Cobb, du bureau d'étude EDG (The Environment and Development Group) au Royaume-Uni. Il est chargé d'évaluer l'efficacité, l'efficience, la pertinence et l'impact de GRASP, à la fois en tant que coalition de parties prenantes coordonnée par le Secrétariat du GRASP et à travers ses interventions menées au nom de GRASP.

Une des composantes principales de cette revue est de solliciter les points de vue des parties prenantes de la conservation des grands singes et cette présente enquête en fait donc partie. Vos réponses à cette enquête seront donc grandement appréciées. Veuillez répondre à autant de questions que possible se rapportent à votre niveau de connaissance / terrain ; n'hésitez pas à laisser vides celles ne s'appliquant pas à vous.

Vos réponses seront traitées de manière confidentielle : vos opinions ne pourront pas vous être attribuées dans le rapport ultérieur. Pour plus d'informations, n'hésitez pas à vous rapporter au site web de GRASP : [www.un-grasp.org](http://www.un-grasp.org)

Nom	
Organisation/ département/ pays	
Poste / situation	

**Votre situation**

1. Avez-vous, vous-même, votre organisation, votre département ou votre pays, déjà été impliqué ou engagé avec GRASP ?

a) Si oui, comment?

--

b) Si non, y a-t-il eu une tentative ou une approche de la part d'une des parties prenantes ?

--

**La situation de GRASP**

2. Selon vous, quelles sont les 3 raisons principales pour lesquelles GRASP a prouvé son efficacité / inefficacité dans la coordination des efforts de conservation des grands singes ?

--

3. Pensez-vous que les engagements pris durant la Déclaration de Kinshasa en 2005 ont été correctement appliqués par les partenaires?

--

4. Selon vous, GRASP a-t-il atteint les objectifs suivant :

a) Les aires protégées au sein des habitats de grands singes ont été étendues et leur sécurité a été améliorée.

--

b) Le taux de perte des grands singes a été réduit par rapport à 2005.

--

c) Il existe un nouveau modèle de mise en œuvre qui allie la conservation des grands singes avec les bénéfices associés au développement.

--

d) Les activités de développement ayant une incidence sur les grands singes contiennent maintenant des stratégies d'atténuation.

--

5. Durant les premières années de son existence l'idée de GRASP a semblé produire une énorme énergie, qui semble avoir depuis diminué. Partagez-vous ce point de vue, et si oui, pourquoi pensez-vous ceci ?

--

6. Etes-vous conscient de projets de terrain financés par GRASP ?

a) Si oui, le(s)quel(s) ?

--



b) Le partenariat GRASP a-t-il amélioré ces projets ?

c) Selon vous, quel rôle GRASP devrait-il avoir envers ces projets : trouver des fonds, mise en œuvre directe, rôle de gestion, autre ?

#### GRASP en tant qu'organisation

7. Selon vous, est-ce que GRASP a atteint un rôle en tant que conseiller faisant autorité sur les politiques affectant la survie des grands singes et de leurs habitats ?

8. A votre avis, quelles sont les 3 faiblesses / forces principales de GRASP ?

9. Le PNUE et l'UNESCO sont les organismes parrains de GRASP. Veuillez commenter si oui ou non vous pensez que ces organismes sont appropriés.

10. GRASP a été rebaptisé en tant que partenariat. Dans ce contexte, pensez-vous que les partenaires ont bien assumé leurs responsabilités ?

#### Vision

11. Quelles sont les contributions, le cas échéant, que GRASP pourrait faire à l'avenir ?

12. GRASP doit-il être réformé et restructuré ? Si oui, quel serait le mieux ?

13. Avez-vous d'autres points de vue non abordés par ces questions ?

## Annexe F. Evaluation overview



### Great Apes Survival Partnership

#### Evaluation - Overview

##### Background

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) created the Great Apes Survival Project (GRASP) in May 2001 to respond to the global conservation crisis facing chimpanzees, gorillas, orangutans and bonobos and lift the threat of imminent extinction.

GRASP was joined by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in September 2002, when GRASP became a fully operational World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) Type II Partnership. Three years later, the Kinshasa Declaration was signed at the 1<sup>st</sup> Intergovernmental Meeting on Great Apes, which laid out a Programme of Action for GRASP to achieve the objectives of the declaration.

As GRASP – since renamed the Great Apes Survival *Partnership* – marks its 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 2011, the world looks much different than it did a decade ago, particularly as it relates to great apes. Deforestation, emerging infectious diseases, human encroachment, illegal hunting, climate change and a host of other factors have combined to take a devastating toll, and place great apes in greater peril than ever before. Therefore, an internal review is both timely and necessary to analyze a number of aspects of GRASP, including the effectiveness and efficiency of the GRASP secretariat and GRASP partnership; measure whether the organization met its targets; gauge GRASP's impact in the conservation landscape; and prepare GRASP to meet the challenges ahead.

Although the GRASP Executive Committee established an ambitious five-year plan that included five Programme Objectives and a Programmes of Action (PoA) when it met in 2006, those targets proved unrealistic and difficult to measure. Therefore, it is proposed that the GRASP review focus on several strategic areas identified below, and be used to create a GRASP strategy that includes short and long-term goals that will be presented to the GRASP Council.

##### Method

The GRASP review will examine three areas in detail:

1. The Effectiveness of GRASP as an Organization
2. GRASP Program Impact & Management
3. The Global Conservation Status of Great Apes

1. **The Effectiveness of GRASP as an Organization:** GRASP is a complex, multi-partner organization that includes a unique blend of national governments, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and private and public funders. Yet the GRASP secretariat – supported by the Technical Support Teams, the Scientific Commission and the Executive Committee-- must be able to manage this partnership effectively, utilizing the tools and resources at its disposal, and be able to play a meaningful role in the fight to conserve great apes and their habitat.

It is proposed that an independent management consultant be hired to review GRASP's internal policies and operations, examine the portfolio of GRASP activities, conduct interviews with GRASP partners, including range state governments, donor governments, NGOs, research institutions and the private sector, and examine GRASP's ability to meet its objectives. Through this process, the independent management consultant will identify areas of strength; highlight areas of weakness; determine the viability of the GRASP partnership; and suggest any management changes that might make the organization more productive and effective.

2. **GRASP Program Impact & Management:** Since the signing of the Kinshasa Declaration in 2005, GRASP has increasingly engaged in project management through its partners in the field. GRASP has contributed an estimated USD \$7 million to over 25 field projects over the past five years, ranging from a program to develop the capacity to monitor wildlife and collect ecological data in association with the Wild Chimpanzee Foundation in Cote d'Ivoire, to empowering local communities to halt illegal logging in the Tanjung National Park in partnership with the Orangutan Foundation in Indonesia.

But are these programs effective? And do these partnerships work? Given the scale of the problems facing great ape survival in this day and age, is GRASP's staff, funds, time and resources best used in this way? It is proposed that two independent consultants be hired to visit GRASP-funded projects in Africa and Asia, and gather data, interviews, and evidence to report back on the efficacy of GRASP's role as a project manager in the field.

3. **The Global Conservation Status of Great Apes:** In the 10 years since GRASP was launched, the situation facing great apes in the wild has grown measurably worse. Wild populations have declined, habitat areas have shrunk, extractive industries have multiplied, deadly diseases have spread, and the very species GRASP was tasked with protecting remain as vulnerable as ever. In fact, GRASP published two reports in recent years – *Last Stand of the Gorilla* (2010) and *Last Stand of the Orangutan: State of Emergency* (2007) – that identify extinction as highly likely unless dramatic measures are taken.

That said, what is the overall assessment as regards great ape populations and great ape habitat? What are the numbers in the wild? Where are the forested areas still in

play? And which field projects – or conservation programs – are proving most effective? An accurate assessment of the state of great ape conservation is necessary to help lay out GRASP's short and long-term goals, especially since priority populations may have shifted in recent years.

It is proposed that an independent expert be hired to draft an overview of the situation facing both African and Asian great apes in the wild. Accurate information as regards populations, locations, density, range, and protected areas is required, and identification of possible threats or vulnerable regions will help lay out GRASP's agenda.

#### **Time Frame**

The need for a GRASP review was approved by the GRASP Executive Committee in October 2009.

The next steps are the following:

1. Assemble Review Team / Consultants (July 2011)
2. Phase I: Analysis / Interviews / Data Collection (July - August 2011)
3. Phase II: Country visits (July - August 2011)
4. Draft Report (August 30 2011)
5. Review of the draft report (September 15 2011)
6. Final report (October 15)
7. Presentation of the report at the GRASP Council meeting in 2012



## Annexe G. Terms of reference



### Great Apes Survival Partnership Evaluation - Terms of Reference

The Great Apes Survival Partnership (GRASP) review is tasked with evaluating the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and impact of GRASP, both as a functioning coalition of stakeholders coordinated by the GRASP secretariat and through its interventions carried out in the name of GRASP.

In 2006, the GRASP executive committee established an ambitious five-year plan that included five Programme Objectives and a Programmes of Action (PoA) to achieve those targets. But a series of unforeseen circumstances and delays left most of those Program Objectives difficult to reach. Therefore, it is proposed that the GRASP review focus on the following strategic areas in order to accurately evaluate the organization and help determine future targets.

The strategic areas for this review are:

1. The Effectiveness of GRASP as an Organization
2. GRASP Project Management & Impact
3. The Global Conservation Status of Great Apes

The three strategic areas are quite different and the approach to measure progress towards achieving these objectives will be different too. To measure habitat loss and population decline is an entirely factually-based scientific exercise, for example, while measuring the effectiveness of GRASP as an organization requires an examination of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of its current model. But it will be important to establish links and identify overlap between the strategic areas, in order to analyse GRASP accurately.

#### **Strategic Area 1: The Effectiveness of GRASP as an Organization**

*Target: To provide enabling conditions for the GRASP partnership to achieve its objectives (see PoA 5)*

The GRASP Programme of Action 5-Year Indicators listed in the GRASP Programme of Action 2006:

- GRASP accepted as the authoritative advisor on policies affecting survival of great apes and their habitat
- GRASP funding secured to achieve objectives
- GRASP rules observed and internal functions maintained

Suggested methods for the evaluation of Strategic Area 1

An institutional review is required to gauge the effectiveness of GRASP, which will analyse and assess key components of the GRASP partnership, such as:

- Review the GRASP organs (secretariat, Scientific Commission, Technical Support teams)
- Review roles and impact of GRASP patrons
- Review the role and impact of the GRASP great ape envoy
- Review whether the GRASP committees have functioned effectively
- Analyse GRASP's record in securing funding
- Compare GRASP partnership to similar models
- Analyse in how far the GRASP "partnership" is intact and which projects are actually undertaken as a "partnership" project

### **Strategic Area 2: GRASP Project Management & Impact**

*Target: To access funding, resources, management and leadership necessary to design and implement field projects that directly contribute to the conservation of great apes and great ape habitat and to identify, promote, in cooperation with local communities, economic activities compatible with great ape conservation and mitigate development activities detrimental to great ape populations and habitat (see PoA Objectives 3 and 5)*

The GRASP Programme of Action 5-Year Indicators listed in the GRASP Programme of Action 2006:

- Protected areas in great ape habitat expanded and security improved
- Rate of loss of great apes reduced relative to 2005
- New model implementation that combines great ape conservation and benefits with development benefits.
- Selected development activities impacting great apes contain mitigation strategies

As mentioned above, some of the 5-Year conservation objectives identified by the GRASP Programme of Action 2006 were too ambitious, and lie well beyond GRASP's current scope. Therefore, it is proposed that those benchmarks be set aside for the purpose of this review, and permit GRASP to be assessed on existing data and results.

Since 2005, GRASP has played an active role in field projects in Africa and Asia, leveraging an estimated \$7 million on behalf of over 25 projects that confront issues such as trans-boundary collaboration, law enforcement, reintroduction, captive welfare and ecotourism. But have these projects been successful? Is this the best use of GRASP resources? And is GRASP equipped to continue in this role?

Suggested methods for the evaluation of Strategic Area 2:

A review of selected GRASP-supported field projects in Africa (Cote d'Ivoire) and Asia (Borneo) is required to assess GRASP's efficacy in this role, which will include visits to project sites, interviews with stakeholders, and analysis of supporting documents, such as donor reports, review reports, and meeting reports, among others. Reviewers will analyse and assess key components such as:

- GRASP ability to access funding
- GRASP management of projects
- GRASP impact on projects
- GRASP role in designing projects
- Relative impact of projects



### **Strategic Area 3: The Global Conservation Status of Great Apes**

*Target: To prevent habitat loss and population decline in 50% of priority populations and habitats of each taxon of great apes, and to reduce the rate of loss or decline in 95% of the other populations (See objective PoA objectives 1, 2 and 4)*

The GRASP Programme of Action 5-Year Indicators listed in the GRASP Programme of Action 2006:

- 50% of priority great ape populations are demonstrably secure
- Rate of loss of other populations (95%) significantly reduced
- Monitoring and evaluation system established
- Outputs of monitoring & evaluation utilized by decision-makers to benefit great ape conservation

As mentioned above, some of the GRASP 5-Year objectives were too ambitious for GRASP to effectively embrace, and the ability to protect priority populations and key habitat falls into that category. The situation facing great apes in the wild has grown measurably worse in the decade since GRASP was launched, and GRASP published two reports in recent years – *Last Stand of the Gorilla* (2010) and *Last Stand of the Orangutan: State of Emergency* (2007) – that identify extinction as highly likely unless dramatic measures are taken.

Nevertheless, the 5-Year objectives remain important, and an evaluation of the current global conservation status of great apes would be an important part of the GRASP review, to provide accurate information that would inform future targets.

Suggested methods for the evaluation of Strategic Area 3

A review is required of the current situation facing both African and Asian great apes in the wild. This review of Strategic Area 3 will not require field visits, but will include an analysis of existing data to identify trends, data gaps, and the latest reports in order to make the link to GRASP activities. It is important that this analysis be done in collaboration with leading institutions in the field of great ape habitat and population surveys, such as the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, which hosts the APES data base. Areas of focus will include, among others:

- Accurate information regarding populations, locations, density, range, and protected areas
- identification of possible threats
- identification of vulnerable regions



#### **Annex 1**

Among people to be contacted:

- GRASP Task Force members
- GRASP Executive Committee members
- GRASP patrons
- Ian Redmond, GRASP great ape envoy
- Melanie Virtue, former GRASP coordinator
- Rob Hepworth, first GRASP teamleader
- Liz Williamson, IUCN – SGA coordinator
- David Jay, Born Free / GRASP liaison
- GRASP range state focal points
- GRASP staff members
- Volcano Safaris (private sector representative)
- Leonie Gordon (PhD on GRASP)
- Ingrid Vlisseren (PhD on biodiversity-related partnerships, including GRASP)
- Sabrina Krief (French GRASP liaison)

#### **Annex 2**

Among documents to be reviewed:

- Kinshasa declaration
- GRASP Programme of Action
- GRASP finance and activity plan
- The four big ideas
- Report of the UNEP evaluation on GRASP project management
- GRASP reports to the EC and any other project report
- Reports of GRASP Executive Committee meetings
- Reports of GRASP Scientific Commission meetings
- Ingrid Vlisseren PhD thesis
- GRASP publications
- Selected presentations
- GRASP reporting & monitoring tools



**Annex 3**

List of projects from 2005 including projects under the Spain-UNEP LifeWeb Initiative

	PoA 1	PoA 2	PoA 3	PoA 4	PoA 5
Title	Construction of a nursery facility and quarantine center	Emergency Construction of boundary wall in Virunga National Park	Engaging the rural poor in participatory environmental management	Scientific Assistance to GRASP through Identification of Priority Ape populations	National plans for pro-poor great ape conservation
Country Implementer	Indonesia Orangutan Foundation (UK)	DRC and Rwanda	Uganda WWF/Nature Uganda	Great Ape Range States The Great Ape World Heritage Species Project UK DEFRA	Great Ape Range States Born Free Foundation
Donor Budget Year 2005	Hilton/Intercontinental USD 15,000 2005	UNEP Reserve Fund USD 50,000 2005	UK FCO USD 20,000 2005	USD 65,000 2005	UNEP FP, USD 60,000 2005
Title				Great Apes Atlas Range	GRASP support to IUCN West Central Africa regional Workshop and action plan
Country Implementer				global WCMC	Central Africa Conservation International
Donor Budget Year 2005				UNEP FP & UK (FCO & DEFRA USD 28,892 2005	UK FCO USD 14,511 2005
Title	Organization of the African primate reintroduction workshop				Support to Tayna Center for Conservation Biology
Country Implementer	Netherlands Pan African Sanctuary Alliance				DR Congo Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund International
Donor Budget Year 2006	Italy USD 59,500 2006				Irish Trust Fund USD 30,000 2006

<b>Title</b>	Strengthening wildlife law enforcement	Indigenous people participation in mapping of traditional forest resources Cameroon World Wide Fund for Nature and Forest Peoples Programme UNEP Stakeholder Branch USD 95,000 2007	Conservation micro-credit and Enterprise Project  DR Congo Bonobo Conservation Initiative  Irish Trust Fund  27,000 2007	Last Stand of the orang-utan, Indonesia,  Indonesia GRID Arendal  DEFRA  USD 30,000 2007	Awareness raising film on Petit Loango  Gabon  UNEP FP (co-funding RAMSAR) 15,000 2007
<b>Country Implementer</b>	Cameroon Last Great Ape Organization				
<b>Donor</b>	DEFRA				
<b>Budget Year 2007</b>	USD 35,000 2007				
<b>Title</b>	Direct support to PAAs in Garamba and Kahuzi-Biega,		Ecotourism development in Cyamudongo forest, Nyungwe National Park		
<b>Country Implementer</b>	DR Congo Africa Parks Network, WCS, WWF		Rwanda Wildlife Conservation Society Irish Trust Fund USD 25,500		
<b>Donor Budget</b>	Spain USD 286,000 in 2008 USD 300,000 in 2009 2008 ongoing		2008		
<b>Year 2008</b>					
<b>Title</b>		Transboundary collaboration and corridor establishment  Ivory and Liberia	Economic incentives to conserve great ape habitat  DR Congo, Indonesia, Cameroon Gorilla Organization, Orangutan Foundation, Bristol Zoo EC	Development and implementation of national monitoring programme  Ivory Coast  Wild Chimpanzee Foundation  EC	Partnership work (Council, ExCom, SciCom) incl. support to focal points global  UNEP and Born Free  EC
<b>Country Implementer</b>		GRASP sec and Wild Chimpanzee Foundation (WCF) EC and USAID-STEWARD			
<b>Donor EC</b>					

Budget Year 2006- 2009		100,000 2009	2006-2009	2006-2009	2006-2009
Title			Economic incentives incl. REDD in Tripa and Batang Toru Indonesia PanEco/ICRAF	State of the gorilla	
Country Implementer				Gorilla Range States GRID Arendal	
Donor Budget Year 2010			Norway, Monaco 171,100 2010	France, UNEP 100,000 2010	
Title			High conservation value Forest approach Indonesia GAWHSP		
Country Implementer			France, DEFRA, UNEP		
Donor Budget Year 2007- 2010			76,300 2007 on-going		
Title	Strengthening of PAAs in Nouabale Ndoki, Lossi and Garamba in ecotourism, monitoring and health	Strengthening of PAAs in Kahuzi-Biega in management planning, health, monitoring	Economic incentives to conserve great ape habitat incl. REDD	Development of A.P.E.S. database and GRASP reporting and monitoring tool	GRASP partnership work incl. council, ExCom, SciCom, review of the partnership
Country Implementer	Congo, DR Congo WCS, Africa Parks Network	DR Congo WWF, WCS, COOPERA, MGVP	Cameroon WCS	Global Max-Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology	
Donor Indicative Budget Year 2010- 2011	Spain LifeWeb 750,000	Spain-LifeWeb 335,000	Spain-LifeWeb 100,000	Spain LifeWeb Un-funded	Global Spain LifeWeb, UNEP 500,000 2010
	2010-2011	2010-2011	2010-2011	2010-2011	