

Rapporteur Notes on Session 2.3

Transboundary Protected Areas

Leaders: Trevor Sandwith (South Africa), Charles Besançon (USA) and Sandra Slater-Jones (South Africa)

Chairs: Alfredo Guillet (Italy), Kishore Rao (India), Trevor Sandwith (South Africa)

Presentations by: Trevor Sandwith (South Africa), Harry van der Linde (Netherlands); Alfredo Guillet (Italy) ; William Wolmer (UK); Simon Metcalfe (South Africa); Floors Strauss (South Africa); Amos Mdluli (South Africa); Sebastian Maluleke (Mozambique); Chief Mingha (South Africa); Sheila Abed de Savala (Paraguay); Francis Auld (USA); Leo Braack (South Africa); Gerardo Budowski (Venezuela); Annette Lanjouw (Kenya); Srdjan Marincic (Serbia); Krishna Oli (Nepal); Carlos Ponce (Peru); Giuliano Tallone (Italy); Manuel Ramirez (Costa Rica); Conrad Steenkamp (South Africa) and Peter Brosius (USA); Anne Hammill (Canada); Charles Besançon (USA); Helen Suich (Australia); Belinda Reyers (South Africa); Willem van Riet (South Africa); Paul Hotham (Canada); and Eva Pongratz (Germany).

Rapporteurs: Dena Cator, Leo Braack, Charles Besançon, Conrad Steenkamp

Panel A: Synthesis of current perspectives on transboundary conservation

Rapporteur: Dena Cator

Trevor Sandwith, Leo Braack & Nigel Dudley: *Overview of global progress in establishing TBPA's and guiding protected area managers.*

This presentation reviewed early work on transboundary protected areas (TBPAs), mentioning Thorsell in 1990, IUCN and EuroParc in 1994, Hamilton et al. in 1996 and Zbicz in 2001. TBPA tools have also been created through the Biodiversity Support Program (2001), which has conducted a number of studies on TBPAs, particularly in Africa. IUCN further created the TBPA Task Force and produced the publication "Transboundary Protected Areas for Peace and Cooperation" which includes definitions and guidelines relating to TBPAs. The goal of the Task Force is to obtain perspective on the strategic direction of TBPAs and what is happening with them. It was acknowledged that managing TBPAs is a complex task – they deal with a multi layered and multi sectoral system. There is a transboundary spectrum including transboundary conservation areas, natural resource management areas and economic development areas. It is important to consider whether a transboundary area needs to be established or whether national interventions are more appropriate to manage environmental, social and economic needs in an area.

A number of different organizations are involved with TBPA research. Europarc has been focusing on certification to determine the quality of cooperation in TBPAs and to what extent TBPAs are addressing a common vision. INWENT and IUCN have conducted five regional workshops in southern Africa that identified needs such as institutional support, guidance/capacity building and monitoring/evaluation effectiveness. IUCN and ITTO also held a workshop in Thailand in February, 2003 that focused on increasing the effectiveness of TBPAs in tropical forests. A main outcome of this meeting was to focus on the future of TBPAs and a refinement of tools to create and manage them. The need for a global learning network was identified at the meeting, which has led to the creation of a website at www.tbpa.net and a portfolio folder that features lessons learned and a variety of case studies and theme papers on TBPAs.

Harry van der Linde (African Wildlife Foundation): *Issues facing transboundary natural resource management.*

Mr. van der Linde raised the question of knowing when to establish a TBPA or not. A number of factors should be considered. It is important to recognize that communities / stakeholders who rely directly on resources in a park can have a very different attitude regarding establishing a TBPA than the general public. If people linked to resources are not engaged in related decision-making processes, the long-term sustainability of a transboundary area can be compromised. Levels of involvement / authority must also be considered. For example, do you need consensus on establishing / managing a TBPA within one country before engaging another country in an initiative? An important lesson to keep in mind regarding managing transboundary areas is that what may work in one

country may not work in another country where different factors and conditions exist. Also, the higher you go in terms of involving national or international intervention, the more local people must be consulted. Also necessary are a variety of agreements to accommodate different needs for transboundary areas; strong communication amongst individuals and organizations involved in TBPA issues; consideration of institutional and individual capacity; and as assessment of whether an enabling environment exists for the TBPA. A main message is that transboundary management should be an iterative process and not a fixed or blueprint approach.

Alfredo Guillet: *Legal and institutional synthesis.*

This presentation explored the evolution of international environmental law and TBPAs, the current legal framework for TBPAs and an analysis of case studies relating to legal issues. The discussion concluded that a need exists to strengthen the legal component of TBPAs and develop a working hypothesis to achieve this.

Current environmental laws relating to TBPAs include motions by UNCED (1992), CEL, ICEL (1995) among others. These laws have reflected the perception of protected areas as “labs” to test models of sustainable development and biodiversity conservation. At the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002, themes that arose in terms of TBPA management were incorporating a holistic approach, good governance and Type 2 partnership initiatives.

A number of legal frameworks can be applied to TBPAs. A total of 47 international treaties currently exist. There are also “soft laws” (e.g. prevalent in Africa) and national laws and institutions. A need exists to conduct a preliminary analysis of national laws and to harmonize the different frameworks that exist. Through work on case studies, the question has been identified of whether legal and institutional frameworks for TBPAs are adequate. It has often been found that analysis and evaluation of legal frameworks has been absent from the early stages of TBPA establishment. Overall, there is a need for consolidation of legal tools relating to TBPAs. A solution is to monitor and strengthen legal and institutional frameworks and promote comparative analysis between them.

William Wolmer: *Transboundary Protected Area governance: tensions and paradoxes.*

This presentation examined the question of whether TBPAs can transcend politics in an area of land or whether they superimpose additional politics. Although it is argued that TBPAs are necessary for reestablishing ecological integrity in some areas, they must be superimposed on a complex political landscape which can create tensions.

Some of these tensions include:

- Bioregionalism versus ecoregionalism – bioregionalism argues for devolved governance, bottom-up development and grassroots empowerment whereas

- ecoregionalism must be implemented at an ecosystem scale and so takes a top-down approach.
- Neoliberalism and Ecoregionalism – neoliberalism focuses on leveraging private sector investment, but do TBPA's increase investment and partnerships or create imbalances in equity?
 - TBPA's and national sovereignty – states cede sovereign power to partner states in TBPA agreements. Asymmetries can occur when there are differences in economic power between the states.
 - Top-down approaches that prioritize conservation and bottom-up approaches that prioritize development – top-down approaches mean communities often are not able to participate in decision-making.

Conclusions are that:

- Underlying power dynamics must be taken seriously.
- Communities need secure access to land and natural resources.
- There are no TBPA blueprints.
- TBPA's need to proceed slowly and cautiously – avoiding political grandstanding.
- There is a need to revisit the ideals of bioregionalists, focusing on full participation, self-representation and self-determination as guiding principles.

Panel B: Local (community) perspectives on TBPA conservation.

Rapporteur: Conrad Steenkamp

Simon Metcalfe: *TBPA Impacts on Communities*

TBPAs create added complexity

Examples exist of TBPAs built from the ground up (e.g. Upper Zambezi)

Examples exist of TBPAs built from the top down (e.g. Great Limpopo)

Means to avoid negative impacts of TBPAs on local people include:

- Zonation of PAs as multiple use areas
- Landholders to participate directly in decision making
- Give local communities property rights to increase their bargaining power
- Ensure community resource use rights
- Commence local participation very early in planning process
- Provide equity in community / private sector partnerships so that communities have a strong stake in joint ventures and receive benefits.

Floors Strauss: *Richtersveld*

Not only communities need capacity building. Also local government and conservation authorities need to be trained to deal with co-management situations.

Real participation in decision making is needed in comanagement situations, not disempowered consultation.

Amos Mdluli: *Mdluli Community, Kruger National Park*

There is a risk that only the elite in the tourism industry will benefit from the transfrontier park.

Community participation is limited to participation in the KNP – there is no real participation in the transfrontier aspect.

Communities need support to launch their own tourism activities.

Sebastian Maluleke – *Makhandizulu community, Limpopo National Park, Mozambique*

There was inadequate consultation before the elephants were released into the park.

We welcome the park development – but we don't want to be resettled.

We also don't want conflict with wildlife.

Chief Mhinga: *Mhinga, Kruger National Park*

Communities need support to participate in tourism.

Communities need compensation for losses due to animals.

We want a concession inside the KNP, like that of the private sector, in exchange for our land claim.

Sheila Abed de Savala: *Gran Chaco Americano, Paraguay*

The legal framework allows establishment of private PAs in a transboundary setting.

Lessons relate to a lack of funding to implement and weak public institutions.

Francis Auld: Waterton Glacier International Peace Park

We were not consulted in the establishment of the park.

The park is now being extended and we are not involved.

Leo Braack:

Too much political commitment behind a TBPA can cause problems, as in Great Limpopo.

No nation will allow loss of sovereignty.

TBPAs raise donor opportunities.

Communities don't have to wait to be involved.

Simon Metcalfe:

If exclusion / eviction occurs as a result of a peace park, then it is no peace park.

In general:

TBPAs cannot be established at the cost of local communities.

TBPAs could be used to promote local participation.

Panel C Transboundary protected areas for peace and cooperation.

Rapporteur: Leo Braack

Gerardo Budowski: *TBPAs as a vehicle for peaceful co-operation*

Key institutions involved in promoting the TBPA concept or TBPA initiatives, or which are interested in TBPAs, have been IUCN (e.g. publication by Sandwith et al 2001), WWF, Conservation International, UNEP, UNESCO, UNDP, ITTO, and UN-funded University for Peace.

Standing out amongst countries which have been particularly active in TBPAs in recent years is South Africa, facilitated by the efforts of Peace Parks Foundation.

One significant factor that has helped to focus interest in TBPAs is the possibility that they can promote peace and cooperation; the labelling of “Peace Parks” holds considerable appeal.

Conflicts over water shortages will increase in the future. Given that international basins make up 45% of the earth’s land surface, TBPAs could contribute in a major way to ensuring benefits and alleviating conflicts.

The fundamental question raised by Budowski was whether Peace Parks should be restricted to only TBPAs? If so, this eliminates the possibility of creating Peace Parks (hereafter shortened to PPs) for island countries (at least for terrestrial areas) as in the case of Australia, New Zealand, Madagascar, Iceland, etc., while limiting the possibility of many other countries with only one or very few or small (in size) borders with neighbouring countries, such as UK, Indonesia, etc.

Budowski proposes that PPs may be part of a category of Protected Areas established at sites where there was a significant conflictive past. There are many promising areas in the world that qualify for PPs without being located on the borders of two or more countries, because they were well-known scenarios of past conflicts. Budowski has proposed a list of 20 potential PPs for Central America, most of them also TBPAs. Africa also has many. Added possibilities for interpretation, education and a ‘good feeling of pride and achievement’ are all tangible benefits when a formerly conflicting area becomes a demonstration that peaceful relations can be achieved. The establishment of TBPAs for conflict prevention and confidence building has also been proposed. PPs may trigger the interest of many organisations when promotion of peace rather than conservation of biodiversity is the main goal. There is also the possibility to attract donors or stakeholders particularly interested in the promotion of peace.

Suggestions for a Peace Parks Programme:

- ❑ Inventory existing or proposed PPs. Part of this has been done by IUCN, but if PPs are 're-defined' then new ones may be developed.
- ❑ Adopt criteria for qualification as a PP.
- ❑ Identify ways of obtaining the greatest value when the PPs are designed and managed.
- ❑ Attract other interested stakeholders, including funding agencies, to participate in the creation and management of PPs
- ❑ Design a system of annual rewards for the most successful PPs established
- ❑ Produce curricula, education and teaching materials in which biodiversity conservation is combined with the promotion of a culture of peace.

Annette Lanjouw: *Virungas – transboundary biodiversity conservation in the context of regional insecurity and conflict*

Annette made one strong point, and that is that transboundary collaboration is a series of strategies along a continuum, and that the definition of successful transboundary collaboration depends on the specific needs of a particular area. It is not necessary to have formal Treaties to achieve successful transboundary management at a particular level.

Annette also advocated that transboundary initiatives work best when they start at ground level and work their way up. Small successes, such as existing transboundary collaboration, can persuade higher officials to proceed to the next higher level, and so proceed along a stepwise process. In some countries this slow 'bottom-up' process will have more likelihood of success than asking politicians for a big-bang, one-step TBPA establishment process.

Srdjan Marincic: *Peace Parks in the Balkans Prokletje, Sar-planina*

This was largely a talk on the nature and process of this TBPA.

Krishna Oli: *The potential for a TBPA in the Kanchajungha Region of the Eastern Himalayas.*

Krishna pointed out that if communities have 'bought in' to the TBPA concept and support it, they can serve as more effective surveillance and monitoring people than government officials (greater number, better spread). But, one of the major challenges is to reconcile the natural resource needs of communities with available resources.

Specific challenges:

- ❑ political commitment for TBPA establishment and management
- ❑ formal legal arrangements
- ❑ establishing institutional frameworks at various levels (a TBPA is most likely to work if institutional arrangements at lower levels are satisfactory)
- ❑ differing languages across boundaries

- ❑ low government priority for establishment of TBPA's
- ❑ follow-up on achievements
- ❑ long-term commitments
- ❑ empowering local level government institutions

Carlos Ponce: *Cordillera Del Condor (Peru-Ecuador)*

This region was a centre of conflict for decades. The Presidential Act of 1988 led to the Declaration of Peace between the two countries over the disputed border area. They established Adjacent Zones of Ecological Protection, which are core areas, subsequently hugely expanded by 'Reserve Zones'.

The TBPA has 'Principles of Good Governance', and clear objectives (peace, biodiversity conservation, and sustainable development of communities). Each component area also has specific objectives, and there is co-management by communities. Carlos stressed 'Empowerment' and 'Partnerships' as key, important elements.

The two countries have now embarked on a 'Bi-national Development Plan' to overcome poverty.

Carlos believes that initiatives such as this one contribute greatly towards achievement and maintenance of peace.

Guiljano Tallone: *Siachen Peace Park: a case study for the valorisation of high mountain ecosystems*

Siachen Peace Park is also an area of high conflict. It lies on the border between the two countries (India, Pakistan), a border which was poorly defined and the subject of territorial disputes, tensions and conflict.

Guiljano suggests that converting this region into a TBPA could contribute towards resolving the conflict.

Proposals to contribute towards peace & collaboration:

- ❑ science centre for cooperation
- ❑ joint mountaineering expeditions
- ❑ WCPA informal group to develop a statement in support of the establishment of a TBPA, for forwarding to the 2 governments
- ❑ each side should recognize the other side's claim
- ❑ they must agree not to change the current status through military means
- ❑ they must engage in a process of de-militarisation

Plenary Comments & Questions:

Comment: TBPA's can complicate funding proposals. No longer is just the Ministry for Environment involved, as is usually the case for purely domestic Pal With TBPA's there is also a need for approval of Defence and other ministries, and this can be complex and time-consuming.

Question: Where countries are engaged in border disputes and outsiders see opportunity for TBPA to alleviate tension, who acts as peace broker? (This became a rhetorical question; no-one took it up.)

Comment: Even in Peace Parks there may still be tensions. Governments may enter agreement and work well together, but there may be displaced communities who still resent historic displacement.

Comment: The TBPA message is very strong and should go through to next year's COP on CBD.

Comment: The possibility of a new concept of TBPA exists in the Rift Valley. This is mega-scale, connects Africa and Asia, and requires a very large scale framework. Rift Valley is 7,000km in length, with 22 countries involved. This is not necessarily a single continuous TBPA, but more of a serial one. The Rift Valley coincides with a major bird migration route.

Panel D: Transboundary Impact Measurement, Evaluation, Certification

Rapporteur: Dena Cator

Manuel Ramirez: *L'Amistad – A case study of peaceful cooperation*

This presentation focused on L'Amistad, a binational World Heritage Site located on the border of Costa Rica and Panama. The component parks stem from an agreement in 1974, when all Central American countries agreed to establish parks and reserves in transboundary areas. The parks were established as a transboundary management area as they share many similarities including high biological, cultural and economic wealth. The area has high levels of endemic species and contains 80-100% of all flora found in Central America. Four major indigenous groups live either within or near the reserve. At the same time, the area has the lowest socio-economic levels in Central America.

A significant degree of alliance building is exhibited in management of L'Amistad. Working agreements have been created in 7 sectoral areas, a coordinating commission has been formed and both governments have agreed to work with NGOs. Lessons from the area include the importance of joint cooperation, collaboration between government agencies and NGOs / other partners, the need for continuous financial support, NGO participation and strong political will. All of these elements are needed for successful TBPA management. Challenges that remain in L'Amistad include more bilateral coordination and further involvement of regional and local authorities.

Conrad Steenkamp and Peter Brosius: *TBPAs and conflict – a synthesis of case studies.*

TBPAs are affected by conflict. This presentation discussed developing frameworks to address these conflicts and different approaches for resolution of issues. Discussed first was the definition of “conflict”. Surveyed responses include the following elements:

- Direct users versus external actors.
- Horizontal versus vertical conflict (vertical is power imbalances between actors).
- Public versus hidden transcripts.
- Actor Network Analysis allowing nuanced perspectives on conflict.

Conflict may mean that a community is against protection in an area; a lack of conflict may mean that a community is not being engaged in TBPA management issues. Ameliorating frameworks have a tendency to not resolve conflicts involving outside actors and internal conflict, and they also often only deal with conflict after it has occurred, rather than preventing it. Other approaches for dealing with conflict are management tools and analytical tools. Management tools tend to be generalized, uniform standards that are accessible to practitioners whereas analytical tools focus on particular situations, horizontal and vertical conflicts and may provide insights at the policy level. Different tools for resolving conflict have different applications.

Improved ways to approach conflict management may include the following:

- Increased use of analytical tools that cut across layers of governance (additional layers of governance in TBPAs add to the complexity of conflicts).
- Early use of analytical tools to help avoid conflict in TBPAs.
- Linking managerial and analytical tools.

Anne Hammill and Charles Besancon - *Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment – an emerging tool for TBPA planning and monitoring.*

This presentation discussed using the Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA) as a tool for better planning in the creation of TBPAs. If the issues involved in TBPAs are not carefully considered before they are implemented, transboundary parks have the potential to exacerbate conflict (especially violent conflict) rather than resolve it. Several unique factors exist in transboundary areas that can fuel conflict. For example, borders are symbols of national sovereignty, but communities on either side of the border may have more in common with each other rather than their fellow nationals. Also, many TBPAs tend to promote top-down decision-making, which can disempower local communities and create inequitable conditions.

The use of PCIA before creation of TBPAs may help to prevent and ameliorate conflict. PCIA can be used a management tool for evaluating how an intervention in the form of TBPA creation can affect conflict dynamics in a conflict-prone area. Donors, local communities and governments can use the tool at any stage of the TBPA planning cycle. Basic components of PCIA are conflict mapping and analysis, project / programme mapping, assessment of the impact of the conflict on the project and assessment of the impact of the project on the conflict. Because the model is conceptual at this time, the presenters suggested testing the model on a TBPA in the early stages of planning. A research proposal has been developed to test the Okavango/Upper Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area – an area characterized by a number of international agreements, the presence of conflict (high number of land mines present in the area) and presence of resettled refugees.

Helen Suich: *TBPAs – Indicators of biological and economic impact.*

This presentation discussed a monitoring system that Conservation International has developed to measure progress on:

- Extinctions avoided
- Areas protected
- Corridors created

There are six core indicators in the framework: 2 species indicators, 2 conservation indicators and 2 corridor indicators. The level of reporting is at the hotspot, wilderness area level and the framework will be phased in over the next 2 to 5 years. The species indicators focus on reduction in the number of threatened species and conservation indicators focus on key biodiversity areas protected and habitat conserved. Corridor indicators focus on the fact that connectivity allows natural biotic interactions. Socio-

economic impacts can be gauged at two levels: the regional economy level and the household / livelihood level. Research utilizing Conservation International's monitoring system will focus on major sectors of the economy but will also try to analyze new activities spurred by the creation of TBPA's.

Belinda Reyers: *Evaluating Transfrontier Conservation Areas in southern Africa in relation to target achievement.*

Literature indicates that TBPA's are valuable because they protect larger areas of contiguous land than what can be captured within national boundaries. The idea is that this, in turn, may facilitate increased conservation of habitat and species diversity in an area. Little literature exists, however, proving whether this assumption is true. The author presented a paper investigating this issue using the presence of bird species in a number of TBPA's located across southern Africa.

The author found that TBPA creation caused an average of 5% more bird species to be captured / conserved in comparison to protection of an area within a single national boundary. Thus, in this instance, creation of TBPA's does not seem to correlate to increased biodiversity protection. It is possible that TBPA's may actually undermine regional conservation efforts. Many protected areas were traditionally created for reasons other than protection of species. The author stressed, however, that investigation of this issue may be a starting point in identifying needs for further evaluation and monitoring of biological representation in TBPA's.

Summary by Annette Lanjouw, Chair

The session focused on measuring the impact of TBPA's on biodiversity and socio-economic factors. Most tools have not yet been applied in a transboundary context, indicating an increased need for evaluation in this regard. Authors identified that transboundary areas have a multitude of objectives, requiring a sophisticated system of evaluation.

Panel E: Workshop on the Global Programme

Rapporteur: Charles Besançon

Charles Besançon: *The Global Transboundary Protected Areas Network*

This presentation began with an indication of why there is a great need to create a global network around transboundary protected areas. In terms of transboundary protected areas:

- TBPAAs have more than doubled in the last decade
- Several more are set to launch in the next few years
- There is no one existing source for TBPA information; either physical or virtual
- There is a growing interest globally in peace parks and transboundary issues.

In terms of Transboundary expertise:

- Individuals and organizations are currently the sole purveyors of information
 - None of these organizations have a strong information dissemination mandate for the public
 - Key individuals are fully committed elsewhere.

In terms of the Internet:

- It is continuing to grow at an exponential rate, especially in developing countries
- The internet is expensive and should not be seen as a panacea; rather, it is but one tool in the “toolbox”.

A new initiative is needed that could be objective and not carry certain stigmas that may be associated with specific organizations. IUCN should take a very active role in the creation of this project and should fully endorse it.

This new initiative could have the following set of resources:

- Interactive publication database
- Database of people with expertise
- Database of all 169 transboundary protected areas
- Allow for interactive discussions through listservs and discussion forums.

We were next given a demonstration of the new transboundary protected areas website (<http://www.tbpa.net>) and then shown the potential for this new initiative by looking at (<http://www.wilderness.net>), a project that Charles built in the United States.

Willem van Riet: *Peace Parks Foundation*

Willem demonstrated several different views of the earth through the use of GIS and fly-through technology. His main point was that current political borders do not match at all geographic borders that are either historical wildlife ranges, geological, hydrographical, elevation, etc. We should therefore be thinking in terms of geography rather than arbitrary political borders. If parks cross borders, we should embrace this.

Willem also told us about a new initiative in which the Peace Parks Foundation would act as a new resource for the SADC (Southern African Development Region). They would provide the funding for someone at SADC to be closely aligned with any new TBPA initiative. Willem also said that IUCN should serve in this role, rather than Peace Parks Foundation.

Paul Hotham: *Transboundary networking in Europe – the EuroParc experience*

Paul addressed TBPAs in Europe and the role of EuroParc Foundation in creating a set of basic standards that must be passed before a TBPA can be certified by EuroParcs to that effect.

The benefits of this system are that;

1. The system can be used to set priorities
2. Standard exist to which transboundary cooperation can aspire
3. The system guides the TBPA creation process through an analytical process

Eva Pongratz: *Launch of EuroParc’s “Transboundary Parks – following nature’s design” initiative*

Eva is the director of the EuroParcs Foundation and she gave an excellent presentation to launch the “Transboundary Parks: Following Nature’s Design” certification programme that was more fully explained by Paul Hotham (see above). Eva presented to the transboundary taskforce a copy of the new publication that launched the initiative.

Discussion

In the Discussion portion of the program we heard commitment from many organizations to the goal of a global TBPA network. These organizations included:

- Alastair Sarre from ITTO (unspecified support)
- Gerardo Budowski, professor Emeritus from The United Nations University for Peace and also the father of the Peace Parks idea – wants to contribute especially in terms of a short course on peace parks by working with the TBPA task force to share information.
- Peace Parks Foundation is happy to help with logistical information and to share GIS materials
- EuroParc Foundation is willing to act as a regional hub for Europe
- Peace Parks Foundation may also act as a regional hub for Southern Africa

There seemed to be consensus that we should encourage regional hubs to be formed so that we could link them together in a global network.

There was also great consensus that, based upon the great interest in transboundary issues, we should seek elevation within the IUCN structure, so that transboundary issues become the subject of a work programme rather than just a taskforce.

We still do not know what the needs of the emerging transboundary community are and therefore should conduct a needs assessment.

Having an inspirational leader like Trevor Sandwith running the global programme is essential to making this happen. Our funding strategy must focus on outputs and projects rather than on trying to hire people.

In summary, there was overwhelming support for a global network and to elevate transboundary to “work programme” status in IUCN.