



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

**BANGLADESH**

# INTEGRATED PROTECTED AREA CO-MANAGEMENT (IPAC)

A Summary Report on  
Work Planning Session  
With Forest Department  
On Co-Management of  
Protected Areas

**July 13, 2008**

This report is made possible by the support of the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The Contents of this report are the sole responsibility of International Resources Group (IRG) and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

# Integrated Protected Area Co-Management (IPAC)

## A Summary Report on Work Planning Session With Forest Department On Co-Management of Protected Areas

Venue: Bana Bhaban, Agargaon, Dhaka-1207

July 13, 2008

**USAID Contract N° EPP-I-00-06-00007-00**

Order No : EPP-I-01-06-00007-00

*Submitted to :*  
**USAID/Bangladesh**

*Submitted By :*  
International Resources Group (IRG)  
With subcontractors:  
WWF-USA, dTS, East-West Center  
Environmental Law Institute, Epler-Wood International  
World Fish Center, CIPD, RDRS, CODEC  
BELA, Asiatic M&C, Oasis Transformation  
Module Architects, IUB/JU



**International Resources Group**  
12 11 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
202-289-0100 Fax 202-289-7601  
[www.irglttd.com](http://www.irglttd.com)

# Table of Contents

Table of Contents .....	1
1. Introduction .....	2
2. Objectives & Program Schedule .....	2
3. The Participants .....	2
4. Workshop Events .....	3
4.1 Inauguration .....	3
4.2 Context Setting.....	3
4.3 Presentations on NSP & MACH.....	4
4.4 Responses; Questions & Answers.....	4
4.5 Presentations on IPAC .....	5
4.6 Question and Answer session following IPAC presentation.....	5
4.7 Review of Priorities for IPAC Program Support in the Context of DPP Preparation...	8
4.8 Closing Remarks .....	11
Annex- 1: Program Schedule.....	12
Annex- 2: List of Participants.....	14
Annex- 3: Briefing on IPAC.....	16

## 1. Introduction

Integrated Protected Area Co-Management (IPAC) Project is committed to develop a visible, recognizable national and integrated system of co-managed Protected Areas (PA) covering more than 367,500 hectares directly benefiting over two and a half million population at least four major new protected areas and an expanded array of more than 50 PAs, including forests, wetlands and ecologically critical areas by September 30, 2013.

The IPAC project has just begun in June 2008 and now the essential job is to consult with each of the concerned Government of Bangladesh (GoB) departments viz. Forest Department (FD); Department of Fisheries (DoF); and Department of Environment (DoE) for their understanding about the project and to obtain their inputs to achieve the project purpose.

This is the second daylong 'Brain Storming/Work Planning Session of FD & IPAC in Co-Management of Protected Areas' after DoF's planning workshop.

The workshop was organized at conference hall, Bana Bhaban, FD on 13 July 2008.

## 2. Objectives & Program Schedule

The objectives of the workshop were:

- a. to familiarize FD staff with scope and major components of IPAC
- b. to obtain inputs from FD staff on key aspects to be taken into account in the work planning and implementation of IPAC
- c. to assist in compiling information needed for the DPP for IPAC

The agenda items covered during the sessions were presentations on:

- Context & scope of IPAC;
- Update on Nishorgo Support Project (NSP) accomplishments and lessons learned;
- Update on MACH accomplishments, lessons learned and remaining challenges;
- Summary of statement of work and components for IPAC;
- review of FD priorities and plans for IPAC program (Detail workshop schedule in Annex – 1)

## 3. The Participants

The workshop was attended by 60 participants of which 48 from FD viz. Chief Conservator of Forests (CCF), Deputy Chief Conservator of Forests (DCCF), eight Conservator of Forests (CF), three Assistant Chief Conservator of Forests (ACCF), 16 Divisional Forests Officer (DFO)/Deputy Conservator of Forests (DCF), 14 Assistant Conservator of Forests (ACF), one Programmer, three Research Officers & Librarian were present. The rest of the participants were senior professionals from development partner organizations viz. one from MACH, two from World Fisheries Center (WFC), one from RDRS and seven from IPAC/NSP including Chief of Party of both NSP & IPAC. The Team Leader, Environment Team from USAID Bangladesh was attended (Annex – 2).

## **4. Workshop Events**

### **4.1 Inauguration**

The workshop was inaugurated by Mr. A. K. M. Shamsuddin, the CCF. He acknowledged NSP's achievements and reminded all the challenges ahead for scaling up co-management in forest as well as in wetland areas. He acknowledged USAID's involvement and support in this regard. CCF felt sorry that he could not be present the all day session as he has to attend four important meetings, and so requested DCCF to chair the meeting.

Mr. Abdul Motaleb, DCCF, welcomed all to the meeting and expressed support to extend Co-management in all Protected Areas (PAs) as well as in wetland.

Mr. Ishtiaq Uddin Ahmad, Conservator of Forests, Wildlife Management and Nature Conservation Circle (CF-WMNC), spelled out the objectives of workshop.

He also introduced Winrock and WFC members to other FD officials. He emphasized the need to develop Development Project Proforma (DPP) and requested all to provide input to the extent possible.

### **4.2 Context Setting**

Mr. Ishtiaq Uddin Ahmad thanked Dr. Azharul H. Mazumder, Team Leader, Environment, USAID-Bangladesh, and all NSP team members for bringing US Ambassador and officials to Mochoni Nature Park of Teknaf Game Reserve (TGR) on July 09, 2008 to open the Nature Interpretation Center named "Oirabot."

He then requested Dr. Mazumder to set context for today's program.

Dr. Azharul H. Mazumder, Team Leader, Environment, USAID-Bangladesh spoke highlighted that the journalists reflected positively on Mochoni ceremony and this will support conservation efforts.

He mentioned that fresh water wetlands of Bangladesh are the third largest in the world and highlighted their socio-economic and ecological importance. Loss of area and productivity due to unsustainable use of these areas led to the formulation & execution of MACH project, which showed that, viable wetlands can be maintained by and for the community; this gave hope to extend community involvement in management of other natural resources, leading to formulation of NSP in forest protected areas.

He mentioned that NSP has many successes but also shortcomings in some areas. He added that Bangladesh does not have a holistic approach to manage wetlands and PAs, and so no national framework exists.

He emphasized the need for a system of freshwater wetland and PAs, improved capacity of the related government institutions.

He thanked Mr. Philip DeCosse, Chief-of-Party of NSP and introduced Mr. Bob Winterbottom, Chief-of-Party of IPAC Project.

### **4.3 Presentations on NSP & MACH**

- Mr. Ishtiaq Uddin Ahmad summarized achievements of NSP by mentioning formation of Co-management Councils and Committees (CMC), community patrolling groups, alternative income generating activities (AIGs) and eco-tourism.

He mentioned that in 2007 about 50,000 people visited the Lawachara National Park which is a reflection of efforts done by NSP members.

He emphasized the need for identifying lessons in order to move forward. He mentioned the need to empower the CMCs, to find out ways and means to work with local people, otherwise the forests cannot be saved. He mentioned that public-private partnership in NSP gained some momentum although not to the extent expected, 50% sharing of benefits although not approved but significant progress has been made.

He requested all to brainstorm to find out ways to make CMCs more active, and to live up to their expectations and aspirations. He again requested all to provide valuable suggestions for successful implementation of co-management for biodiversity conservation.

- Mr. S.N. Chowdhury, Ex-National Coordinator of MACH Project shared his experiences by a PowerPoint presentation on MACH project (Annex – 3). This included a discussion of the problems being addressed, the main objectives of MACH, the project interventions, impacts and lessons learned.
- Mr. Philip J. DeCosse underscored that the traditional management regime of FD did not help to better protect and conserve the biodiversity due to lack of resources/manpower/support. Now, in the five pilot PAs, with the help of CMCs biodiversity has increased as evident in the higher density of indicator bird species and reduced illegal logging. The basic premise is that participation of people is a must.

He also mentioned that although CMCs were involved, future challenges will be to involve the entire or broader constellations of stakeholders and it should be one of the roles of FD in IPAC to seek ways for broader involvement.

Another challenge would be to incorporate or embed DFO and ACF in the co-management system or structure to better guide the CMCs to take future challenges ahead.

He mentioned that in NSP, where strong leadership of DFO and ACF existed, the respective CMC showed better involvement in the co-management process.

### **4.4 Responses; Questions & Answers**

- Mr. Younus Ali, CF-Social Forestry Circle, asked Philip to explain more about the role of Range Officers (ROs).
- Mr. Philip explained that the ROs may need support for strengthening the outlook or stature to steer CMCs in the direction intended. The respective

- DFOs and ACFs should have more role in the process as approved by the gazette notification.
- CF-WMNC also supported more involvement of DFOs and ACFs in the approved co-management structure.
  - Dr. Mazumder too supported re-defining the structure of co-management and issues of accountability.
  - Mr. Anwar Hossain, CF, Chittagong Circle, mentioned that under MACH Project RMOs (Resource Management Organizations) have direct authority over the wetlands through leasing agreements and received direct benefit from resource harvesting. On the other hand CMCs under the NSP do not have the direct authority. He raised the importance of providing sustained direct benefit to the community patrolling groups.
  - Mr. S. N. Chowdhury of MACH Project clarified that RMOs under the MACH project did not get direct benefit, instead they have been assigned management of the wetlands and that the benefits are shared by the entire community.
  - Abdul Motaleb explained the basic difference between MACH and NSP; the later is involved in developing /protecting resource base with no direct benefit. But in MACH, the fish resources are shared sustainably by the community.
  - Mr. Rahman, ACF-TGR informed that in NSP, priority was not set to select beneficiaries for AIG support and as a result, maximum stakeholders that depend on forest entirely were not covered under the AIG support. The IPAC project should be careful about this issue. He also mentioned that members of the CMCs feels that they have an advisory role to play, and the FD members are not sure about what role they should be playing.
  - Uttam Kumar Saha, DFO Rangamati asked NSP member on how to provide sustained economic benefits to CMC and local poor stakeholders?
  - Mr. Philip informed that protection can generate tangible and intangible economic benefits. Every PA should have a buffer area that can be a means to generate tangible economic benefit to the beneficiaries through sustainable use of restored and well-managed buffer zone forest areas.

#### **4.5 Presentations on IPAC**

Mr. Ishtiaq Uddin Ahmad requested Mr. Bob Winterbottom, COP to give presentation on IPAC.

- Mr. Bob Winterbottom gave a PowerPoint presentation on IPAC highlighting issues like objectives, major components, targets/achievements over five years, structure, partners (national, international, strategic), project sites (a copy of presentation attached herewith), etc. (Annex – 4).

#### **4.6 Question and Answer session following IPAC presentation**

Mr. Abdul Motaleb thanked Mr. Bob Winterbottom for his presentation and invited responses/questions.

- Mr. Modinul Ahasan, ACF-Lawachara National Park (LNP), asked whether (1) there will be any studies like RRA/PRA in the IPAC like NSP. (2) How

the sites under IPAC were selected and if there is any chance to include forests under sherpur? and (3) how will so many partners be coordinated?

- Dr. Ram Sharma answered that (1) such studies will be conducted where necessary, (2) all official PAs were included except two PAs in the Coastal area based on ease of management and importance, (3) and that the partners will be working collaboratively like the way they have been doing in NSP.
- o Mr. Mohammad Ali, ACF-Chunoti Wildlife Sanctuary, asked why St. Martin has been included in the list of working areas and this site will be managed?
- Dr. Ram answered that a meeting was held at DOF and they suggested that IPAC include St. Martin. In fact, in the IPAC project this entire peninsula has been given preference for developing eco-tourism, this site may be managed as indirect new site through collaboration of CWBMP.
- o Mr. Ali, further asked who will be the stakeholders of IPAC?
- Mr. Philip replied that in general at the field level, stakeholders will be those who will assist in protection and conservation. He went on to add that whether stakeholder model of NSP was correct or not be evaluated by FD. He also added that depending on issues and context, stakeholders may differ from PA to PA like Madhupur NP and Sundarbans.
- Dr. Ram added that FD will be a key stakeholder.
- o Mr. Amir Hossain, DFO, Chittagong-South, asked that how IPAC will develop co-management in Sundarban?
- Mr. Philip acknowledged the difference once again and said that some level of collaboration and composition of co-management for Sundarbans need to be discussed within the FD.
- Mr. Robert Winterbottom reiterated that there is no simple answer; however, broader range of stakeholders will be incorporated depending on their necessity and importance. There will be key stakeholders like GoB institutions (FD, DOF, DOE etc) and local people, as well as indirect stakeholders who will help in building constituency and help in advocacy.
- o Mr. Abani Bhusan Thakur, DFO, Cox's Bazar (North) asked what type of activities will be at the direct existing, direct new, indirect new and leveraged sites?
- Dr. Ram replied that component 1, 2 & 3 will be carried out in all direct sites (new or existing), indirect sites may not get AIG support and the leveraged sites will be getting support as they have been under the partners (WFC).
- o Mr. Abani Bhusan further asked if sites under IPAC can be rearranged under FD's Divisional arrangement.
- Dr. Ram replied that most of the PAs & wetlands have been included under the cluster approach based upon connectivity and dependency upon one another. He added that he along with COP-IPAC has already visited Sherpur (Gazni area) as it an important catchments area for the wetlands below and will consider about its inclusion.
- Mr. Bob Winterbottom reminded about the limited resources and work force for the IPAC and assured the additional funding will be sought or synergy will be created from other donors/projects to include more areas.



- Mr. Anwar Hossain, CF-Chittagoing Circle mentioned that some members of the CMC are not directly related to conservation. Therefore, IPAC should carefully rethink the structure.
- Dr. Ram acknowledged, appreciated, and assured that proper attention will be given.

*Mr. Ishtiaq Uddin Ahmad asked every one for suggestions on how to make CMCs more effective.*

- o Mrs Rafiq Sultana, ACF, asked on how DPP will be prepared with three GoB institutions and be implemented. She also asked about the future of Nishorgo Program of FD.
- Dr. Ram mentioned that mode of operations were different in NSP and in MACH. For IPAC the system is yet to be finalized which will become clearer in course of time with consultation and support from FD. He mentioned that at this point of time FD should mention specific activities and budget for the DPP.
- Dr. Azhar replied that it is with FD to decide the future course of Nishorgo Program.

*Mr. Ishtiaq Uddin Ahmad suggested that let the DPP process start immediately and later decision can be made whether to have a composite DPP or separate one. Again he asked FD officials to provide input to the DPP for FD part on specific activity and budget.*

- o Mr. Tariqul Islam, ACCF Management, asked whether another Wildlife Sanctuary be created on the northern side of the Sundarbans Reserved Forest.
- Dr. Ram replied that in the IPAC project, Sundarban-ECA under DOE already has been included, also included Sundarban East as direct site and rest two Ws as indirect sites. Whether new PA will be created can be discussed within the FD based on their capacity and resources.
- o Quazi Md. Nurul Karim, ACF-TGR asked about the sites under Teknaf under IPAC.

He also informed that some of the GoB members of the Co-management Committee are not able to participate in the meeting and this may need changes of those positions.

He also asked that currently eight CMCs exist, how the legality of the future CMCs be obtained.

He also mentioned that AIG support will be very important & crucial to support forest users groups and community patrolling groups.

- Dr. Ram replied that Teknaf peninsula has been included and also St. Martin per the suggestions of DoF, but not Sonadia Island.

About the GoB official positions in the CMC, he mentioned that these are designated post by the Gazette.

Participation of the members holding these positions depend on personal attitude, motivation by the other members. He mentioned that some of these members (like in Satchari, the Social Welfare Officer) helped NSP a lot in getting approval of the CMC. However, he acknowledged and said

there are rooms for improvement. About the legality of the future CMCs, he mentioned that similar process for Gazette notification will be taken.

He also assured that focus will be given to Community Patrolling Groups and Forest User Groups with respect to AIG.

- Mr. Ratan Kumar Mozumdar, CF, Rangamati, asked how such big tasks be done with a relatively small amount of money (2.5 million RPA).
- Mr. Philip acknowledged that 2.5 million is not optimal figure. However, two ways we can achieve targets by (1) no extensive site construction work but only essential once like staff quarter can be constructed and (2) the same rate of restoration works as under NSP can be done and (3) complementary funding from other donors like EU, GTZ be sought.
- Mr. Ratan Kumar Mozumdar reminded about the bitter experience of SBCP.
- Mr. Abdul Motaleb, Ishtiaq Uddin Ahmad told that such problem should not arise if work is done properly.
- Mr. Uttam Kumar Saha, DFO CHT North asked how to minimize / mitigate demand for fuel wood and other resources and cautioned if demand not met, risk of failure will be higher.
- Dr. Ram, Philip and Ishtiaq Uddin Ahmad (CF-WMNC) said that most of the fuel wood is used to meet demand for cities or urban areas and not for the surrounding areas of PAs. So PAs cannot and should not be used to meet outside's demand.

Mr. Abdul Motaleb requested all to have lunch and request all to meet again at 2.30 pm.

#### ***4.7 Review of Priorities for IPAC Program Support in the Context of DPP Preparation***

Mr. Abdul Motaleb, welcomed every one once again and request Mr. Bob Winterbottom to present IPAC issues for discussion.

- Mr. Bob Winterbottom then invited further discussion from the participants on the following points and others deemed most relevant:
  - a. Suggestions for additional sites
  - b. DPP: suggested components, such as habitat restoration, benefit sharing, facility development or other key points
  - c. Suggestions for conservation based AIG activities
  - d. Ideas about key stakeholders to engage in development of IPAC strategy and action plan
  - e. Thoughts on training needs and priorities
  - f. Communications strategy development, including target audience, key messages, most effective communication tools, etc
- Mr. Rahman, ACF-TGR, reiterated the role of CMC a with respect non-traditional works like awareness building, health and sanitation, family planning issues, and role of women. Such CMC related issues can be incorporated and political leaders needs to be trained.

- Mr. Zahir, DCF, RIMS-GIS Unit, FD, mentioned that Nijhum Dweep NP and Char Kukri Mukri WS need to be included. But FD officials did not agree. Mr. Ali, ACF-CWS said that Nijhum Dweep is shrinking; it is a habitat for migratory birds and needs to be included in the IPAC sites.
- Mr. Abani Bhusan, DFO Cox's Bazar North, suggested including two indirect Wildlife Sanctuaries of Sundarbans as direct sites.
- Mr. Rezaul Sikdar, DFO Dhaka Wildlife Division said that Gazni Sal forests under Mymensingh need to be included in the IPAC.
- Mr. Md. Modinul Ahsan, ACF-LNP, informed that under NSP, buffer plantations were done under Habitat Restoration in the budget line item, and the actual habitat restoration works were done under "Others" item in the budget line. He suggested that in the IPAC, separate line items for buffer and habitat restoration be kept in the budget line item. He also mentioned that the current benefit sharing agreement for buffer plantations under NSP is done following FSP system. He suggested that as the CMCs are involved, the FSP agreement model can and needs to be modified to incorporate CMCs share of benefit. He also expressed that under the current system the researchers doing research in the PAs do not submit their report to the FD which could have an important bearing in the management planning. He suggested that a system be developed which will ensure submission of such research reports / findings to the FD. He also mentioned that universities can be linked with the FD for better information sharing and knowledge sharing. He proposed to set up a Wildlife Rescue Center under IPAC. He emphasized training needs of Beat Officers and Forest Guards and requested to give proper attention in this regard. He also mentioned that no recent inventory of forest resources exists and the field level staff really does not know what to conserve, and which are threatened. Two other issues he underscored were (1) poor or lack of any outreach capacity of FD which needs to be strengthened and that (2) boundary demarcation activity should be carried out.
- Mr. Saidul, DFO Cox's Bazaar suggested to focus on two sites (1) Rajarkul Range where great ecotourism potential exist and (2) Ukhia Range adjacent to Inani Range where rohoinga refuge is a problem.
- Mr. Hasan, ACF Planning said that Sundarban Wildlife Sanctuaries are different where no encroachment, no degradation and no illegal felling exist. Therefore, co-management approach should be different from other sites.
- Mr. Abul Bashar Miah, DFO-WMNC Sylhet suggested that Char Kukri-Mukri Wildlife Sanctuary be included in the IPAC. He mentioned that it is an important site for bird, there is no influx of population and co-management can be very successful over there. This site is needed to be included to prevent calamities of cyclone by raising coastal plantation.
- Mrs. Rafiq, ACF said that there are not proper guidelines for what species to be planted to the various sties or objectives and that similar species is planted everywhere by the FD. She mentioned that site-specific guidelines be developed. She also mentioned that AIG support be increased.
- Mr. Ratan Kumar Mozumdar (CF-Rangamati Circle) said that development of ecotourism infrastructures is needed in the Kaptai NP as it has the oldest and beautiful plantations in the Bangladesh. He also mentioned that if authority of Kaptai NP is given to WMNC then complicacy may arise. He also suggested that in the IPAC Land ministry should be involved as one of

the key stakeholders or motivated in some way to minimize conflicts between FD and Land Ministry, as well as law enforcing agencies.

*Dr. Azhar strongly supported his idea of involving Land Ministry in the IPAC strategy or working group.*

- Mr. Ratan Kumar Mozumdar (CF-Rangamati Circle) also supported the idea and said that District Commissioners be motivated and incorporated in the process as they give permission to lease out forest land into agricultural land (for shrimp farming).
- Mr. Anwar Hossain, CF, Chittagong Circle, gave similar opinion and highlighted the importance of a uniform Land Lease Policy. He suggested to include the Secretary to the Prime Minister as Chairman of the Steering Committee and/or Working Group. He mentioned that under Forestry Sector Project the Secretary to the Prime Minister was Chairman of the Steering Committee.
- Mr. Uttam Kumar Saha, DFO CHT North said that as the Ministry of Finance has a direct role to optimize revenue, they should also be involved in the proposed working group for IPAC.
- Mr. Mabud, DFO Sylhet, suggested incorporating Ratarkul (Companyganj) in the IPAC sites. He sought for guidance about rehabilitation of the Forest Villagers as their family size is increasing. For DPP, he suggested to build an all weather road circling RKWS. He suggested increasing AIG support. He mentioned that in future management plans the concept of zonation is needed. He also requested for inventory of natural resources for PAs.
- Quazi Md. Nurul Karim, ACF-TGR, told that the biogas plant of Hnila is a great example to reduce pressure on fuel wood and suggested to install under IPAC at BDR camp (700-600 members) and Rohingya Refugee camp at Kutuplaong. For DPP he suggested to keep provision for at least one pickup truck for each Range / CMC. Also suggested that nursery be established for species that provides fruit all the year round. He also suggested for plantations that would meet food requirement for elephant.
- Mr. Zahir, ACCF, RIMS-GIS Unit of FD requested all GIS works be done by the RIMS unit and not by other organization like NSP. He also proposed that the RIMS unit be developed as MIS unit.

*Dr. Azhar strongly supported his idea and asked for better planning from his side that will increase capacity of the Unit itself.*

- Mr. Shah-E-Alam, DFO Tangail, said that BELA should be informed to do community forestry in the buffer zone area.
- Mr. Abani Bhusan, DFO Cox's Bazaar North, said that FD has great / better expertise and example of social forestry in Bangladesh compared to other South Asian countries. According to him, these resources can be utilized by arranging Training in Bangladesh by the FD by developing training modules for 2 /3/ 5 days. He said no need to send officials in other countries. He also mentioned that "dhoincha" can be used as fuel as vast denuded areas in or surrounding the PAs. He mentioned that the areas that cannot be used for habitat restoration or buffer plantation activities under the budget can be used to produce fuel.
- Mr. Abu Naser Khan, ACCF Establishment, suggested that training module be developed for different strata / positions, courses can range from AIG,

biodiversity, environment, plantations, policies, holistic / integrated approach, eco-tourism etc. He also mentioned that existing training facilities like FDTC and Forest Academy can be improved and utilized in this regard.

- Mr. Uttam Kumar Saha, DFO CHT North said that analysis of stakeholders is necessary and strengthening of training institutes is necessary.

*Dr. Ram Sharma (DCOP-NSP/IPAC) said that like FSP, training will be conducted through institutions like Forest Academy. He also mentioned that training of DCs, Land Ministry Officials, UNO will be under taken. He also said that study on fuel wood demand can be taken where necessary and “dhoincha” can be used to meet demand for fuel wood.*

- Mr. Ratan Kumar Mozumdar (CF-Rangamati Circle) said that training of GOB Cadre Officials is also necessary on biodiversity related issues.
- Mr. Rezaul Sikdar, DFO Dhaka Wildlife Division said that Bhawal NP be given high priority (as direct site).
- Mr. Michael Mrong, Consultant NSP said that a series of discussions need to be held for Madhupur NP.

## **4.8 Closing Remarks**

### **Dr. Azharul H. Mazumder:**

Dr. Azharul mentioned that in the next meeting issues like Public-Private Partnership, Climate Change Adoption and Nature Tourism in Cox's Bazaar be discussed more thoroughly.

### **Mr. Philip J. DeCosse:**

Mr. Philip said that nature tourism has great potential. However; FD should play a facilitating role (i.e. provision for nature tourism expansion) rather than enter into tourism business.

He also said that capacity building is an important component and there will be training leading to diploma certificates.

He emphasized that IPAC team members can support FD to make change in the policy.

However, it requires FD to come up with solutions to the problem rather than identifying problems.

### **Mr. Ishtiaq Uddin Ahmad**

Mr. Ishtiaq thanked all for providing inputs to the meeting.

### **Mr. Abdul Motaleb:**

Finally the DCCF as well as Chairperson of workshop reminded that IPAC is not a tool to solve all problems.

He said that proper attention be given during scaling up of activities.

He also reminded that FD must own the concept of multi stakeholder concept, give due attention to the capacity building, strong policy and legal support, sustainable financing mechanisms and its legal issues.

Finally he thanked all the participants for their contribution and concluded the meeting.

## Annex- 1: Program Schedule

### Tentative Schedule for the workshop on IPAC to be held at Forest Department Conference Hall on Saturday, 13 July 2008

Purpose and Objectives:

- a. to familiarize FD staff with scope and major components of IPAC
- b. to obtain inputs from FD staff on key aspects to be taken into account in the work planning and implementation of IPAC
- c. to assist in compiling information needed for the DPP for IPAC

9:00 am	-	9:30 am	Participants Receive IPAC Packet
9:30 am	-	9:45 am	Welcome by DCCF
9:45 am	-	10:00 am	Inauguration by CCF
10:00 am	-	10:20 am	Context and scope of IPAC by USAID representative
10:20 am	-	10:30 am	Tea Break
10:30 am	-	11:15 am	Update on Nishorgo accomplishments and lessons learned PD, NSP
11:15 am	-	11:30 am	Update on MACH accomplishment, Lessons learned and remaining challenges
11:30 am	-	1:30 pm	Summary of statement of work for IPAC  IRG/IPAC project team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Purpose and scope</li> <li>o Expected results and proposed indicators</li> <li>o Timeframe and funding</li> <li>o Partners</li> <li>o Targeted areas – Cluster</li> <li>o Organizational Structure</li> <li>o Major components</li> <li>o Proposed Training Plan</li> <li>o Priority Activities for the First Year</li> </ul>
1:30 pm	-	2:30 pm	Lunch Break
2:30 pm	-	4:30 pm	IPAC: Statement of Work and Components

- Review of FD priorities and plans for integrated Protected Area co-management
  - Program strategies and policy development in support of PA management
  - Field operations in support of improved PA management
  - Infrastructure development
  - Training and institutional capacity building
  - Partnerships for sustainable financing
  - Outreach and communications
  - Other

4:30 pm -

Closing

## Annex- 2: List of Participants

### Integrated Protected Area Management (IPAC)

#### Brain Storming/Work Planning Session of FD and IPAC in Co-Management of Protected Areas

Venue: Bana Bhaban, Agargaon, Dhaka  
July 13, 2008

(Not according to seniority)

Sl.	Name	Designation	Address
01	A. K. M. Shamsuddin	CCF	FD, Dhaka
02	Abdul Motaleb	DCCF	FD, Dhaka
03	Ishtiaq Uddin Ahmad	CF & PD	FD, Dhaka
04	Md. Altaf Hossain Khan	CF	FD, Dhaka
05	Md. Younus Ali	CF	FD, Dhaka
06	Haradhan Banik	CF	FD, Dhaka
07	Anwar Hossain	CF	Chittagong
08	Amalendra Shaha	CF	Khulna
09	Ratan Kumar Majumder	CF	Rangamati
10	Zahir Hossain Khandaker	CF	Bogra
11	Md. Abu Naser Khan	ACCF (E)	FD, Dhaka
12	Md. Shafiqul Alam Chowdhury	ACCF	FD, Dhaka
13	Md. Tariqul Islam	ACCF	FD, Dhaka
14	Zahir Uddin Ahmed	DFO	Dhaka Division
15	Rezaul Sikder	DFO	WLNC, Dhaka
16	Md. Amir Hossain Chowdhury	DFO	Cht Hill Tracts (S)
17	Md. Abul Bashar Miah	DFO	WMNC D, M Bazar
18	Md. Shah-E-Alam	DFO	Tangail
19	Uttam Kumar Shaha	DCF	FD
20	Abani Bhushan Thakur	DFO	Cox's Bazar
21	Abdul Mabud	DFO	Sylhet
22	Md. Saidul Islam	DFO	Cox's Bazar (S)
23	Md. Ruhul Amin	DCF	Legal Unit, Dhaka
24	Md. Zaheer Iqbal	DCF	RIMS, Dhaka
25	Asma Parvin	DCF	SFW, Dhaka
26	Mozammel Haque Shah Chowdhury	DFO	WMNC Division, Cht
27	Md. Shofiqul Islam	DCF	M&E Unit, Dhaka
28	S.M. Shahidullah	DFO	Bagerhat
29	Marufa Akhter	DCF	FD, Dhaka
30	Farid Ahmed	Programmer	FD, Dhaka
31	Md. Mahmudul Hassan	ACF	FD
32	Quazi Md. Nurul Karim	ACF	Teknaf
33	Mohammad Ali	ACF	WMNC D, Cht
34	Mollah Rezaul Karim	ACF	WMNC D, M. Bazar
35	M. Oli Ul Haque	ACF	DPU, Dhaka
36	Ruhul Mohaiman	ACF	DPU, Dhaka
37	M. Golam Kuddus Bhuiyan	ACF	Sylhet
38	Rafiqua Sultana	ACF	NSP, Dhaka
39	Mahmuda Rokhsana Sultana	ACF	DPU, Dhaka
40	Abdur Rahman	ACF	Cox's Bazar



<b>Sl.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Address</b>
41	Md. Modinul Ahsan	ACF	Sreemangal
42	Md. Rafiqul Islam	ACF	NSP, Dhaka
43	Rabindra Nath Thakur	ACF	Modhupur, Tangail
44	Hossain Mohammad Nishat	ACF	Bhawal National Park
45	Harun Or Rashid	Research Officer	FD
46	Ruma Hossain PhD	Research Officer	DPU, Dhaka
47	Nasima Sultana	Research Officer	DPU, Dhaka
48	A. K. M. Rezaul Haque Khan	Librarian	FD, Dhaka
49	S. N. Chowdhury	Ex-National Coordinator	MACH
50	M. G. Mustafa PhD	Sr. Fisheries Coordinator	World Fish Center
51	Md. Gias Uddin Khan PhD	Sr. Fisheries Scientist	World Fish Center
52	Nasim Aziz	ESMS	NSP, Dhaka
53	Azharul H. Mazumder	Team Leader	Environment, USAID
54	Philip J. DeCosse	COP	NSP, Dhaka
55	Kazi M. A. Hashem	Trg & Grants Coordinator	NSP, Dhaka
56	Bob Winterbottom	COP	IPAC, Dhaka
57	Ram A. Sharma	DCOP	NSP, Dhaka
58	Michael Murong	Consultant	NSP, Dhaka
59	Utpal Datta	LGCBS	NSP, Dhaka
60	Md. Raihanul Islam Chowdhury	Field Coordinator	NSP, North

## Annex- 3: Briefing on IPAC



### **Briefing on IPAC** **Integrated Protected Area Co-Management**

Brainstorming and Planning Workshop  
Forest Department  
13 July 2008, Ban Bhaban, Dhaka



#### **Building on the Accomplishments of Nishorgo**

- Excellent progress on all six objectives of the Nishorgo Program
- Much experience gained; many lessons learned
- Clear demonstration of the benefits of multi-stakeholder, landscape level, co-management approach
- Proof of concept and model applied in 5 FD protected areas; need to sustain achievements and to capitalize on opportunity to extend to additional PA's

## IPAC Objectives and Areas of Concentration

- Designed to contribute to sustained, broad based Economic Growth through
  - Continued support to sustain successes in *biodiversity conservation* and *AIG* achieved at Nishorgo and MACH pilot sites
  - Expanded support for development an *integrated strategy* and *coherent national program* to support *co-management*, *environmental governance* and mitigation and adaptation to *Climate Change*
  - Increased emphasis on *training* and building *institutional capacity*
  - Targeted assistance to *scale up co-management* through a pro-poor landscape based participatory approach, in keeping with Forest Policy (1994), National Strategy for Accelerated Poverty Reduction, Inland Capture Fisheries Strategy and DOF Road Map

## Purpose of IPAC



1. Support further development of natural resources management and conservation of biological diversity
2. Develop an integrated Protected Area Strategy that applies to significant wetland and forest ecosystems
3. Build technical capacity for PA co-management
4. Expand the area under co-management and ensure long term success in extend benefits to communities
5. Address climate change mitigation and adaptation

### Expected Results - Overall



- *Strengthening of stakeholders* engaged in sustainable natural resource management and enhanced biodiversity conservation – to assist in the preservation of Bangladesh's natural capital while promoting equitable economic growth and stronger environmental governance systems
- *Empowerment of poor resource user groups* and capacity building to enable their central role in participatory, multi-stakeholder, transparent approach to resource management and benefit sharing

### Expected Results - Overall

- *Widespread adoption of co-management approach* with local communities, local government bodies and technical departments assuming *joint responsibility* for sustainable use and conservation of aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems



### Specific Results over five years

- Formal policy recognition of a PA system and approval of a national integrated PA co-management strategy and action plan devolving authority to communities
- Institutionalization of co-management as the accepted approach for PA management and biodiversity conservation
- Implementation of approved IPAC strategy establishing sustainable, productive, resilient PA
  - Sustained co-management of existing MACH and Nishorgo sites
  - Increased number of hectares under co-management
- Pragmatic conservation financing mechanisms developed and approved by GOB to mainstream conservation financing in favor of co-management implementation

### Specific Results over five years (continued)

- Successful implementation of conservation financing mechanisms and demonstration of sustainability of conservation partnerships
- Climate change mitigation and adaptation through improved land use and adaptation of communities
- Communication Strategy and Action Plan in support of IPAC designed and implemented, and targeted outreach activities carried out
- Community based NRM organizations involved in IPAC are sustainable, transparent, pro-poor, equitable
  - AIG activities involving targeted beneficiary groups implemented



### Specific Results over five years (continued)

- Cadre of professionals trained in PA management and co-management within GOB institutions and community organizations
  - Needs for institutional capacity assessed and training plan developed
  - Development of a foundation course on integrated PA management
  - Strengthened capacity of existing training centers
  - Training programs at the community level conducted
  - Development at community level of a pool of trained extension agents
- Development and demonstration of ecological restoration plans to rehabilitate degraded critical ecosystems through co-management
- Public-private sector alliances for PA co-management established and successfully operating
  - Business plans for community-based eco-tourism developed

### Targeted Locations for Site Specific Implementation

- *Sylhet*: Tanguar Haor, Hail Haor, Hakaluki Haor, Lawachara, Rema-Kalenga, Satchari, Khadimnagar
- *Chittagong Hill Tracts*: Pablakhali, Kaptai
- *Southeastern*: Teknaf, Chunati, Inani, Himchari, Medha Kachapia, Fasiakhali, St Martin's
- *Central*: Kangsan-Malijhee watershed, Turag-Bangshi, Madhupur, Bhawal
- *Sundarbans*: Sundarbans Wildlife Sanctuaries and ECA

Proposed IPAC Project Sites




## IPAC Implementation

- Funded by USAID/Bangladesh – Environmental Program, for five years (5 June 2008 – 4 June 2013)
- Implemented through MOFL and MOEF with technical assistance from IRG and partners
  - Forest Dept
  - Dept of Fisheries
  - Dept of Environment
  - Local Government
  - Community Based Organizations in 5 Clusters

## IPAC Team / Implementing Partners

- IRG with WWF, East West Center, Epler Wood Int'l, dTS, ELI
- World Fish Center – Bangladesh
- Adivasi Unnayan Kendra /Center for Indigenous Peoples Development - CIPD
- Rangpur Dinajpur Rural Services - RDRS
- Community Development Center - CODEC
- Asiatic Marketing and Communications, Ltd.
- Oasis Transformation Ltd.
- Independent University of Bangladesh/Jahangirnagar University
- Bangladesh Environmental Lawyers Association - BELA
- Module Architects
- Arannayk Foundation, Bangladesh Scouts, BRACNet and other strategic partners

## IPAC Stakeholders





## Work Plan Components and Tasks

1. Development of Coherent IPAC Strategy
  - Constituency Building
  - Strategy Development
  - Partnership Building for Sustainable Financing
  - Outreach
2. Building Stakeholder and Institutional Capacity
  - Training
  - Local support services
3. Site-Specific Implementation
  - Selection of demonstration sites
  - Alternative income generation and financing
  - Outreach
4. Cross-Cutting Approaches – gender and youth perspective

## IPAC Work Plan Priorities - 1

- Organize working group to develop IPAC strategy
- Facilitate and mobilize widespread support for national IPAC program
  - Engage national leadership, local government, civil society
  - Promote synergy and collaboration with other programs/projects (EC-Sundarbans, others)
- Build on lessons learned from FSP, Nishorgo, MACH and other co-management initiatives
  - Scale up from 45,000 ha to more than 350,000 ha



## IPAC Work Plan Priorities - 2



- Work with existing community based organizations and established entities – and replicate in other areas
  - UFC, RMO, FRUG, RUG, others established by CBFM
  - CM Councils, CM Committees, CPG, FUG, Federations, Nishorgo Clubs
- Emphasis on communication, training, social mobilization, environmental governance, partnerships and linking conservation and improved community well-being

## Desired inputs from brainstorming / planning session

- Suggestions for site specific implementation of IPAC: forests and wildlife habitat areas of greatest ecological and economic significance
- Additional, continuing assistance needed to sustain achievements and successes of Nishorgo
- Opportunities for extension / scaling up of co-management
- Ideas for IPAC communication strategy
- Training needs to implement IPAC; priorities for institutional capacity development
- Key constraints to be addressed to implement IPAC
- Other suggested priorities for first annual work plan for IPAC
- Inputs from FD staff on physical works planning for DPP