

## **Methodology for field consultation on the International Standard for Sustainable Wild Collection of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants (ISSC-MAP)**

The field consultation phase, scheduled for summer/autumn 2005, is an important part of the standard development process to assess the appropriateness of the draft standard in the context of responsible management of MAP resources. Only the feedback from collectors and organisations at the operational level dedicated to the sustainable wild collection of medicinal and aromatic plants will assure its relevance to and applicability in field projects world-wide and thus support the acceptance of the standard by a wide range of stakeholders involved in the sourcing of MAP.

**Main objective** of the field consultation phase is:

- to test relevance, degree and range of applicability and clarity of standard components to draw recommendations for the revision of the draft ISSC-MAP

The field consultations will help to identify:

- Dispensable and missing components of the standard
- Needs for capacity building amongst collectors, producers and other stakeholders with respect to a potential implementation of ISSC-MAP
- Specific local conditions that would support or hamper the implementation of the standard and the timeframe needed to prepare projects for its implementation
- Procedures for verifying compliance with the standard
- Potential uses of the standard (e.g. certification, voluntary implementation) in the project context

The field consultations should also help to increase the future acceptance of the standard by practitioners.

Priority of the consultation shall particularly be given to principles 4-8.

### **Actors:**

The field consultations will be implemented by contracted consultant(s). The consultant(s) will engage local experts to get support in two respects: by delivering information on specific local conditions and by helping to implement the field consultation interviews, workshops etc. WWF will establish the initial contact to the field projects selected; further communication will be coordinated by the contracted consultant(s).

### **Participating projects**

For the following projects funds for a field consultation were successfully raised:

1. Iracambi Medicinal Plants Project, Mata Atlantica, Brazil (financed by Manfred Hermsen Foundation)
2. UNCTAD projects in Ecuador and Peru (financed by UNCTAD, with contribution of Manfred Hermsen Foundation for an additional consultant)
3. Medicinal and Aromatic Plants – Wild Collection and Sustainable Use, BiH (financed by BfN and SIPPO)
4. WWF and TRAFFIC China project in Sichuan (financed by WWF Germany)
5. Devil's Claw Project, CRIAA, Namibia (financed by SALUS Haus)

### **Revision of the draft ISSC-MAP**

The results of the field consultations will contribute to the revision of the draft standard document.

### **Activities of the field consultations:**

The consultation phase will be split into several tasks which employ specific work techniques e.g. desk work analysis of already existing data, field interviews, team sessions and/or workshops and field visits. The expert teams are requested to decide on the best assessment technique for each standard component, giving particular priority to **principles 4 to 8**, and to those other principles considered to be of particular relevance to the assessed field project.

The remaining principles should be assessed at least generally (e.g. explain why the principle and associated criteria are not a priority), depending on the time available for the field consultation. The idea is to assess each indicator concerning its relevance, applicability and clarity, which will lead to its acceptance, modification or elimination, and possibly to its reorganization. Key practical problems concerning compliance are analysed for the underlying causes.

The following plan provides a model framework for the contracted consultants

<b>Activity</b>
PREPARATION phase: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Establish expert team</li><li>➤ Analyse the standard document and decide how the information needed to assess each single element can be achieved (e.g. identify relevant persons to gather information, which information could be obtained beforehand by literature research, which information has already been accumulated by the project management?)</li><li>➤ Identify relevant stakeholders (e.g collectors, retailers, certifiers, authorities, NGOs, scientists, etc.)</li><li>➤ Plan and organize field consultation – invite relevant interview/workshop participants, arrange technical logistics, translators etc.</li></ul>
IMPLEMENTATION phase: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Coordinate and facilitate field consultation</li></ul>
DOCUMENTATION phase: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Compile and evaluate results from the field consultation in a final report (see reporting requirements)</li><li>➤ Support review of the standard (support integration of lessons learnt during the field consultation into the draft document)</li></ul>
Present (interim) results of field consultation on 2 <sup>nd</sup> project expert workshop on the Isle of Vilm, December 2005

*Table 1: Process plan for standard field consultation*

## **Reporting Requirements:**

Please provide the results and observations of the field consultation in two reporting documents R1 and R2 (see points I and II, respectively), according to the following structure:

### **I. Specific evaluation of draft ISSC-MAP components (a basic reporting format (R1) will be provided)**

#### **Sources of information**

- Listing of any used source of information such as literature, interview partners, consulted experts or stakeholders, etc. (please provide detailed information in an annex)

#### **A. Component**

- Evaluation of the standard component according to a set of attributes and proposal of concluding modifications.

Please focus on those elements of the component that you deem most important or problematic in the project's context:

##### **A.1 Indicator**

Please evaluate the indicator (e.g. according to its relevance, applicability, simplicity) and, if necessary, propose appropriate modifications to its wording:

- Relevant:* Is application / verification of the requirement relevant for sustainable wild collection practices in the context of the test operation, project country, collected species, etc.?
- Applicable:* Does the requirement reflect a reasonable performance level that a manager/collector can be expected to comply with?
- Simple:* Is the meaning clear or is there a better way of expressing the requirement?

##### **A.2 Verifiers**

Please indicate additional, alternative or fewer means or types of verification, if necessary (e.g. because verifiers are not complete, appropriate or cost-effective):

- Completeness:* Do the proposed means of verification provide the necessary information to verify compliance with the requirement? Are any additional verifiers required?
- Appropriateness:* Are all of the proposed verifiers and types of verification required or should they (partly) be modified or dropped?
- Cost-effectiveness:* Do the proposed verifiers support a quick and economical assessment process?

##### **A.3 Guidance**

- Indication whether (additional) guidance is needed to fully comprehend the requirement beyond the one given in the standard document (if any).

### **B. Implementation**

#### **B.1 Project potential**

- Evaluation of the project's context-specific potential to achieve fulfilment of the requirement.

## **B.2 Barriers and deficits**

- Analysis of existing barriers and underlying causes for the project to not (fully) achieve fulfilment of the requirement (if any).
  - Reasons in case the requirement is seen as not being relevant / applicable in the project's context
  - Internal factors such as required resources (e.g. time, capital, etc.) or capacity to (fully) meet the requirement
  - Economic, social or other external factors that impede a successful implementation (e.g. lack of infrastructure, etc.)

## **C. Conclusion**

- Summary of recommendations by specifying the suggested treatment of the component as far as possible

## **D. Remarks**

- Any further or general remarks on the component or the process of decision-making (e.g. explanation if recommendations are not in line with the opinion of the field project staff).

## **II. General evaluation of ISSC-MAP field consultation (please design your own WORD file (R2) for this part of the report)**

*Please provide the following background information which will help us to get a better idea of results and answers obtained in the specific context of the project*

1. Brief description of the project (background, history, aims/objectives, stakeholders, maps and fotos, etc.)
2. Information on consultation methods used (e.g. interviews, workshop sources of secondary information)
3. Estimation of overall reliability of information
4. General evaluation
  - a. Is the level of comprehensiveness of the ISSC-MAP (structure, language)
    - i. adequate?
    - ii. too complex / difficult to understand (possibly alternative suggestions)?
    - iii. not comprehensive enough? What else should be included?
  - b. What are potential scenarios for the implementation of ISSC-MAP concerning your project/ your region (e.g. certification, national legislation, etc.) and what are responsible actors for implementation (please provide detailed information to enable us to follow up on this)?
  - c. Which components (principles, criteria, and indicators) are priorities/most relevant or most problematic to this project (ranking)?
  - d. Which local aspects have the potential to hamper the implementation (e.g. infrastructure, know-how, incentive, market-links etc.)? Please estimate time and costs needed to adapt project conditions accordingly.
  - e. What benefits are expected from the implementation of ISSC-MAP?
  - f. Which reservations exist related to ISSC-MAP?

## **Annex**

1. Notes from interviews, team sessions, workshops etc. (including list of participants)
2. Available background documents (such as management plan, harvester guidelines etc.)

# Form R1: Specific evaluation of ISSC-MAP components

Sources of information:

Please list any used source of information such as literature, interview partners, consulted experts or stakeholders, etc.

DRAFT COMPONENT				Abbrev.*			
Level	No.	Requirement	Verifiers	F	D	I	C
Principle	1	<b>LEGITIMACY: MAP collection and management activities are carried out under legitimate tenure arrangements, in compliance with relevant laws, agreements, and guidelines.</b>					
Criterion	1.1	<b>Management authority, tenure, and use rights</b>					
Indicator	1.1.1	The area where wild collection is carried out is clearly defined and its boundaries well established.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site map</li> <li>• Survey</li> </ul>		X		

\* F = Field inspection; D = Documentation; I = Interview (management/staff); C = Consultation (stakeholders, authorities)

<b>A</b>	<b>Component</b>	<i>Please evaluate those elements of the component that you deem most important or problematic in the project's context:</i>
<b>A.1</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<i>Please evaluate the indicator (e.g. according to its relevance, applicability, simplicity) and, if necessary, propose appropriate modifications to its wording:</i>
<b>A.2</b>	<b>Verifiers</b>	<i>Please indicate additional, alternative or fewer means or types of verification, if necessary (e.g. because verifiers are not complete, appropriate or cost-effective):</i>
<b>A.3</b>	<b>Guidance</b>	<i>Please indicate whether (additional) guidance is needed to comprehend the component:</i>

<b>B IMPLEMENTATION</b>	
<b>B.1</b>	<b>Project potential</b> <i>Please evaluate the project's potential to achieve fulfilment of the indicator:</i>
Operation could... <input type="checkbox"/> <u>fully</u> <input type="checkbox"/> <u>only partly</u> <input type="checkbox"/> <u>not</u> ...achieve fulfilment of requirement.	
<b>B.2</b>	<b>Barriers &amp; deficits</b> <i>If the operation could not or only partly fulfill the indicator, analyse existing barriers and provide an estimation on possibly required resources (e.g. time, capital, etc.):</i>

<b>C CONCLUSION</b> <i>Please summarize your recommendations by specifying the suggested treatment of the component as far as possible:</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Keep</b> or <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Drop</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (no change) <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Modify</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Indicator (wording)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Verifiers</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Guidance (more)</li> </ul>
	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional <input type="checkbox"/> Alternative/other <input type="checkbox"/> Less

<b>D</b>	<b>REMARKS</b> <i>(E.g. explanation if your recommendations are not in line with the opinion of the field project staff)</i>