**GUIDANCE NOTES**

These notes are in three sections: general information (for all applicants); additional information for students (UG/PGT/PGR) and additional information for faculty/research associates.

**1. GENERAL**

Guidance on ethics is available in the International Development Ethics Handbook and on the UEA website <http://www.uea.ac.uk/dev/ethics> Please consult these sources of information before filling this form.

|  |
| --- |
| **STUDENTS** |
| You must submit this application form and any accompanying documents as follows:-   1. Electronically to Professor Janet Seeley - [j.seeley@uea.ac.uk](mailto:j.seeley@uea.ac.uk), with a copy to [dev.ethics@uea.ac.uk](mailto:dev.ethics@uea.ac.uk) **AND** copy to your Supervisor.   (Consent forms etc should be submitted as separate documents and not included in the same file as the ethics form. Complete the top of the Part B page)   1. A hard copy INCLUDING THE **REQUIRED SIGNATURES** to:   DEV Local Office, room ARTS 1.72, School of International Development.  Checklist: **BEFORE** submitting please check the following:   * You have included a consent form and an interview schedule/ survey if these are being used in the research * Your Supervisor has read and commented on your ethics form and accompanying materials (consent form, questionnaire or interview schedule if these are being used) * You and your Supervisor have signed the original form * You have included *your name in the file name* of the electronic copy of the form and any accompanying documents. **Forms which are not properly labelled will be returned and may miss the deadline for that month’s ethics committee meeting**. You have you completed the top Section of the PART B of the form (on the last page) * You have copied your supervisor in on the electronic submission * You have submitted a risk assessment form signed by you and your supervisor to Learning and Teaching Services |

|  |
| --- |
| **ALL OTHER APPLICANTS** |
| You must submit this application form and any accompanying documents as follows:-   1. Electronically to Professor Janet Seeley - [j.seeley@uea.ac.uk](mailto:j.seeley@uea.ac.uk), with a copy to [dev.ethics@uea.ac.uk](mailto:p.quinn@uea.ac.uk). (Consent forms, etc should be submitted as separate documents and not included in the same file as the ethics form. Complete the top of the Part B page. Include your name in the file name of the electronic copy) 2. A hard copy INCLUDING THE **REQUIRED SIGNATURES** to DEV Local Office (Room 1.72), Arts 1, School of International Development. |

* **RESUBMISSION** – if you are asked to resubmit your application following review by the committee, please resubmit a new signed hard copy and electronic form, **PLUS** **include a letter** with your revised application **detailing** how you have responded to the committee’s comments. The covering letter should be submitted as a separate file, not included within the ethics form.

**2. Additional information for Students (Undergraduate and Postgraduate taught and Postgraduate research)**

Students should ensure that their supervisor has read and approved their application, and any subsequent resubmissions.

a) DEV UG/PGT students must include their ethics form as an appendix in their dissertations.

b) DEV UG/PGT students who seek ethical clearance, and therefore include their form as an appendix, must include a brief paragraph (which may be expanded in an appendix, if space is limited) describing the ethical issues related to their research and any changes to their outline procedures.

c) Applicants should not start data collection before ethical approval is granted.

d) Postgraduate research students will be required to submit a one page report on the ethical issues related to their research to the PGR students office at the conclusion of their fieldwork, which will be forwarded to the Chair (the PGR students hub will have a record of who seeks ethical clearance from the International Development Committee or from another Committee).

e) Postgraduate research students are expected to include their ethics form as an appendix in their thesis and explain their approach to ethical issues in their thesis. Examiners are increasingly aware of ethical issues in research and may well ask questions related to the ethics of research during the viva voce.

f) Separate guidance is available for UG Development Work Experience students in the School of International Development. Please consult course directors.

**3. Additional information for Faculty/Research Associates Faculty members/research associates are invited to submit a copy of their full proposal with this form.**

Dev Faculty/DevCo associates members should submit a report on the ethical issues related to their research to DEVCo at the conclusion of their project, which will be forwarded to the Chair (DEVCo will have a record of who seeks ethical clearance from the International Development Ethics Committee or from another Committee). Please use the form available at <https://intranet.uea.ac.uk/dev/intranet/ethics> (if you do not have access to the intranet please request the form from [Dev.general@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Dev.general@uea.ac.uk) or from the Committee Chair).

Faculty/research associates who access research funding via SSF/other route, rather than DEV, will be asked to voluntarily send their report to the Chair of the International Development Ethics committee (a list will be kept by the Chair of such projects so that we can check).

Faculty/research associates with projects that last more than one year will be required to submit an annual report to the Chair of the International Development Ethics committee reporting on progress. Please use the form, which should not time consuming to fill in—the template is available at <https://intranet.uea.ac.uk/dev/intranet/ethics> (if you do not have access to the intranet please request the template from [Dev.ethics@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Dev.ethics@uea.ac.uk) or from the Committee Chair)

COMPLETE ALL SECTIONS IN **PART A** AND APPLICANT INFORMATION IN **PART B**

| **APPLICANT INFORMATION** | |
| --- | --- |
| Forename | Adrian |
| Surname | Martin |
| Gender | M |
| Student ID number *(if applicable)* |  |
| Contact email address | Adrian.martin@uea.ac.uk |
| Date application form submitted | 5/6/13 |
| 1st application or resubmission? | 1st |

| **PROJECT INFORMATION** | |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title | Conservation, Markets and Justice: a comparative study of local and global conceptions |
|  | |
| *\* DEV/DEVco faculty or DEVco research associate applications only:* | |
| \* Project Funder | ESRC |
| \* Submitted by SSF or DEVco? | ? |
| If yes – Project Code: |  |
|  | |
| *Postgraduate research students only:* | |
| Date of your PP presentation |  |

| **PERSON(S) SUBMITTING RESEARCH PROPOSAL** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name(s) of all person(s) submitting research proposal.  Including main applicant | Status  (BA/BSc/MA/MSc/MRes/  MPhil/PhD/research associate/faculty etc.)  Students: specify your course | Department/Group/  Institute/Centre |
| Adrian Martin | Faculty | DEV |
| Thomas Sikor | Faculty | DEV |
| Bereket Kebede | Faculty | DEV |
| Nicole Gross-Camp | RA | DEV |
| Iokine Rodriguez | RA | DEV |

| **SUPERVISOR AUTHORISATION** | |
| --- | --- |
| *In the case of undergraduate and postgraduate research, please give details of supervisor(s). The Supervisor is asked to certify the accuracy of the following account. If the supervisor is out of the country at the time of submission they should send an email to the Chair of the ethics committee (*[j.seeley@uea.ac.u*k*](mailto:j.seeley@uea.ac.uk)*), copied to* [*dev.ethics@uea.ac.uk*](mailto:dev.ethics@uea.ac.uk) *stating that they have seen and approved the application.* | |
| Name of supervisor(s) | Position held |
|  |  |
| Signature *(supervisor of student)* | Date |
|  |  |

| **APPLICANT SIGNATURE** | |
| --- | --- |
| Signature *(proposer of research)* | Date |
|  |  |

| 1. OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY |
| --- |
| Describe the purposes of the research/project proposed. Detail the methods to be used and the research questions. Provide any other relevant background which will allow the reviewers to contextualise your research or project activities. Include questionnaires/checklists as attachments, if appropriate. |
| Despite the seemingly widespread shift towards ‘just conservation’, including the popularity of rights-based approaches, we are lacking any substantive body of knowledge that informs us about how such globally constituted justice principles align with local conceptions of justice. Our project will contribute to building this new body of knowledge by asking the following questions and sub-questions:  **RQ1**: What justice principles are deployed within conservation interventions?   * What is the provenance of these principles, in terms of social justice theory? * How are principles applied in practice, as mediated by national and sub-national institutions?   **RQ2:** What justice principles are deployed within local communities?   * What variation exists within and between communities? * What is the provenance of these local principles, including both the socio-political and material contexts that they evolve with?   **RQ3**: What are the key areas of convergence and divergence between local and global justice principles?   * How does this influence local receptivity to conservation initiatives? * How does this vary across conservation approaches, and across countries?   The project will research conceptions of environmental justice through comparative cases in China, Tanzania and Venezuela (Table 1). All locations have seen the introduction of some form of market-based conservation interventions (ecotourism, certified timber sales, carbon forestry) alongside other forms of conservation based on participatory forest management (PFM). At the same time the locations are selected for cultural and political difference that we hypothesise to contribute to the shaping of environmental justice conceptions. The selection of these sites therefore enables us to make local comparisons of justice conceptions across sites with greater and lesser emphasis on market-based conservation, and international comparisons across different country contexts. The investigators have existing research partnerships in each location, ensuring effective project management and value for money arising from access to relevant existing data.   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Location** | **Forest type and tenure** | **Sites** | **Ongoing research/project** | **Main local partner** | **Available secondary data** | | **China**  Teng-chong County | Sub-tropical and temperate forest mosaic  Collective and private forests | i) Villages under PFM and carbon market.  ii) villages under PFM only | EU-funded research on voluntary carbon market project  NERC/ESRC/DFID-funded ESPA project on watershed governance. | Kunming Institute of Botany (KIB) | - land use classifications using Rapideye and Landsat images for 2011, 1989, 2002  -socio-economic and governance data | | **Tanzania**Kilwa district. | Miombo woodland (savannah-forest mosaic).  Village forest lands (adjacent Selous reserve). | i)Villages under PFM & REDD+ pilot carbon market  ii)Villages under PFM only | NORAD funded REDD+ pilot project led by local partner, with UEA leading social and economic assessment. | Mpingo Conservation and Development Initiative (MCDI) | -Socio-economic and governance monitoring data in REDD+ villages.  -Landsat images  -2010 Aerial photographs  -Community biodiversity monitoring | | **Venezuela**  Canaima National Park | Savannah-forest mosaic.  National Park with indigenous rights over ancestral lands | i)Villages dependent on nature tourism markets.  ii)Villages less dependent on tourism. | Impact of climate change and human occupations on savanna-forest mosaics.  Pemon Life Plan Project | Venezuelan Institute for Scientific Research (IVIC) | -Archival records  -Serial data on community perceptions of environmental change (1997, 1999, 2010).  -Landsat images  -Self-demarcated Pemon Territorial Map. |   We propose multiple and multi-disciplinary methods to elicit conceptions of justice, and to explore the material and socio-political contexts that frame them. The reasons for this are, a) due to the originality of the research, there is little experience of which methods will be most successful or whether different methods will produce consistent results; b) different methods have relative strengths in relation to the three dimensions of justice studied; c) as stated, we need methods that can capture both public and privately held conceptions of justice.  **Methods**  **RQ1**will initially be researched through review of relevant conservation policy and project documents, employing discourse analysis to identify and categorise embedded justice principles. Interviews with principal policy and project actors, along with insights from the ethnographic study (see below) will then map the progression of these principles, both in terms of their introduction to project design and their realisation in practice.  **RQ2 & 3** form the core empirical research agenda and are addressed through multiple, triangulated methods, that both test previously known principles of justice (deductive instruments) and take a more grounded approach to identifying principles of justice (inductive instruments).   1. *Semi-structured survey (Deductive):*   This deductive instrument will explore a set of statements for each of the three justice dimensions (distribution, procedure, recognition), with each statement representing a particular social justice tradition. For example, the set about distributive justice will include individual statements representing traditions of egalitarianism, needs-based distribution, merit/desert, and so on. Respondents will undertake a ranking exercise for each of the three sets of statements followed by open comments that justify the ranking. We will also test the relationship between the three dimensions of justice by eliciting responses to ‘ethical vignettes’ (Barter and Renold 1999) – short scenarios that we find can cleanly get at trade-offs between e.g. procedure and outcome (Martin et al., under review). The survey will be conducted in the six sites with ~60 randomly selected respondents in each (n = 360).   1. *Experimental games (Deductive)*   Experimental games involve people in incentivised decisions in a lab-type setting to elicit true preferences and they are particularly suited to study of distributive and procedural dimensions of justice. To capture distributive justice we will adapt games that have been designed to examine the link between responsibility and justice/fairness norms (see for example, Cappelen, et al., 2007; Cappelen, et al., 2010; Almaz, et al., 2010). These games will help us identify which type of distribution fairness norms are dominant in the different localities; are people strictly egalitarian, meritocratic, libertarian, etc.? What are the implications of these norms to market-based conservation measures? In addition to distributive justice, other experimental games will be adapted to examine concerns over procedural justice (for example, see Bicchieri and Chavez, 2010; Karni, et al., 2008). These games capture whether people react differently for the same distribution outcomes depending on the different procedures followed. The experimental games will be played with the same sample group (n= 360).   1. *Ethnographic study (Inductive)*   This more inductive component will investigate a) natural resource use claims and decision-making procedures, b) conceptions of justice across different justice dimensions, including distinction between those publicly constructed as valid and those held and deployed privately, c) the cultural and political contexts that shape justice conceptions over time, d) perceptions of environmental change, including the nature and drivers of change, e) perceptions of locally relevant conservation approaches as a means for environmental justice, including disaggregated study of the costs and benefits of interventions. The ethnographic studies will employ a set of data collection techniques for triangulation (Yin 1994): in-depth interviews with 20 people per site (n = 120) using a stratified selection from the same survey sample; direct observation and informal conversations in sites of production (forestry, agriculture, tourism management) and in local meetings; and focus groups. In addition to these researcher-led methods, we will employ participatory video (White 2003) as an innovative tool for community-led research into local justice norms and perceptions of environmental change. A critical preparation for this will be the development of mutual research objectives, for example where the community itself sees value in better understanding local justice claims. Ethnographic research will take place over a 6 month period in each country.   1. *Environmental change*   We will explore the material context in which environmental justice principles are produced and acted upon. To do this we will examine land use change utilizing existing remote sensing data. These data will provide information about biophysical change that will then be paired with the ethnographic information to explore the formation of environmental justice claims. We will develop a series of maps depicting past and present distributions of land cover that will be brought to the respective communities for a participatory mapping exercise exploring communities’ acceptance of the maps, ground-truthing exercises to verify areas of disagreement, and potential drivers of land cover change. We will also explore the change in distribution of flora and fauna that are particularly important to local communities. For example, in Tanzania the Mpingo Conservation and Development Initiative completed an assessment of the current stocks of East African Blackwood (*Dalbergia melanoxylon*) in 2006. We will build upon the existing data collected by the project to assess changes in production and harvest, and in particular the formation of justice principles around notions of access and benefit-sharing. |

| 2. SOURCES OF FUNDING |
| --- |
| The organisation, individual or group providing finance for the study/project. |
| ESRC Open Call Grant |

| 3. RISKS OR COSTS TO PARTICIPANTS |
| --- |
| What risks or costs to the participants are entailed in involvement in the research/project? Are there any potential physical, psychological or disclosure dangers that can be anticipated? What is the possible benefit or harm to the subject or society from their participation or from the project as a whole? What procedures have been established for the care and protection of participants (e.g. insurance, medical cover) and the control of any information gained from them or about them? |
| The nature of the research means that participants will express views that may well show disagreement with formal or informal rules, or reveal conflicts of interests with others in their community. For example, some community members might be in favour of a conservation initiative or an economic opportunity such as gold mining, whilst others are not. There is thus the possibility of getting participants into some form of trouble, either with authorities such as park managers, or with other community members.  There are two main ways in which we will seek to minimise such risks. First, we will work to develop understanding of the purpose of the research, including understanding of why certain individuals will be selected for participation. In Venezuela, for example, CO-I Rodriguez is currently working with Pemon communities on a cultural-ecological history project which will contribute to the life plan that they are developing for their people. She plans to build this new project on that existing project, through discussion of how explorations of justice conceptions can also contribute to community learning and life plan development. In this way, we hope that there will be better understanding of the project, and support for those chosen to participate. However, building on previous work also carries some risks.  Although the fact that the project benefits enormously from having local partners that are engaged in on-the-ground work, it also means that inevitably the project will inherit the history, style, limitations and possible flaws that the work of local partners may have.  We think the only way to manage this risk is to ensure good communication among the project participants, and to be open about this risk from the beginning. Comments from the project participants to the local partners about possible limitations of their work could be seen as an opportunity to identify and improve certain deficiencies that perhaps had not been spotted before.  In fact, one of the added values of the project for local partners could be precisely to have the opportunity to reflect about their own interventions with colleagues from other parts of the world and enhance in the long term their work in each country case study. Thus, this risk could be easily turned into a learning opportunity for local partners and all project members  Second, whilst there will be no attempt to conceal participation in the research, we will ensure confidentiality of resulting raw data, in paper and electronic form, and anonymisation of data subsequently. The exception to this will be visual anthropology component that will involve community members independently making films. For this, we think that prior consent to make public use of filming is adequate, but we welcome any advice on this. We will also be advised by InsightShare who will help with the design of this research component and who are leaders in participatory video methods in development contexts.  One further risk arises from the potentially delicate nature of discussions in qualitative interviews. Discussions of environmental justice are likely to lead to self-reflection by respondents on ways in which their agency is impaired by forms of domination and failures of recognition. Reflecting on forms of individual and community subjugation could prove emotionally distressing. We will train interviewers to respond sensitively to any signs of distress and to be sure to take time to talk through issues where this seems appropriate. |

| 4. RECRUITMENT/SELECTION PROCEDURES |
| --- |
| How will study/project participants be selected? Is there any sense in which participants might be ‘obliged’ to participate – as in the case of students, prisoners or patients – or are volunteers being recruited? If participation is compulsory, the potential consequences of non-compliance must be indicated to participants; if voluntary, entitlement to withdraw consent must be indicated and when that entitlement lapses. |
| Participants for surveys and economic games will be randomly selected by the researchers. Subsequently, stratification will be used to select a sub-sample for more in-depth, qualitative interviews. We have not yet determined the strata to be used but it is likely to be characteristics including gender, ethnicity and wealth. The exception to this sample will be the participatory video work. Here the community researchers will be selected by villagers and will subsequently select who they interview/film.  All selected participants, including those for AV, can choose not to participate and can withdraw at any time. All will be provided basic information about the project and consent will be sought using the accompanying consent form in local languages.  Participants for ‘interviews with principal policy and project actors’ will be selected purposively. These are professional people who are much less likely to feel pressure to participate but who will still be approached through the same consent procedure. |

| 5. PARTICIPANTS IN DEPENDENT RELATIONSHIPS |
| --- |
| Specify whether participants will include students or others in a dependent relationship (this could affect their ability to decline to participate). If such participants will be included what will you do to ensure that their participation is voluntary etc.? |
| In Tanzania, the partner is a small local NGO that has worked extensively with communities over a number of years. They are therefore known to bring benefits to the community as a whole and there is presumably therefore some desire to please them – this could arguably be constructed as a form of dependence that makes it harder for participants to say no. A similar situation exists in Venezuela where the project forms part of a longer-term relationship, and to a lesser extent in China where Co-I Jun has previously worked with communities for ICRAF.  Whilst we cannot entirely remove this risk that people will feel compelled to participate, we can reduce it through clear communication about the independence of the research project from other interventions, both during inception/consultation meetings and through the consent process.  In the case of Canaima, it is not so much a risk of people feeling compelled to participate, but rather of enhancing a historical patron-client relationship that could distort the possible contribution of the project in strengthening the Pemon life plan process, through hiring community members as researchers for the participatory video. This can be avoided through making it transparent to the village members that although the 4 community members will be receiving a paid compensation for their work, such compensation seeks to allow them to devote themselves to this work, while leaving aside other possible responsibilities they may have.  Also that their commitment to the participatory videos will be not so much with the project, as it will be with the community as a whole and particularly the life plan process. For this part of the project, our role as researchers should be clearly seen as community facilitators and not as of external bosses |

| 6. VULNERABLE INDIVIDUALS |
| --- |
| Specify whether the research will include children or people with mental illness. If so, please explain the necessity of involving these individuals as research participants and what will be done to facilitate their participation. |
| No persons under 18 years of age will be selected. The research will not deliberately select people with mental illness but nor will it seek to eliminate them from the random sample as this would add to risks of harm, not reduce. |

| 7. PAYMENTS AND INCENTIVES |
| --- |
| Will payment or any other incentive, such as a gift or free services, be made to any participant? If so, please specify and state the level of payment to be made and/or the source of the funds/gift/free service to be used. Please explain the justification for offering payment or other incentive. |
| We will generally seek to respect peoples time through some form of compensation. The form of compensation – cash or gift – is likely to vary between sites and we prefer to defer this decision until after local consultation.  The project budget allows for payments or gifts to participants |

| 8. CONSENT |
| --- |
| Please give details of how consent is to be obtained. A copy of the proposed consent form, along with a separate information sheet, written in simple, non-technical language MUST accompany this proposal form (do not include the text of the form in this space, attach with your submission as a separate document). |
| A script (see consent form) will be read to each putative participant, describing the purpose of the project, how we would like them to participate in this, and how information will be used. We will then ask if they have understood this or want to ask questions. Once they are satisfied that they understand this information, we will request verbal consent.  In addition to individual consent, it is also necessary to gain community level consent. In China and Tanzania, this is a matter of good practice, in Venezuela it is also compulsory to have the consent of the Pemon as a precondition for obtaining research permission with national authorities.  Thus, consent will first be sought in each community through presenting the project in community assemblies/meetings, which is the normal and regular way to seek local permission in order to initiate any form of research in their homelands. Once this consent has been approved, other forms of individual consent will be put into place when the time comes |

| 9. CULTURAL, SOCIAL, GENDER-BASED CHARACTERISTICS |
| --- |
| Comment on any cultural, social or gender-based characteristics of the participants which have affected the design of the project or which may affect its conduct. |
| In the Chinese sites, the people are Han-Chinese, who are the ethnic majority group in China. Culturally, they are very much influenced by the combination of Buddhism and Confucian and some still practice the Confucian occasionally. Both communities have their own traditional forest management practice. However, policy changes often undermine traditional institutional management of natural resources on which the livelihoods of most communities depend. Poverty and environmental degradation have become part of the socio-economic and ecological landscape of the uplands. Upland communities are now under great pressure to find alternative sources of income that conform to sustainable development practices.  In the Tanzania sites, villagers are from a number of tribal groups and the great majority are Muslims. Long-term residents are arable farmers using fire to clear lands. More recently, some pastoral people have been moved to the area by the state, ostensibly for reasons of drought, but there may be more political reasons we are as yet unaware of. In terms of material measures of wealth, it is an area characterised by high rates of poverty.  In Venezuela, the local population are the indigenous Pemon people who are now predominantly Christians but retain cosmologies rooted in animist traditions. Pemon communities in the area are facing difficult struggles for control over their homelands, including internal tensions over decisions such as whether to enter into partnerships for gold mining.  Across the three sites, we are working with people who are not wealthy and often quite vulnerable. This places a responsibility on us to work carefully and with respect. One of the things that we want to do, is make this a beneficial learning process for communities themselves. This idea has progressed farthest in respect of the Pemon people because, as mentioned, Co-I Rodriguez will be able to discuss how our work can be tailored to the needs of their life plan. The idea for participatory video partly flows from this – that the community identifies its own need to understand its justice perspectives and then undertakes part of the ‘research’ that supports this. Whilst we don’t want to be naive about how easy it will be to achieve such a mutually beneficial partnership, we certainly want to see how this works – starting in Venezuela with support of InsightShare in the field, and then rolling out to other sites. |

| 10. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT |
| --- |
| Identify any environmental impacts arising from your research/project and the measures you will take to minimise risk of impact. |
| Based in Europe, with field sites in Africa, Asia and S. America, this project will have a high carbon footprint. Whilst we will use Skype for the majority of team meetings, we will still be holding a face to face inception meeting in Tanzania as this is vital for collectively developing field methods, and subsequent workshops in year 2 and 3.  Within country, we will try to be as efficient as possible with field travel. For example, in Tanzania it is MCDI’s normal practice to take tents and camp at village sites during fieldwork rather than travelling back and forth. |

| 11. CONFIDENTIALITY |
| --- |
| Please state who will have access to the data and what measures which will be adopted to maintain the confidentiality of the research subject and to comply with data protection requirements e.g. will the data be anonymised? |
| Data will be collected on paper and using electronic devices. Confidentiality will be maintained by:  Field workers will be trained not to discuss the content of any interviews, other than with project team members.  Paper copies will not be anonymised as we will retain sufficient information to organise return visits. These will be stored in locked offices until project completion with access by team members only.  Data in electronic form will be anonymised, identified by code only. This will only be available to team members via password protected wiki site. We will ask project team members to take reasonable measures to ensure that uploaded data is secure. For example, access via password protected workstation at UEA would be considered acceptable, but where file is on the c-drive of a laptop used for travel, the file itself should be password protected.  For those respondents occupying positions that make anonymisation difficult – such as a village chief – we will permission to refer to them by position. This will tend not to be more vulnerable members of the community and we would expect this strategy to be acceptable. |

| 12. THIRD PARTY DATA |
| --- |
| Will you require access to data on participants held by a third party? In cases where participants will be identified from information held by another party (for example, a doctor or school) describe the arrangements you intend to make to gain access to this information. |
| Currently, we do not envisage any use of third party social data – only physical/GIS data. Should that situation change we would need to seek separate ethical clearance. |

| 13. PROTECTION OF RESEARCHER (APPLICANT) |
| --- |
| Please state briefly any precautions being taken to protect your health and safety. Have you taken out travel and health insurance for the full period of the research? If not, why not. Have you read and acted upon FCO travel advice (website)? If acted upon, how? |
| All locations are currently considered safe by FCO and we agree with this. The Venezuela site has seen some tensions in recent years relating to control of resources such as gold, but is not a current concern and we have the capacity to monitor things closely through IVIC.  The primary risks relate to travel and health for team members during field research. To reduce risks, we insist that all field staff have adequate insurance. For UEA staff this is covered by the institution, for local staff, we will liaise with the local partner/employer to determine what is appropriate.  We will use well maintained vehicles for travel to field sites. We will establish communications protocol during fieldwork – e.g. local office always informed of when someone will be in the field, where, and when they will report on progress. Cellphone should be adequate for communication but we will purchase a satellite phone if coverage proves inadequate in any site. |

| 14. PROTECTION OF OTHER RESEARCHERS |
| --- |
| Please state briefly any precautions being taken to protect the health and safety of other researchers and others associated with the project (as distinct from the participants or the applicant). |
| This is covered above, in 13 |

| 15. RESEARCH PERMISSIONS (INCLUDING ETHICAL CLEARANCE) IN HOST COUNTRY AND/OR ORGANISATION |
| --- |
| The UEA’s staff and students will seek to comply with travel and research guidance provided by the British Government and the Governments (and Embassies) of host countries. This pertains to research permission, in-country ethical clearance, visas, health and safety information, and other travel advisory notices where applicable. If this research project is being undertaken outside the UK, has formal permission/a research permit been sought to conduct this research? Please describe the action you have taken and if a formal permit has not been sought please explain why this is not necessary/appropriate (for very short studies it is not always appropriate to apply for formal clearance, for example). |
| We have not yet sought permission but will do so. To explain – fieldwork will not begin until Spring 2014, so we will ensure that permissions are in place by then. However, ESRC insists that we have ethical clearance before the start of the grant itself in September. We do not envisage problems in any site as team members are already working, or have recently worked, in all sites. |

| 16. MONITORING OF RESEARCH |
| --- |
| What procedures are in place for monitoring the research/project (by funding agency, supervisor, community, self etc). |
| We do not have an advisory committee for the project so we will be self-monitoring through regular progress meetings – at least one every two months for the whole team, more regularly for national teams.  We will also be required to provide progress reports to the funder.  We need to consider some way of enabling feedback from communities – for example in case our research is causing anxieties that respondents have not felt they can raise with us directly. We propose that we identify individuals in each community who will play a liaison role between the project and the community. In practice that is likely to be a local political or religious leader, or other prominent persons. Again, we are more than happy to take on board suggestions here. |

| 17. ANTICIPATED USE OF RESEARCH DATA ETC |
| --- |
| What is the anticipated use of the data, forms of publication and dissemination of findings etc.? |
| Academic articles and a book. Conference papers. Policy briefs  Local language leaflets and films for each community. These will also be used at an intercultural workshop in which we bring together community representatives from each country to present and discuss their communities’ conceptions of environmental justice. |

| 18. FEEDBACK TO PARTICIPANTS |
| --- |
| Will the data or findings of this research/project be made available to participants? If so, specify the form and timescale for feedback. What commitments will be made to participants regarding feedback? How will these obligations be verified? |
| The key outputs for use by communities will be leaflets about community views on environment/justice and accompanying films. These will be available around end of year 2 for feeding into national and intercultural workshop events. |

| 19. DURATION OF PROJECT | |
| --- | --- |
| *The start date should not be within the 2 months after the submission of this application, to allow for clearance to be processed.* | |
| Start date | End date |
| 30th September 2013 | 29th September 2016 |

| 20. PROJECT LOCATION(S) |
| --- |
| Please state location(s) where the research will be carried out. |
| Kilwa, Tanzania; Yunnan, China; Canaima, Venezuela |

| **APPLICANT INFORMATION** | |
| --- | --- |
| *To be completed by the applicant* | |
| Forename | Adrian |
| Surname | Martin |
| Student ID number *(if applicable)* |  |
| UG, PGT or PGR *(if applicable)* |  |
| Supervisor  *(if applicable)* |  |
| Project Title | Conservation, Markets and Justice: a comparative study of local and global conceptions |
| **RESUBMISSIONS** – IF YOU ARE ASKED TO RESUBMIT YOUR APPLICATION FOLLOWING REVIEW BY THE COMMITTEE PLEASE **INCLUDE A LETTER** WITH YOUR REVISED APPLICATION DETAILING HOW YOU HAVE RESPONDED TO THE COMMITTEE’S COMMENTS. Students please ensure your supervisor has approved your revisions before resubmission. | |

| **REVIEWER'S RECOMMENDATION (🗸)** | |
| --- | --- |
| *To be completed by the Ethics Committee* | |
| Accept |  |
| Request modifications |  |
| Reject |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **REVIEWERS’ CHECKLIST** | *Delete as appropriate* | |
| Risks and inconvenience to participants are minimised and not unreasonable given the research question/ project purpose. | 🗸 | 🗴 |
| All relevant ethical issues are acknowledged and understood by the researcher. | 🗸 | 🗴 |
| Procedures for informed consent are sufficient and appropriate | 🗸 | 🗴 |

| **REVIEWERS’ COMMENTS** |
| --- |
|  |

| **COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION** |
| --- |
|  |

| **SIGNATURE (CHAIR OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ETHICS COMMITTEE)** | |
| --- | --- |
| Signature | Date |
|  |  |