

Journal of Applied Ecology

DR MICHAEL POCOCK (Orcid ID : 0000-0003-4375-0445)

DR HELEN ROY (Orcid ID : 0000-0001-6050-679X)

Article type : Policy Direction

Editor : Ailsa McKenzie

Developing the global potential of citizen science: Assessing opportunities that benefit people, society and the environment in East Africa

Michael J.O. Pocock¹ : michael.pocock@ceh.ac.uk

Helen E. Roy¹: hele@ceh.ac.uk

Tom August¹: tomaug@ceh.ac.uk

Anthony Kuria²: tba-africa@tropical-biology.org

Fred Barasa³: cpo@naturekenya.org

John Bett⁴: jbett@wwfkenya.org

Mwangi Githiru⁵: mwangi_githiru@yahoo.co.uk

James Kairo⁶: gkairo@yahoo.com

Julius Kimani⁷: jkenvo@yahoo.com

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/1365-2664.13279

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

Accepted Article

Wanja Kinuthia⁸: eafrijet@africaonline.co.ke

Bernard Kissui⁹: bkissui@fieldstudies.org

Ireene Madindou¹⁰: ilhanmadindou@gmail.com

Kamau Mbogo¹¹: mbogokamau2001@yahoo.co.uk

Judith Mirembe¹²: mirembe.judith@natureuganda.org

Paul Mugo²: programmes@tropical-biology.org

Faith Milkah Muniale¹³: fngugi2001@gmail.com

Peter Njoroge¹⁴: pnjoroge@museums.or.ke

Edwin Gichohi Njuguna¹⁴: olenjuguna@gmail.com

Mike Izava Olendo¹⁵: izavamike@gmail.com

Michael Opige¹²: michael.opige@gmail.com

Tobias O. Otieno¹⁶: toby@ewasolions.org

Caroline Chebet Ng'weno¹⁷: cngweno@uwyo.edu

Elisha Pallangyo¹⁸: epallangyo@tfcg.or.tz

Thuita Thenya¹⁹: tthenya@yahoo.co.uk

Ann Wanjiru⁶: wanjiruanne31@yahoo.com

Rosie Trevelyan²⁰: rjt34@cam.ac.uk

¹ Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Maclean Building, Wallingford, Oxfordshire OX10 8BB, UK

² Tropical Biology Association, c/o Nature Kenya, P.O. Box 44486, 00100-Nairobi, Kenya

³ Nature Kenya, Museum Hill, Nairobi, Kenya

⁴ WWF Kenya, The Mvuli, Mvuli Road off Raphta Road, Westlands. Nairobi, Kenya

⁵ Wildlife Works, P.O. Box 310-80300, Voi, Kenya

⁶ Kenya Marine & Fisheries Research Institute, Blue Carbon Unit, P.O. Box 81651-80100, Mombasa, Kenya

⁷ Kijabe Environment Volunteers, P.O. Box 49 Matathia 00221 Kenya

⁸ Eastern African Network of BioNET-International, National Museums of Kenya, P.O. Box 40658-00100, Nairobi, Kenya

⁹ School for Field Studies, Center for Wildlife Management Studies, P.O. Box 304 Karatu, Arusha Tanzania

¹⁰ Ecological Society of Eastern Africa, National Museums of Kenya, P.O. Box 40658-00100, Nairobi, Kenya

¹¹ Imarisha Naivasha, P.O. Box 2122-20117, Naivasha, Kenya

¹² NatureUganda, P.O. Box 27034, Kampala, Uganda

¹³ ERMIS Africa, P.O. Box 17347-20100 Nakuru, Kenya

¹⁴ National Museums of Kenya, Museum Hill, Nairobi, Kenya

¹⁵ World Wide Fund for Nature, P.O. Box 99-80500, Lamu, Kenya

¹⁶ Ewaso Lions Project, P.O. Box 14996 - 00800, Nairobi, Kenya

¹⁷ Department of Zoology & Physiology, University of Wyoming, 1000 E. University Ave, Laramie, WY 82071

¹⁸ Tanzania Forest Conservation Group, Plot 323, Msasani Village, Old Bagamoyo Road, P.O. Box 23410 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

¹⁹ Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Nairobi, 30197-00100, Nairobi, Kenya

²⁰ Tropical Biology Association, The David Attenborough Building, Pembroke Street, Cambridge CB2 3QZ, UK

Running title: Citizen science in East Africa

Keywords: conservation: citizen science; Eastern Africa; monitoring; public engagement; science-policy; social capital; sustainable development;

Article type: Policy Direction

Abstract: 201 words

Total Tables: 4

Figures: 1

Corresponding author:

Michael J.O. Pocock

Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Maclean Building, Crowmarsh Gifford, Wallingford,

Oxfordshire OX10 8BB, UK

Email: Michael.pocock@ceh.ac.uk

Tel: +44 (0)1941 692566

Abstract

1. Citizen science is gaining increasing prominence as a tool for science and engagement. However, despite being a potentially valuable tool for sustainable development, citizen science has little visibility in many developing countries.
2. We undertook a collaborative prioritization process with experts in conservation and the environment to assess the potential of environmental citizen science in East Africa, including its opportunities, benefits and barriers. This provided principles that are applicable across developing countries, particularly for large-scale citizen science.
3. We found that there was great potential for citizen science to add to our scientific knowledge of natural resources and biodiversity trends. Many of the important benefits of citizen science were for people, as well as the environment directly. Major barriers to citizen science were mostly social and institutional, although projects should also consider access to suitable technology and language barriers.
4. *Policy implications.* Citizen science can provide data to support decision-making and reporting against international targets. Participation can also provide societal benefits, informing and empowering people, thus supporting the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals. In developing countries innovation is needed to further develop culturally-relevant citizen science that benefits participants and end-users. This should be supported through regional networks of stakeholders for sharing best practice.

Abstract: Swahili

1. Sayansi ya wananchi inaendelea kuongezeka kwa umaarufu kama chombo cha sayansi na ushiriki. Hata hivyo, licha ya kuwa chombo cha thamani cha maendeleo endelevu, sayansi ya wananchi haionekani sana katika nchi nyingi zinazoendelea.
2. Tulifanya mchakato wa ushirikiano wa kutoa vipaumbele pamoja na wataalamu wa uhifadhi na mazingira ili kuchunguza uwezekano wa sayansi ya wananchi ya mazingira katika Afrika ya Mashariki, ikijumuisha fursa, faida na vikwazo. Hii ilitoa kanuni zinazoweza kutumika katika nchi zinazoendelea, hasa kwa sayansi ya wananchi kwa kiwango kikubwa.
3. Tuligundua kuwa kuna uwezo mkubwa wa sayansi ya wananchi ili kuongeza ujuzi wetu wa kisayansi kuhusu nyenzo za asili na mielekeo ya bioanuwai. Faida muhimu nyingi za sayansi ya wananchi zilikuwa kwa watu, lakini moja kwa moja kwa mazingira pia. Vikwazo vikuu kwa sayansi ya wananchi vilikuwa kijamii na kitaasisi hasa, ingawa miradi inapaswa pia kufikiria upatikanaji wa teknolojia zinazofaa na vikwazo vya lugha.
4. Athari za sera ni kama ifuatavyo. Sayansi ya wananchi inaweza kutoa data kusaidia kuunda maamuzi na kuandika ripoti ili kufikia malengo ya kimataifa. Ushiriki unaweza pia kutoa faida za jamii, kuwajulisha na kuwawezesha watu na kwa hiyo kuunga mkono Malengo ya Maendeleo ya Umoja wa Mataifa. Katika nchi zinazoendelea kunahitaji kuwa na ubunifu ili kuendeleza sayansi ya wananchi inayofaa utamaduni inayopata washiriki na watumiaji wa mwisho. Hii inapaswa kuungwa mkono kupitia mitandao ya kikanda ya washikadau kwa kugawana taratibu bora.

Introduction

The world is increasingly facing rapid and dramatic change with the loss of habitats and species, and alteration of ecosystems, with detrimental impacts on people. Concern about this is highlighted through international treaties. For example, the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs) seek to increase human wellbeing while ensuring environmental sustainability (UNGA 2015). The Convention on Biological Diversity's Aichi Biodiversity Targets sought to reduce biodiversity loss with benefits for people (SCBD 2010). It is vital to make progress towards these goals, and to assess progress.

Citizen science is the involvement of people in the scientific process, including participating in environmental recording and monitoring. It has a two-fold role to play in supporting international agreements. Firstly, an outcome of good citizen science is scientifically-robust data, useful for environmental monitoring and assessing progress towards environment targets (Danielsen *et al.* 2014; Chandler *et al.* 2017). Secondly, the citizen science activity itself can be valuable for individuals and society (and their interactions with the environment) because undertaking, and participating in citizen science can increase social capital, support awareness raising, empower individuals and communities, and inspire action (Pretty & Smith 2004; McKinley *et al.* 2015; West & Pateman 2017).

Citizen science beyond the 'western world'

Citizen science includes a diversity of approaches, but it is useful to distinguish between contributory approaches, in which people engage with activities designed by professionals, and collaborative approaches (also called participatory or community-based monitoring), in which potential participants are involved in defining the scope, purpose and methodology (Danielsen, Burgess & Balmford 2005; Bonney *et al.* 2009a). Recent surveys have reported

that the majority of environmental citizen science is ‘contributory’ and most prevalent in North America, Europe and Australia (Bonney *et al.* 2014; Theobald *et al.* 2015; Pocock *et al.* 2017; Chandler *et al.* 2017). Currently, there is relatively little visibility of activities in developing countries, but they do occur: there are both contributory projects (e.g. recording plants in southern Africa; Hulbert 2016), and participatory monitoring projects (such as reviewed by Danielsen, Burgess & Balmford 2005; Chandler *et al.* 2017). There are also activities with international reach that are: field-based, e.g. iNaturalist (<https://www.inaturalist.org/>), eBird (www.ebird.org), iSpot (<https://www.ispotnature.org/>) and the EarthEcho Water Challenge (<http://www.monitorwater.org/>); and online, e.g. identification of mammal species from camera traps (Swanson *et al.* 2015).

Collaborative prioritization of the potential of citizen science in East Africa

Here, we undertook a systematic assessment of the potential for citizen science in East Africa; the first such assessment outside of developed countries. In June 2016 we held a conference in Nairobi, Kenya, entitled ‘Unlocking Africa’s potential for citizen science’ for 49 delegates from Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania (Appendix S1). Following this, 22 people (Appendix S2) participated in a one-day workshop. The workshop participants (authors of this paper) are experts in conservation and natural resource management and were drawn from government, non-governmental organizations and research organizations/academia in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania (henceforth termed ‘East Africa’). Therefore they mainly (but not exclusively) represented institutional users of environmental data and tended to consider large-scale (e.g. ‘contributory’) citizen science activities, but some also had practical experience working with communities for environmental monitoring. Our objectives were to identify and prioritize the (i) opportunities for, (ii) benefits of, and (iii) barriers to citizen science and to show how these are related to policies for sustainable development (Table 1). The remit of this assessment was all East Africa, the whole environment (air, land and water,

as well as biodiversity), and with emphasis on outcomes within 5 years. We used a collaborative prioritization approach, which is useful for collating expert opinions (Sutherland et al. 2011) and ranking issues (Pocock *et al.* 2015).

Our workshop had two parts. Firstly, we identified the key opportunities, benefits and barriers for citizen science in East Africa. We undertook initial consultation with conference attendees, and then refined the lists and their wording through discussion at the workshop (Table 1). Secondly, we used anonymous voting to rank these opportunities, benefits and barriers in order to support future decision-making about citizen science. The overall ranks were unanimously accepted at the workshop. After the workshop, we classified items on each list according to their policy context (Table 1) considering Aichi biodiversity targets (SCBD 2010) and the DPSIR (Drivers, Pressures, States, Impacts and Responses) framework (Smeets & Weterings 1999).

The opportunities for citizen science

We identified 15 specific opportunities for citizen science in East Africa (Table 2) including subjects for which there were already successful citizen science projects in the region (e.g. distribution mapping of birds and mammals) and novel subjects (e.g. natural resource mapping). These would help assess progress towards 11 of 20 of the Aichi Biodiversity targets (Appendix S3). We concluded that the most fruitful opportunities for developing large-scale citizen science in East Africa over the next few years would be monitoring habitats, species and freshwater. This would provide valuable information on environmental States (including natural capital assessment, mapping of natural resources and species), thus supporting conservation assessments. By collecting data across time or space, citizen science could also provide information on Impacts, i.e. measures of change due to pressures (Table 2;

Fig. 1; Danielsen et al. 2014). Specific activities could also assess Pressures (e.g. utilization of natural resources or pollution). Other relevant opportunities for citizen science, e.g. human health and disaster relief, were outside of our remit.

The benefits from citizen science

Our top-ranked benefits of citizen science in East Africa were a mix of social benefits, e.g. increasing people's awareness and empowering young people (see also Conrad & Hilchey 2011) and the provision of data, which can lead to better and more effective action (Table 3). This means that citizen science could have most influence on the societal Responses to, and the Drivers of, environmental change (Fig. 1; Table 3), thus supporting the UN SDGs and Aichi Biodiversity Targets to 'mainstream biodiversity'. We identified many different beneficiaries of citizen science: including participants in citizen science, communities, decision-makers and data-users. We concluded that these beneficiaries were inter-dependent, and should all be included in the design and delivery of citizen science, rather than being involved independently. This would ensure the design and delivery of citizen science is collaborative rather than 'top down'.

The barriers to the increased use of citizen science

The current barriers to citizen science that we ranked highly were mostly about people and institutions, so requiring social solutions, rather than concerns of data quality or coverage (Table 4). Institutional-level barriers (e.g. organisational capacity, perceived value of data and staff member's awareness of opportunities for citizen science) were regarded as especially fruitful to resolve, although this could have been influenced by institutional backgrounds of the workshop participants. Some additional barriers ('structural': access to

technology, uneven spatial distribution of participants, literacy of participants and language barriers) could be tackled with appropriate project design.

Recommendations for realizing the potential of citizen science in developing countries

Our findings were directly applicable to East Africa, but have relevance elsewhere. We make three recommendations for citizen science in developing countries, in addition to existing principles for best practice in citizen science (e.g. Bonney *et al.* 2009; Tweddle *et al.* 2012; ECSA 2015).

Develop projects for the needs of multiple stakeholders

We concluded that citizen science has many different beneficiaries (Table 3), and so recommend that funders, data-users, policy-makers, communities and participants should all be involved in the development of projects. This will ensure that the data are useable (scientifically rigorous) and useful. But for activities to be successful and sustained, local participants need to be involved from inception to implementation of each project, so that it meets their needs and motivations (Participatory Monitoring and Management Partnership (PMMP) 2015). The involvement of all beneficiaries is necessary to address the drivers of and societal responses to environmental change (Fig. 1; Danielsen *et al.* 2010).

Develop projects that are locally-relevant

One of our key findings was that the barriers to and benefits of citizen science were predominantly social. This emphasizes that each citizen science activity takes place within a specific social context (e.g. cultural and technological), which must be considered for activities to be successful (Conrad & Hilchey 2011; Loos *et al.* 2015). Context will vary

Accepted Article

across the world: there is a culture of contributory citizen science in western countries as ‘serious leisure’ volunteering for personal enjoyment and to ‘help nature’ (Haklay 2013; reviews in Geoghegan *et al.* 2016), but attitudes towards ‘volunteering’ vary culturally (Hacker, Picken & Lewis 2017). We (and others, including Danielsen, Burgess & Balmford 2005) concluded that focusing on action towards solutions to environmental and societal problems could be especially important in developing countries. Access to technology, especially smartphones, facilitates participation in citizen science (Newman *et al.* 2012; Pocock *et al.* 2017) so the interconnected growth in internet use and smartphone ownership in developing nations is noteworthy (Pew Research Center 2016), but access varies across East African countries (e.g. smartphone ownership varies from 4% to 26%). This could constrain the use of existing technological solutions for citizen science (e.g. online databases, mobile applications and data visualization tools) that have developed elsewhere. Cultural context and technological accessibility also varies between demographics: urban/rural, across incomes and between languages. It would be good to test whether large-scale contributory activities can be developed in East Africa that successfully motivate diverse audiences, or whether activities need to be targeted for (and designed collaboratively with) each demographic.

Establish networks to share, collaborate and act strategically

Evaluation of our citizen science conference in East Africa (TBA 2016) showed the benefits of this opportunity to interact with other practitioners. We recommend governments and NGOs fund regional networks of citizen science stakeholders (see Vogel, Bowser & Brocklehurst 2017; <http://citizenscience.asia/>). These should include funders and data users for greatest strategic impact, but also ensure that participants’ values and motivations are represented. Such networks should link with each other internationally for two-way learning in innovation and evaluation.

Conclusions

Our study shows that citizen science has great potential in East Africa, which is indicative of the global potential for citizen science (Pocock et al. 2018a). Sustained investment and commitment should be made available to overcome important social barriers (especially for institutions), to develop locally-relevant approaches (including participatory approaches based around the needs of participants, not just institutions) and to support networks of practitioners. This will help the opportunities we identified to provide great benefits to nature, people and society.

Acknowledgements

The conference and workshop was financially supported by the British Ecological Society, with additional support from the Tropical Biology Association (TBA) and the Natural Environment Research Council via national capability funding to the Centre for Ecology & Hydrology. TBA staff gave organisational support. Authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Authors' contributions

M.J.O.P., H.E.R., T.A. and R.T. designed and chaired the workshop; all other authors contributed to the workshop. M.J.O.P. led the writing of the manuscript. All other authors contributed to the drafts and gave final approval for publication.

Data accessibility

Participant's scores are available via the Dryad Digital Repository

<https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.v6028g3> (Pocock et al., 2018b).

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

References

- Bonney, R., Ballard, H., Jordan, R., McCallie, E., Phillips, T., Shirk, J. & Wilderman, C. (2009a) *Public Participation in Scientific Research: Defining the Field and Assessing Its Potential for Informal Science Education. A CAISE Inquiry Group Report*. Center for Advancement of Informal Science Education (CAISE), Washington, D.C.
- Bonney, R., Cooper, C.B., Dickinson, J., Kelling, S., Phillips, T., Rosenberg, K. V. & Shirk, J. (2009b) Citizen science: a developing tool for expanding science knowledge and scientific literacy. *BioScience*, **59**, 977–984.
- Bonney, R., Shirk, J.L., Phillips, T.B., Wiggins, A., Ballard, H.L., Miller-Rushing, A.J. & Parrish, J.K. (2014) Citizen science. Next steps for citizen science. *Science*, **343**, 1436–7.
- Chandler, M., See, L., Copas, K., Bonde, A.M.Z., López, B.C., Danielsen, F., Legind, J.K., Masinde, S., Miller-Rushing, A.J., Newman, G., Rosemartin, A. & Turak, E. (2017) Contribution of citizen science towards international biodiversity monitoring. *Biological Conservation*, **213**, 280–294.
- Conrad, C.C. & Hilchey, K.G. (2011) A review of citizen science and community-based environmental monitoring: issues and opportunities. *Environmental monitoring and assessment*, **176**, 273–91.
- Danielsen, F., Burgess, N.D. & Balmford, A. (2005) Monitoring matters: examining the potential of locally-based approaches. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **14**, 2507–2542.
- Danielsen, F., Burgess, N.D., Jensen, P.M. & Pirhofer-Walzl, K. (2010) Environmental monitoring: the scale and speed of implementation varies according to the degree of peoples involvement. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **47**, 1166–1168.

Danielsen, F., Pirhofer-Walzl, K., Adrian, T.P., Kapijimpanga, D.R., Burgess, N.D., Jensen, P.M., Bonney, R., Funder, M., Landa, A., Levermann, N. & Madsen, J. (2014) Linking public participation in scientific research to the indicators and needs of international environmental agreements. *Conservation Letters*, **7**, 12–24.

ECSA. (2015) 10 Principles of Citizen Science, <http://ecsa.citizen-science.net/engage-us/10-principles-citizen-science>

European Environment Agency. (2010) *Assessing Biodiversity in Europe: The 2010 Report*. EEA, Copenhagen.

Geoghegan, H., Dyke, A., Pateman, R., West, S. & Everett, G. (2016) *Understanding Motivations for Citizen Science. Final Report on Behalf of UKEOF*.

Hacker, E., Picken, A. & Lewis, S. (2017) Perceptions of volunteering and their effect on sustainable development and poverty alleviation in Mozambique, Nepal and Kenya. *Perspectives on Volunteering: Voices from the South* (eds J. Butcher & C.J. Einolf), pp. 53–73. Springer International Publishing, Switzerland.

Haklay, M. (2013) Citizen Science and Volunteered Geographic Information: overview and typology of participation. *Crowdsourcing Geographic Knowledge: Volunteered Geographic Information (VGI) in Theory and Practice* (eds D.Z. Sui, S. Elwood, & M.F. Goodchild), pp. 105–122. Springer, Berlin.

Hulbert, J.M. (2016) Citizen science tools available for ecological research in South Africa. *South African Journal of Science*, **Volume 112**.

Loos, J., Horcea-Milcu, A.I., Kirkland, P., Hartel, T., Osváth-Ferencz, M. & Fischer, J. (2015) Challenges for biodiversity monitoring using citizen science in transitioning social–ecological systems. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, **26**, 45–48.

McKinley, D.C., Miller-Rushing, A.J., Ballard, H.L., Bonney, R.E., Brown, H., Evans, D.A.,

Accepted Article

French, R.A., Parrish, J.K., Phillips, T.B., Ryan, S.F., Shanley, L.A., Shirk, J.L., Stepenuck, K.F., Weltzin, J.F., Wiggins, A., Boyle, O.D., Briggs, R.D., Chapin, S.F.I., Hewitt, D.A., Preuss, P.W. & Soukup, M.A. (2015) Investing in citizen science can improve natural resource management and environmental protection. *Issues in Ecology*, **19**, 1–27.

Newman, G., Wiggins, A., Crall, A., Graham, E., Newman, S. & Crowston, K. (2012) The future of citizen science: emerging technologies and shifting paradigms. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, **10**, 298–304.

Participatory Monitoring and Management Partnership (PMMP). (2015) Manaus Letter: Recommendations for the Participatory Monitoring of Biodiversity. In. *International Seminar on Participatory Monitoring of Biodiversity for the Management of Natural Resources 2014* (eds P.A. Constantino, K.M. Silvius, J. Kleine Büning, P. Arroyo, F. Danielsen, C.C. Durigan, G. Estupinan, S. Hvalkof, M.K. Poulsen, & K.T. Ribeiro), p. Manaus, Brazil.

Pew Research Center. (2016) *Smartphone Ownership and Internet Usage Continues to Climb in Emerging Economies*.

Pocock, M.J.O., Newson, S.E., Henderson, I.G., Peyton, J., Sutherland, W.J., Noble, D.G., Ball, S.G., Beckmann, B.C., Biggs, J., Brereton, T., Bullock, D.J., Buckland, S.T., Edwards, M., Eaton, M.A., Harvey, M.C., Hill, M.O., Horlock, M., Hubble, D.S., Julian, A.M., Mackey, E.C., Mann, D.J., Marshall, M.J., Medlock, J.M., O’Mahony, E.M., Pacheco, M., Porter, K., Prentice, S., Procter, D.A., Roy, H.E., Southway, S.E., Shortall, C.R., Stewart, A.J.A., Wembridge, D.E., Wright, M.A. & Roy, D.B. (2015) Developing and enhancing biodiversity monitoring programmes: a collaborative assessment of priorities. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **52**, 686–695.

Pocock, M.J.O., Tweddle, J.C., Savage, J., Robinson, L.D. & Roy, H.E. (2017) The diversity and evolution of ecological and environmental citizen science. *PLOS ONE*, **12**, e0172579.

Pocock, M.J.O., Chandler, M., Bonney, R.E., Thornhill, I., Albin, A., August, T., Bachman, S., Brown, P.M.J., Cunha, D.G.F., Grez, A., Jackson, C., Peters, M., Rabarijaon, N.R., Roy, H.E., Zaviezot, T., Danielsen, F. (2018) A vision for global biodiversity monitoring with citizen science. *Advances in Ecological Research* **59**. doi: 10.1016/bs.aecr.2018.06.003.

Pocock, M.J.O., Roy, H.E., August, T., Kuria, A., Barasa, F., Bett, J., Githiru, M., Kairo, J., Kimani, J., Kinuthia, W., Kissui, B., Madindou, I., Mbogo, K., Mirembe, J., Mugo, P., Muniale, F.M., Njoroge, P., Njuguna, E.G., Olendo, M.I., Opige, M., Otieno, T.O., Ng'weno, C.C., Pallangyo, E., Thenya, T., Wanjiru, A., Trevelyan, R. (2018b) Data from: Developing the global potential of citizen science: Assessing opportunities that benefit people, society and the environment in East Africa. Dryad Digital Repository. <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.v6028g3>.

Pretty, J. & Smith, D. (2004) Social Capital in Biodiversity Conservation and Management. *Conservation Biology*, **18**, 631–638.

SCBD. (2010) *COP-10 Decision X/2. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity*.

Smeets, E. & Weterings, R. (1999) *Environmental Indicators: Typology and Overview. Technical Report No. 25*. Copenhagen.

Sutherland, W.J., Fleishman, E., Mascia, M.B., Pretty, J. & Rudd, M.A. (2011) Methods for collaboratively identifying research priorities and emerging issues in science and policy. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **2**, 238–247.

Swanson, A., Kosmala, M., Lintott, C., Simpson, R., Smith, A. & Packer, C. (2015) Snapshot

Serengeti: high-frequency annotated camera trap images of 40 mammalian species in an African savanna. *Scientific Data*, **2**, 150026.

TBA. (2016) *Unlocking Africa's Potential for Citizen Science: Symposium Report*.

Theobald, E.J., Ettinger, A.K., Burgess, H.K., DeBey, L.B., Schmidt, N.R., Froehlich, H.E., Wagner, C., HilleRisLambers, J., Tewksbury, J., Harsch, M.A. & Parrish, J.K. (2015) Global change and local solutions: Tapping the unrealized potential of citizen science for biodiversity research. *Biological Conservation*, **181**, 236–244.

Tweddle, J.C., Robinson, L.D., Pocock, M.J.O. & Roy, H.E. (2012) *Guide to Citizen Science: Developing, Implementing and Evaluating Citizen Science to Study Biodiversity and the Environment in the UK*. Natural History Museum and NERC Centre for Ecology & Hydrology for UK-EOF, London, UK.

UNGA. (2015) *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UNGA Resolution A/RES/70/1, 25 September 2015)* ('2030 Agenda').

Vogel, J., Bowser, A. & Brocklehurst, M. (2017) Commitment adopted by the Global Citizen Science Delegation, <http://citizenscience.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Citizen-Science-Global-Vision-Statement-UN-Forum-2017.pdf>

West, S. & Pateman, R. (2017) *How could citizen science support the Sustainable Development Goals?* Stockholm Environment Institute, Stockholm, Sweden.

Table 1. Summary of the questions asked in order to create and rank lists of the opportunities for, benefits of and barriers for citizen science in East Africa.

Topic	Open question for gathering and refining the set of answers	Question for ranking within the set of answers	Linked to policy context (frameworks and targets)	Comments
Opportunities	What topics are suitable and important for citizen science activities in East Africa in the next 5 years?	Which topics would be most fruitful* for citizen science in East Africa in the next 5 years?	Aichi biodiversity targets; DPSIR framework	Participants considered measurable attributes of biodiversity and the environment
Benefits	What are benefits of citizen science in East Africa?	What are the most important benefits of citizen science in East Africa?	Aichi biodiversity targets; DPSIR framework	Including benefits for science (applied science and ‘blue skies’ research), participants (direct and indirect benefits to individuals and communities) and society (including decision-makers)
Barriers	What are barriers that limit the use of citizen science in East Africa?	Overcoming which barriers would have most impact on citizen science in East Africa?	Social capital	We considered where support would be beneficial, e.g. resources (for personnel or infrastructure), strategic support, or increased understanding (of issues or benefits)

* We defined ‘fruitful’ as “achievable, useful and likely to be successful, considering current and new activities”.

Table 2. Opportunities for citizen science in ecology and the environment in East Africa as ranked at a collaborative prioritization workshop, and the targets they support.

Rank	Opportunity*	Score from collaborative prioritization†		Data can support:‡	
				Aichi Biodiversity Target	DPSIR causal framework‡
1	Monitoring habitats and their change	25	●	5,7,12	SI
2	Monitoring species (including counting and census)	18	●	7,12	SI
3	Fresh water quality and quantity	14	●	8,14	PSI
4	Impact of development on wildlife and natural resources	12	●	5,7	I
5	Distribution mapping of species	12	●	7	SI
6	Assessing habitat quality	11	●	5,7,8	SI
7	Natural resource mapping	10	●	5	PS
8	Natural resource utilization (legal and incidental)	8	●	1,3,6,14	P
9	Pollution	6	●	8	P
10	Productivity of food (includes pollination)	5	●	7,14	I
11	Detecting invasive species	4	●	9	P
12	Illegal resource use	2	●	6	P
13	Human-wildlife conflict	2	●	3	PI
14	Understanding potential for citizen science	2	●	1,19	-
15	Documenting indigenous local knowledge	1	●	18	-






* Full wording, as agreed by workshop participants, listed in Appendix S3.

† Sum of the ranks from individuals, where their top priority was scored three, second scored

two and third scored one. The area of the circle is proportional to the score.

‡ Classification made after the workshop. Aichi Biodiversity Targets are listed in Appendix S4. DPSIR categories (European Environment Agency 2010): D = Driver; P = Pressure; S = State; I = Impact; R = Response.

Table 3. Benefits of citizen science in ecology and the environment in East Africa as ranked at a collaborative prioritization workshop, and the targets that they support.

Rank	Benefit*	Score from collaborative prioritization†	Benefits	Data can support:‡		
				Aichi Biodiversity Targets	DPSIR causal framework	
1	Increased awareness of conservation and the environment by individuals, communities, media, NGOs & governments	44		Social	1,4	R
2	Enhanced data collection, including coverage, resolution (spatial, temporal and taxonomic), accuracy and inter-disciplinarity	22		Data	1	PSI
3	Creating next-generation conservation leaders and champions	15		Social	1	R
4	Improved conservation action leading to better environment including ecosystem function, ecosystem services and resilience	13		Data	1,2,4	D
5	Improved wellbeing and livelihoods through connection to (and consequent ownership of)	7		Social	1	R

	nature and sense of belonging					
6	Increased ability to leverage funds and enhance sustainability through cost-effectiveness	6	●	Data	4	DR
7	Enhanced capacity and empowerment of all stakeholders in conservation, leading to action	6	●	Social	1,2,4	DR
8	Greater ownership through involvement at every stage, including motivations for monitoring and action, increased trust, tolerance and attitudes to nature	5	●	Social	1,2,4	DR
9	Wider user of data, including appropriate dissemination which improves accessibility of data and understanding	4	●	Data	2	SI
10	Widening perspectives through better integration of indigenous knowledge and reflections from participants	4	●	Social	1	R
11	Widens participation to all stakeholders (not just elites)	3	●	Social	1,2	DR
12	Developing and enhancing skills sets, including organization and science	3	●	Social	1,4	R

* Full wording, as agreed by workshop participants, listed in Appendix S3.

† Score as defined in Table 2.

‡ Classification made after the workshop. Description of categories as in Table 2.

Table 4. Barriers to citizen science in ecology and the environment in East Africa as ranked at a collaborative prioritization workshop, and the type and target of solutions for these barriers.

Rank	Barrier	Score from collaborative prioritization*	Type of solution†
1	Limited awareness of opportunities	23	Social: Institutions + Participants
2	Limited organizational capacity, including planning, leadership and coordination	19	Social: Institutions
3	Lack of interest	13	Social: Participants
4	Lack of appreciation of the value of citizen science from decision makers	13	Social: Institutions
5	Limited access to the right technology, including access to the internet and mobile coverage	13	Structural
6	Lack of skilled participants	11	Social: Participants
7	Limited networking and collaboration	11	Social: Institutions
8	Inadequate funding	7	Social: Institutions
9	Uneven distribution of citizen scientists	6	Structural
10	Limited incentives (financial or other)	6	Social: Participants
11	Cultural barriers to participation	3	Social: Participants
12	Limited confidence and trust among participants	2	Social: Participants
13	Data/information not fit for purpose	2	Social: Institutions
14	Site accessibility	2	Structural
15	Corruption and democracy in government and local communities	1	Social: Institutions
16	Language barrier	0	Structural
17	Threat of adverse outcomes, including legal action	0	Social: Institutions
18	Lack of understanding between sectors and stakeholders (and conflict of interest, including	0	Social: Institutions

	institutional competition)		
19	Limited access to reference sources, e.g. field guides	0	Structural

* Score as defined in Table 2.

† Classification made after the workshop.

Figure 1. The opportunities and benefits of environmental citizen science could support knowledge and action across the DPSIR causal framework of interactions between people and the environment, in line with international goals, as established through our workshop on citizen science in East Africa. Icons: United Nations Sustainable Development Goals: copyright UNIC; Aichi Biodiversity Target icons: used with permission, copyright BIP/SCBD.

