



SUBMISSION

In relation to the notification requesting views and information regarding the Programme of Work on Article 8(j) and related provisions

Ref.: SCBD/SPS/DC/VN/JS/DM/86220 and SCBD/SPS/DC/VN/JS/VF/jh/86220

Convention on Biological Diversity
Cristiana Paşca Palmer, PhD
Executive Secretary
413 Rue Saint-Jacques Ouest, Suite 800
Montreal, Quebec
Canada H2Y 1N9

1 May 2017

Dear Dr. Paşca Palmer,

This is a submission by the Global Forest Coalition (GFC), a coalition of 86 Indigenous Peoples' Organisations and NGOs from 58 different countries, and members and partners of the Community Conservation Resilience Initiative,¹ together comprising a diverse group of Indigenous Peoples', community-based and civil society organisations and networks working on issues related to collective action and biodiversity conservation.

This submission addresses the following items in the notification:

- (4) Resource Mobilisation: collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities and safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms;
- (5) Integration of Article 8(j) and provisions related to indigenous peoples and local communities in the work of the Convention and its Protocols; and
- (6) In-depth Dialogue.

It is intended to complement and support the submission of the ICCA Consortium, which will be submitted separately and addresses items (2), (4), (5) and (6). We also support the observations submitted by Forest Peoples Programme. Thank you for the opportunity to provide inputs on these important matters, and please do not hesitate to contact us for any clarifications. We look forward to further contributing to this process and other preparations for the tenth meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions in December 2017.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Holly Jonas".

Holly Jonas (holly@globalforestcoalition.org)
Legal Team Coordinator, Community Conservation Resilience Initiative

¹ For more information about the Community Conservation Resilience Initiative, please see: <http://globalforestcoalition.org/resources/supporting-community-conservation/>.

Item 4: Resource Mobilisation: collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities and safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms

Collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities

1. The collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities were explicitly recognised in at least six COP13 decisions, namely:
 - **Decision XIII/1** (“Progress in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and towards the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets”), para. 15;
 - **Decision XIII/2** (“Progress towards the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12”), para. 5(b)(vii);
 - **Decision XIII/3** (“Strategic actions to enhance the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, including with respect to mainstreaming and the integration of biodiversity within and across sectors”), paras. 18(b) and 97;
 - **Decision XIII/20** (“Resource mobilization”), preamble, paras. 18-21, Annex and Appendix;
 - **Decision XIII/29** (“Global Biodiversity Outlook and Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services”), para. 1(c)(v); and
 - **Decision XIII/31** (“Key scientific and technical needs related to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and related research”), para. 6(h).
2. In response to the notification’s request for information about activities on assessing the contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities to the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets, we wish to share information about the Community Conservation Resilience Initiative (CCRI).² The CCRI was also discussed in our joint submission with the ICCA Consortium from 15 May 2015 (in response to the notification requesting information on the contribution of collective action to biodiversity conservation, Ref.: SCBD/TSI/RS/YX/84650).
3. We gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Government of Germany, which is funding the CCRI through the International Climate Initiative, and The Christensen Fund, as well as the support of the Siemenpuu Foundation, Swedbio, Commonwealth Foundation and IPOs, NGOs and communities for the local assessments themselves.
4. The CCRI was established by an informal alliance of national and international Indigenous Peoples’ organisations, non-governmental organisations and social movements that shared a joint belief in community stewardship, governance and rights-based approaches to biodiversity and ecosystem conservation and restoration. It is coordinated by the Global Forest Coalition in collaboration with national and local organisations in 22 countries.

² For more information, see: https://www.international-climate-initiative.com/en/projects/projects/details/promoting-community-conservation-resilience-413/?no_cache=1?b=2,0,0,4,0,1&kw= and <http://globalforestcoalition.org/resources/supporting-community-conservation/>.

5. The aim of the Community Conservation Resilience Initiative (CCRI) is to contribute to the implementation of the CBD's 2011-2020 Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets by providing policy advice on effective and appropriate forms of support for community conservation, including ICCAs. It involves the documentation and review of bottom-up, participatory assessments in 22 countries in Africa, Asia-Pacific and Latin America of the resilience of community conservation initiatives and the support that should be provided to strengthen these initiatives. It promotes more appropriate legal, political, financial and other forms of support for community conservation initiatives that reflect the recommendations of communities themselves.
6. A guiding methodology and toolkit, country reports and a global report from the first ten countries involved, and CBD submissions and position papers are all available online at: <http://globalforestcoalition.org/resources/supporting-community-conservation/>.
7. At COP13, Parties adopted guiding principles on assessing the contribution of collective action by indigenous peoples and local communities (Decision XIII/20, Annex), and requested the Executive Secretary to develop elements of methodological guidance for identifying, monitoring, and assessing the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities to the Strategic Plan and Aichi Biodiversity Targets (Decision XIII/20, para. 21). We wish to express our support for the guiding principles as contained in the Annex to Decision XIII/20.
8. We also wish to suggest the following five cross-cutting principles derived from the CCRI methodology³ for inclusion in the CBD's methodological guidance:
 - (a) **Indigenous Peoples' and Local Communities' Rights, including the Right to Free, Prior and Informed Consent:** Respect for and realisation of the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, including their right to provide or deny free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) regarding activities that take place on their lands and territories, or otherwise affect them, should be at the heart of collective action assessment methodologies. The decision to provide or withhold FPIC is an ongoing process, not a single moment or one-off event. At any stage of engagement with external actors, a community has a right to seek more information, say "no", or withdraw entirely. Customary means of consensus building or other forms of decision-making can be used as the basis for culturally appropriate FPIC processes. By definition, FPIC processes must respect the community's timelines and self-determined processes and must not be driven or influenced by project proponents.
 - (b) **Indigenous & Community Ownership:** The process and outcomes of collective action assessment methodologies should be driven and created by Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Power relations between Indigenous and dominant societies are often highly imbalanced and inequitable. The methodologies should be emancipatory, participatory, and representative of local realities. They should recognise that indigenous peoples' and local communities' relationships with their territories and areas are an integral source of their identities, cultures and well-being. The emphasis on Indigenous methodologies and approaches lays the foundations for bridging complementary systems of traditional indigenous and mainstream knowledge.
 - (c) **Adaptive Facilitation:** Facilitation of collective action assessments requires respect, reciprocity, equity, sensitivity, flexibility, trust, and adaptability. Open communication and

³ The CCRI methodology is available online in English (http://globalforestcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/New-Last-CCR-Initiative-methodology_May-2014.pdf) and Russian (<http://globalforestcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/CCRI-Methodology-Russian.pdf>).

mutual sharing and learning lie at the heart of the CCRI. Facilitators of collective action assessments should ensure that both the process and outcomes are emancipatory. Communities and facilitators should also consider how they may wish to manage: (i) expectations (for example, through reflection and evaluation at different stages to ensure expectations are realistic and attainable); (ii) timeframes (for example, by planning for necessary financial and human resources, time required to engage with communities, and adapting to circumstances such as natural disasters or changes in government); and (iii) information (including process documentation and safeguarding sensitive or restricted information).

- (d) **Participation & Representation:** It is important to create space for meaningful and culturally appropriate participation of representatives of all social groups (children, youth, women, men, elders, people with disabilities or illnesses, ethnic minorities, etc.) in collective action assessments. Some groups may seek their own spaces for more open discussion amongst peers, which can then be conveyed in an appropriate manner to the broader community. Other groups may prefer certain activities than others (for example, use of GPS units and cameras by youth), while others still may only have specific times of the day, week or season in which they can contribute to community assessments. The gender dimension is particularly important in this.
- (e) **Women & Gender:** Women and men have different roles in many aspects of household and community life. Further to para. 8(d) above, community assessments of collective action should integrate a gender 'lens' or 'dimension' to better enable the facilitation and support team and other key actors to understand, accommodate and support the specific rights, roles, needs, and aspirations of more marginalised groups (which often includes women). The Annex to the CCRI methodology contains further guidance and tools for mainstreaming gender.
9. In addition, the CCRI methodology contains further guidance about nine possible components of a community driven participatory assessment process such as the CCRI, namely:
- Preparation and strategic visioning;
 - Coordination and facilitation;
 - 'Site selection', including FPIC;
 - Mutual learning and skill-sharing;
 - Baselines of legal and non-legal recognition of ICCAs and other forms of community conservation;
 - Designing and undertaking the resilience assessments, prioritising Indigenous approaches and methods of inquiry and community-determined indicators;
 - Visioning, strategic planning and consolidation of community recommendations;
 - Strategic advocacy and engagement to put the community assessments and visions into practice; and
 - Reflection, reporting and revision of the methodologies, assessments and strategies.

Aichi Biodiversity Target 3

10. We also wish to underscore the importance of fully implementing Aichi Biodiversity Target 3 as part of the strategy for resource mobilisation. In Decision XIII/20, COP13 recalled its invitation to Parties to report progress in achieving the milestones for the full implementation of Aichi Target 3 and invited Parties *"to include information on national analytical studies that identify candidates for elimination, phase-out or reform of incentives,*

including subsidies, that are harmful for biodiversity, and that identify opportunities to promote the design and implementation of positive incentive measures, such as appropriate recognition and support for indigenous peoples and local communities that conserve territories and areas, and other effective community conservation initiatives” (para. 23).

11. Both ‘pillars’ of Aichi Target 3 – namely, removing harmful incentives and supporting positive incentives – are essential to its implementation. The initial outcomes of the CCRI have shown that community conservation initiatives contribute significantly to the implementation of the Aichi Targets, the SDGs and biodiversity conservation and restoration in general, but these initiatives are severely threatened and undermined by policies and projects that support unsustainable land use, climate change and unsustainable development. The co-existence of sustainable and unsustainable models of development is unfeasible in the long run. It should thus be a priority to eliminate or phase out perverse incentives that may cause biodiversity loss, in line with the agreed milestones to implement Aichi Target 3. Financial resources normally used for harmful incentives should be redirected to support positive initiatives such as ICCAs and other effective community conservation initiatives. This would be an efficient and effective way to implement Aichi Target 3 and also mobilise significant financial resources.

Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms

12. With reference to the voluntary guidelines on safeguards for biodiversity financing mechanisms (Decision XII/3, Annex III), we wish to offer some key points based partly on a working paper on climate finance produced in collaboration with the ICCA Consortium.⁴
13. ICCAs and other forms of community conservation contribute significantly to the CBD and achievement of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. However, indigenous peoples and local communities face prejudices in mainstream biodiversity financing mechanisms, which continue to prioritise government-centric (and often exclusionary) protected areas as well as species conservation projects that largely ignore the positive and potential contributions of Indigenous Peoples, local communities and women.
14. Biodiversity financing – including but not only for protected areas and species conservation projects – must be subject to human rights standards and instruments such as the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (as referenced in the Decision XII/3 guidelines on safeguards) and the right of indigenous peoples and communities to give or withhold their free, prior and informed consent.
15. As stated in the Decision XII/3 guidelines on safeguards, *“Particular attention needs to be given to the impacts on, and contribution of, indigenous and local communities as well as women, and to their effective participation in the selection, design, and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms”* (Annex III, para. 1). In this respect, it is important to recognise and distinguish Indigenous peoples, local communities and women as rights-holders – not mere “beneficiaries”. Rights-holders should also be clearly distinguished from stakeholders that merely have a financial stake in certain conservation initiatives, especially in consultation, multi-actor dialogue and FPIC processes.

⁴ Lovera, S., H. C. Jonas, S. Fischer and C. de la Plaza, with G. Borrini- Feyerabend, M. E. Didane, T. Farvar, S. Saifaleupolu, and A. Singh. 2015. *Climate Finance, Results-based Payments and Conservation by Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities*. Working Paper of the ICCA Consortium and Community Conservation Resilience Initiative. Available online at: <http://globalforestcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Climate-finance-ICCAs-and-community-conservation-nov-2016.pdf>.

16. Additional concerns arise when biodiversity financing mechanisms attempt to introduce results-based payments for conservation and foreign concepts such as 'natural capital accounting' to indigenous peoples and local communities. The introduction of new governance arrangements to handle financial incentives tends to undermine customary institutions. Results-based payments for conservation or improved land use practices often lead to inequity, mismanagement and even corruption, especially if there are no strong governance systems in place. They also tend to target actors with secure land rights, which discriminates against indigenous peoples, local communities and women with unrecognised or disputed land tenure rights.
17. Another problematic development is the increasing tendency to merge private sector investments with public biodiversity financing. Private sector investments need to be commercially profitable, whereas ICCAs and other forms of sustainable use of biodiversity and territories tend to provide a broad range of social, cultural, spiritual and livelihood benefits, but only modest financial profits. Meanwhile, there are clear perverse incentives for the private sector to invest in projects that are commercially attractive or otherwise serve their public relations image (for example, biodiversity offsets), despite their negative impacts on biodiversity and the livelihoods of the peoples and communities on the frontlines of biodiversity and habitat loss.
18. We recommend the following for consideration in the CBD's safeguards for biodiversity financing mechanisms:
 - (a) Recognise ICCAs and other community conservation initiatives as effective, holistic non-market-based approaches for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and offer appropriate legal, political, social, economic and other forms of support rather than results-based payments;
 - (b) Promote comprehensive and participatory reporting on community conservation initiatives and other land use actions, taking into account their multiple benefits and values – rather than using flawed accounting methodologies such as natural capital accounting or carbon accounting;
 - (c) Halt and reverse the corporate take-over of biodiversity policy through public-private partnerships and redirect perverse incentives to support positive initiatives such as ICCAs that serve public rather than commercial private interests;
 - (d) Redirect biodiversity finances away from ineffective and exclusionary protected areas and species conservation projects toward collective actions of indigenous peoples, local communities and women that already do or have the potential to contribute significantly to biodiversity; and
 - (e) Ensure the full and effective participation and FPIC of indigenous peoples, local communities and women in national policies, plans and programmes for biodiversity and related financing mechanisms, and address the findings of community-based assessments and monitoring in biodiversity-related decision-making.

Item 5: Integration of Article 8(j) and provisions related to indigenous peoples and local communities in the work of the Convention and its Protocols

1. As requested in **Decision XIII/26**, para. 3, the Executive Secretary is inviting views on possible ways and instruments for *achieving full integration of Article 8(j) and provisions related to indigenous peoples and local communities in the work of the Convention and its Protocols*, with full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities and aiming at enhancing efficiencies, coherence and coordination. The Working Group is expected to consider this information and make recommendations to the Subsidiary Body on Implementation.
2. In **Decision XIII/31** (“Key scientific and technical needs related to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and related research”), Parties requested the Executive Secretary to “*collaborate with relevant organizations to promote tools and methodologies for assessing the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity*” (para. 5(b)). Parties were also encouraged to “*continue to promote awareness about the role of traditional knowledge systems and the collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities to complement the scientific knowledge in support of the effective implementation of the Strategic Plan*” (para. 6(h)).
3. In **Decision XIII/25** (“Modus operandi of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and mechanisms to support review of implementation”), para. 7 requests the Executive Secretary to identify options to *strengthen processes for integrating matters related to indigenous peoples and local communities* into the work of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation in accordance with the process referred to in Decision XIII/26, para 3 (above).
4. In addition, **Decision XIII/25** (para. 3) invites Parties to review and share information through the clearinghouse mechanism about measures taken for the implementation of the Convention and related strategic plans – *including participatory approaches and engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities, civil society, women and youth* – to identify obstacles that may exist to such implementation. Para. 4 of the same decision requests information on obstacles and effective practices related to implementation of national and global targets, including possible elements of mechanisms for review of implementation (such as the voluntary peer review mechanism for NBSAPs).
5. From these most recent decisions, *inter alia*, it is clear that Parties are committed to integrating matters concerning indigenous peoples and local communities into the work of the Convention and its subsidiary bodies. We wish to underscore the central role played by the Working Group on Article 8(j) and related provisions as the dedicated platform for discussing such matters, and urge Parties to support its continuation.

Including NBSAPs and national reports in the voluntary peer review mechanism

6. According to SBI/1/2/Add.3, para. 36, only 30 percent of NBSAPs referred to indigenous peoples and local communities, only 5 percent mentioned customary sustainable use, and only two Parties reported participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in their NBSAP Committees.

7. As communicated in our joint position paper for COP13 with ICCA Consortium, indigenous peoples and local communities are integral to implementation of the Convention and to the achievement of the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets. Traditional knowledge and innovations, customary practices and collective action such as ICCAs contribute significantly to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity around the world. The lack of consideration in NBSAPs of indigenous peoples, local communities and women demonstrates the continuing significant gaps between their *de facto* contributions and Parties' commitments to ensure their full and effective participation in the work of the Convention and in national planning, implementation, reporting and review processes and mechanisms.
8. In the context of the development of a voluntary peer review mechanism for NBSAPs (as per Decision XIII/25), we thus wish to underscore the critical importance of the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples, local communities and women in this mechanism. For example, indigenous peoples, local communities and women's groups should be invited to provide comments and have the opportunity to pose questions to Parties during the review process.
9. In addition to NBSAPs, we also wish to recommend the inclusion of CBD national reports in the voluntary peer review mechanism. NBSAPs and national reports go hand-in-hand as the two main tools for implementation of the Convention and should be considered in tandem. Regardless of how clear and ambitious an NBSAP may be, it tells us little if anything about actions taken in practice to achieve the Strategic Plan and Convention as a whole. Consideration of national reports should thus be a necessary complement to consideration of NBSAPs in the peer review mechanism, and the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples, local communities and women should again be integral to this process.

Global Biodiversity Outlook and Local Biodiversity Outlooks

10. In Decision XIII/29, Parties decided to start preparation of the fifth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, which they agreed should draw upon "official and the best available scientific information", including "[i]nformation provided by indigenous peoples and local communities, including information on the contributions of collective actions to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020" (para. 1(c)(v)).
11. This is a positive decision and it is hoped that the fifth edition will accordingly have a much stronger focus on the contributions of indigenous peoples, local communities and women to achieving the Strategic Plan.
12. We welcome the publication of the first edition of *Local Biodiversity Outlooks* in 2016.⁵ We also acknowledge the request from Parties in Decision XIII/29 (para. 2) to prepare a second edition of the *Local Biodiversity Outlooks*, and encourage Parties and the Secretariat to allocate financial resources to assist in its timely production and broad dissemination. The *Local Biodiversity Outlooks* is an excellent initiative for documenting the contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities and their collective actions towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, as well as the integration of traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use into the work of the Convention. In light of the vital role of women in

⁵ Forest Peoples Programme, the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (2016) *Local Biodiversity Outlooks. Indigenous Peoples' and Local Communities' Contributions to the Implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. A complement to the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook*. Moreton-in-Marsh, England. Available online at: <http://localbiodiversityoutlooks.net>.

biodiversity conservation, we reiterate the importance of integrating a gender perspective in the *Local Biodiversity Outlooks*.

Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use

13. **Decision XIII/1** (“Progress in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and towards the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets”) encourages Parties to “reinforce and strengthen efforts to mainstream Article 8(j) and Article 10(c), including the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity... in the development, updating and implementation of the national biodiversity strategies and action plans” (para. 18).
14. Decision XIII/1 also invites Parties, indigenous peoples and local communities, and others “to submit updated information on progress towards Aichi Biodiversity Target 18 ... including on the various elements of the target, as well as implementation of the plan of action on customary sustainable use...” for consideration by the next meetings of the Working Group on Article 8(j) and the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (para. 22).
15. The Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use was also mentioned in several other COP13 decisions, including:
 - **Decision XIII/3** (“Strategic actions to enhance the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, including with respect to mainstreaming and the integration of biodiversity within and across sectors”), preamble;
 - **Decision XIII/5** (“Ecosystem restoration: short-term action plan”), para. 8 and Annex, para. 9;
 - **Decision XIII/19** (“Article 8(j) and related Articles: other matters related to the programme of work”), Annex, para. 7; and
 - **Decision XIII/20** (“Resource mobilization”), para. 19.
16. We support the points raised in the submission of the Forest Peoples Programme (in response to the same call as the present submission), calling for a concerted focus on Phase 2 of the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use.

Biodiversity Liaison Group

17. As a final suggestion, we wish to propose greater emphasis on indigenous peoples and local communities in the Liaison Group of Biodiversity-related Conventions.⁶ As the Secretariat for the Liaison Group, the CBD Secretariat has an important leadership role to play and is well placed to convey the good practices and benefits of integrating indigenous peoples and local communities into the work of the CBD.
18. One option is to invite representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities as observers to the Liaison Group.
19. Another option is to add a standing agenda item to Liaison Group meetings on indigenous peoples and local communities. This could consider topics such as (*inter alia*) assessing the contributions of collective actions (such as ICCAs) to achieving all of the biodiversity-related

⁶ See Modus Operandi for the Liaison Group of the Biodiversity-related Conventions: <https://www.cbd.int/cooperation/doc/blg-modus-operandi-en.pdf>.

conventions, including through opportunities for harmonised national reporting, and enhancing cooperation of the respective scientific advisory bodies on matters concerning indigenous peoples and local communities.

Item 6: In-depth Dialogue

1. As adopted in Decision XIII/19 A, the topic of the in-depth dialogue to be held at the tenth meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j) is: *“Contribution of the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local communities to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development with particular emphasis on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity”*.

Data disaggregation and participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in reporting on the SDGs and CBD national reports

2. The 16th session of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (PFII) is convening from 24 April to 5 May 2017 in New York. Agenda Item 9 concerns the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and considers a note by the Secretariat on indigenous peoples and the 2030 Agenda (E/C.19/2017/5).
3. We wish to respectfully request that a Member of the PFII be invited to the In-depth Dialogue in December to present the outcomes of the 16th session of the PFII on the 2030 Agenda and to contribute to the Dialogue more broadly.
4. A consistent demand of indigenous peoples in the SDG process has been to ensure disaggregation of data by ethnicity and/or indigenous identifier in relevant indicators, and ensure the participation of indigenous peoples in monitoring the SDGs.
5. Especially in the context of the CBD, we would also like to underscore the importance of data disaggregation for non-indigenous local communities who contribute to sustainable development as well as biodiversity conservation, as per Article 8(j) and related provisions.
6. The template for the sixth national reports to the CBD (adopted in Decision XIII/27) includes a question specifically on contributions to the SDGs. We urge CBD Parties to ensure disaggregation of data for indigenous peoples and local communities, and women, and their full and effective participation in the reporting process, including through community-based monitoring systems.
7. The UN High-Level Political Forum will discuss a set of SDGs and their interlinkages with other Goals every year, with the aim of facilitating an in-depth review of progress of all Goals. The schedule for the review of the Sustainable Development Goals is: (a) in 2017, Goals 1 (poverty), 2 (hunger), 3 (health and well-being), 5 (gender equality), 9 (industry, innovation and infrastructure) and 14 (coastal and marine ecosystems); (b) in 2018, Goals 6 (water and sanitation), 7 (energy), 11 (cities and communities), 12 (consumption and production) and 15 (terrestrial ecosystems); and (c) in 2019, Goals 4 (education), 8 (work and economic growth), 10 (inequalities), 13 (climate action) and 16 (peace, justice and institutions). Goal 17 (partnership for the goals) will be reviewed on an annual basis.
8. Each year, the High Level Political Forum will also consider Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) of a number of UN Member States. We urge Parties to the CBD to include a strong

emphasis in their VNR reports on synergies with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as well as on the contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities to the Aichi Targets and the SDGs.

9. We also wish to respectfully request a presentation during the In-depth Dialogue on the status of indigenous peoples and local communities (including women) in the HLPF and VNR process, for example, assessing the number of VNRs that included any reference to their contributions to the SDGs and identifying ways to improve the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities (including women) in the VNR process.

The Chennai Guidance for the Integration of Biodiversity and Poverty Eradication

10. Decision XII/5 and the *Chennai Guidance for the Integration of Biodiversity and Poverty Eradication* (the Annex to Decision XII/5) arguably amount to the strongest recognition of ICCAs in the CBD. The Chennai Guidance acknowledges that many ‘poor’ communities have traditionally been very effective at conserving nature and biodiversity, including through ICCAs (preamble). Of particular importance, it underscores the need to appropriately recognise ICCAs and traditional knowledge and conservation practices as the basis for local biodiversity conservation plans and in turn identified such plans as the basis for achieving Sustainable Development Goals (Section 3/B, para (b)).
11. The notion of ‘appropriate’ recognition of ICCAs responds directly to **CBD Technical Series No. 64 on recognition of ICCAs** (including a series of country case studies). The ICCA Consortium produced this volume in collaboration with several partners, including the CBD Secretariat and a number of CBD Parties, which was launched at COP11 by the former CBD Executive Secretary Braulio de Souza Dias during a colloquium on the role of ICCAs in achieving the Aichi Targets (13 October 2012).⁷ CBD Technical Series No. 64 is of direct relevance to the Chennai Guidance, and we encourage the CBD Secretariat and Parties to consider its recommendations in implementing Decision XII/5 and the Chennai Guidance.
12. A selection of good practices and recommendations was included in the 31 August 2016 joint submission by the Global Forest Coalition (GFC) and members and partners of the Community Conservation Resilience Initiative (CCRI) in response to the notification requesting information on the contribution of biodiversity for poverty eradication and sustainable development (Decision XII/5).
13. We acknowledge the 2016 note by the Executive Secretary on “Mainstreaming and the integration of biodiversity across relevant sectors, and further implications of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and of other relevant international processes for the future work of the Convention” (UNEP/CBD/COP/13/10), which contains a section on “Follow-up to the Chennai Guidance for the Integration of Biodiversity and Poverty Eradication”. This section refers to submissions from a number of Parties and other organisations, including GFC and CCRI.
14. Further information is needed about implementation of the Chennai Guidance, especially in light of efforts to implement SDGs 1 and 2, *inter alia*, and from the perspective of indigenous peoples and local communities themselves.

⁷ See report at: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/pa/icca-day-report-en.pdf>.

15. Towards this, we wish to respectfully request a presentation during the In-depth Dialogue on the Chennai Guidance and experiences and recommendations relating to its implementation, including experiences with appropriately recognising and supporting ICCAs.