



Policy Recommendations for CBD **SBSTTA-21** and **WG8(j)-10**

December 2017



Policy Recommendations for CBD SBSTTA-21 and WG8(j)-10

The 21st meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (**SBSTTA-21**) and the 10th meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions (**WG8(j)-10**) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) will be held 11-16 December 2017, in Montréal, Canada. SBSTTA-21 and WG8(j)-10 will consider issues ranging from the Global Biodiversity Outlook and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development to the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use and assessing the contributions of Indigenous Peoples' and Local Communities' collective actions.

This position paper highlights key issues and additional considerations identifying ways of strengthening the draft recommendations to more appropriately recognise community conservation. It draws on the recommendations and perspectives of Indigenous peoples and local communities involved in the Community Conservation Resilience Initiative (CCRI). CCRI aims to contribute to the implementation of the CBD Aichi Targets by providing policy advice on effective and appropriate forms of support for community conservation and restoration initiatives by Indigenous peoples and local communities. Coordinated by the Global Forest Coalition (GFC), it has been supporting more than 70 communities in 22 countries to assess their own conservation efforts and to identify forms of support needed to sustain and strengthen them.

For more information about SBSTTA-21 and WG8(j)-10, please contact:

Simone Lovera, PhD, Executive Director, GFC, simone@globalforestcoalition.org

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

Mrinalini Rai, Indigenous advisor, GFC, mrinalini.rai@globalforestcoalition.org

For general information, please visit: Community Conservation Resilience Initiative,
<http://globalforestcoalition.org/resources/supporting-community-conservation/>

To access the documents referenced in this position paper, please visit:
<https://www.cbd.int/meetings/SBSTTA-21> and <https://www.cbd.int/meetings/WG8J-10>

Front and back cover photos: Mountains in Tajikistan, Noosfera/GFC

Front cover inset photos: Livestock herding in the Banni grasslands, India. Sahjeevan/GFC; Planting trees in a community forest in Tanzania. Simone Lovera/GFC; Community Conservation Resilience Initiative in Kyrgyzstan. Vladislav Ushakov/GFC

Our activities have been made possible through generous support of the International Climate Initiative (IKI) of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB), The Christensen Fund and the Siemenpuu Foundation. The views expressed in this document are not necessarily those of our contributors.



Agenda Item 3: Scenarios for the 2050 Vision for biodiversity, and links between the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals

Background

This Agenda Item is intended to provide the Subsidiary Body with relevant information concerning biodiversity-related scenarios and related scientific and technical information on trends and projections towards 2050 and possible pathways to achieve the 2050 Vision on “Living in Harmony with Nature”. It also includes an assessment and gap analysis on the relationship between the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).



Relevant documents

CBD/SBSTTA/21/2: “Scenarios for the 2050 Vision for biodiversity”

CBD/SBSTTA/21/2/Add.1: “Links between the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals”.

Key Points

- Future scenarios for living in harmony with nature must include better representation and participation of Indigenous peoples and local communities. Currently the scenarios document is largely devoid of their perspectives and wisdom.
- We encourage Parties to explicitly include Indigenous peoples and local communities in the process of developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and related analytical work.
- We encourage Parties to better consider the gender dimension of biodiversity conservation, and mainstream gender through implementation of the CBD’s 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action.

Comments on SBSTTA/21/2

The overall conclusions (para. 55) are broadly relevant and welcome. However, a common thread across almost all of the assessments upon which the “Scenarios” note is based [1] is the insufficient representation and participation of Indigenous peoples and local communities who depend upon biodiversity for their identities, cultures and ways of life. Such peoples and communities have arguably contributed the least to

biodiversity loss and degradation, whereas they contribute significantly to biodiversity conservation and sustainable development, largely without government or donor recognition and support. Future scenarios for living in harmony with nature are deficient and lack local grounding in reality if they are not informed by Indigenous peoples’ and communities’ perspectives and wisdom, including spiritual visioning processes.

In the draft recommendation (para. 56), we encourage Parties to explicitly include Indigenous peoples and local communities in the process of developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and in related analytical work. This should include consideration of visioning, scenario planning and assessments undertaken by Indigenous peoples and local communities (for example, through the Community

[1] The “Scenarios” note is largely based on the second, third and fourth editions of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO), and other scenario-related work designed to inform future assessments under both the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) (para. 2).

Conservation Resilience Initiative (CCRI) and community-based monitoring and information systems).

In addition, we encourage Parties to contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including Target 15.2, by recognising and supporting conservation initiatives by Indigenous peoples and local communities (including those that may be recognised as 'other effective area-based

conservation measures' under Aichi Target 11), and by using indicators with disaggregated data with respect to Indigenous peoples, communities and gender, to facilitate the effective monitoring of implementation.

Notably, the document *SBSTTA/21/2/Add.1* fails to mention the CBD's 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action when considering links between the CBD and SDG 5 on gender equality. (This is the case as well

for the documents under WG8(j) Agenda Item 9.)

We urge Parties to mainstream the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action across the work of the Convention, including consideration of synergies with other international instruments such as the SDGs.

In some countries such as Nepal, community organisations are taking matters into their own hands to mainstream gender equality and contribute to SDG 5 (Box 1).

Mainstreaming gender equality for biodiversity and sustainable development: lessons from the CCRI in Nepal

Box 1

Nepal's constitution gives priority to community-based natural resource management systems and equitable benefit-sharing with local communities, and Community Forest User Groups have tenure over the forestlands and resources. Despite some improvement in political, administrative and elected bodies, there is very little representation of women, Indigenous peoples, and local communities in the economic and development sectors. In marked contrast, however, rural women's groups and local communities have increasingly established inclusive, participatory and democratic cultures at the community level through community-based resource management systems. These include community forestry, community enterprises, community water management and public land management.

The community-based organisations have now established a democratic system whereby at least 33-50 per cent of participants are women, which will contribute to achieving SDG 5 on gender equality in Nepal. Overall, these community forestry groups have greatly contributed to food security, renewable and alternative energy, community health and education, poverty alleviation, and employment and income generation.

Women members of community forests are collecting Niguro in Morang district, Nepal. **FECOFUN Morang**



Members of Community Forest User Groups are assessing gender mainstreaming in community conservation. **Dil Raj Khanal/FECOFUN**



Agenda Item 4: Sustainable wildlife management: guidance for achieving a more sustainable bushmeat sector

Background

This Agenda Item will provide the Subsidiary Body with guidance to improve the sustainable use of wild meat resources, focusing on how to work with actors at the source to improve the sustainability of supply, how to manage and reduce the demand along the whole value chain, and how to create the enabling conditions for a controlled, sustainable management of wild meat.



Relevant document

CBD/SBSTTA/21/3: "Sustainable wildlife management: guidance for achieving a more sustainable bush meat sector"

Key Points

- Recognition of Indigenous peoples' and local communities' rights and subsistence needs and customary practices is critical to the success of any efforts to address unsustainable wildlife consumption. Specific attention should be paid to the rights and subsistence needs of women in this respect.
- It is also necessary to address drivers and contributing factors such as middle class and tourist demand for wild meat, including through demand-reduction strategies, dismantling wildlife trade syndicates, and promoting balanced and (primarily) plant-based diets as alternatives to meat.

Comments on SBSTTA/21/3

We appreciate the consideration of Indigenous peoples' and local communities' rights and subsistence needs and customary practices and threats thereto (including, *inter alia*, in paras. 10, 13, 15, 24, 25(a) and (b) and 26-30). These aspects are critical to the success of any interventions aimed at addressing unsustainable wildlife consumption.

We also appreciate the explicit reference to broader drivers of and contributing factors to unsustainable hunting, including

(inter alia) land use conversion for agricultural commodities and natural resource extraction, growing human populations and rural-urban trade, migration, and consumption of wild meat for social status (paras. 9, 10 and 13).

We agree with the explicit reference in para. 37 and 39(a) to behavioural change interventions and demand-reduction strategies to reduce consumer demand for wild meat and increase uptake of alternatives. The growing middle class (globally) is consuming increasing amounts of meat and

far more than is actually necessary for a healthy diet. It is increasingly accepted that primarily plant-based diets have far less environmental impact than primarily meat-based diets and more benefits for human health.

We urge Parties to provide viable dietary alternatives to unsustainable hunting by promoting balanced and primarily plant-based diets, especially to the middle and upper classes and urban populations that are driving the demand for wild meat.

In addition, the expansion of low-cost airlines and associated tourism in tropical countries is a source of growing demand for wild meat, including of endangered and protected species in range states (for example, pangolins in Southeast Asia). Social media is actively used to facilitate trade and consumption. In many countries, law enforcement officers have inadequate skills and resources to monitor such trade or to investigate complex syndicates involved in wildlife trade. Instead, enforcement efforts tend to target and make examples of 'low-hanging fruit' such as hunters from rural communities who (sometimes unknowingly) sell meat to middlemen and then face severe sentences. These issues must also be tackled when addressing the unsustainable wild meat trade. In this light, we agree

with the suggested steps in para. 39(c) to decrease the availability of and demand for unsustainably produced wild meat.

In addition to these steps, we urge Parties to:

- (a) Promote awareness campaigns among tourists, particularly through social media, about the illegality of consuming endangered and protected species, in order to reduce demand;
- (b) Step up legal investigation and prosecution of middlemen and kingpins in order to dismantle trade syndicates; and
- (c) Provide legal aid to people from rural communities who get swept up in the legal system and suffer disproportionately from wildlife enforcement efforts.

Finally, we agree that States should be encouraged to devolve wildlife rights to local populations in line with the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use (para. 30(a)(ii)) and to recognise and support territories and areas conserved by Indigenous peoples and local communities (also abbreviated as 'ICCAs') and community involvement in sustainable management of

wildlife resources through a range of governance models such as community conservancies (para. 30(c)(i)) (also see Box 2 below). We also urge them to take into account the specific rights, subsistence needs and customary practices of women in policies designed to address the impacts of wild meat consumption and trade.

However, para. 30(c)(i) and para. 30(c)(iv) refer to certification schemes. **We recommend deleting these references to certification schemes, as their effectiveness is disputed and there is no evidence that they have led to a decrease in unsustainable production patterns and levels.**

Sustainable use of wildlife: lessons from the CCRI in Malaysia and DRC

Indigenous peoples and communities around the world have developed traditional knowledge and customary practices finely tuned to their local ecosystems, including taboos that regulate hunting and prevent the over-exploitation of animals. However, in some situations, external and internal pressures to change customary ways of life have undermined the sustainability of subsistence practices (particularly shifting from hunter-gathering to settled agriculture and the increasing population density of human settlements).

In Sabah, Malaysia, the Murut Tahol of Alutok, Ulu Tomani, are a community of forest-dependent hunter-gatherers. They practice a unique customary system called *tavol* in preparation for large and important occasions such as weddings. *Tavol* prohibits the hunting of wildlife and gathering of natural resources in specific areas in the forest for extended time periods before the community event. This ensures that resources are not depleted and prevents conflict and competition in the community. Those who break this agreement are socially shunned by the community or fined. However, this customary practice faces long-term threats due to the community's exclusion from a forest concession that overlaps with their territory, lack of recognition of the contributions

of this stewardship system to wildlife conservation, and declining interest and pride of youth in their traditional knowledge.

In DRC, the traditional knowledge and conservation practices of the indigenous Bambuti Babuluko pygmies, in Walikale, North Kivu, have conserved important forests and the rich biodiversity and wildlife within them, including outside of state protected areas and in the face of various challenges and threats. They use hunting methods and tools that are regulated by custom, including the use of liana

ropes for trapping rather than wire snares to reduce harm for the targeted animals. However, the establishment of protected areas in some portions of the Walikale territory, as everywhere else in the DRC, has had adverse consequences on the life of the forest community, including expulsions and restrictions on rights to use resources located in their traditional territories. This results in loss of their means of survival and includes police surveillance, leading in some cases to violations of human rights.



Alutok, Malaysia. PACOS Trust



Indigenous Bambuti Babuluko women in Walikale, North Kivu, DRC. PIDP-DRC

Agenda Item 5: Biodiversity and human health

Background

This Agenda Item will provide the Subsidiary Body with technical guidance to support the consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem management in the application of the “One Health” approach, as well as a progress report on work of the interagency Liaison Group on Biodiversity and Health, information dissemination and partnerships, and regional meetings.



Relevant document

CBD/SBSTTA/21/4: “Biodiversity and human health”

Key Points

- We welcome the more progressive aspects of the text, including acknowledgement of the need to address drivers of biodiversity decline, environmental degradation, and other global environmental changes and ill health.
- However, the text generally fails to consider the rights and roles of Indigenous peoples and local communities, including women. We encourage CBD Parties to adopt a recommendation to include in the Interagency Liaison Group on Biodiversity and Health representatives from Indigenous peoples and local communities, identified through their own selection process, and gender experts.
- In order to address unsustainable livestock production—a key driver of biodiversity loss and of ill health—we urge Parties to promote a shift to healthy and balanced, primarily plant-based diets, and to eliminate or redirect perverse incentives for unsustainable agriculture, including livestock production. This is a significant opportunity for biodiversity and for the health of consumers as well as producers.

Comments on SBSTTA/21/4

We welcome this area of work on biodiversity and health and agree with Decision XII/21’s recognition of the value of an integrated approach that is consistent with the ecosystem approach (Decision V/6) and “integrates the complex relationships between humans, microorganisms, animals, plants, agriculture, wildlife and the environment” (para. 18). We also welcome the understanding of a “One Health” approach to addressing the cross-cutting issue of biodiversity and human health as “an interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral approach that seeks to examine holistically

interconnections among human and environmental or ecosystem health” (para. 21).

However, the Interagency Liaison Group steering this work does not appear to include any representatives of Indigenous peoples and local communities or any grassroots organisations working on these issues. This gap in representation is apparent in the lack of consideration of Indigenous peoples’ and community perspectives in the SBSTTA document and guidance therein. For example, traditional medicines are only mentioned once in this lengthy document in

Annex II (*SBSTTA/21/4*), which is merely a summary of an existing COP decision (XIII/6). In failing to consider the interconnections between Indigenous peoples and local communities, their diverse knowledge systems and practices, and health and biodiversity, the document and guidance fall far short of the intended integrated approach.

This representation gap also runs counter to CBD decisions on full and effective participation of Indigenous peoples and local communities, and women, and on mainstreaming Article 8(j) and related provisions across the

Traditional knowledge and customary practices that benefit both biodiversity and human health need more support: lessons from the CCRI in Sri Lanka

In Sri Lanka, traditional and customary practices benefit both biodiversity and human health, but they face many threats. In the Kegalle district of the Sabaragamuwa province, traditional snakebite healers maintain biologically diverse home gardens as repositories of the medicinal plants needed for their treatments. They also acknowledge snakes' right to live. As healers, they do not kill animals and abstain from eating meat and eggs as a taboo to sustain their healing power. Kandyan forest gardens are resilient ecosystems and the presence of the snakes, which are often top predators, indicates the gardens' richness and diversity. However, snakebite healers are finding it difficult to pass on their traditional knowledge, as poverty and lower living standards push people towards urban areas, and they receive inadequate support from the government, especially compared to the support enjoyed by allopathic medical practitioners. Although the

healers are wary and distrustful of government authorities and cumbersome registration procedures, they still seek recognition and validation of their traditions and biocultural healing products such as 'sarpa viasa gala' (snake venom-removing medicinal stones).

Elsewhere in Sri Lanka, the Kithul palm tree (*Caryota urens*) is also an indicator of a healthy ecosystem. It grows naturally, with its seeds disseminated by tree-dependent fauna such as civets and the Green Emerald Pigeon. Local communities tap the Kithul tree to produce sweet syrup from the sap of its flowers. Kithul syrup is often regarded as a healthier alternative to cane sugar, but it is gradually being replaced by sugar in people's diets. Kithul tappers face several challenges, including police harassment and allegations of toddy (alcohol) production, inadequate support

Tapping Kithul in Sri Lanka. Mahesh Rupasinghe



Nimal Hewanila



and protection for their traditional knowledge, and the absence of a system to regulate the quality of Kithul syrup so that adulterated versions are not sold by others.

work of the Convention. **We encourage CBD Parties to adopt a recommendation to include in the Interagency Liaison Group on Biodiversity and Health representatives from Indigenous peoples and local communities, identified**

through their own selection process, and gender experts.

In general, we support the guiding principles (para. 37), including the mention of social justice and gender equity (para. 37(g)). However, the principles

should also include explicit recognition of the rights of Indigenous peoples and local communities and women and the need to mainstream their participation in One Health approaches. The guidance should consider the necessary

connections between securing the rights and territories of Indigenous peoples and communities and their health and wellbeing. Collective intergenerational trauma is all too common among Indigenous peoples who have been displaced and disconnected from their traditional territories by industry or the establishment of protected areas (also see Box 11 under WG8(j) Agenda Item 8 for lessons from the CCRI about protected areas).

We strongly agree with the need for “fundamental shifts in political economy, governance and consideration for key social-ecological issues jointly driving biodiversity decline, environmental (resource) degradation, and other global environmental changes and ill health” (para. 26). This includes drastically changing consumption habits, particularly shifting middle and upper classes’ diets away from over-consumption of industrially produced meat and dairy and towards primarily plant-based diets. Unsustainable

livestock production—driven by growing demand for high quantity and low quality livestock products—has a devastating impact on the environment and on Indigenous peoples and local communities whose territories and livelihoods (including subsistence and small-scale pastoralism) are affected by unsustainable livestock and feedstock production (see Box 4).

Millions of animals are raised in inhumane, unsanitary and polluting industrial conditions, including in concentrated animal feedlot operations such as mega-dairies. This intensive approach to livestock production—for example, in India’s poultry sector—is associated with numerous human health issues, including due to the heavy use of growth hormones and antibiotics and impacts on water availability and quality. Overall, consumers may be consuming a cocktail of pesticides, hormones, parasites and/or bacteria. At the same time, industrial livestock production is harming ecosystems and biodiversity and

the Indigenous peoples and local communities who depend upon them. For example, cattle ranching is a significant driver of forest and biodiversity loss, especially in Latin America, where much of the world’s deforestation takes place. It has been estimated that emissions from cattle ranching may be responsible for half of all Brazil’s greenhouse gas emissions, and many other countries such as Bolivia and Paraguay are similarly impacted. [2]

We urge Parties to promote a shift to healthy and balanced primarily plant-based diets and eliminate or redirect perverse incentives for unsustainable agriculture (including livestock production) to subsistence and small-scale agriculture. This is a significant opportunity for biodiversity and for the health of consumers as well as producers.

[2] For more information see “What’s at Steak?: the real cost of meat”, Global Forest Coalition, December 2016, <http://globalforestcoalition.org/whats-steak-real-cost-meat/>.

Expansion of the industrial livestock system at the expense of biodiversity, health and local livelihoods: lessons from the CCRI in Paraguay and Central Asia

The Paraguayan CCRI assessment that was performed in 2015 clearly demonstrated that unsustainable livestock and feedstock production caused serious health problems in the impacted communities due to the use of dangerous agrochemicals, as well as massive damage to forests and biodiversity.

The CCRI in Kyrgyzstan found that the enforced prioritisation of economic wellbeing over nature protection triggers overgrazing by livestock, without taking into consideration the degradation of community pastures and plant life. In Tajikistan, the communities of Obigarm and Jonbakht are similarly deeply concerned about overgrazing,

and are studying the issues of managing pasture resources to ensure that they can at least regulate their own livestock numbers. Support for such community-determined initiatives could help revive sustainable livelihoods and enable communities to conserve the lands upon which they depend.

Communities are surrounded by genetically modified soy crops in Paraguay. **Vicky Hird/GFC**



Water polluted by toxic agrochemicals causes health problems in Paraguay. **Luis Wagner/GFC**



Over-grazing damages land in Tajikistan. **Noosfera/GFC**



Erosion on hillsides in Tajikistan due to over-grazing and deforestation. **Noosfera/GFC**

Agenda Item 6: Mainstreaming of biodiversity into the sectors of energy and mining, infrastructure, and manufacturing and processing industry, and health: scientific and technical considerations and use of the programmes of work of the Conventions

Background

This Agenda Item will provide the Subsidiary Body with relevant information concerning the trends, potential impacts and measures for mitigating impacts of and mainstreaming biodiversity into these three sectors.

Key Points

- We urge Parties to consider in more detail the many negative impacts of these sectors on Indigenous peoples and local communities and on their lands and territories, especially when activities are undertaken without their free, prior and informed consent.
- We urge Parties to explicitly recognise Indigenous peoples and local communities as rights-holders (not mere 'actors' or 'stakeholders') and to support them through positive incentive measures such as recognition of their conserved territories and areas and other conservation initiatives.
- Mainstreaming biodiversity in these sectors requires the elimination, phasing out and reform of harmful and perverse incentives (i.e. achieving the milestones for Aichi Biodiversity Target 3).
- We encourage Parties to be more nuanced about the utility and practical limitations of certain tools and practices, including environmental impacts assessments and to reject offset schemes. These tools can also be used to justify politically motivated industrial projects.



Relevant document

CBD/SBSTTA/21/5: "Mainstreaming of biodiversity into the sectors of energy and mining, infrastructure, and manufacturing and processing industry, and health: Scientific and technical considerations and use of the programmes of work of the Convention"

Comments on SBSTTA/21/5

The energy and mining, infrastructure and manufacturing and processing industries—which are often developed in concert or close succession—pose significant threats to biodiversity and to Indigenous peoples' and local communities' customary laws and traditional knowledge, innovations and practices and the

territories and lands upon which they depend for survival, livelihoods and cultures. Mainstreaming biodiversity should fully recognise and include rights-holders, including Indigenous peoples, local communities and women, in all decision-making processes that affect them, and should

recognise, respect and support the diverse contributions of collective action, traditional knowledge and customary practices to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity within and across sectors (see Box 5 below). [3]

[3] For more information, see: "Mainstreaming Biodiversity and the Resilience of Community Conservation" (2016). Global Forest Coalition Briefing Paper. Available online at: <http://globalforestcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/mainstreaming-biodiversity-paper.pdf>.

Threats from energy, mining and infrastructure for community conservation: lessons from the CCRI in Ghana

In Ghana, the protection and preservation of fundamental human rights and freedoms are guaranteed, but rights to control and manage resources such as timber and minerals remain vested in the Executive President. This creates a disincentive for community nature conservation, and arguably contributes to Ghana's current annual rate of deforestation of 2 per cent.

Communities' traditional practice of protecting ecosystems and biodiversity through a system of sacred groves and sites is threatened by many factors, including the further development of extractive industries. This is the experience of the community in Avuto, located around the Avu Lagoon, a coastal savannah zone in the southeast of Ghana within the Keta Lagoon Complex Ramsar Site. This area is an important site

for migratory birds and the only Ghanaian site for the sitatunga (a swamp-dwelling antelope). Key threats to both the ecosystem and the community include the opening up of their territory for the exploitation of oil and gas by multinational companies and the damming of the River Tordzie upstream, which will affect the inflow into the lagoon, leading to water insecurity and inadequate environmental flows.

Coastal fisherman in Ghana depend on lagoon protection.
Simone Lovera/GFC



Non-timber forest products in a rural community, Ghana.
Simone Lovera/GFC



A coastal lagoon in Ghana. Simone Lovera/GFC



Practical limitations of environmental impact assessments: lessons from Malaysia

The fact that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is legally required—and even when it has been conducted—is no guarantee that it will effectively protect ecosystems, biodiversity and communities from harmful industrial impacts. The case of Sungai Eloi, in the coastal Pitas district of Sabah, Malaysia, is a case in point. The Sungai Tombonuo ethnic group depends on their mangroves and surrounding forests for protein, fuelwood and medicinal plants and as the location for spiritual ceremonies. They have protected and sustainably used the forests

for several generations and co-exist with endangered and endemic species such as the proboscis monkey.

However, a large-scale shrimp-farming project in Sungai Eloi has cleared more than 2,000 acres of the mangroves since 2012 under the guise of ‘poverty eradication’. The Environment Protection Department allegedly approved the EIA for this government-linked project after the clearing had started and without public consultation or a proper assessment of the impacts on the communities who depend upon

the mangroves for their identity and ways of life. The company plans to clear another 1,000 acres of mangroves despite protests from the communities and NGOs. Although they now face threats to their safety and politically motivated internal divisions, several community members continue to resist the mangrove clearance and work to protect, restore and sustainably use their forests. In such situations, even having a legally mandated EIA will do little if anything to protect the environment and communities from harmful industrial activities.

“For us in Sungai Eloi, there are many challenges because the area that we have been taking care of for nine generations, is being taken over by the government for a non-sustainable development—the largest shrimp pond in Malaysia. This affects the livelihood source for us, the Indigenous people of the area. We should be given the chance to defend our rights. We are not anti-development, but we want a balanced development. We do not want to lose our rights as the Indigenous people, who are defending our community conservation areas, due to development.”

**Mastupang Somoi, 53 years old.
Native Customary Rights Defender
from Kampung Sungai Eloi in Pitas,
Sabah, Malaysia**

A Sungai Tombonuo woman gathering shells in the mangrove forest in Kampung Sungai Eloi in northern Sabah. **Pacos Trust**



Currently, the document SBSTTA/21/5 does not sufficiently address these issues and thus falls short of its stated aim of mainstreaming biodiversity. Although it briefly refers to the Akwe:Kon Guidelines (paras. 10 and 18), and to the impacts of mining (para. 24) and road expansion (para. 29) on Indigenous peoples and local communities, these brief mentions do not sufficiently acknowledge or address the extreme and often irreversible impacts that these industries have on Indigenous peoples and local communities and on the lands and territories that they defend. Importantly, Indigenous peoples and local communities are rights-holders, not mere “actors” in mainstreaming (para. 44), and should be referred to as such.

In the draft recommendation, we urge Parties to strengthen the brief mention of Indigenous peoples and local communities (para. 75(c)) with an explicit reference to them as rights-holders, recognition of the specific role and rights of women, recognition of their contributions to biodiversity conservation, and commitment to supporting them through positive policies and incentives.

Mainstreaming biodiversity within these industries requires

compliance with the agreed milestones to implement Aichi Target 3. Thus a key way forward is to eliminate, phase out and reform harmful and perverse incentives and replace them with positive incentives that actively support implementation of the Strategic Plan and CBD more broadly. This should include, *inter alia*, positive legal, policy, financial, technical and other incentives to appropriately recognise and support ICCAs and other community conservation initiatives. We welcome the reference to incentive measures and Aichi Target 3 milestones in para. 64.

In addition, environmental impact assessments (EIAs) are identified as one of the most important tools for addressing the impacts of the infrastructure, energy and mining, manufacturing and processing sectors and helping businesses seeking to mainstream biodiversity into their operations (para. 49). The document identifies some procedural shortcomings of EIAs (para. 51), but fails to acknowledge how EIAs can be used as tools for rubber-stamping politically motivated projects without genuine assessment of impacts on communities and the environments upon which they depend and proposals for mitigation (see Box 6).

Finally, a number of highly questionable approaches such as offsetting and ‘no net loss’ approaches (para. 58), promoting the concept of ‘natural capital’ (para. 63) and certification (paras. 66-67) are suggested as potential mechanisms for mainstreaming biodiversity in these sectors. However, they pose additional threats for Indigenous peoples and local communities, particularly where communities are not involved in decision-making processes that affect them and where their rights more broadly are not recognised and respected. For example, offsets do not prevent biodiversity degradation where it is occurring, so there would be no change for any communities affected by the degradation at source, whereas the company causing the degradation would benefit from an improved social image by ‘offsetting’ the damage elsewhere. By definition, offset schemes deny the *in situ* links between biodiversity and Indigenous peoples and local communities, and are thus at odds with Articles 8(j) and 10(c) and the many related CBD decisions, including the Chennai Guidance for the Integration of Biodiversity and Poverty Eradication (Decision XII/5).

Agenda Item 7: Fifth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook

Background

This Agenda Item is intended to address the preparation of the fifth Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-5). The background document includes information on the proposed content (including key questions to be addressed and elements of an outline) and information on the preparation process (including the main information sources, a mechanism for oversight and peer review, elements of the communication strategy, information on related reports, a timeline for the preparation of the report and an indicative budget).



Relevant document

CBD/SBSTTA/21/6: "Fifth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook"

Key Points

- We welcome the inclusion of information provided by Indigenous peoples and local communities as one of the key sources for GBO-5, especially as past national reports and editions of the GBO have contained relatively limited information from Indigenous peoples and local communities.
- We call on Parties to incorporate a detailed gender assessment in the sixth national reports and GBO-5.
- The processes to develop the sixth national reports and GBO-5 need to be more accessible to and inclusive of Indigenous peoples and local communities; this will also contribute to better representation of Indigenous peoples' and local communities' visions and priorities in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
- We provide several suggestions of how to do so, for example, by including representatives of Indigenous peoples and local communities, and women's groups in the technical expert review of the 'zero' draft of GBO-5, and supporting communities to conduct and effectively communicate the findings of their own assessments of their contributions to biodiversity.

We encourage Parties and the Secretariat to allocate financial resources and technical support to assist in the inclusive and timely production and broad dissemination of the second edition of *Local Biodiversity Outlooks*.

Comments on SBSTTA/21/6

We welcome the suggested information sources for GBO-5 (para. 6(c)) and particularly highlight: "(v) Information 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". Such information provided by Indigenous peoples and local communities will be crucial to

addressing GBO's four cross-cutting questions (para. 8), which are expected to inform the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (para. 9).

Past national reports and editions of the GBO, including GBO-4, have contained relatively limited information from Indigenous peoples and local communities, despite their significant contributions to biodiversity

conservation (see Box 7 below). The fact that it may be more challenging to gather information from Indigenous peoples and local communities than to gather information from the other sources listed in para. 6(c), due to factors such as physical remoteness and language barriers, should not be considered an obstacle. GBO-5's assessment of progress towards the Aichi Targets is expected to

“draw heavily from the sixth national reports” (para. 10(b)). It is especially important to ensure that the processes to prepare the sixth national reports and GBO-5 are accessible to and inclusive of Indigenous peoples and local communities.

Additional efforts are thus needed to ensure information from Indigenous peoples and local communities is well represented in the sixth national reports and GBO-5 and subsequently, in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. This is part of a broader need to (a) mainstream Article 8(j) and related provisions across the Convention, and (b) enable effective participation of Indigenous peoples and local communities in decision-making processes that affect them—in this case, the multi-year process leading to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

We call on Parties, donors and supporting organisations to make additional efforts to incorporate information provided by Indigenous peoples and local communities into the sixth national reports and GBO-5. This includes, *inter alia*:

- (a) Ensuring that the processes to develop the sixth national reports and GBO-5 are accessible to and enable effective participation of Indigenous peoples and local communities. For example, the group of invited experts that will review a ‘zero’ draft of GBO-5 (para. 13) should include representatives of Indigenous peoples and local communities, and women’s groups. In addition, oversight of the preparation of GBO-5 should include representation of Indigenous peoples and local communities, in addition to the SBSTTA Bureau (especially if Parties decide to establish a subsidiary body on Article 8(j) and related provisions under WG8(j) Agenda Item 7); and
- (b) Supporting communities to conduct and effectively communicate the findings of their own assessments of their contributions to biodiversity.

For the 22 countries involved in the CCRI since 2015 (see map on following page), we encourage those Parties to actively reach out to the communities who have already conducted their own assessments and to invite them to contribute information to their respective sixth national reports.

We also call on Parties to include in their sixth national reports and in GBO-5 a detailed gender assessment of biodiversity policy and its impacts. This should include an analysis of the roles, needs and aspirations of women regarding biodiversity conservation and the impact of biodiversity loss on women.

Finally, we welcome plans to prepare a second edition of Local Biodiversity Outlooks (paras. 11(e) and 18) and express our interest in contributing to this process, including the integration of gender. **We encourage Parties and the Secretariat to allocate financial resources and technical support to assist in its inclusive and timely production and broad dissemination.**



Kenya

Simone Lovera/CIC



Panama

Coraina de la Plaza/CIC



Colombia

Diego Cardona/CIC



Chile

Carolina Lagos/CIC





Iran

Maedeh Salimi/Cenesta



Russia

BROC/CIC

Kyrgyzstan



Nepal

Malaysia

India

Samoa

Tanzania

Sri Lanka



Solomon Islands

James Meimana/CIC



Ethiopia

Cath Traynor/CIC

The benefits of including Indigenous peoples and local communities in conservation decision-making: lessons from the CCRI in Africa and Asia

The 2017 reports of the CCRI in 12 countries show that when Indigenous peoples and local communities are effectively involved in decision-making, it can have highly significant benefits for biodiversity conservation. Indigenous peoples and local communities have a wealth of traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use practices to contribute to conservation. They are motivated to engage—especially if it will benefit their environment and livelihoods—and their involvement will help shape policies, plans and projects that work for rather than against communities, increasing the prospects of success. Examples from several countries in Africa and Asia highlight just some of the diverse actions undertaken by Indigenous peoples and local communities when they are empowered to do so.

This has been clearly demonstrated in Nepal, where more than 20,000 Community Forest Users Groups now manage approximately 40 per cent of the country's forests. Biodiversity conservation and sustainable utilisation are integral elements of their community forest management plans. The 2015 State of Nepal's Forests report has shown that these community-based forestry groups have contributed significantly to the

reduction of forest degradation and fragmentation. In addition, alien species have been controlled and/or eradicated within community forests, and they protect socio-economically and culturally valuable species of wildlife, and habitats for wildlife more generally. They have also incorporated specific provisions for ecosystem resilience and to enhance carbon stocks.

In Tanzania, the dual land tenure system means that customary land rights can also be exercised in the villages (although this system still discriminates against women). In addition, all registered villages have a democratically elected Village Council which has committees that are responsible for developing village plans and

making decisions on environment, health, community development, education, land, water and community forests. They have shared responsibilities under village bylaws to protect water sources, land resources and the forests. In spite of various constraints, the villages of Wiri, Sanya, Lawate and Ngasini have taken steps to conserve biodiversity, including by establishing tree nurseries to plant trees around water sources and farms and adjacent to forests, farming organically and keeping bees. Communities involved in the CCRI in Kenya have called for the formation of similar community environmental committees to strengthen their role in conservation.

Planting trees in a community forest in Tanzania. **Simone Lovera/GFC**



In the Democratic Republic of the Congo, local community forestry concessions are now formally recognised, although they have to be registered as forestry concessions. The intention is to ensure the management and sustainable use of forests and natural resources for the benefit of present and future generations.

In Kyrgyzstan, local communities are calling for the opportunity to participate in the state monitoring of ecosystems, including forests, pastures and hunted species of wild animals. The State Agency on Nature Conservation and Forestry, following a public initiative, has now developed a methodology and procedure for monitoring ecosystem health, including

through public involvement in independent monitoring of biological indicators. Community members are motivated to protect their environment: In the village of Kalmak Ashu, in Kyrgyzstan, local residents, mostly young people, have formed an initiative to combat tree felling, poaching and illegal grazing. In the last three years they have prevented more than 100 violations, and there is an increase in the numbers of species such as partridges, pheasants and roe deer, which were previously becoming increasingly rare.

Georgia provides a contrast, with local communities who are generally disengaged and disempowered from participating in relevant decision-making

processes. The CCRI assessment revealed that centralised governance in Georgia is a major problem; local authorities have little to no power and thus little motivation to initiate new local development strategies. When combined with stark socio-economic conditions, this means that local communities are unable to engage in or influence decision-making (although community members have since been inspired by the CCRI project, see Box 8).



Mapping threats to community conservation in Kyrgyzstan. Vladislav Ushakov/GFC

Agenda Item 6: Resource mobilisation: assessing the contribution of collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities and safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms

Background

This Agenda Item will provide the Working Group with elements of methodological guidance for assessing the contribution of Indigenous peoples' and local communities' collective actions to the CBD and Strategic Plan, as well as information about voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms.

Key Points

- We applaud the growing recognition of the invaluable contributions to the CBD of Indigenous peoples' and local communities' collective action, and welcome efforts to develop methodological guidance on its identification, monitoring and assessment.
- In order to be effective and equitable, such methodologies must be genuinely participatory and ideally developed from the outset in collaboration with Indigenous peoples and local communities themselves.



Relevant documents

CBD/WG8J/10/5: "Elements of methodological guidance for identifying, monitoring, and assessing the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities"

CBD/WG8J/10/6: "Taking the voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms into account when selecting, designing and implementing biodiversity financing mechanisms and when developing instrument-specific safeguards"

Participant at the national CCRI workshop in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan.
Simone Lovera/GFC



Supporting Indigenous peoples and local communities to document and assess their contributions to conservation: lessons from the CCRI in Colombia and Georgia

The Community Conservation Resilience Initiative (CCRI) offers one example of a participatory methodology co-developed by Indigenous peoples and local communities and their support organisations. [The methodology](#) provides a framework for Indigenous peoples and local communities to document and assess the resilience of their conservation initiatives and identify what kinds of support (legal, political, technical, moral, financial, etc.) are needed to sustain and strengthen them. The CCRI is being undertaken in 22 countries with more than 70 Indigenous and local communities. It is contributing to bottom-up assessments of the many ways in which Indigenous peoples' and local communities' collective actions are contributing to the conservation and restoration of biodiversity around the world.

In many countries, the CCRI process underscored that externally proposed projects—including for conservation purposes—that may affect Indigenous peoples and local communities must always be developed and agreed with the communities concerned, never devised or imposed upon them without their participation and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). Conservation-related initiatives are also more effective when developed and

undertaken by communities themselves. In Colombia, for example, the CCRI process stated that territorial management initiatives that have emerged from the communities themselves have legitimacy, benefit both the human population and ecosystems, and have a greater probability of longevity.

The CCRI also assesses the external and internal challenges that influence communities' motivations and capacities to conserve biodiversity. In some cases, it has demonstrated that a genuinely participatory and community-led discussion about their conservation practices and about Indigenous and local knowledge and customary use can reignite communities' interest in conserving their local biodiversity. For example, the communities of Sakorintlo and Okhami in Eastern Georgia suffer unemployment and other socio-economic

hardships. Initially, there was a lack of enthusiasm, local initiatives and trust, as well as pessimism. However, the CCRI assessment triggered a marked interest in and demand for more information among the local population. It also inspired a visit to an organic farm, where community members investigated methods for the organic production of vegetables and fruit, marketing issues and renewable energy technologies and their development in Georgia.

Discussing community conservation in Colombia. CENSAT/GFC



An organic farm and community-managed forest in Georgia. Simone Lovera/GFC



Agenda Item 7: Progress towards Aichi Biodiversity Target 18, implementation of the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use, and integration of Article 8(j) and provisions related to indigenous peoples and local communities in the work of the Convention and its Protocols

Background

This Agenda Item will provide the Working Group with an interim report on: (a) progress towards Aichi Target 18; (b) mainstreaming Article 8(j) and related provisions in the work of the Convention; (c) the participation of Indigenous peoples and local communities in the Convention and its protocols; and (d) strengthening the work on Article 8(j) and related provisions through ongoing capacity-building efforts in partnership with Indigenous peoples and local communities. A draft recommendation on the integration of Article 8(j) and related provisions into the Convention is contained in CBD/WG8J/10/7. Parties have been requested to submit further information about progress towards Aichi Target 18 for consideration by the 2nd meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation..



Relevant documents

CBD/WG8J/10/7: “Progress towards Aichi biodiversity Target 18 on traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use of biodiversity”

CBD/WG8J/10/8: “Integration of Article 8(j) and provisions related to indigenous peoples and local communities in the work of the Convention”

Key Points

- The documents for this agenda item are broadly acceptable and the progress made to date is very welcome.
- However, the documents also highlight serious concerns about the lack of involvement of Indigenous peoples and local communities in the NBSAPs—one of the two core mechanisms for implementation of the Convention—and implementation of the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use. Much more effort is needed to seek information about Target 18 from the local level, including Indigenous peoples and local communities and their support organisations, rather than relying primarily on State Parties.
- These issues indicate a significant gap between: (a) the many welcome efforts undertaken by the Secretariat and certain Parties and donors to increase participation of Indigenous peoples and local communities in the Convention and to strengthen work on Article 8(j) through ongoing capacity-building efforts; and (b) the continuing low levels of involvement and representation of Indigenous peoples and local communities in NBSAPs (and national reports and GBOs, as noted in our recommendations above on SBSTTA-21 Agenda Item 7). This gap clearly needs to be bridged for the benefit of Indigenous peoples and local communities and the Convention as a whole.

Comments on WG8J/10/7

PART I: Progress towards Aichi Biodiversity Target 18 through NBSAPs

According to the document, the Secretariat has received 147 NBSAPs by September 2017 and reviewed them to analyse progress in implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. We express serious concern that (as reported): (a) only five Parties reported Indigenous peoples and local communities participating on NBSAPs Committees; (b) only 28 Parties reported that Indigenous peoples and local communities were consulted in the revision of the NBSAPs; (c) only four Parties reported that Indigenous peoples and local communities would be involved in the implementation of the NBSAPs; and (d) 107 NBSAPs did not mention the participation

of Indigenous peoples and local communities in the revision of the NBSAP.

We fully agree with the Secretariat's following clear assessments (emphasis added):

"Unfortunately, this represents a **lost opportunity** for many Parties in the effective implementation of the Convention, especially at the local level, as indigenous peoples and local communities are on-site or in-situ communities actively pursuing conservation and sustainable use and contributing directly to the effective implementation of the Convention. Additionally,

traditional knowledge, along with science, has proven an effective knowledge base for species and ecosystem management..." (WG8J/10/7, para. 8).

"Overall, greater efforts are required by most Parties to ensure that indigenous peoples and local communities are participating in the review and implementation of NBSAPs. Such **efforts will be rewarded many times over** by recognizing, valuing and enhancing the contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities to the goals of the Convention." (WG8J/10/7, para. 11).

A house in the Buxa Tiger reserve, India. Simone Lovera/GFC



Contributions of Indigenous peoples and local communities to conservation: lessons learned from the CCRI around the world

The 2017 reports of the CCRI in 12 countries revealed that Indigenous peoples' and local communities' traditional knowledge and customary use practices are making critical contributions to biodiversity conservation around the world. However, these contributions are being undermined by a number of threats, combined with lack of support from local and national governments. Reversing this situation will be critical to successful and equitable biodiversity conservation.

In Kenya, the Rendille pastoralists have a strong connection to the environment, and values related to conservation are rooted in their culture. For example by tradition they will only cut tree branches when they are needed for constructing houses, and medicine and herbs are extracted sustainably. They have migration routes for their livestock planned so that the vegetation can regenerate. But they are threatened by deforestation and overgrazing (which are themselves driven by an erosion of traditional knowledge), by increasing population and illegal settlers, and by the impacts of invasive species and extractive industries such as sand mining.

In the village of Mangkuwagu in Sabah, Malaysia, the forest-dependent Dusun Rumanau people are one of the few

communities that still knows how to harvest wild honey from bees that establish their hives in a particular tree species (Menggaris). By harvesting honey sustainably for generations, the community also protected the surrounding forest area, providing broader environmental benefits. However, Mangkuwagu was included within a Class II Forest Reserve in 1984, in an effort to address the perceived socio-economic needs through rubber cultivation, among other things. Yet the reality is that the community had no governing power over the forest area, which could be logged by the concessionaire without their consent. In mid-2017, the community was dealt an additional blow when—after years of requests for recognition of their native customary rights—part of their traditional territory was excised from the Forest Reserve but then immediately allocated for an oil palm joint venture under the much-maligned communal title scheme. The company in control of this joint venture promptly destroyed the

remaining forest within the titled area.

Communities participating in the CCRI in Tanzania described foodstuffs used, their benefits and taboos, soil fertility, seed security and land and water use. They discussed a wide range of wild and domesticated animals, describing uses including rituals predicting weather, harvests and wealth, and traditional medicines that are made from animal parts and byproducts such as ostrich oil and python faeces. They described the types of indigenous trees they use for their livelihoods, beekeeping, health problems, construction and agroforestry. Many of their traditional laws and customs also concern and help to protect water and related resources. Major threats include conventional farming using intensive agrochemicals that kill beneficial organisms, agricultural



Kenyan pastoralists mapping community conservation. IAITPTF/GFC

expansion, illegal deforestation, charcoal-making and brick-building, and climate change.

The CCRI assessment in India involved diverse communities in the Buxa-Chilapata forest area in the state of Bengal, the Tadoba Andhari National Park and Tiger Reserve in the state of Maharashtra, and the Banni grasslands in the state of Gujarat. Traditionally, these communities all enjoyed customary rights to practice their livelihoods, including grazing, small-scale agriculture and the collection of non-timber forest products. They have been custodians of their landscapes, and their ecological knowledge and cultural norms have played a significant role in conserving natural resources. For example the forest villages in Buxa-Chilapata have traditionally practiced swidden agriculture and the controlled use of fire to preserve the biodiversity of land and forests. However, the communities' rights have been encroached by the Forest

Department, restricting their access to these lands, which will be harmful to the community as well as to the ecological resources.

Local communities are also motivated proponents of biodiversity restoration projects. In Colombia, for example, communities involved in the CCRI have defined objectives for biodiversity monitoring, as well as analysing the positive impacts of community conservation actions. In Los Maklenkes, the community is identifying and monitoring threatened and endangered bird species protected in the declared *campesino* reserve area. In Barbas de Mono, bird diversity in agricultural areas is being compared with that within the reserve.

In Ghana, communities in Kpoeta, Saviefe Gborgame and Avuto are engaged in Community Resource Management Areas (CREMAs), an approach fashioned on the traditional conservation practices

of sacred groves and sites. These practices are designed to safeguard critical ecosystems, such as rivers, springs, waterfalls and endemic species, and are considered to be critical to conserving and restoring

ecosystems and halting deforestation outside forest reserves. For instance, the Kpoeta community is restoring the Tsii waterfalls, and has acquired the skills to use GPS to demarcate the site of the falls. It has also established a tree nursery for endemic species for boundary and enrichment planting.

In Shabadan village, Chuy Oblast, inside Kyrgyzstan's highly biodiverse Chon-Kemin National Park, the community is endeavouring to develop its own initiatives to protect livelihoods and local biodiversity. For example, the central Tian-Shan area is a zone where wild apple trees are indigenous, and a number are included in the Red Book of Kyrgyzstan (such as Sievers's apple *Malus sieversii*, Niedzwetzki's apple *Malus niedzwetzkyana* and other endemic types, including *Malus kirghisorum*). The village has established a nursery to grow wild apples, which are highly resistant to diseases and unfavourable weather. Villagers are also creating an ethnobotanical garden in the local school, and students are learning about the biological diversity in their area and how to protect and conserve it. Parents are involved in this work too. The students have transplanted apple trees to village households and planted others in the wild.

Livestock herding in the Banni grasslands, India. Sahjeevan/GFC



PART II: Progress in the mainstreaming of Article 8(j) and related provisions in the work of the Convention

According to para. 21: “Investing focused attempts in the next year, to collect information on the contributions of indigenous protected areas and ICCAs will help reach the 17 per cent quantitative aspect of Target 11 by the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The results of such efforts will also show an improvement in all other elements of Target 11 (such as connectivity, key biodiversity areas, ecological representativeness, areas important for biodiversity).”

Such explicit reference to Indigenous protected areas and ICCAs is very welcome. However, we wish to underscore **three points**:

(a) Indigenous protected areas and ICCAs contribute to many Aichi Targets, not only Target 11, and these contributions should be recognised as well in national and global reporting;

(b) Recognition of any Indigenous peoples’ or local communities’ territories or areas as Indigenous protected areas or ICCAs must be subject to their free, prior and informed consent; and

(c) Efforts to meet Aichi Target 11’s quantitative targets of 17% of terrestrial and 11% of marine and coastal areas could backfire if not done appropriately and with the participation and free, prior and informed consent of the peoples and communities concerned.

In para. 24, the document states that a technical workshop will be held in the coming year to develop guidelines on ecosystem-based approaches to climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction. In CBD Decision X/33, Parties and other Governments were invited to recognise the role of ICCAs in strengthening ecosystem

connectivity and resilience and supporting biodiversity-based livelihoods in the face of climate change. Parties were also invited to consider traditional knowledge, including the full involvement of indigenous and local communities in planning and implementing effective climate change mitigation and adaptation activities.

Along these lines, **we encourage Parties and the Secretariat to consider the role of ICCAs and other community conservation efforts more broadly in climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction**. In this sense, Parties should consider **“territory-based approaches”** alongside “ecosystem-based approaches”, as Indigenous peoples’ and communities’ territories can span multiple ecosystems (for example, in nomadic pastoralist systems in Iran).

PART III: Participation of Indigenous peoples and local communities in the Convention and its protocols

Further to para. 25 in the document, we acknowledge and thank the Parties that have supported the Voluntary Trust Fund. **We encourage these**

Parties and others to continue providing support to the Voluntary Trust Fund to enable the continued participation of Indigenous peoples and local

communities in meetings held under the Convention.

PART IV: Strengthening the work on Article 8(j) and related provisions through ongoing capacity-building efforts, in partnership with Indigenous peoples and local communities

As noted in paras. 28-34, a number of regional and local training workshops have been organised on (a) community protocols of traditional knowledge and; (b) indicators for traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use within the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Partners of the CCRI and members of the Global Forest Coalition participated in and benefitted from these workshops. We acknowledge and thank the donors and Secretariat for supporting this capacity-building programme and encourage additional support to enable its continuation. We also encourage the peoples and communities who participated in

these workshops to **contribute information to national and global reporting processes** (including the sixth national reports and GBO-5; see recommendations for SBSTTA-21 Agenda Item 7) to ensure their many contributions to the Strategic Plan are appropriately recognised.

Towards this, we welcome the Secretariat's 2017-2018 plans to build capacity among the Parties and Indigenous peoples and local communities to develop national action plans for traditional knowledge to implement obligations arising from Article 8(j) and to achieve Aichi Target 18, *inter alia* (paras. 36-37).

We note that the Secretariat pursues opportunities for capacity-building beyond specific capacity-building workshops, including on the margins of official meetings under the Convention and of other meetings so as to save travel-related costs and greenhouse gas emissions, including the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (para. 39). We wish to **publicly express our interest in collaborating with the Secretariat on relevant capacity-building events**, particularly a global conference in July 2018 (see Box 10).

Looking ahead to a global conference in 2018 on conservation by Indigenous peoples and local communities

Box 10

In the margins of the CBD subsidiary meetings in July 2018, the Global Forest Coalition and its CCRI partners will host a global conference to discuss, distil and share the key findings and lessons learned to date from the CCRI and help strengthen the skills and capacities of Indigenous peoples and local communities to sustain their own conservation initiatives. The CCRI aims to provide community-determined,

bottom-up policy advice on effective and appropriate forms of support for conservation and restoration initiatives by Indigenous peoples and local communities, as a contribution to the implementation of the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets. This is the second global conference of this nature on fostering community conservation, the first was held in 2015 in South Africa, prior to the

World Forestry Congress, and attended by more than 100 representatives of Indigenous Peoples, local communities and other rightsholders and stakeholders. The conference report is available online: <http://globalforestcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Fostering-Community-Conservation-Conference-Report-2015.pdf>

Comments on WG8J/10/8

Reported progress in implementation of the first phase of the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use “has been, at best, minimal” (para. 14). In addition, a 2016 analysis (see *UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.3*) found that only three NBSAPs had mentioned customary sustainable use. In response, Decision XIII/1 (para. 18) encouraged Parties to reinforce and strengthen efforts to mainstream Articles 8(j) and 10(c), including the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity and capacity development, in the development, updating and implementation of NBSAPs. **We urge Parties to implement this decision with immediate effect.**

We support the views submitted to the Secretariat by the Forest Peoples Programme (FPP) and other member organisations of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) about the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use (as contained in *CBD/WG8J/10/INF/4*). **In line with this FPP and IIFB submission, we urge Parties to:**

(a) Continue implementation of the Plan of Action and proactively invest in a second phase, including through trainings and regional workshops and inter-cultural dialogues and work sessions held alongside national (or sub-regional) events;

(b) Revisit the list of indicative tasks under the WG8(j) in light of developments since 2011;

(c) Take actions to develop better partnerships and collaboration, using guidance from the first edition of Local Biodiversity Outlooks; and

(d) Improve reporting against the Plan of Action, including through national reports and the Local Biodiversity Outlooks (also see related our recommendations on reporting under SBSTTA-21 Agenda Item 7).



Community Conservation Resilience Initiative in Ghana. Simone Lovera/GFC

Agenda Item 8: Recommendations of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues

Background

This Agenda Item will provide the Working Group with information about recommendations of relevance to the CBD from the fifteenth (9-20 May 2016) and sixteenth (24 April-5 May 2017) annual sessions of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII).



Relevant document

CBD/WG8J/10/9: “Recommendations from the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous issues to the Convention on Biological Diversity”

Key Points

- The CBD document for this agenda item (WG8J/10/9) does not consider the most recent UNPFII recommendation concerning conservation and human rights, issued during its sixteenth session.
- Recognising and respecting human rights in conservation initiatives is of direct relevance to the CBD and tensions between human rights and protected areas continue to this day (see Box 11).
- Parties are urged to implement UNPFII recommendations on conservation and human rights and related CBD COP decisions with immediate effect.

Comments on WG8J/10/9

According to para. 8: “During the period 2016-2017, the Permanent Forum did not address any specific recommendations to the Convention on Biological Diversity. However, some of the general recommendations may be of relevance to the Convention on Biological Diversity.” It then considers select UNPFII recommendations from paras. 9-21.

However, the CBD document does not refer to an important UNPFII recommendation on conservation and human rights.

Para. 33 of the UNPFII report of its sixteenth session states:

“The Permanent Forum has made a number of recommendations, in particular at its seventh and ninth sessions, on conservation and human rights, which to date remain largely unimplemented. Particular attention has been given by the Forum to the critical issue of free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples in establishing and managing any protected area that affects their territories, livelihoods and resources. Those

recommendations should be implemented urgently, considering the continued infliction of human rights violations on indigenous peoples in relation to conservation measures.”

This recommendation—and the previous recommendations of the UNPFII on this issue—are of crucial importance to the CBD and to mainstreaming Article 8(j) and related provisions across the Convention. This UNPFII recommendation also resonates strongly with past CBD COP

decisions on governance and equity in protected areas. For example, Decision XIII/2, para. 5(viii) invites Parties to involve the full and effective participation and seek the (free,) prior

informed consent of Indigenous peoples and local communities “whose territories, areas and resources overlap wholly or partially with the protected areas” when establishing new and/or

expanding existing protected areas or undertaking other effective area-based conservation measures. Protected areas continue to have a negative impact on Indigenous peoples

Impacts of protected areas on Indigenous peoples and local communities: lessons from the CCRI in DRC, India, Kyrgyzstan and Malaysia

In many countries around the world, protected areas overlap partially or completely with Indigenous peoples’ and communities’ territories and areas. The establishment and expansion of protected areas without the free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) of such communities has had many negative impacts.

For example, in the territory of Walikale in North Kivu, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), this has led to the expulsion and forced displacement of the Indigenous Bambuti Babuluko from their traditional territories and restrictions on their access to resources and sources of basic livelihoods, as well as human rights abuses. Similarly, the Gonds, a tribe in the

state of Maharashtra in Central India, have faced the threat of displacement and eviction and pressure to relocate outside of the Tadoba Andhari National Park and Tiger Reserve since its

protect their forests, biodiversity and livelihoods.

The establishment and expansion of protected areas without the FPIC of Indigenous peoples and

Community Conservation Resilience Initiative in Kyrgyzstan. Vladislav Ushakov/GFC



establishment. Grazing has been limited to a specific area and collection of non-timber forest products has been barred from the Reserve. Villagers continue to struggle to secure the right to live with dignity and to conserve and

communities whose territories overlap with such areas continues to this day. This is despite the introduction of a ‘new protected areas paradigm’ at the 2003 World Parks Congress and subsequently through the 2004

and local communities around the world (see Box 11) and it is incumbent upon CBD Parties to address these issues as part of their commitments under both

conservation and human rights instruments.

We urge CBD Parties to implement the UNPFII

recommendations on conservation and human rights and related CBD COP Decisions with immediate effect.

Box 11

CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas (Decision VII/28). However, some promising

that recognise the capacity of local communities and councils to effectively conserve

efforts to address situations of overlap between state parks and Indigenous peoples' traditional

territories. Sabah Parks has taken steps to establish a Community Use Zone in the Crocker Range Park with the village of Terian, but the process has stalled. Near Kinabalu Park, the community of Kiau is working with Sabah Parks to identify ways to legally recognise the community's rights to and stewardship of a 1,024-acre forest area that they have voluntarily set aside as a heritage area.

Women in India praying before a feast. **Souparna Lahiri/GFC**



developments have also been identified through the CCRI. For example, in Kyrgyzstan, regulations have been developed and implemented in draft laws

and restore local ecosystems and species through micro-reserves. In the Malaysian state of Sabah, the state government has made some

Agenda Item 9: In-depth dialogue on thematic areas and other crosscutting issues

Background

This Agenda Item will provide the Working Group with relevant information on the in-depth dialogue on the contributions of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Key Points

- We urge Parties to better recognise the role of gender and the contributions of women from Indigenous peoples and local communities to the SDGs, including by mainstreaming the CBD's 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action across the work of the Convention.
- We suggest a third question for the dialogue, focusing on mainstreaming Article 8(j) and related provisions and the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action in the SDGs.
- We encourage Parties to consider the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the contributions of Indigenous peoples and local communities to the Aichi Targets and the SDGs in their reports to the High Level Political Forum for the Voluntary National Review process.
- We welcome the proposed topic for the next in-depth dialogue.



Relevant document

CBD/WG8J/10/10: "In-depth dialogue: 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"

Comments on WG8J/10/10

We welcome the acknowledgments that: (a) "the potential contribution of traditional knowledge to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is significant and is yet to be fully realized"; and (b) of the importance of keeping Indigenous peoples and local communities "at the centre" of actions related to achieving the SDGs (para. 11).

We also welcome consideration of our earlier submission on this topic (*WG8J/10/10, Annex I; CBD/WG8J/10/INF/5*) and support the earlier submission of the Indigenous Women's Network on Biodiversity from Latin

America (*IWNB-LAC*), which emphasised the important role of Indigenous women for the achievement of SDG 15.

However, the note does not sufficiently consider the gender dimension of the SDGs, including the many diverse contributions of women from Indigenous peoples and local communities. For example, the overview of the links between traditional knowledge and relevant SDGs and CBD COP decisions (*WG8J/10/10, Annex II*) fails to mention the CBD's 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action in the section on SDG 5 on gender equality.

We urge Parties to better recognise the role of gender and the contributions of women to the SDGs, including by mainstreaming the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action (as adopted in Decision XII/7) in all relevant areas of work of the CBD. (This is similar to our recommendation for SBSTTA-21 Agenda Item 3; see Box 1 in that section for an example from Nepal.)

Para. 13 identifies two questions that panellists and other participants in the dialogue may wish to consider. **We wish to suggest a third question for the dialogue, namely:**

- How can Article 8(j) and related provisions as well as the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action be mainstreamed in the implementation, monitoring and reporting of the SDGs?

Finally, the High Level Political Forum annually considers Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) of a number of UN Member States. This is a good opportunity to mainstream biodiversity considerations and Article 8(j) and related provisions in the SDG process.

We encourage Parties 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, local communities and women to the Aichi Targets and the SDGs.

Comments on the draft recommendation (WG8J/10/10, para. 15)

We welcome the proposed topic for the next in-depth dialogue, namely: “Contribution of the

traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples and local

communities to the post-2020 global biodiversity framework”.



Cows at the edge of a community-managed oak forest in Georgia. **Simone Lovera/GFC**



Global Forest Coalition

Community Conservation Resilience Initiative

The image shows two logos side-by-side on a white background. The logo on the left is for the 'Global Forest Coalition' and features a stylized green tree with three main branches above a blue wave-like graphic. The logo on the right is for the 'Community Conservation Resilience Initiative' and features a central white star-like shape composed of several hands in various colors (green, blue, brown) reaching outwards. To the right of this graphic, the text 'Community Conservation Resilience Initiative' is written in blue and green.