

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRAINING WORKSHOP ON COMMUNITY-BASED
MONITORING, INDICATORS ON TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND CUSTOMARY
SUSTAINABLE USE AND COMMUNITY PROTOCOLS, WITHIN
THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020

INTRODUCTION

1. At its twelfth session, the Conference of the Parties (COP) adopted several decisions relevant to capacity-building and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in the work of the Convention. In paragraph 10, Annex, Appendix I of decision NP-1/8, the Conference of the Parties referred to the importance of developing community protocols in relation to access to traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of that knowledge, and in the paragraph 17 of decision X/43, paragraph 17, the Conference of the Parties requests to the Executive Secretary to organize and facilitate international technical workshops and regional workshops on indicators on the status of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices and customary sustainable use and to further explore the added value of contributions from indigenous and local communities' Community-Based Monitoring and Information Systems and of applying a Multiple Evidence Base approach when monitoring indicators on the status of traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use, in order to assess progress towards implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, especially Targets 18 (TK) and 16 (NP).

2. In paragraph 1 section B of decision XII/12 the Conference of Parties endorses the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity, contained in the annex of the same decision and also in paragraph 8 requests the Executive Secretary to support the implementation of the plan of action on customary sustainable use of biological diversity through the organization of regional and subregional workshops and other capacity-building activities involving indigenous and local communities.

3. The tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in its decision X/2, adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and in paragraph 6 of the same decision, highlighted the need to undertake capacity-building activities and an effective exchange of knowledge, consistent with decisions VIII/8 and IX/8 and other relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties, in order to support all countries, especially developing countries and in particular the least developed countries, small island developing States, the most environmentally vulnerable countries and countries with economies in transition as well as indigenous and local communities, in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 established:

Target 11: By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascape;

Target 16: By 2015, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation; and

Target 18: "By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels."

4. Pursuant to these decisions, the Secretariat of the Convention in collaboration with the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB), Forest Peoples Programme (FPP), Natural Justice (NJ), SwedBio, and Sotzil Association, organized the International Training Workshop on

Community-Based Monitoring, Indicators on Traditional Knowledge and Customary Sustainable Use and Community Protocols, within the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

5. This international training was made possible thanks to the generous financial support from the Governments of Guatemala and Japan, through the Japan Biodiversity Fund, as well as the European Union and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, through SwedBio at the Stockholm Resilience Centre.

6. The international training workshop provided an opportunity to build and strengthen the capacity of representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities and government officials working on issues related to traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use of biological diversity, as well as to have discussions about the opportunities, gaps, challenges of implementation; as well as to provide advice on the development and design of specific content (i.e. Indicators, Customary Sustainable Use and Community Protocols) for the four regional programmes planned for Latin America, Africa, Asia and the Pacific in 2016. Each regional workshop in 2016 will form an essential part of a regional training programme combining six weeks of online training (e-learning platform)¹ and 4 days of face-to-face training.

7. The implementation of these four Training Programmes during 2016 will contribute to the achievement of the Strategic Plan on Biodiversity 2011-2020, with a special focus on Targets 11, 16 and 18. In addition, it will address issues under the Nagoya Protocol related to traditional knowledge at the local, national and regional levels. As a result of the programme, participants will be able to use and monitor indicators on traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use of biodiversity and thus assist the implementation of Target 18 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. They will also be able to develop Community Protocols on traditional knowledge, which will contribute to the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS), at national and local levels and thus assist in achieving Target 16 of the Strategic Plan of Biodiversity.

8. The global workshop took place at Hotel y Centro de Convenciones Jardin del Lago, Calle Monterrey, Panajachel, Guatemala. To assist the participants, the Secretariat distributed an information note containing details of logistical arrangements for the workshop, including registration, travel information, visa requirements, accommodation and other matters, well in advance of the meeting. The meeting was held in both English and Spanish with simultaneous interpretation.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE TRAINING WORKSHOP

9. Representatives of the Executive Secretary, representatives of the Government of Guatemala, and representatives of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity welcomed the participants and opened the training workshop at 9 am on Monday, 8 June 2015. The opening included a traditional indigenous Mayan ceremony to welcome delegates.

10. Representing the Government of Guatemala, Marta Eulalia Estrada, Vice-Minister of External Relations on behalf of the Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores de Guatemala (MINEX), welcomed all to Guatemala, a country considered as a Like-minded Mega-diverse country because of its great cultural and natural diversity. Panajachel is one of its jewels. Guatemala is currently the President of the Mega-Diverse Group.

11. Mr. Luis Francisco Garcia, Departmental Government of Solola, welcomed the participants and clarified that. Panajachel is part of the Solola Department. The landscape, nature and culture of Panajachel have made it a hotspot for tourism for many decades and tourism remains and is increasingly the main economic activity, closely linked to handcrafts, and local agriculture. The area of the volcanic lake is the central point for the merging of three Mayan-descendant peoples, the Kakchiqueles, Tzutuhiles and Quiches. The government is working with these communities in poverty reduction

¹Where necessary and possible, the Secretariat made available hard copies of workbooks or USB keys containing the content available to participants with no or unreliable internet connection.

projects through empowering the local people. He welcomed all the participants on behalf of the Guatemalan President.

12. Mr. Benedicto Lucas, Executive Secretary of Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas (CONAP), provided the welcoming remarks on behalf of all board members of CONAP and staff. He noted that the CBD is one of the UN Conventions with a lot of success in Guatemala. The Guatemalan protected areas system covers 34% of the country. The view and landscape of Panajachel is one of the 328 protected areas of Guatemala, and 97% of its inhabitants are Mayan-descendant peoples. Discussions concerning the recognition of indigenous peoples rights and access to land are just beginning in Guatemala, although there are some initial successes including the first inscription or recognition of collective territory for collective/community and sustainable use. He also took the opportunity to thank Mr. Bráulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, the Executive Secretary of the Convention, and Mr John Scott for the opportunity of working together on this workshop and the broader series of events with Guatemala.

13. Mr. John Scott, the senior programme officer for traditional knowledge at the Secretariat of the Convention, on behalf of Mr. Bráulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, welcomed the partners and participants to this workshop. He thanked the local indigenous peoples for the traditional spiritual opening ceremony to the ancestors. He noted that Panajachel is particularly high in biological and cultural diversity and that that Guatemala, as president of the Mega-Diverse Group of countries, has an important regional role to play in the effective implementation of the Convention. He noted that when the Executive Secretary visited Guatemala, in 2014, many sectors expressed their desire to be more involved in the CBD processes, especially on issues related to Indigenous Peoples. He welcomed the multiple partnerships that will shape the regional training programmes in 2016, which will in turn contribute to strategic targets 11, 16 and 18, as well as the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.

14. Carlos Batzin, of Fondo para el Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas de América Latina y El Caribe (Fondo Indígena), greeted the participants calling on with the permission of the Mayan Gods and the Ancestors. He welcomed brothers and sisters from different parts of the globe, and acknowledged the presence of Maria Eugenia Choque Quisque as the representative of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII). He recognized the global indigenous social movement for the recognition of their rights and improvement of their living conditions. He reminded us that modernity brings improved communications but also an important message that the “economy of the future is knowledge”. This has implications for indigenous traditional knowledge and its use by large corporations.

15. Dr. Diego Recalde, the National Representative for UN FAO in Guatemala, thanked the Secretariat to inviting FAO to these events on biological diversity. In his presentation he noted that today there are more than 800 million peoples on the planet who do not have enough food to eat while at the same time there are 200 million people suffering from obesity. This is a world that produces enough food for all people but is plagued with inequitable production and distribution problems. Almost 40% of all food produced, mostly perishables, are wasted. He emphasised that humanity needs to increase food productivity by 50% by 2050 to meet population demands but questions the real cost of that production. He also noted such initiatives as UN REDD in Guatemala, and new climate change laws and other indigenous initiatives that show that Guatemala is moving in the right direction. Guatemala is also increasingly recognizing the importance of indigenous peoples’ traditional knowledge, especially for biodiversity and food sovereignty.

ITEM 2.

2.1. Officers

16. The workshop was facilitated by the senior programme officer, associate programme officer and administrative assistant for Article 8(j) and related provisions of the Convention’s Secretariat, in collaboration with representatives of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB), Forest Peoples Programme (FPP), and Natural Justice (NJ).

2.2. Adoption of the agenda

17. The participants were invited to consider and adopt the provisional agenda that was prepared by the Secretariat for the training workshop.

2.3 Organization of work

18. The training workshop was held mainly in plenary and additionally participants also worked in small groups for particular issues. The workshop used the methodology of a participatory workshop. Each topic was presented in PowerPoint presentations and some items were in turn, discussed in regional groups, after which the chairpersons of each group presented their findings to the plenary. The workshop included practical exercises and case studies where participants were able to apply what they learnt from the presentations.

19. As part of the training workshop, participants were invited to participate in an electronic preparatory process, which allowed participants to access essential information materials from the website of the Secretariat, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Nagoya Protocol, the programme of work on Article 8(j), two weeks prior to the workshop.

20. After the opening of the workshop each participant was requested to introduce themselves and their organizations, as well as their expectations for the workshop. A list of participants is included in annex I. A summary of the evaluations received from the participants of the workshop is available in annex II². A sample of the evaluation form used for the evaluations is contained in annex III.

ITEM 3. TRAINING WORKSHOPS OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES

21. Under Item 3, the representative of the Executive Secretary introduced the objectives and expected outcomes of the workshops. She provided an overview of the contents of the Training Programme which included *Community Protocols for Traditional Knowledge, Indicators for Traditional Knowledge (TK) and Customary Sustainable Use (CSU) and next steps in the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol*. This workshop will assist in developing the 2016 training programme, which will be implemented in four regions: Latin America, Asia, Pacific and Africa. She invited participants to consider and discuss throughout the workshop, regional approaches and substantive priorities for the effective development and implementation of these programmes at the regional level.

ITEM 4. OVERVIEW OF THE COMMUNITY PROTOCOLS UNDER THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL

(i) What are Community Protocols?

22. Item 3 commenced with an introductory presentation by the Secretariat on the Nagoya Protocol, with a focus on aspects related to community protocols. This included a historical overview and an analysis of the Nagoya Protocol articles related to community protocols and their potential contribution to achieving the objectives of the Nagoya Protocol, as well as more broadly, their potential application for traditional knowledge under the Convention on Biological Diversity, and in pursuit of Target 18 of the Strategic Plan for Biological Diversity 2011-2020.

(ii) What can they contain?

23. The representative of Natural Justice provided a presentation with a focus on the potential elements or contents of community protocols. Natural Justice explored in detail, community processes for developing community protocols, including case studies and diverse experiences. In addition Natural Justice discussed more broadly, the potential contribution of community protocols to the implementation of tasks 7, 10 and 12 of the revised Multi-Year Programme of Work on Article 8 (j) and related provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity and through these to Target 18 on traditional knowledge.

² To be added.

24. The Fundacion para la Promocion del Conocimiento's indigenous representative of the Guna people of Panama challenged participants to critically consider community protocols in the context of customary laws and traditional procedures and traditional territories and resources. He also introduced a broader concept of bio-cultural protocols emphasising the interconnection between culture and biodiversity. He noted that community protocols are often based on rules or customary laws that already exist and which guarantee sustainable use. Community protocols can assist potential users of traditional knowledge and associated genetic resources with clarity and transparency of procedures for access and use of traditional knowledge. The strength of community protocols is in the process that creates them. The process can empower communities and bring divergent views together. Above all community protocols should be community driven and be a community product.

(iii) How can a Community Protocol be developed?

25. The representative of Brazil provided participants with an overview of the new access and benefit sharing legislation in Brazil for genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge. Amongst other matters, the Brazilian legislation addresses instances where the original knowledge holders are difficult to ascertain and provides for benefit sharing measures, in such cases. The Brazilian legislation institutionalises the recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities. The legislation provides clarity and certainty and will foster biodiversity research and development. Under the new legislation, genetic resources are considered the heritage of all Brazilians and a National Fund has been established to assure that all the benefits arising from the utilization of the genetic resources are to be channelled to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. The legislation also recognises community protocols as an instrument for granting prior informed consent, in the case the indigenous and local communities (ILCs) wish to do so. The legislation provides for a definition of community protocols as a procedural norm for indigenous peoples, local communities, and small farmers to grant prior informed consent (PIC).

26. In Brazil all community protocols, which have been developed are driven by the demands of the community, and within Brazil, community protocols can be as diverse as the communities developing them. In the Brazilian context, there are many community-to-community exchanges and peer learning in the development of community protocols. Brazil also includes a role for communities in monitoring agreements to ensure the on-the-ground effectiveness of the legislation. The representative of Brazil emphasised that here is no magic formula or one off solution to developing community protocols and their development and the protocols themselves, can be as diverse as the community that drive them.

27. The various presentations were followed by a rich exchange of questions and answers. Some questions included: the legal recognition of community protocols; how to bring divided communities together to develop community protocols; how to address traditional knowledge that has become publically available; what happens to traditional knowledge when it leaves the community; how to recognise customary sustainable use based on customary laws; the issue that current arrangements seems to be based on partnerships and outside users developing genetic resources and traditional knowledge but can indigenous peoples develop their own resources on their own territories ? What happens when the traditional knowledge leaves the traditional territory and who has the burden of protection for traditional knowledge? And what is the understanding of indigenous peoples and local communities of national legal systems and their applicability to access and benefit sharing of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge.

(iv) Exchange of experience

28. The representative of local communities in Brazil presented her experience in developing a community protocol for traditional medicine. Local communities commonly use biodiversity as medicines for human and animal health. Health from their perspective includes food, nutrition, and food security and sovereignty and hence health is a holistic concept. The official recognition of traditional medicine is a relatively new concept in Brazil. The community protocol allows the community to articulate their vision of their rights and resources and allows them to market their traditional medicines. This included a registration process for related knowledge that lead to a publication, which has assisted in the "legislative" or official recognition of traditional knowledge and medicines. Local or traditional

communities in Brazil have limited accessed traditional plants often based on negotiations with private land holders but they are increasingly seeking recognition of rights to territories and access to traditional resources, based on principles of customary sustainable use. Part of the training of traditional healers involves conservation of endangered species but also includes the sustainable use of readily available species (mainly plants). The traditional healers association also works on the intergenerational transfer of traditional knowledge. Regarding being approached by pharmaceutical companies, the traditional healers committee has a “no negotiation” policy. The committee remains focussed on protection of traditional medicines and related knowledge and sustainable use rather than profit.

29. The representative of Bolivia spoke of the Bolivian experience of developing community protocols and the development of national legislation to protect traditional knowledge. The Government recognises that community protocols need to be developed at the community level but at the same time, is developing a broad model or template to assist communities. Community protocols can strengthen participatory democracy and increase clarity concerning community visions of their rights, resources and territories, and provide for transparency for processes such as prior informed consent. The government through the Vice Ministry of Environment is supporting the development of community protocols in different regions of the country.

30. The representative from the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) presented on the use of seed banks in-situ conservation, and food security. He explained in detail the role of indigenous and local community women and the traditional processes of seed saving. On occasions communities can lose their seeds because of hurricanes, floods, high winds, pests and diseases and hence the important role of seed banks, including community-to-community exchanges, is crucial in maintaining food security and food sovereignty. Food insecurity can leave communities with little choice but to eat seeds reserved for planting so for such occasions there is a need to put in place emergency measures. FAO and the government are working on mechanisms to help communities in such situations. Such emergency situations need special mechanisms that can save not just seeds but crop diversity such as seed banks and infrastructure such as silos, managed by the community through balanced committees. “Masa selection” techniques help communities to improve their own varieties based on their own needs and local conditions. FAO’s family agricultural policy assists small farmers continue their roles as in-situ conservationists.

31. After the presentations, the presenters considered and answered questions posed by the participants including: what is the internal work within communities needed to develop community protocols; how have traditional healers dealt with inquiries from Pharmaceuticals companies; does FAO also work on other traditional practices for food security, including in-situ conservation, in addition to seed banks, amongst others?

32. In concluding the session on community protocols, and in order to test their uptake of the information received, participants formed regional groups and shared their answers to a fictional case study on access and benefit sharing. This exercise assisted in assessing knowledge uptake from the session. Whilst in regional groups, participants were also able to share their experiences on community protocols, as well as identified possible approaches and specific content to inform the planning of programmes for regional training workshops in 2016. The various groups reported back to plenary on their discussions.

33. In reporting back, the chairs of the various regional groups discussed various issues that arose in their discussions, including: the need for prior capacity building, including on the Convention, the Nagoya Protocol and relevant National Laws (or absence of laws), before being approached by potential users of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge; the role of Government National Focal Points (NFP) for the Nagoya Protocol, and their capacity building needs, including possible guidelines to support them and also recognition of their national and/or local expertise; how to deal with traditional knowledge shared between and amongst communities; the role of indigenous trainers in assisting communities to develop community protocols; prior and informed consent needs to consider both benefits and risks to arrive at a decision; recognition of gender and other community differences and

processes, including how to involve youth in decision-making; safeguards for community processes to ensure that all views are equitably taken into account; advice for national focal points; financial support for developing community protocols; community protocols should facilitate communities to decide on their own consent process; community protocols could contain mechanisms and processes for community decision-making aligned to the communities needs and realities; additional information about third parties and potential use of traditional knowledge and conditions under which consent may or may not be granted; community protocols as a way of articulating IPLCs rights as the community views them; negotiated agreements should be on “level playing field” or between “equals”; after prior and informed consent is granted, if there is proposed changes in use or the user transfers the traditional knowledge to a third party a renegotiated agreement is required; intellectual property rights and copyright issues including possible solutions such as shared ownerships should be considered; reciprocity and knowledge exchange is important for communities; community protocols need to take into account national legislation and vice versa; what is the relationship between community protocols and national legislation; a process for appealing violations of community protocols and/or ensuring compliance with community protocols; promotion of dialogue and alternate dispute resolution mechanisms to bring governments and communities together to resolve differences; community protocols should be recognised by national legislation on a case by case basis (based on compatibility); national legislation should be supportive of indigenous peoples and local community rights in general; community protocols can be a statement of autonomy and therefore may not be compatible with national legislation; autonomy is a contextual issue and may apply internally or externally; there are many steps and procedures to consider in effectively implementing the Nagoya Protocol including both national and community processes that will require communities and governments to work together; community protocols could be registered to show they are recognised by the government; various government systems including federal systems posed different challenges and opportunities for community protocols; pilot projects are useful in determining the workability of national laws and community protocols; how to resolve benefit-sharing for traditional knowledge across borders; the role of regional laws to address shared traditional knowledge across borders.

34. The representative from Belarus used the opportunity of the workshop to present on the situation in her country regarding genetic resources and traditional knowledge. Belarus is rich in genetic resources and some traditional knowledge remains held by small farmers.

ITEM 5. OVERVIEW OF GLOBAL PLAN OF ACTION ON CUSTOMARY SUSTAINABLE USE (CSU)

(i) What is Customary Sustainable Use of Biodiversity/Subsistence Use?

Article 10(c) of the Convention on Biological Diversity requires that:

“Each Contracting Party shall, as far as possible and as appropriate:

- (c) Protect and encourage customary use of biological resources in accordance with traditional cultural practices that are compatible with conservation or sustainable use requirements;*

33. A representative of the Forest Peoples Programme provided an introduction to Article 10(c) of the Convention. The Forest Peoples Programme (FPP) is a well-known international NGO working with indigenous peoples and local communities on issues of relevance to the Convention, including customary sustainable use. FPP first held a session on “What is customary use, and what are the sustainable particularities of customary practices and use systems?” which described examples from of customary rules/laws, spiritual beliefs underpinning these rules, collective ownership and use, dependency on ecosystems, customs and rituals when interacting with natural resources, and the role of traditional institutions and other control mechanisms. This was followed by interactions/exchanges of examples from the floor, where participants in turn provided examples from their own experiences regarding customary rules that assist to ensure sustainability. Some rules are introduced through consensus and some have been passed down, some are permanent and some are temporary measures. For example the Guna Elders (Panama) met and decided to close the customary fishing grounds for three months each year and also

prohibited taking certain plants and animals at various times of the year to ensure availability and sustainability. For the Aymara of Bolivia there are strict rules governing the husbandry of llamas, particularly young llamas.

34. The representative of the Participatory Monitoring and Management Partnership (PMMP) also noted that perhaps through contact with settler societies, some indigenous groups have lost some knowledge and subtlety in taking or hunting animals, for instance, although there may be a taboo on killing pregnant animals, but without sufficient expertise, it may be difficult to determine if an animal is pregnant during the hunt. Additionally pressures such as food insecurity may lead to some customary rules being ignored. Many participants noted there were customary rules in place for hunting and gathering but at the same time, some rules are decided by Elders, subject to local conditions, resulting in temporary measures being put in place, which are then monitored.

35. A representative of the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP) discussed rotational farming practices and timeframes for regeneration, as well as spiritual beliefs, which regulate biodiversity use. Indigenous peoples and local community participants also cautioned not to over-generalising customary use rules which in turn could “overly romanticise” indigenous cultures and work against local customary rules and the realities of indigenous peoples and local communities, and that sustainability is very context-based. For instance in Northern Australia, indigenous peoples understand that taking adult crocodiles in the long term is unsustainable, however it can be quite sustainable to take as many crocodile eggs as one can find, as long as there is a strong adult population. The Elders also used to risk going into the crocodile’s nest to turn the eggs and move them to change the number of males that were hatched to control their population. Also CSU needs to take into account climate change and pressures on increasing populations (the Earth’s human population has doubled since 1950). For instance, as climate change moves plants and animals beyond existing traditional territories, indigenous peoples may not have a right to pursue them beyond their territories. These kinds of animal and plant movements can also make hunting and gathering more difficult requiring longer distances for hunting and gathering. Also taking of indigenous plants and animals by the general population can greatly reduce the availability for customary sustainable use for traditional communities. Multiple demands on lands and waters by increasing populations and food production (the need to double food production globally by 2050) and mega-projects are placing increasing demands on traditional territories and reducing communities’ ability to manage their territories and practice their traditional knowledge and customary sustainability use. The representative of the UNPFII advocated for a new vision of traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use, as not archaic practices but as innovative solutions for sustainability and the future, which recognise ecosystem boundaries and limits. The representative of Guatemala said that indigenous peoples and local communities are able to register collective lands so that their tenure is respected.

36. The FPP presented a summary overview of IPLCs contribution to process leading to development and adoption of the Plan of Action for CSU, which had been aimed at sharing actual experiences from the grassroots level, threats and challenges concerning CSU, and provided some recommendations for the consideration of the participants. Some key issues and lessons include the importance of secure land tenure (customary sustainable use requires access to territories and resources and also the right and ability to manage those territories and resources); recognition of customary laws and institutions; and the role of education. The case studies shared in the process assisted in dispelling some of the myths about customary sustainable use. Some case studies involved protected areas, which had been established over traditional territories, forcing out communities, restricting access and use of resources in those areas, and as a consequence thereof, customary sustainable use can no longer be applied and knowledge can be irretrievably lost. He noted that the destruction of traditional areas and reduced access to resources because of extractive industries or development activities has similar consequences.

(ii) *Opportunities and challenges in implementing the Plan of Action*

37. Under this item, the FPP presented a background to the Global Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use³ of Biological Diversity endorsed by the Conference of Parties according its decision XII/12 B, paragraph 1, Annex, including its origins at COP 9 and evolution and eventual adoption at COPs 10, 11 and 12. The presentation had a special interactive focus on the three tasks of the first phase of the Plan of Action. On Task 1 some experiences were shared about engagement in national-level planning and reporting and discussions were held about the full and effective participation of IPLCs. The representatives of Uruguay and Antigua Barbuda discussed the revision of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NPSAP) and opportunities for recognition of traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use. On task 2, examples of relevant community-based initiatives that focus on customary sustainable use and enhanced implementation of 10(c) were shared, and discussions about how these could be further supported. On task 3 some experiences were shared about CSU in relation to protected areas and some best practices ideas were also shared. The indigenous representative of Guyana presented on the experience of the Wapichan people who used community mapping to assert their rights to customary sustainable use, which included proposals for community conserved forests within the territory. He described a complex and sometimes difficult inclusive process, which ultimately bore very useful results. The Wapichan people are using their community mapping to assist with their land title extension claim processes.

ITEM 6. OVERVIEW OF INDICATORS ON TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE (TK) AND CUSTOMARY SUSTAINABLE USE (CSU) INCLUDING COMMUNITY-BASED MONITORING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS (CBMIS)

(i) What are the adopted indicators on TK?

38. Under this item, the participants considered the four indicators⁴ adopted by the Conference of the Parties (COP) for traditional knowledge, in order to measure movement towards Target 18 (of the Strategic Plan on Biodiversity), as well as the possible contributions of Community-based Monitoring and Information Systems (CBMIS). Collectively, participants were able to plan future directions for this work, including how these indicators could be operationalized at the local and national levels.

39. The Executive Director of the FPP presented on the links between the Convention and other international processes including the Post 2015 Development Agenda and the establishment of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and opportunities for synergies for indigenous peoples and local communities, with a particular focus on indicators. This provided an interesting context for the introduction of the agenda item on indicators and community based monitoring and information systems.

40. The Executive Director introduced the four indicators for traditional knowledge, which are: status and trends in traditional languages, status and trends in traditional occupations, changes in land use and security of land tenure on traditional territories, and participation of indigenous peoples and local communities in the revision of the NBSAPs (participation). She also linked their usefulness to other international processes including the climate change, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

(ii) Update on the operationalisation of indicators

41. Under this item, participants presented case studies on operationalizing of the TK indicators. The representative of the Tebtebba Foundation, a well-known international Indigenous organization based in the Philippines, provided the participants with a detailed examination of the indicators on changes in land use and land security, traditional languages, and traditional occupations and the experience of her people with Community-based Monitoring and Information Systems (CBMIS). The community discovered that veering away from traditional knowledge led to loss of forests, including the quality of those forests, decreased in number and quality fresh water springs, increased in health problems such as increasing number and frequency of children hospitalized and cases of mental retardation amongst children. The

³ Which is sometimes referred to as subsistence use

⁴Those being: traditional languages, traditional occupations, secure land tenure and changes in land use on traditional territories and participation in the revision of NPSAPs.

community then planned to revitalise their knowledge and traditional occupations and re-balance their landscape through community comprehensive land use plans. The implementation of these plans led to measurable benefits for the community, i.e. demarcation of the lands of the commons to stop land privatization, strengthened forest protection which resulted in the re-growth of a forest from a long time grassland, retrieval and the reintroduction of traditional crops from 25 to now 35 food crops in the *inum-an* or rotational agricultural areas assisting with food security and improving human health. The on-going innovation in the rice lands is expected to achieve rice self-sufficiency within 3 to 6 years.

42. An interesting example was provided from Indonesia concerning the value of community mapping. To assist with national planning and having recognised that different sectors and government departments were using different maps of the same area, the Indonesian Government has decided on a “one map policy” as an aid to coordinated planning and development. This has prompted indigenous and local communities to use this strategic moment to submit their community maps to the Government so that they can be taken into account in the one map approach.

(iii) What are Community-Based Monitoring and Information Systems (CBMIS)⁵?

43. In order to assist the participants in understanding Community-Based Monitoring and Information Systems (CBMIS), the representative of the Wapichan people of Guyana provided a case study on his people’s experience with CBMIS and its usefulness, including in their land title extension claim process, as well as technologies used to collect and organize information. He also provided examples of how modern technologies, including the use of drones, are being used by the Wapichan people for continually updating community maps and for CBMIS to monitor changes, including threats posed by incursions across borders for hunting, and illegal mining and logging. The Wapichan people have found CBMIS to be very helpful. They are seeking the formal recognition of the community maps by the Government.

44. The representative of the Ngati Hine Indigenous Peoples of New Zealand (Aotearoa) presented on the use of CBMIS by her community on their traditional lands and waters. Her community used their traditional knowledge and modern technologies such as “tough pads” and storing information on “the GIS cloud”, and had recently used this process to design a catchment management plan for their territories. They continue to use these technologies and others, to monitor their territories and biological resources and to defend those territories and resources. These technologies are integrated into their daily activities, so it is not seen as extra work. Some community members working in a small community office then organize the data collected. The Eel holds great significance for her people and in recent history its habitat was almost wiped out by settler populations, and is still regarded as endangered. Hence the community has a particular interest in the health of this species. The community work has stimulated Government interest in monitoring the eel populations across New Zealand in collaboration with “Eel Maori”. The community has strict policies on how community information is used. The community is also considering how to use their information for the CBDs indicator process.

45. A representative of the Indigenous Peoples of Siberia (Russia) provided a detailed presentation on how her people are monitoring traditional occupations and more broadly traditional lifestyles. In light of increasing extractive industries on their traditional lands, the community is responding by increasing their community based monitoring, with a focus on the CBD indicators. As communities have seasonal movements, there are logistic challenges and long timeframes needed for CBMIS. Community-based monitoring is revealing drastic changes in short periods of time – one community had 12,000 reindeers a decade ago and now the herd is reduced to 4,000 animals because of loss of traditional territories. Along with this decline is a loss of traditional occupations and livelihoods and corresponding knowledge. Community mapping is assisting her people in negotiations with the government concerning extractive industries.

⁵ Community-based monitoring and information systems (CBMIS) refers to the bundle of monitoring approaches related to biodiversity, ecosystems, land and waters, and other resources, as well as human well-being, used by indigenous and local communities as tools for their management and documentation of their resources.

(iv) What are the potential contribution of CBMIS to the CBD's and broader indicator processes?

46. The final presentation by the Executive Director of the FPP linked CBMIS and indicators under the CBD to the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UN DRIP), the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the Post 2015 Sustainable Development Agenda, the outcome document of the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples (WCIP), and other international processes. She emphasised that the UN DRIP is not about new rights but is a collective reflection of universal human rights contained existing human rights instruments. An interesting methodology referred to as the “Indigenous Navigator” which takes the form of a national questionnaire, a community questionnaire and indigenous rights index, and its potential in monitoring Indigenous Peoples’ human rights, was examined in detail and is being trialled in a number of countries.

(v) How can Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities contribute to the CBD indicator process for TK, including through CBMIS?

47. Under this item, after a presentation by the FPP, participants considered in plenary how CBMIS could contribute to the CBD indicator process. Discussions took into account national reporting processes and obligations and other ways to submit information to the Secretariat for consideration by the various subsidiary bodies including the Working Group on Article 8(j), SBSTTA, and SBI and also to the COP. Participants also considered such outlets as the CBD Clearing House Mechanism and the Traditional Knowledge Portal. This discussion led into the final section of exchange of experiences.

(vi) Communities, Monitoring and Information Systems-Exchange of experience

48. Participants worked in regional groups and reported back to plenary to share their experience on indicators and CBMIS and identified possible approaches. Participants also discussed possible specific content and activities on this topic for the regional training programmes. Participants spoke about the need of more community-to-community exchanges to agree on common frameworks and to build confidence and flexibility so that communities can do CBMIS, in their own way. CBMIS will require capacity building for Governments, so that they fully understand the value of traditional knowledge and the need for indicators and monitoring, as well as the additional value of community based monitoring as a possible contribution the monitoring the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Communities will also need capacity building to ensure they can design and operationalize their own CBMIS recognising and building their expertise, for their own purposes. Those working on CBMIS will need to consider its strategic usefulness at different scales, including local, national, regional and global. As seen within the IPBES process, using information at different scales and contexts can provide a real challenge. Primarily CBMIS is for indigenous peoples and local communities themselves. One group discussed CBMIS and traditional skills such as tracking in the context of community mapping. Many indigenous peoples and local communities have extensive traditional experience in tracking of wildlife and this could be included in CBMIS. CBMIS needs to occur within community processes and should not be seen or implemented, as additional work or burden but as part of daily activities of the community members. One group discussed values of biodiversity, such as spiritual and cultural values. This prompted other participants to consider how such intangible values could be calculated or expressed. The representative of the UNPFII, Mr Alvaro Pop, asked participants to think deeply and ask themselves why indigenous peoples should use indicators to monitor for their traditional knowledge. Motivations should be to defend their rights and to raise awareness among Governments of those rights. Indigenous peoples and local communities must determine for themselves, what CBMIS is for and how will it serve them, as indigenous peoples. In response, another member of the UNPFII, Ms Maria Eugenia Choque agreed that overall the indicator process should lend itself to the defence of traditional territories and resources. Certainly it is for indigenous peoples and local communities themselves to decide whether they wish to pursue indicators and CBMIS, as well as possible uses for that information collected.

(vii) Local Biodiversity Outlook:

49. A representative of the Forest Peoples Programme provided an overview of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and made references to the 4th edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO4), to introduce a recently started initiative to develop a publication on the role and contribution of indigenous peoples in the implementation and achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The publication, preliminarily titled ‘Local Biodiversity Outlook’ is expected to complement the GBO4, and additional information on Target 18 as a cross-cutting issue. He also presented on the possible content of the Local Biodiversity Outlook (LBO) and asked the participants to consider what the main messages could be. The timeframe is to try to launch the LBO by the 9th meeting of the WG8j in November 2015.

52. After the introduction of LBO, the representative of the FPP took the participants through an exercise to discuss possible contents, main messages, indicators and advice in relation to each of the five strategic goals and the twenty targets contained in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Participants were divided into language, regional and sub-regional groups and appointed a chairperson, who then reported back to plenary. In reporting back to plenary, the chairpersons of the various groups, reported back some possible main messages as follows: local communities are key to local conservation; the global community should not sacrifice long term sustainability for short term economic gains; Indigenous peoples and local communities need to be recognised and well informed so they can contribute to the global conservation targets; engagement of IPLCs are vital to achieve the global conservation goals; TK and practices hold the key to a sustainable future; recognition and engagement of IPLCs are crucial if the global community is to achieve the Aichi targets; investigate use of social media to engage the youth; make it mandatory that environmental ministers attend the COP; promote co-management opportunities for Protected Areas; extractive industries and urban development need to become sustainable; increase awareness of the links between biodiversity, spirituality and culture; a registry of agricultural biodiversity (agri-diversity) may be useful; indicators on indigenous peoples and local community participation need to include a focus on women; closer monitoring of loss of traditional languages; sacred sites and Protected Areas and access; recognition of customary laws; access to medicinal plants; bio-piracy/misappropriation of traditional knowledge; promotion of conservation and ecosystems and traditional territories are key; IPLCs in local management committees especially for development proposals such as mega-projects; IPLCs are on the front lines to incursions and protection of the environment; participation and consultation process for IPLCs should be more overtly included in NBSAPs; create synergies between TK and science; development of community protocols; creating funds for developing regional plans to support national plans; recovering of TK memory of IPLCs and restoration and opportunities for application including through CSU; usefulness of community to community exchanges; need to carefully organize thoughts on support materials for GBO including how does TK and CSU apply to each of the Strategic Goals and Aichi Targets, and additional cross-cutting issues; how does Article 8(j) as a cross-cutting issue apply to other cross-cutting issues; demonstrating through case studies the relationship between TK and CSU and biodiversity to show that in practical ways, so that it is fully understandable to all, and hence the need to mainstream TK and CSU; LBO could consider additional local indicators, biodiversity hotspots, sacred sites and relationship to TK and CSU and IPLCs and role in regeneration and in-situ conservation; focus on the four main causes of biodiversity loss (as per GBO4), especially habitat loss: lessons learned through case studies; reciprocal relations between TK, CSU and biodiversity demonstrating how they are inextricable – bio-cultural diversity.

53. The Chairperson of the IIFB Working Group on Indicators noted that the discussions produced useful ideas and that these ideas need to inform additional resources to support and complement GBO 4. It is expected that a publication will come out from the Secretariat (SCBD) in partnership with the IIFB and FPP by November 2015 in time for the ninth meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j) in November 2015, and that the process should ensure that the IIFB feels some ownership of the product. There is a strong desire to have as many IPLCs contributing to the product as possible. The member of the UNPFII also noted that the report on TK of the UNPFII published in early 2015, may be a valuable contribution, and that it includes the phenomenon of the urbanisation of Indigenous Peoples, TK and CSU in urban contexts.

ITEM 7. THE WAY FORWARD WITH THE INDICATORS PROCESS- REGIONAL, SUBNATIONAL, LOCAL WORKSHOPS FOR 2016 AND UP TO COP 13

49. Under this item, participants worked in regional groups to agree on possible content, possible additional donors that could be approached, other potential partners, timing and possible venues for the four regional training workshops to be held in 2016. Indigenous peoples from developed countries also developed contents for a concept note, which will be drafted by the Secretariat in order to approach donors, in the objective of holding a workshop for indigenous peoples from developed countries, if possible in 2016.

50. A representative of each region presented to the plenary their proposals and recommendations for the implementation of the regional, subnational and local workshops and training programmes for 2016.

ITEM 8. GENERAL DISCUSSIONS, PLANNING AND PREPARATION FOR UPCOMING CONVENTION MEETINGS

(ii) The ninth meeting of the Working Group on the Article 8 (j) and related provisions

50. Under this agenda item, the Secretariat presented to the participants in plenary the provisional agenda for the ninth meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j) and related provisions in order to prepare participants to prepare for, contribute to and effectively participate in the Working Group when it meets in Montreal, Canada, from 4 to 7 November 2015.

51. The Secretariat also presented on participation mechanisms for IPLCs under the Convention, as well as the new division of agenda items between the Working Group on Article 8(j) and SBI and the rationale behind the new arrangements. The IIFB also discussed its processes and methods of operation leading up to and at the COP. This was followed by questions and answers in plenary.

(iii) The 1st meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Review of Implementation (SBI I)

52. Under this agenda item, the Secretariat presented to the participants in plenary the mandate and provisional agenda of the Subsidiary Body on Review of Implementation (SBI) to be held from 2 to 6 May 2016, in Montreal, Canada. This was followed by a question and answer session in plenary. In particular, participants inquired as to working methods and effective participatory mechanisms for IPLCs on relevant agenda items.

(iii) The thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP 13)

53. Under this agenda item, the Secretariat presented to the participants in plenary, emerging plans for the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP 13). This was followed by a presentation by the representative of the Government of Mexico regarding logistics and preparations in the lead up to the COP 13. The representative of the Government of Mexico also used the opportunity to have various meetings with the IIFB, local community representatives and the Indigenous Women's Biodiversity Network on the margins of the workshop for advice and to build partnerships for a successful COP 13.

54. As the regional workshops for 2016 focus on preparation for COP 13, under this agenda item, the Secretariat also provided the various regional groups with an opportunity to plan their regional workshops for 2016, including possible agenda items and regional priorities, additional potential funders, other possible partners, including governments, possible venues and dates.

55. The participants from the Latin American and Caribbean Region (LAC) provided the following advice for the LAC regional workshop to take place in August 2016. Regarding content, the participants recommended that the agenda include community protocols, as well as community based monitoring and information systems. It is also important to include amongst the participants a balance between the Andes, South America, Meso-America and the Caribbean, noting that all the sub-regions should be represented. If possible, a sub-regional workshop should be held in English for the Caribbean. The

representative of Antigua and Barbados expressed some interest in the workshop and training programme and offered to investigate local support. The participants from Bolivia and Brazil noted these countries could possibly host the regional workshop. Most participants want to include training on the Nagoya Protocol and find synergies and funds for other regional events – including Mexico as part of the journey to COP 13.

56. The LAC participants emphasised that the selection criteria are very important and need to consider the participants/trainers responsibilities after the workshop. It would be useful if the workshops could explore the relationship between community protocols and national legislation, consider other sources of funding, including by bringing in more partners for the event and in following-up. The workshop should be supported by online training but taking into account participants with connectivity problems. Such participants may require access to hard copies, such as workbooks or e-learning materials, sent in advance of the workshop. The workshop should be clear about the selection criteria for priority participants: trainers from IPLC organizations and government officers working on traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use issues, and the organizers and participants should consider how to expand results. The participants from the Caribbean sub-region also recommended that a small sub-regional workshop be held in English, perhaps in Antigua Barbados with a focus on local communities, especially local fisher-folks.

57. The participants from the Asian region emphasised the focus on training trainers and noted that this is a priority in the selection criteria. They noted that participants from institutions that train, including on CBD processes should have a priority. The facilitation of the workshop needs to consider capacity for interpretation, gender equality, and regional priority contents. Preparations for each regional workshop needs to develop a broad framework and materials which will already be available should be assessed, such as materials on CBMIS, examples and case studies of community protocols, as well as presentations on the NBSAPs process, including time for practical training using practical tools. Participants felt that it is better for the workshops to focus on priority issues and perhaps less on the COP agenda rather than too much. The participants believe that a relevant field visit is necessary. The Government of Bhutan showed some interest and offered that January to March or June 2016 are good times of the year for such a gathering in Bhutan.

58. The participants from the African region informed that the priority topics for African regional workshops are community protocols and the Nagoya Protocol. They would like the workshop to achieve a better understanding of community protocols in the context for the NP and PoW 8(j), illustrated through working case studies from the region. IPLCs in the African region would like to see the NP and more broadly 8(j), provide a clear mechanism on benefit sharing. The participants believe that clear and regionally relevant case studies are needed, as well as a better understanding of legal frameworks governing ABS and the NP. The participants are also interested in pursuing in the workshop a discussion on traditional resource governance structures, including the role of women. They also want the selection process to take into account trainers and for the Secretariat to develop a training resource database. Possible partners recommend that the workshop take place in Kenya, possibly in 2016, late January.

59. The participants from the Pacific region echoed many of the same issues as other regions. They also noted the problems with connectivity and internet for on-line preparation and urged that hard copies of training materials be made available on request. They also provided practical advice to improve online forum and noted that other electronic forums may also be worth investigating such as the WIN online forum. They also explored if “e-groups” could be utilised for decision making in order to agree on positions in advance of CBD meetings. They also suggested the University of South Pacific, as a useful partner in delivering training and noted the University may have additional funding for related issues, including climate change. They also recommended approaching Norway as a partner and also WIN EI UNDP for the possibility of back-to-back events for efficiencies. In the Pacific it may be more efficient to use venues in Australia or New Zealand, as they are travel hubs for the region. The Secretariat may need to investigate whether funding for the workshop can be expended in a developed country or otherwise consider Fiji and the University of South Pacific. The Pacific representatives noted the significance of customary sustainable use in the Pacific and the need for frameworks for monitoring

conservation and sustainable use. Under CBMIS, the participants also considered what to do with data being gathered, how to analyse it and what can be learned from existing case studies. They noted in terms of indicators that Vanuatu measures human wellbeing, including IPLCs and others.

60. The participants from the Eastern, Central Europe and the Caucasus (CEEC), discussed possible partners including Russia and asked the Secretariat to approach them, as a possible source of funding, also noted the need to involve the Arctic Council and Norway as a potential partner for greater efficiency. With this in mind, and in order to encourage synergies, they recommended to explore synergies including the Arctic or Far Eastern Russia. The participants from Russia and North America also noted that they would like to have expert meetings and capacity building workshops for the Arctic region as a priority theme - Cultural and EBSAs including climate change, together with Russia, the European Arctic (Saami Land) and North America. The participants from Russia and CEEC informed that in the past five years, it was held only one official workshop, with the CBD Secretariat, in Russia, with the participation of indigenous peoples of Russia: “North Pacific Regional Workshop to Facilitate the Description of EBSAs”, in February 2013 (Moscow). Participants noted the urgent need to translate the existing books, best practices and learning materials on the CBMIS subject, Community Protocols in the context of the Nagoya Protocol, into the Russian language. These materials could be used for practical training of indigenous peoples of Russia, and local communities of the Caucasus.

61. The IPLCs from developed nations suggested a workshop should to be considered for developed country IPLCs but noted that at this time, there is no funding available. They asked the Secretariat to develop a concept note to possible partners and at the same time to develop and send a comprehensive agenda and possible list of partners including other UN agencies. They suggested that the workshop could include indigenous diplomacy (UNITAR), improve capacities around participation, practical skills such as lobbying parties and participating in text development. On a regional level they also considered better organization and alignment of various commitments and processes such as UNDP WIN, which can now extend to working with communities in developed countries, through such mechanisms as community exchanges. The Maori and Indigenous Australians participants reflected on the reintroduction of traditional eel farming in New South Wales and Victoria in Australia and felt much could be learned from the Maori Eel people and discussed a possible “eel-knowledge exchange”. The IIFB noted that it was also having difficulties raising funds for IPLCs from the developed world to participate in CBD meetings and implications for regional balance and perhaps a need for alignment with other workshops and venues – including for Scandinavia (Saamiland), Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Russia and the Arctic.

ITEM 9. CLOSURE OF TRAINING WORKSHOP

62. The workshop closed at 5 p.m. on Wednesday, 10 June 2015 by a representative of the Secretariat. A Mayan spiritual leader also led the group in a ceremony to close the meeting.

Annex I

International Training Workshop on Community-based Monitoring, Indicators on Traditional Knowledge and Customary Sustainable Use and Community Protocols, within the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020

8 - 10 June 2015, Panajachel, Guatemala

Participants

	Country	Name	Organization
1.	Antigua and Barbuda	Ruth Spencer	Environment Division
2.	Australia	Beau Austin	Charles Darwin University
3.	Australia	Christine (Chrissy) Teresa Grant	Jabalbina Yalanji Aboriginal Corporation
4.	Belarus	Elena Makeyeva	National Coordination Centre of ABS
5.	Brazil	Henry-Philippe Ibanez de Novion	Brazilian Ministry of Environment; ABS National Competent Authority.
6.	Brazil	Lourdes Laureano	Red Pacari
7.	Belize	Celia Mahung	World Indigenous Network (WIN)
8.	Bolivia	Carmen Miranda	ICCA Consortium
9.	Bolivia	Sorka Jannet Copa Romero	Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores
10.	Bhutan	Thinley Dorji	Compliance Monitoring Division National, Environment Commission Secretariat
11.	Canada	Myrle Ballard	Native Women's Association of Canada
12.	Colombia	Emmerson Miguel Pastás Cuastumal	Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos "Alexander Von Humboldt"
13.	Costa Rica	Diego Lynch	World Indigenous Network (WIN)
14.	Ecuador	Yolanda Teran	Andes Chinchansuyo
15.	Guatemala	Cesar Azurdia	CONAP
16.	Guatemala	Jose Fredy Quintanilla Chan	World Indigenous Network (WIN)
17.	Guyana	Tony James	South Central Peoples' Development Association (SCPDA)
18.	India	Kosalai Pargunam Raghuram	National Biodiversity Authority
19.	India	Mrinalini Rai	Global Forest Coalition
20.	Kenya	George Gathuru Mburu	Institute for Culture and Ecology
21.	Kenya	Lucy Mullenkei	Indigenous Information Network
22.	Malawi	John Mayamiko Mawenda	Environmental Affairs Department

23.	Malaysia	Nik Musa'adah Mustapha	Forest Research Institute Malaysia (FRIM)
24.	Mexico	Emilia Blancarte	COP 13/ Mexico
25.	Mexico	Maria Andrea Pech Moo	World Indigenous Network (WIN)
26.	Mexico	Rosa Maricel Portilla Alonso	CONABIO
27.	New Zealand	Tui Shortland	Nga Tirairaka o Ngati Hine
28.	Panama	Florina Lopez Miro	Red de Mujeres Indígenas sobre Biodiversidad
29.	Panama	Onel Masardule	Fundación para la promoción del conocimiento indígena (FPCI)
30.			
31.	Philippines	Florence Daguitan	Tebtebba
32.	Thailand	Thingreiphi Lungharwo	Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact
33.	Russia	Polina Shulbaeva	Center for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the North (CSIPN / RITC)
34.	United States of America	Preston Hardison	Tulalip Natural Resources Treaty Rights Office
35.	Uruguay	Miguel Angel Pereira Guadalupe	Mundo Afro
36.	Uganda	Zaninka Penninah	UOBDU
37.	Zambia	Ephraim Mwepya Shitima	Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection
Local partners/Staff			
38.	Guatemala	Felix Sarazua	Sotzil
39.	Guatemala	Yeshing Upun	Sotzil
40.	Guatemala	Melissa Ojeda	CONAP
41.	Guatemala	Freddy Eli Cholutio	Comunidad San Juan
42.	Guatemala	Juliana Tatiana Noak	Comunidad San Juan
43.	Guatemala	Susana Xinik Pijc	Comunidad San Juan
44.	Guatemala	Rosario Urpan Perez	Comunidad San Juan
45.	Guatemala	Jose Luis Echeverria	CONAP
46.	Guatemala	Edgar Perez	GIZ
47.	Guatemala	Clotilde Cu Caal	CONAP
48.	Guatemala	Felipe Gomez	ICCA Consortium
International Partners/UN Bodies			
49.	ACTO	Sharon Austin	
50.	FAO	Alvaro Pop	
51.	FPP	Jocelyn (Joji) Carino Nettleton	
52.	FPP	Caroline de Jong	
53.	FPP	Maurizio Ferrari	
54.	Natural Justice	Jael Makagon	
55.	Part. Monitoring & Management Partnership	Pedro de Araújo Lima Constantino	

56.	SCBD	Djessy Monnier
57.	SCBD	John Scott
58.	SCBD	Viviana Figueroa
59.	Swedebio	Pernilla Malmer
60.	Swedebio	Maria Schultz
61.	UNDP	Eva Gurria
62.	UNU/IAS	William Dunbar
63.	UNPFII	Maria Eugenia Choque

Annex II
EVALUATIONS

The workshop participants had the opportunity to evaluate the workshop. Analysis of evaluations revealed the following:

- (a) Most of the participants said they gained more knowledge (practical and theory) on the specific topics (Community Protocols on Traditional Knowledge including under the Nagoya Protocol; Customary Sustainable Use of Biodiversity; Indicators on Traditional Knowledge) and that the knowledge is applicable to their daily activities;
- (b) In terms of content, most participants said that the content was excellent;
- (c) In terms of delivery, the participants agreed that the methodology was appropriated and effective;
- (d) Participants also made recommendations to implementation of the regional training programs including:
 - (i) Developed training material on the topics, including in indigenous languages;
 - (ii) Exchanges of information among participants and use peer-to-peer learning.
 - (iii) Establish a steering committee for each regional training programme
 - (iv) Include as training material best practice on the development of community protocol.
 - (v) Practical cases studies on the use of indicators on traditional knowledge and mapping

*Annex III***SAMPLE** - Evaluation Form of the TRAINING workshop

International Training Workshop on Community-based Monitoring, Indicators on Traditional Knowledge and Customary Sustainable Use and Community Protocols, within the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020
8 - 10 June 2015 - Panajachel, Guatemala

Evaluation

Please answer the following questions in order to evaluate the workshop, including suggestions for future workshops

What is your gender?

Male ☐ Female ☐ Other ☐

Are you representing:

- ☐ Indigenous Peoples Organization
☐ Local Community Organization
☐ Government

Were you familiar with the topics before of the training workshop?

Community Protocol on Traditional Knowledge including under the Nagoya Protocol	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Customary Sustainable Use of Biodiversity	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Indicators on traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use including Community-Based Monitoring and Information Systems	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Comment

I. EXPECTATIONS

Did the training workshop meet your overall expectations?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Comment

Is what you learned applicable to your activities?

Fully ☐ Partly ☐ Barely ☐

Comment

II. CONTENT

II.1 Briefly describe the usefulness of sessions

A) Community Protocol on Traditional Knowledge including under the Nagoya Protocol

Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐

B) Customary Sustainable Use of Biodiversity

Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐

C) Indicators on traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use including Community-Based Monitoring and Information Systems

Very good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐

Comment

III. Delivery

Describe one thing you have experienced or learned from the workshop and explain how it will help change the way you will be doing your work in future?

Comment

IV. RECOMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

IV-i) Content:

If you participate in the Regional Training Programme, what would you like to learn about these topics?

Community Protocol on Traditional Knowledge including Traditional Knowledge associated with genetic resource under the Nagoya Protocol

Comment

Customary Sustainable Use

Comment

Indicators on traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use including Community-Based Monitoring and Information Systems

Comment

IV-ii) Other suggestions or recommendations you may have for implementation of the regional training programme

IV-iii) Are you interested in contributing to the implementation of the regional training programme? Which region, and how? (Latin America, Asia, Pacific and Africa).

Yes ☐

No ☐

Describe your potential contribution

V. OTHER COMMENTS
