



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/A8J/WS/2015/1/2  
27 June 2016

ENGLISH ONLY

---

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  
Panajachel, Guatemala, 8 - 10 June 2015

**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, the Conference of the Parties requested 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 (Traditional Knowledge) and 16 (Nagoya Protocol).
2. In paragraph 1 of decision XII/12 B, the Conference of Parties endorses the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity, contained in the annex to the same decision and 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 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)<sup>1</sup> and four 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 to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefit Arising from their Utilization, 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

---

<sup>1</sup>Where 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.

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.

### **Attendance**

9. A total of 60 participants participated in the workshop, including Government representatives working on traditional knowledge issues and indigenous peoples and local communities' representatives from the following countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Kenya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, Philippines, Thailand, Russia, United States of America, Uruguay, Uganda, Zambia. With the special participation of international partners/United Nations bodies as follows: Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization (ACTO), FAO, Forest People Programme, Natural Justice, SwedBio, United Nations Development Programme/Equator Initiative (UNDP/EI), United Nations University (UNU/IAS) and the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII). The complete list of participants is available in annex II of this report.

### **ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE TRAINING WORKSHOP**

10. 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.

11. 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 the participants to Guatemala, a country considered a Like-Minded Megadiverse country because of its great cultural and natural diversity. Panajachel is one of its jewels. Guatemala is currently the President of the Group of Like-Minded Megadiverse countries.

12. Mr. Luis Francisco Garcia, Departmental Government of Solola, welcomed the participants. He explained that Panajachel was part of the Solola Department. The landscape, nature and culture of Panajachel had made it a hotspot for tourism for many decades and tourism remained and was increasingly the main economic activity, closely linked to handicrafts, and local agriculture. The area of the volcanic lake was the central point for the merging of three Mayan-descendant peoples, the Kakchiqueles, Tzutuhiles and Quiches. The Government was working with these communities in poverty reduction projects through empowering the local people. He welcomed all the participants on behalf of the Guatemalan President.

13. 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 was one of the United Nations Conventions with a lot of success in Guatemala. The Guatemalan protected areas system covered 34% of the country. The view and landscape of Panajachel was one of the 328 protected areas of Guatemala, and 97% of its inhabitants were Mayan-descendant peoples. Discussions concerning the recognition of indigenous peoples' rights and access to land were just beginning in Guatemala, although there were 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 during the workshop and the broader series of events with Guatemala.

14. Mr. John Scott, 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 the workshop. He thanked the local indigenous peoples for the traditional spiritual opening ceremony to the ancestors. He noted that Panajachel was particularly high in biological and cultural diversity and that Guatemala, as president of the Megadiverse Group of countries, had 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.

15. 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 participants that modernity brought improved communications but also that the “economy of the future was knowledge”. This had implications for indigenous traditional knowledge and its use by large corporations.

16. Dr. Diego Recalde, the National Representative for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in Guatemala, thanked the Secretariat for inviting FAO to these events on biological diversity. In his presentation he noted that at that time, more than 800 million peoples on the planet did not have enough food to eat, while at the same time there were 200 million people suffering from obesity. This was a world that produced enough food for all people but was plagued with inequitable production and distribution problems. Almost 40% of all food produced, mostly perishables, was wasted. He emphasized that humanity needed to increase food productivity by 50% by 2050 to meet population demands but questioned 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 showed that Guatemala was moving in the right direction. Guatemala was also increasingly recognizing the importance of indigenous peoples’ traditional knowledge, especially for biodiversity and food sovereignty.

## **ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS**

### **2.1. Officers**

17. 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**

18. 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**

19. The training workshop was held mainly in plenary and additionally participants also worked in small groups on 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 learned from the presentations. The workshop was delivered in English and Spanish with simultaneous interpretation.

20. 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 and the programme of work on Article 8(j), two weeks prior to the workshop.

21. After the opening of the workshop, participants were 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 sample of the evaluations received by the participants in the workshop is available in annex II.

### ITEM 3. WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES

22. 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?*

23. 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?*

24. 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.

25. 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 emphasizing the interconnection between culture and biodiversity. He noted that community protocols were often based on rules or customary laws that already existed and which guaranteed 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 was in the process that created 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?*

26. 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. He explained that among other matters, the Brazilian legislation addressed instances where the original knowledge holders were difficult to ascertain and provided for benefit-sharing measures, in such cases. The Brazilian legislation institutionalized the recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities. The legislation provided clarity and certainty and would foster biodiversity research and development. Under the new legislation, genetic resources were 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 were to be channelled to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. The legislation also recognized 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 provided for a definition of

community protocols as a procedural norm for indigenous peoples, local communities, and small farmers to grant prior informed consent (PIC).

27. He explained that in Brazil, all community protocols, which had been developed were driven by the demands of the community, and within Brazil, community protocols could be as diverse as the communities developing them. In the Brazilian context, there were many community-to-community exchanges and peer learning in the development of community protocols. Brazil also included a role for communities in monitoring agreements to ensure the on-the-ground effectiveness of the legislation. The representative of Brazil emphasized that there was no magic formula or one-off solution to developing community protocols and their development and the protocols themselves, could be as diverse as the community that drove them.

28. 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 recognize 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*

29. The representative of local communities in Brazil presented her experience in developing a community protocol for traditional medicine. She explained that local communities commonly used biodiversity as medicines for human and animal health. Health from their perspective included food, nutrition, and food security and sovereignty and hence health was a holistic concept. The official recognition of traditional medicine was a relatively new concept in Brazil. The community protocol allowed the community to articulate their vision of their rights and resources and allowed them to market their traditional medicines. This included a registration process for related knowledge that lead to a publication, which had assisted in the “legislative” or official recognition of traditional knowledge and medicines. Local or traditional communities in Brazil had limited accessed to traditional plants often based on negotiations with private land holders but were 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 involved conservation of endangered species but also included the sustainable use of readily available species (mainly plants). The traditional healers association also worked on the intergenerational transfer of traditional knowledge. Regarding being approached by pharmaceutical companies, the traditional healers committee had a “no negotiation” policy. The committee remained focussed on protection of traditional medicines and related knowledge and sustainable use rather than profit.

30. The representative of Bolivia spoke of the Bolivian experience of developing community protocols and the development of national legislation to protect traditional knowledge. He said that the Government recognized that community protocols needed to be developed at the community level but at the same time, was 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 was supporting the development of community protocols in different regions of the country.

31. The representative from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (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 could 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, was crucial in maintaining food security and food sovereignty. Food insecurity could leave communities with little choice but to eat seeds reserved for planting, so for such occasions there was a need to put in place emergency measures. FAO and the Government were working on mechanisms to help communities in such situations. Such emergency situations needed special mechanisms that could 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 helped communities to improve their own varieties based on their own needs and local conditions. FAO’s family agricultural policy assisted small farmers continue their roles as in-situ conservationists.

32. 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, among others?

33. 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. While 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.

34. 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 among 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 were 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 recognized 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.

35. 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 remained held by small farmers.

## **ITEM 5. OVERVIEW OF GLOBAL PLAN OF ACTION ON CUSTOMARY SUSTAINABLE USE (CSU) OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**

### *What is Customary Sustainable Use of Biodiversity/Subsistence Use?*

36. 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.

37. 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.

38. A representative of the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP) discussed rotational farming practices and timeframes for regeneration, as well as spiritual beliefs, which regulated biodiversity use. Indigenous peoples and local community participants also cautioned not to over-generalizing customary use rules which in turn could “overly romanticize” indigenous cultures and work against local customary rules and the realities of indigenous peoples and local communities, and that sustainability was very context-based. For instance in Northern Australia, indigenous peoples understood that taking adult crocodiles in the long term was unsustainable, however it could be quite sustainable to take as many crocodile eggs as one can find, as long as there was 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 needed 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



could also make hunting and gathering more difficult, requiring longer distances for hunting and gathering. Also, the 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 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 recognized ecosystem boundaries and limits. The representative of Guatemala said that indigenous peoples and local communities were able to register collective lands so that their tenure was respected.

39. 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.

*Opportunities and challenges in implementing the Plan of Action*

40. Under this item, the FPP presented a background to the Global Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use<sup>2</sup> of Biological Diversity endorsed by the Conference of Parties according to its decision XII/12 B, paragraph 1, annex, including its origins at COP-9 and evolution and eventual adoption at COP-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 were using their community mapping to assist with their land title extension claim processes.

---

<sup>2</sup> Which is sometimes referred to as subsistence use.

## **ITEM 6. OVERVIEW OF INDICATORS ON TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND CUSTOMARY SUSTAINABLE USE INCLUDING COMMUNITY-BASED MONITORING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS**

### **A. What are the adopted indicators on Traditional Knowledge?**

41. Under this item, the participants considered the four indicators<sup>3</sup> adopted by the Conference of the Parties 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.

42. 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.

43. The Executive Director introduced the four indicators for traditional knowledge, which were: 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.

### **B. Update on the operationalization of indicators**

44. Under this item, participants presented case studies on operationalizing 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 of fresh water springs, increased in health problems such as increasing number and frequency of children hospitalized and cases of mental retardation among children. The community then planned to revitalize 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 *inuman* or rotational agricultural areas assisting with food security and improving human health. The ongoing innovation in the rice lands was expected to achieve rice self-sufficiency within 3 to 6 years.

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

---

<sup>3</sup>Those being: traditional languages, traditional occupations, secure land tenure and changes in land use on traditional territories and participation in the revision of NPSAPs.

### **C. What are Community-Based Monitoring and Information Systems (CBMIS)?<sup>4</sup>**

46. 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, were 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 had found CBMIS to be very helpful. They were seeking the formal recognition of the community maps by the Government.

47. 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 continued to use these technologies and others to monitor their territories and biological resources and to defend those territories and resources. These technologies were integrated into their daily activities, so it was not seen as extra work. Some community members working in a small community office then organized the data collected. The Eel held great significance for her people and in recent history its habitat was almost wiped out by settler populations and was still regarded as endangered. Hence the community had a particular interest in the health of this species. The community work had stimulated Government interest in monitoring the eel populations across New Zealand in collaboration with “Eel Maori”. The community had strict policies on how community information was used. The community was also considering how to use their information for the CBDs indicator process.

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

### **D. What are the potential contribution of CBMIS to the CBD's and broader indicator processes?**

49. The final presentation by the Executive Director of the FPP linked CBMIS and indicators under 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 emphasized that UN DRIP was not about new rights but was a collective reflection of universal human rights contained in existing human rights instruments. An interesting methodology referred to as the “Indigenous Navigator” which took 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 was being trialled in a number of countries.

### **E. How can indigenous peoples and local communities contribute to the CBD indicator process for TK, including through CBMIS?**

---

<sup>4</sup> 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.

50. 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.

#### **F. Communities, monitoring and information systems-exchange of experience**

51. 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 for more community-to-community exchanges to agree on common frameworks and to build confidence and flexibility so that communities could do CBMIS, in their own way. CBMIS would require capacity-building for Governments, so that they fully understood 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 to the monitoring the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Communities would also need capacity-building to ensure they can design and operationalize their own CBMIS recognizing and building their expertise, for their own purposes. Those working on CBMIS would 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 was 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 UNPFII, Mr Alvaro Pop, asked participants to think deeply and ask themselves why indigenous peoples should use indicators to monitor 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.

#### **G. Local Biodiversity Outlook**

52. A representative of the Forest Peoples Programme provided an overview of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and made references to the fourth 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 GBO-4 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 was to try to launch the LBO by the ninth meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j) in November 2015.

53. After the introduction of LBO, the representative of 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 subregional 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 recognized and well informed so they can contribute to the global conservation targets; engagement of IPLCs is 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 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 GBO-4), especially habitat loss: lessons learned through case studies; reciprocal relations between TK, CSU and biodiversity demonstrating how they are inextricable – bio-cultural diversity.

54. The Chairperson of the IIFB Working Group on Indicators noted that the discussions produced useful ideas and that these ideas needed to inform additional resources to support and complement GBO-4. It was expected that a publication be issued by the Secretariat of the Convention in partnership with IIFB and FPP by November 2015 in time for the ninth meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j) and that the process should ensure that IIFB felt some ownership of the product. There was a strong desire to have as many IPLCs contributing to the product as possible. The member of UNPFII also noted that the report on TK of UNPFII published in early 2015 may be a valuable contribution and that it included the phenomenon of the urbanization of indigenous peoples, TK and CSU in urban contexts.

**ITEM 7. THE WAY FORWARD WITH THE INDICATOR PROCESS - REGIONAL, SUBNATIONAL, LOCAL WORKSHOPS FOR 2016 AND UP TO THE THIRTEENTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**

55. 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.

56. 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 UPCOMMING MEETINGS****A. The ninth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on the Article 8(j) and Related Provisions (WG8J-9)**

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

58. The Secretariat also presented 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 the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and the rationale behind the new arrangements. The IIFB also discussed its processes and methods of operation leading up to and at the meeting of COP. This was followed by questions and answers in plenary.

**B. The first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI-I)**

59. Under this agenda item, the Secretariat presented 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.

**C. The thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP-13)**

60. Under this agenda item, the Secretariat presented the emerging plans for the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. This was followed by a presentation by the representative of the Government of Mexico regarding logistics and preparations in the lead up to COP-13. The representative of the Government of Mexico also used the opportunity to have various meetings with 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.

61. 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.

62. 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 among the participants a balance between the Andes, South America, Meso-America and the Caribbean, noting that all the subregions should be represented. If possible, a subregional 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 wanted 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.

63. The LAC participants emphasized that the selection criteria were very important and needed 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 subregion also recommended that a small subregional workshop be held in English, perhaps in Antigua Barbados with a focus on local communities, especially local fisher-folks.

64. The participants from the Asian region emphasized the focus on training trainers and noted that this was a priority in the selection criteria. They noted that participants from institutions that provided training, including on CBD processes, should have a priority. The facilitation of the workshop needed to consider capacity for interpretation, gender equality and regional priority contents. Preparations for each regional workshop needed to develop a broad framework and materials which would 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 was better for the workshops to focus on priority issues and perhaps less on the COP agenda rather than too much. The participants believed that a relevant field visit was necessary. The Government of Bhutan showed some interest and suggested January to March or June 2016 as good times of the year for such a gathering in Bhutan.

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

66. The participants from the Pacific region echoed many of the same issues raised by other regions. They also noted the problems with connectivity and internet for online 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 utilized 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 were travel hubs for the region. The Secretariat may need to investigate whether funding for the workshop could 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 could be learned from existing case studies. They noted in terms of indicators that Vanuatu measured human wellbeing, including IPLCs and others.

67. 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. They also noted the need to involve the Arctic Council and Norway as potential partners 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 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.

68. The IPLCs from developed nations suggested a workshop should to be considered for developed country IPLCs but noted that at that time, there was 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 United Nations 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 could then 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. They felt much could be learned from the Maori Eel people and discussed a possible “eel-knowledge exchange”. 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 (Saami land), Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Russia and the Arctic.

#### **ITEM 9. CLOSURE OF THE WORKSHOP**

69. Under this item, participants had the opportunity to evaluate the workshop (see annex II). Analysis of evaluations revealed the following:

(a) Most of the participants said they gained better a knowledge (practical and theory) of 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 was 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 implement regional training programmes, 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.

70. 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***LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

	<b>Country</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
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 Mulenkei	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.	Philippines	Florence Daguitan	Tebtebba
31.	Thailand	Thingreiphi Lungharwo	Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact
32.	Russia	Polina Shulbaeva	Center for Support of Indigenous Peoples of the North (CSIPN / RITC)
33.	United States of America	Preston Hardison	Tulalip Natural Resources Treaty Rights Office
34.	Uruguay	Miguel Angel Pereira Guadalupe	Mundo Afro
35.	Uganda	Zaninka Penninah	UOBDU
36.	Zambia	Ephraim Mwepya Shitima	Ministry of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection
<b>Local partners/Staff</b>			
37.	Guatemala	Felix Sarazua	Sotzil
38.	Guatemala	Yeshing Upun	Sotzil
39.	Guatemala	Melissa Ojeda	CONAP
40.	Guatemala	Freddy Eli Cholutio	Comunidad San Juan
41.	Guatemala	Juliana Tatiana Noak	Comunidad San Juan
42.	Guatemala	Susana Xinik Pijc	Comunidad San Juan
43.	Guatemala	Rosario Urpan Perez	Comunidad San Juan
44.	Guatemala	Jose Luis Echeverria	CONAP
45.	Guatemala	Edgar Perez	GIZ
46.	Guatemala	Clotilde Cu Caal	CONAP
47.	Guatemala	Felipe Gomez	ICCA Consortium
<b>International Partners/UN Bodies</b>			
48.	ACTO	Sharon Austin	
49.	FAO	Alvaro Pop	
50.	FPP	Jocelyn (Joji) Carino Nettleton	
51.	FPP	Caroline de Jong	
52.	FPP	Maurizio Ferrari	
53.	Natural Justice	Jael Makagon	
54.	Part. Monitoring & Management Partnership	Pedro de Araújo Lima Constantino	
55.	SCBD	Djessy Monnier	
56.	SCBD	John Scott	
57.	SCBD	Viviana Figueroa	
58.	SwedBio	Pernilla Malmer	
59.	SwedBio	Maria Schultz	

60.	UNDP	Eva Gurria
61.	UNU/IAS	William Dunbar
62.	UNPFII	Maria Eugenia Choque

*Annex II*

**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 you potential contribution

---

---

**V. OTHER COMMENTS**

---

---