



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WG8J/6/INF/5  
20 October 2009

ENGLISH ONLY

---

AD HOC OPEN-ENDED INTER-SESSIONAL  
WORKING GROUP ON ARTICLE 8(j) AND  
RELATED PROVISIONS OF THE  
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Sixth meeting

Montreal, 2-6 November 2009

**WORKSHOP ON INDICATORS ON INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' WELL-BEING AND  
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT FOCUSING ON TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE**

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

1. The Executive Secretary is circulating herewith, for the consideration of participants in the Ad Hoc Open-ended Inter-Sessional Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions, the report of the Workshop on Indicators on Indigenous People's Well-being and Sustainable Development Focussing on Traditional Knowledge, which was held in Nairobi, from 1 to 3 October 2009.

2. The document is being circulated in the form and languages in which it was provided to the Secretariat.

/...

## **WORKSHOP ON INDICATORS ON INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' WELL-BEING AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT FOCUSSING ON TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE**

Nairobi, Kenya  
1-3 October 2009

### *Introduction*

1. Building on the previous work, the Indigenous Working Group on Indicators, the Tebtebba Foundation, together with Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD), and supported by the Inter-Agency Support Group on Indigenous Peoples' Issues (IASG), agreed to facilitate an international technical workshop on indicators on indigenous peoples well-being, with a focus on status and trends in land use on indigenous territories, 1-3 October, 2009, back to back with the IASG annual meeting, in Nairobi. Participants included: a representative of the Government of the Philippines, representatives from the Indigenous Working Group on Indicators, IASG members, as well as technical experts, from the relevant agencies, including SCBD, UNPFII, ILO, UNESCO, IFAD, FAO, OHCHR, UNEP-WCMC, and the International Land Coalition hosted by IFAD.

2. The meeting focused on specific technical advice on this issue, as well as refining the draft recommendations to be considered by the sixth meeting of the Working Group (refer UNEP/CBD/WG8J/6/INF/5). The workshop recommended minor revisions and refinement of the proposed indicators that will be made available as UNEP/CBD/WG8J/6/Add.4/Rev.1.

### **A. Updates on relevant indicators work**

3. Ms. Joji Carino, Chairperson of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) Working Group on Indicators (IWGI), and Mr. John Scott, programme officer for Article 8(j) (Secretariat of the CBD), welcomed participants to the meeting on behalf of the IWGI and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

4. Ms. Carino provided an introduction to the work of the IWGI concerning indicators and indigenous peoples' well-being and advised participants that a book on Indicators Relevant for Indigenous Peoples Resource would be launched in November. She recalled the work of the previous meetings held in Baguio City, November 2008. She encouraged participants to identify possible options for collaboration and coordination, and a strategic way forward to identify data management systems to underpin the framework of indicators being proposed.

5. Mr. Scott provided an introduction to the process under the Convention on Biological Diversity on determining indicators to assess progress towards the 2010 biodiversity target regarding the status and trend of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices (hereafter referred to as TK), as follows.

### *Introduction to Framework for assessing progress towards the 2010 target*

6. At the sixth meeting of the Conference of Parties (COP-6), the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted a Strategic Plan and the 2010 target to significantly reduce the rate of biodiversity loss. The Conference of the Parties adopted, in decision VII/30, a framework for Assessing Progress Towards the 2010 Target covering seven focal areas, goals, targets and the identification of provisional indicators, comprising indicators for immediate testing and possible indicators for development.

7. One of the focal areas identified is to 'protect traditional knowledge, innovations and practices'. Goal 9 of the 2010 Target is to 'Maintain socio-cultural diversity of indigenous and local communities', with two targets and the relevant indicators to be developed by the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions. Target 9.1 is to 'Protect traditional knowledge, innovations and

practices’ and Target 9.2 is to ‘Protect the rights of indigenous and local communities over their traditional knowledge, innovations and practices, including their rights to benefit-sharing’.

8. With regard to traditional knowledge, an indicator on the status and trends in linguistic diversity and speakers of indigenous languages was included as an indicator for immediate testing. Building on this, in paragraph 3 of decision IX 13 H, the Parties recommended that a maximum of two additional indicators on the status of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices should be selected for inclusion in the framework for monitoring the implementation of the 2010 target and requested the Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions at its sixth meeting to continue its work on the identification of a limited number of indicators on the status of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices, for assessing progress towards achieving the Convention's Strategic Plan and the 2010 biodiversity target.

9. Based on work that had been previously carried out, in particular, the regional and international expert workshops organized by the Indigenous Working Group on Indicators (established by the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity) to identify a limited number of meaningful, practical and measurable indicators on the status of traditional knowledge, the Conference of the Parties invited Parties, Governments and relevant organizations, in consultation with indigenous and local communities, to design and, as appropriate, test, indicators at the national level for status and trends of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices, in order to assess progress towards the 2010 biodiversity target, as well as to assess progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

*Overview of the work conducted by the Indigenous Working Group on Indicators, focusing on the International Technical Workshop on Indicators Relevant for Indigenous Peoples held in Baguio City, Philippines, from 17-19 November 2008.*

10. The Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions is requested to continue its work on the identification of a limited number of meaningful, practical and measurable indicators on the status of TK, for assessing progress towards achieving the Convention's Strategic Plan and the 2010 biodiversity target, at its sixth meeting.

11. In a series of regional and thematic workshops held between 2006 and 2008, with generous financial support of the governments of Norway, Spain and Sweden, indigenous peoples’ organizations working with the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) identified core thematic areas for the development of indicators.

12. In late 2008, the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) organized an International Expert Seminar on Indicators Relevant for Indigenous Peoples, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Millennium Development Goals. The Workshop was organized as a follow-up to the series of regional, thematic and international workshops held on indicators under the umbrella of the UNPFII and the Convention on Biological Diversity.

13. The workshop brought together key experts from among indigenous peoples, United Nations organizations, researchers and Governments to share experiences, identify datasets, derive lessons and elaborate methodologies and tools to guide further work on indicators at national, regional and local levels.

14. The Technical Workshop was organized by Tebtebba Foundation and the IIFB’s Working Group on Indicators and co-sponsored by the ILO programme for the promotion of Convention No. 169 and the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, with financial support from the Agencia Española de

Cooperación Internacional. It was held at Camp John Hay, Baguio City, Philippines, from 17 to 19 November 2008.

15. Participants in the Workshop included indigenous peoples' representatives from Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Nepal, the Philippines, the United Republic of Tanzania and the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact; technical experts; representatives of sponsoring international organizations (ILO, SCBD and the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues); and officials of the Governments of Nepal and the Philippines.

16. The participants at this meeting were first divided into sub-working groups and then reports from the sub-working groups were discussed in a plenary session, which broadly supported the recommendations made and identified the next steps forward. It was noted that traditional occupations might be a good entry point for addressing issues affecting indigenous peoples in Africa, who defined themselves by their occupations (hunter-gatherers and pastoralists). It was also noted that the indicators on traditional knowledge needed to be tested in different countries, with indigenous communities helping to develop methodologies.

17. The discussion of the November meeting, focused on two indicators to be proposed for adoption by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in 2010. Further indicators may be proposed for the post-2010 monitoring framework, and eventually for article 10(c) on customary sustainable use. The report of the meeting noted that immediate action on indicators was needed, because the sixth meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j), in November 2009, would discuss and make recommendations on these matters.

18. The Workshop recommended the following:

(a) That the two indicators to be proposed to the Conference of the Parties for adoption should be (i) status and trends of land use in indigenous peoples' territories; and (ii) status and trends in the practice of traditional occupations;

(b) The indicators on traditional occupations should focus on occupations where knowledge of traditional culture and practices may influence the way the work is performed;

(c) A strong gender perspective should be ensured in developing both indicators;

(d) A reference group comprising participants of the workshop should guide further work on these indicators;

(e) The International Labour Organization (ILO), the SCBD and the IIFB should collaborate on finding resources and a consultant who will be assigned the task of refining the description of traditional occupations;

(f) The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) should be asked to collect data on status and trends in land (and water) use in indigenous peoples' territories;

(g) The International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) should be asked to reactivate its work on indicators.

19. The Indigenous Working Group on Indicators (IWGI) also identified the need for further technical discussions on the proposed indicator: "status and trends of land use in indigenous peoples' territories".

20. Considering this ongoing body of work and the urgent need to complete technical discussions, to provide advice to the sixth meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j) on these matters, the Indigenous Working Group on Indicators contacted the Secretariat and members of the IASG and established a partnership to organize and facilitate this current meeting.

### ***B. Plenary presentations***

*OHCHR, Ms. Samia Slimane – Using indicators to promote and monitor the implementation of human rights*

21. The representative from OHCHR gave a presentation on the work on indicators that the Office initiated in 2006 at the request of the Inter-Committee Meeting (ICM) of treaty bodies to help them make use of statistical information in States parties' reports in assessing the implementation of human rights. She explained the process leading to endorsement of a conceptual and methodological framework for identifying indicators for monitoring compliance with international human rights instruments, in order to create a structured and consistent approach for translating universal human rights standards into indicators that are contextually relevant and useful at the country level.

22. She explained that the framework began by identifying a limited number of attributes for each right to facilitate identification of indicators, and opted for using a configuration of structural-process-outcome indicators, reflecting the need to capture a duty-bearer's commitment, efforts and results, respectively. More detailed information on the work of OHCHR on indicators is available at: [www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/indicators/index.htm](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/indicators/index.htm)

23. The representative of OHCHR also referred to the recommendation made by the working group discussing indicators for indigenous well-being at the Philippines International Technical Workshop on Indicators relevant for Indigenous Peoples to, *inter alia*, develop a monitoring framework with structural - process - outcome indicators for the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, endorsing the OHCHR conceptual and methodological framework. She concluded by stressing that the indicators for cross-cutting human rights norms and principles identified by OHCHR, in particular non-discrimination and participation, are of special relevance to the work on indicators for indigenous peoples as these indicators are meant to guide the process of implementing their human rights in general.

*UNESCO Institute for Statistics, Mr. Mauritz, – Briefing on the 2009 UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics (FCS)*

24. The representative of UNESCO's Institute of Statistics provided a briefing on the 2009 draft of the Framework of Cultural Statistics. He introduced the notions of culture cycle ('functions') and domains of culture ('breadth'), and their relationship in the proposed FCS. He explained the suggested indicator structure and discussed the transversal dimensions of traditional and local knowledge, including cultural and natural heritage; performance and celebration; visual arts, crafts and design; books and press; audio-visual and digital media; sports and leisure; as well as intangible heritage.

*UNESCO, Ms. Susanne Schnuttgen and Ms. Fumiko Ohinata – Status and Trends in the Numbers of Speakers of Indigenous Languages and Linguistic Diversity*

25. UNESCO continues to work on the development of the indicator on "status and trends of linguistic diversity and numbers of speakers of indigenous languages". As part of the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership project, supported by the Global Environment Facility, UNESCO has re-evaluated available data on languages and numbers of speakers and decided to focus its efforts on data derived from comparable country censuses. This information will be made available for the third edition of Global Biodiversity Outlook and consequently for the seventh meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions.

*International Labour Organization (ILO), Ms. Birgitte Feiring – Update on traditional occupations/livelihoods and related ILO work*

26. Ms. Feiring of ILO provided an update on relevant work of the ILO related to traditional occupations and livelihoods. She introduced the scope of ILO 107, ILO 169 and Convention 111 that prohibits discrimination against traditional occupations, which is particularly relevant in countries where indigenous peoples are defined by their livelihoods, such as pastoralists and hunter/gatherers in Africa and shifting cultivators in Asia. She also explained the role of the ILO in labour market statistics. Discussed the need to look beyond indicators – monitoring, institutional mechanisms for generating data, methodologies for activating indicators. ILO supervisory mechanisms may be used to monitor implementation of the UN-DRIP.

27. The representative of the ILO also went on to provide advice on the concept of traditional occupations versus livelihoods, and emphasized that the ILO could only work at this stage with the concept of traditional occupations because the concept of livelihoods remains outside of their scope.

*International Land Coalition, Ms. Annalisa Mauro*

28. Ms Mauro of the International Land Coalition (ILC) explained that the organization was created in 1995 during conference organized by IFAD, as a result of the need for access to land for the poor identified as an urgent priority. The ILC was created with the aim of building a multi-stakeholder alliance to uphold the resource rights of poor men and women.

29. In 2009, the ILC has 83 member organizations from IGOs and CSOs, with increasing representation of indigenous peoples. Although the demand for land was originally led by landless farmers, a diverse cliental has emerged. The Secretariat of the ILC is hosted by IFAD in Rome. Its governing structure includes an assembly and council with regional platforms and nodes in Philippines, Kenya and Peru.

30. The ILC mandate focuses on advocacy, dialogue and capacity-building at country, regional and global levels. It also has a Land Reporting Initiative- LRI, launched during ECOSOC in 2004 with the aim of developing one unique land indicator. However different constituents have requested different indicators for different purposes.

31. The LRI initial phase has shown a divide between IGO and CSO interests. There were demands to support land monitoring done by CSO at local and regional level. There were demands to support multiple forms of monitoring rather than one unique model to fit all different needs. ILC also supports an initiative know as Land Watch. IGO members have developed their own indicators. It was noted that UN-HABITAT, WB, IFAD, all have different land indicators.

32. Land monitoring activities can be an important tool for promoting constructive, inclusive and evidence-based dialogue on land governance issues. It can be a tool for empowerment and provides information for well-informed public participation. ILC's approach to land governance is to see it not just as the state's role in administering access to land resources, but as a wider governance process that is a subset of democratic governance. It is how society governs the use of its land resources. Assuming this broader view of land governance, monitoring land issues can be seen as an important part of the land governance process itself.

33. ILC noted the difficult bridge between land governance and land administration. Also ILCs work has shown convergences between gender and indigenous as well as landless issues and demands. In Central America difficulties arose over free trade agreements, whilst in other regions, there are different issues.

*2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, Mr. Tristan Tyrrell*

34. Mr. Tyrrell introduced the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership and the CBD Indicator Suite. He outlined several headline indicators relevant to sustainable land management and land-use change, including: extent of biomes/ecosystems/habitats; coverage of protected areas; areas under sustainable management; and connectivity/fragmentation of ecosystems.

35. He discussed current considerations on post-2010 indicators and reported on a workshop convened by SCBD and UNEP-WCMC in July 2009. Recommendations included: (a) A small set of broad headline indicators, clearly linked to the main target and sub-targets and underscored by more specific sub-indicators/measures; (b) The current framework of global indicators should be modified and simplified into four 'focal areas': Threats to Biodiversity; State of Biodiversity; Ecosystem services, and; Policy responses; (c) Some additional measures on threats to biodiversity, status of diversity, ecosystem extent and condition, ecosystem services and policy responses should be developed; (d) National capacity for framework application, indicator development, data collection and information management should be further developed and properly resourced; (e) Priority must be given to developing a communication strategy for the post-2010 targets and indicators in order to inform policy discussions and ensure effective communication of messages; and (f) A flexible and inclusive process/partnership for post-2010 indicator development should be maintained and adequately resourced.

*Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), Ms. Regina Laub*

#### *1. Focus on Land cover*

36. Ms. Laub gave an overview of FAO's work on land cover and land use. She presented key data bases which are available for land cover (Global Land Cover Network, established in collaboration with FAO and UNEP) and land use data bases, such as Agro-Maps data base. These global data bases may be relevant for the current technical discussions on indicators.

37. She also presented several FAO publications on data bases as well as a GIS database book which examines food insecurity and poverty.

38. She posed some interesting considerations for the participants including; How do you measure change over time? She also explained the Global Land Cover 2000 data base. Globe Cover which is a data base from 2005/2006 with a different resolution, with the newer data bases being much more detailed. She emphasized the need to combine local level information (e.g. well mapped in Philippines) with global level information. This could be the best way to start a collaboration that could deliver the type of results that indigenous and local communities are seeking.

39. Ms. Laub also stressed the need for more and better data about indigenous peoples, including more information about their knowledge on different forms of land use and land management and the importance of not relying only on official statistics. For instance, the reality is that many national censuses don't take indigenous peoples or their different forms of land use into consideration.

40. She also mentioned concern about how global data bases could include indigenous peoples' data. FAO can only collect public information and indigenous people's maps are not always public, official or recognized by States.

#### *2. Country reports*

##### *Philippines*

41. Mr. Navarro, representative of the government of the Philippines, presented on the collection of statistics on indigenous peoples in the Philippines and lessons learned. He explained that data collection was not centralized in the Philippines, as it was in other countries such as Canada. He fully explored

attempts by the Philippines to include information emanating from the census and special surveys of indigenous communities. He also explained that social and economic development plans depend on the results of the surveys and thus the importance of capturing accurate statistics to assist government planning, especially in regards to the distribution of resources and decisions on infra-structure.

42. A national census captures a specified time in a specific territory. Censuses have been conducted since 1903 in the Philippines. In 2010 the Philippines will participate in the world housing survey. Mr Navarro went on to discuss the construction of the census and the process. It was also explained that the populations of indigenous peoples can tend to be understated, as for instance, in the Philippines, in the 2000 census, identification depends on mother tongue. However it is possible to derive a general picture of the demographics of indigenous peoples within a national population. Data from the 2000 census shows that more than half (51%) the indigenous population in the Philippines is under 14 years of age and this was increasingly common amongst many indigenous peoples. 58% percent are employed according to mainstream concepts of employment. Specific studies are able to provide a more accurate micro-picture of indigenous realities. Statistical tools are being developed to measure the rights of indigenous peoples to such things as access to traditional ancestral lands, that take into account both quantitative and qualitative measures. It was noted that translation of questionnaires into indigenous languages would assist in more accurate findings.

43. At the policy level there are some developments including the adoption of a definition for indigenous peoples, drawn from the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act. Ground level initiatives include mapping initiatives – such as poverty mapping and other mapping that looks at the quality of life for indigenous peoples in various areas. The mapping of data provides interesting visual picture of access to rights by indigenous communities. Also participatory mapping helps communities to plan and address their concerns. Mr Navarro finished by mentioning some options for further action include operationalizing surveys, mapping to increase the accuracy of indigenous realities.

44. In discussions which followed, Laetitia Zoebel (UNEP) commented on the recently conducted Kenyan national census, which apparently was quite well done and included questions on ethnicity. However, she also noted that in compiling the data, codes were not provided for minorities, so there is a concern that some indigenous peoples may not have been captured in the results. An indigenous representative from the LAC region further commented that in the LAC region, there are discussions on indicators for indigenous identifiers. This also touched on fluidity of language proficiency.

#### *Nepal*

45. Mr. Balkrishna Mabuhang, Chairperson, Centre for Ethnic and Alternative Development Studies (CEADS), Nepal, presented on the situation of statistics and indicators in Nepal. In Nepal caste and ethnicity were included in the National Censuses, but its population began to publish since 1991. However disaggregated data by Caste/ Ethnicity still lacks in Nepal. In compare to other attributes, caste/ ethnicity reveals poverty gaps most significant. He mentioned that a decade long Maoist insurgency was speeded up when Maoist took over ethnic and other social exclusion issues, such as autonomy and right to self-determination of indigenous peoples, secular state, *Dalit* (untouchables) and women rights, and so on. Re-instated constitutional democratic system of 1991 could not incorporate social and ethnic issues, so that it paved the way for Maoists to flourish in a severe social and economic deprivation. It is also analyzed in a way that the Maoist movement assisted to highlight indigenous people's struggle. In fact, Maoist exploited it under the political and radical strategy against indigenous peoples and communities who were raising it under the social advocacy and right based movement. Nepal is now a secular and republican state against the Hindu Kingdom and there is a new constitution and nation building process that will transform the very unitary Hindu Kingdom into federal democratic republican state. Indigenous peoples and communities are actively working to ensure their accommodation in the new national arrangements. Federalism may be more accommodating for indigenous peoples as they believed that it



provides internal self-determination or self-governance along with ethnic autonomy at the regional and local levels.

46. An appropriate methodology to devise the federal units of Nepal has been under discussion, meanwhile Mr. Mabuhang along with other indigenous peoples experts and communities are arguing that ethnic, linguistic, and historical continuity should be taken as primary indicators to devise the federal and local units. Ethno-linguistic and demographic database also shows a number of feasible regional, and local units located at certain geographic points. As a result, the Constituent Assembly has also taken these factors into consideration Mr. Mabuhang also demonstrated various forms of mapping of the location of ethnic groups and castes which provide a fascinating visual image of the realities of various ethnic groups on the ground.

#### *IFAD*

47. Antonella Cordone (IFAD) presented on the ongoing work, in partnership with the UNPFII, concerning indicators. She also outlined ongoing work on *Support the spread of "good practice" in generating, managing, analysing and communicating spatial information* (mapping exercise) with the Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Co-operation ACP-EU. This project will produce a multilingual, multimedia and modular training kit on "Participatory Spatial Information Management and Communication" composed of a number of "modules."

48. In 2005, a stock-taking was carried out of 300 IFAD funded projects and as a result of this appraisal 85 projects were identified that addressed access to land. Many lessons emerged from this exercise and the results are available in the IFAD policy of land. Policies on land and indigenous peoples arose from the constituency of IFAD including small farmers and indigenous peoples. The policy on indigenous peoples recognizes the principle of free, prior and informed consent and is quite a mile stone for both IFAD and indigenous peoples.

#### *Update by the Coordinator of the Indigenous Working Group on Indicators*

49. Ms. Joji Carino presented on the most recent plans concerning indicators and indigenous peoples, on behalf of the IIFB IWGI. This group is made up of indigenous organizations interested in and working on relevant indicators for indigenous peoples. They have prioritized which indicator processes to participate in and in particular have targeted the UNPFII and CBD processes. Members of the group are also working on specific indicators in the Philippines, India and the Arctic region. Indigenous organizations are being supported to work with national processes to ensure inclusion in the census and the generation of other data and statistics. This group is also an affiliate member of the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership.

50. Ms. Carino went on to discuss post-2010 work in influencing the new strategic plan particularly in relation to the ecosystem approach, and thus is very relevant to the realities of indigenous peoples, who are ecosystem-based.

51. The IIFB Working Group on Indicators has focused its efforts on the UNPFII and CBD and in the future will also prioritize indicators relevant to the UN DRIPs and influencing national processes.

### ***C. Overview of the discussions presented by the Sub-Working Group I and II***

52. On day II the plenary broke into two sub-working groups. Sub-Working Group I would discuss options for a third indicator on land for traditional knowledge and Sub-Working Group II would focus on indicators for indigenous rights and the implementation of the Declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples, and plans for a meeting on indigenous human rights indicators as per the recent recommendation emanating from the 8<sup>th</sup> session of the UNPFII, requesting the IASG facilitate a technical meeting.

*1. Sub-Working Group I - A possible land Indicator for traditional knowledge*

53. Sub-Working Group II discussed the possible 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> indicators for traditional knowledge to complement the first indicator adopted – linguistic diversity and speakers of indigenous languages. Ms. Carino explained the relevant indicators work under the Convention on Biological Diversity to date and future processes that indigenous peoples should try to influence concerning post 2010.

54. Ms. Carino presented the report of the indicators meeting held in November 2008 in the Philippines, which focused on traditional occupations/livelihoods. The group discussed whether traditional occupations could be proposed and whether this fully captured indigenous realities. The ILO explained that using their current structures and processes, it would be difficult to move beyond traditional occupations to include livelihoods which is a different and broader concept.

55. An expert from the Living Planet Index provided advice that a broad overview could be obtained for land cover/use overlaid with indigenous territories. Considering the current lack of data, indigenous territories could be defined by a proxy indicator of traditional languages.

56. An indigenous representative from the LAC region offered some experiences from islands of Bolivia, which divide land into collective and non-collective ownership. Land tenure and land governance were looked upon as useful indicators. She further explained indigenous governance characteristics of indigenous territories, including reciprocity in work and land arrangements.

57. The coordinator of the LAC IWBN reflected upon the situation in Panama. She explained the importance of community mapping which has assisted in defining indigenous territories.

58. The participants discussed whether indigenous languages are helpful for defining indigenous territories and whether an overlay of satellite imaging can assist in achieving an effective indicator. Demarcated indigenous territories may be much smaller in size and therefore not an accurate indication of indigenous territories. However, community mapping may provide a more accurate view of actual indigenous territories.

59. Many participants acknowledge that the Arctic social indicators process selected fate control and the area of land under the control of indigenous peoples or local government (of indigenous peoples) as an accurate indicator.

60. The chairperson inquired what type of indicator can be put forward to accurately capture indigenous realities. National maps of biomes already exist in many places. Overlaid with indigenous territories, these may be able to show an accurate picture of where indigenous peoples can exercise their traditional knowledge.

61. An indigenous representative of the LAC region offered reflections on the situation in Bolivia and in particular on indigenous languages and ethnicity and in particular how indigenous peoples see themselves in contrast to how the government perceives indigenous peoples and their territories. Mr Zent discussed experiences regarding community mapping projects in Venezuela which assisted in land claim processes. The maps included features such as settlements and boundaries, garden areas, natural resources areas, topography, trails and borders. The maps were extremely detailed and also capture sacred sites, burial sites and important resources. Community mapping has become a global trend that can really assist in this current process. Much local information is available but would need to be collected for these purposes to make relevant information available. Top down processes could be complemented by such local information. A global portal to bring this valuable information together could be most useful. An international organization could assist in bringing this information together at the global level.

62. A representative of the Living Planet Index reflected that a global collection of local level maps would be perfect but does not currently exist. Perhaps currently available data could use language mapping as a proxy for indigenous territories. An indigenous representative recommended that a task force be established to bring information from the bottom up to complement global information.

63. The representative from Nepal noted that many States are moving from mono-cultural and monolithic states to multi-ethnic realities and the post 2010 process gives us an opportunity to change mind-sets to new realities. Post 2010 should guide us to common efforts. Visual mapping assist in deeper understanding of on the ground realities. A linguistic world map already exists and this could help convince governments of the do-ability of the proposals. Multi-scale approaches should be advocated and stakeholders should be encouraged to start working on this to bring it all together. Another representative discussed indicators for well-being of indigenous peoples. What emerges as the main element is security of land tenure as the bottom line.

64. The Chairperson noted that well-being for indigenous peoples is connected to land and it must be highlighted and this is what is meant as security of tenure. There is a need to link this to ecosystems and languages. We need to sharpen the actual indicator being proposed. An expert presented on the potential of overlaying various maps of global information or at least national information to arrive at the desired measures.

65. The Chairperson emphasized that forest and land rights could provide opportunities for mapping. There may be many data-sets that could be translated into maps. An ILC representative offered that some areas have maps of collective lands. Also the Forest Peoples Programme (FPP) representative offered that overlaying maps of linguistic, biological and cultural diversity shows areas of convergence. Maps of threats to indigenous peoples' territories are already in existence in some areas. Maps showing mining concessions, protected areas and indigenous territories already exists for some areas.

66. The ILO suggested it may be best to work with established definitions, including languages. In Africa, the indicative list which came out of the African Commissions work should be used (study of 24 countries).

67. The Chairperson asked Sub-Working Group I to focus on the recommendations which should come out of this workshop to assist in identifying the two additional indicators that will be recommended at the sixth meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j), including issues of land cover, use, land rights governance, demarcation, and tenure as status indicators. Also potential indicators for article 10(c) were considered.

68. Mr. Stanford Zent, an expert from the LAC region, to assist the group in focusing on specific recommendations, presented on a Venezuelan experience in developing indicators which directly measure TK retention. The expert from Venezuela further discussed his project which aimed directly at producing an indicator directly related to TK itself and could show changes over time. The tools being designed are based on local community methodologies, which attempt to address the problem from the bottom up. This also is in line with the characteristics of possible indicators adopted by the Convention on Biological Diversity. The methodology relies on sampling for an efficient process. After obtaining FPIC and cooperation from the participating communities, it involves two major steps: a) construction of a data-register and b) application of a test instrument for rating individual knowledge. The first step starts with a list of predetermined topics (cosmopolitan list: for example, plants, animals, soils, subsistence tasks, etc.) which are then tested for local confirmation (relevant areas of knowledge for these people). It is simply a preliminary guide, which can be added to or subtracted from. He stressed the importance of semantic domain – principle categories of items that local people decide are important, based on local experts and should be gender sensitive, to arrive at an arbitrary list of up to 100 plants/animals/etc. In the second step, items are selected for testing and applied to a random sample of local subjects covering at least three

generations. There are three measures including: intergenerational rate of retention, accumulative rate of retention, and annual rate of change. This test attempts to measure vitality of TK as expressed by the rate of retention vs. change of knowledge across generations.

69. This can assist communities by raising awareness and in communicating these issues to outside entities (for funding, support, etc.). Periodic assessment (5 or 10 years) would show a good picture and would also measure the success of measures put in place to retain TK. This process also helps to explore causes of knowledge loss. Pilot studies could assist in knowing the practicality of such a tool. This tool is a direct measure of TK at the community level. It could be applied in a sampling of communities – and combined with the first language indicator.

70. Mr. Jonathon Loh, the expert from the Living Planet Index provided an overview of the index of linguistic diversity. The ILO noted some problems with this approach in conceptual and activity (practice) based knowledge. However, Mr. Loh emphasized that this measures environmental knowledge and could it be adapted to other forms of cultural expressions.

71. Ms. Carino emphasized the need to focus on the direct contribution of our discussions to a global indicator. This was supported by the indigenous representative from Bolivia who reinforced the need for a land indicator and noted that perhaps sub-indicators could be attached. Ms. Carino noted that the meeting should confirm that the two additional indicators will be traditional occupations and land. Under a land indicator it may take into account sub-indicators include tenure, use, access and others of relevance. Many countries have data on indigenous territories and some have demarcated it. A land indicator could embrace a parcel of relevant sub-indicators.

72. The expert from Nepal clarified whether that the meeting is seeking to dealing with the current or the post 2010 process and whether the two processes can be connected. He noted that without delimiting regional or local territory based on ancestral domain/ present occupation, or security of tenure indigenous and local communities will loose TK. The major question is where IPs and local communities do preserve and promote their traditional and indigenous knowledge in a rapid encroachment of alien population and species. IPs and local communities are losing their control over land. He emphasized that the land indicator should be linked to governance and local management and the policy aspect is the most important in operationalising the land indicator. Mr. Mabuhang recommended that in order to reduce the rapid loss of existing biodiversity, IPs and local communities' entitlement over land within their territories should be ensured by delimiting the area under the larger territorial integrity

73. The representative of the ILO clarified that the indicator on traditional occupations and livelihoods should be reflected as traditional occupations, otherwise it would fall outside of the scope of the ILO and thus ILO would have a great deal of difficulty in identifying and collecting statistics.

74. The International Land Coalition (ILC) noted that status in trends in land access, use and control of the territories of indigenous peoples' and local communities' may be a suitable proposal. It was noted that the Arctic Social Indicators (ASI) project had recommended the percentage of surface lands legally controlled by the inhabitants through public governments and Native corporations as an indicator under fate control.

75. The representative of the FAO discussed the availability of data-bases and training but further commitment would need to be negotiated. At this time FAO remains committed to free access of information that may assist this work.

76. The Chairperson, Ms. Joji Carino noted that a coordinating body is needed to put relevant information together.

77. The ILO representative noted that three indicators must be looked at together for a holistic view. A structure related indicator such as land governance would assist the other impact indicators to provide a holistic picture of status and trends in TK. The IFAD representative noted that it is not well positioned with respect to land issue competencies and that the International Land Coalition (ILC) may be better positioned to assist. However, the representative of the ILC emphasized that the ILC remains new to the process and small in comparative terms with other institutions but certainly ILC can contribute with its land monitoring expertise and experiences. All three agencies are committed to collaborate. IUCN could also be a partner.

78. It was noted that the Arctic Working Group on Indicators had recommended the percentage of land under the control of indigenous or local authorities. The Chairperson finished by emphasizing that we need to be clear about what are the indicators that will be proposed in this process. .

2. *Sub-Working Group II - Indicators for indigenous peoples well-being – human rights and the UNDRIP*

79. Sub-Working Group I, discussed indicators for indigenous rights, well being and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). Participants believed there was a need to go beyond indicators to establish a clear monitoring framework for the UNDRIP. Participants further noted that ILO 169 and UNDRIP are compatible and mutually reinforcing standards. OHCHR has proposed a structured framework of structural-process-outcome indicators, which could form a basis for identifying indicators relevant to monitor the implementation of both the UNDRIP and ILO 169. The Human Rights treaty bodies would more easily integrate the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People if a consistent approach is adopted. ILO 169 also has a supervisory body which can also assist. OHCHR and the ILO proposed to organize a side event, hosted by UNEP, at the 2010 UNPFII session to discuss further and inviting all relevant UN partners, including the IIFB Working Group on Indicators, the UNPFII members and all interested indigenous representatives.

80. The chairperson drew attention to the Arctic Indicators process which has proposed as an indicator for fate control the percentage of surface lands legally controlled by the local inhabitants through public governments and native corporations.

81. The indigenous representative from Bolivia expressed doubts about adapting this particular wording and proposed percentage of lands controlled by governments and companies may be a better measure of land not under indigenous control. Other areas may consider lands under indigenous governance. The participants were also reminded that the final recommendation must be accepted by Parties as part of the CBD strategic plan.

**D. *Summary of main discussion points arising from the discussions***

(a) Changes in status and trends in land use are closely associated with traditional occupations and livelihoods and there may be a need to consider another option, such as “presence and effectiveness of laws, policies and programmes for the respect, preservation and promotion<sup>1</sup> of traditional knowledge”. A focus on land governance as an indicator could make the two proposed indicators more distinct;

(b) Should a land indicator be retained, the following should be considered land conversion, degradation, change in land title/legal recognition, restitution, rehabilitation, areas of traditional territories, surface areas legally recognized, areas currently occupied, community conserved areas and indigenous protected areas;

---

<sup>1</sup> With the prior informed consent of the knowledge holders.

- (c) Consideration of land issues related to TK should focus on access and use;
- (d) Land access and use is central as a possible indicator on status and trends in changing land use. Land security is also important. The quality of lands returned may also be a consideration;
- (e) Legal title and types of land title are important consideration, including policies to privatize collective lands of ILCs;
- (f) Land governance is a diverse and complex issue on a global level and may be politically difficult;
- (g) ILCs have certain traditional social organization that regulate and distribute access and use of lands and waters;
- (h) Indicators should capture enjoyment of rights to ancestral domains (to lands and waters);
- (i) Increasing commercial pressures on land in developing and transition countries pose threats to poor land users, particularly where their customary tenure of land resources is not recognized by statute. The emergence of large-scale international land acquisitions, or “land grabbing”, as a pressing international concern has generated a set on new data on land availability, this information is often restrictedly used and is not accessible by the public opinion;
- (j) A conceptual and methodological framework is needed to monitor compliance with treaty obligations and the enjoyment of substantive rights;
- (k) Adopted indicators may have multiple uses for CBD, ILO, UNPFII and OHCHR, particularly regarding the implementation of the UN DRIPS;
- (l) Global efforts should be complemented by “ground truthing”, including community initiatives such as participatory community mapping;
- (m) Efforts should focus on compiling and analysis existing data, where possible. Generate primary land data, globally comparable, could be a real challenge for a small organization;
- (n) Visual indicators of land could be considered such as satellite imaging which is also a way of monitoring land degradation. Some studies have shown that restitution of traditional lands can decrease land degradation;
- (o) Information on land availability may be confidential;
- (p) Land based indicators are likely composed of multiple data sets;
- (q) If data efforts depart from existing data sets generating primary and/or new data is time consuming. Efforts should focus on compiling and analysis existing data, where possible;
- (r) Land satellite imaging exists from 1975 to present and is being used for measuring other indicators (fragmentation of ecosystems) but the resolution may not be sufficient for the purposes of tracking changes on ILC territories;
- (s) The CBD recognizes TK of ILCs therefore it is relevant for all Parties;
- (t) Land issues should be further explored including access, use and control rights. By examining land cover it may be possible to map changes in land cover and overlay this map with demarcated indigenous territories;
- (u) Current land classification systems do not adequately capture indigenous territories;

(v) Much local and sub-nation information already exists and needs to be brought together and could be combined with global data to provide a picture of trends and status on indigenous lands and waters. A sampling strategy may be a useful methodology;

(w) Consideration of land issues related to TK should focus on access and use;

(x) Land access and use is central as a possible indicator on status and trends in changing land use. Land security is also important. The quality of lands returned may also be a consideration;

(y) Legal title and types of land title are important consideration, including policies to privatize collective lands of ILCs;

(z) Land governance is diverse and complex on a global level;

(aa) ILCs have certain traditional social organization that regulate and distribute access and use of lands and waters;

(bb) Indicators should capture enjoyment of rights to ancestral domain (to lands and waters);

(cc) A conceptual and methodological framework is needed to monitor compliance with treaty obligations and the enjoyment of substantive rights;

(dd) Adopted indicators may have multiple used for CBD, ILO, UNPFII and OHCHR, particularly regarding the implementation of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People;

(ee) Global efforts should be complemented by “ground proofing”, including community initiatives such as participatory community mapping;

(ff) Visual indicators of land could be considered such as satellite imaging which is also a way of monitoring land degradation. Some studies have shown than return of traditional lands can decrease land degradation;

(gg) Information on land availability may be confidential;

(hh) Land based indicators are likely composed of multiple data sets;

(ii) If data efforts depart from existing data sets generating primary and/or new data is time consuming. Efforts should focus on compiling and analysis existing data;

(jj) Land satellite imaging exists from 1975 to present and is being used for measuring other indicators (fragmentation of ecosystems) but the resolution may not be sufficient for these purposes;

(kk) Traditional knowledge should not be seen as an indigenous issue only as this may ghettoise traditional knowledge. Hence local communities must also been considered for a more holistic approach. If TK is to be valued as a vital component of ecosystem management, this is necessary;

(ll) Land issues should be further explored including land coverage, land access and use and land rights. By examining land cover it may be possible to map changes in land cover and overlay this map with demarcated indigenous territories;

(mm) Current land classification systems do not capture indigenous territories;

(nn) Much local and sub-nation information already exists and needs to be brought together and could be combined with global data to provide a picture of trends and status on indigenous lands and waters. A sampling strategy may be a useful methodology.

***E. Recommendations***

*The following recommendations were adopted by consensus at 2 pm on Saturday, 3 October, and the meeting concluded.*

*Welcomes* the proposed UNESCO technical workshop cultural/linguistic indicators,

*Requests* UNESCO to ensure the effective participation of IPs and LCs,

Regarding indicators work under the auspices of the Convention on Biological Diversity recommends:

1. That a land indicator should take into consideration access, use, management, governance, control, the role of traditional authorities and customary law in land management, land conversion, degradation, change in land title/legal recognition, restitution, rehabilitation, areas of traditional territories, surface areas legally recognized, areas currently occupied, community conserved areas and indigenous protected areas.

2. The land indicator is a useful and practical indicator for inclusion in the proposed post-2010 framework as an effective indicator for ecosystem resilience, human well-being, and local sustainable development.

3. That a partnership of relevant agencies and indigenous peoples and local communities should be established to guide the process, also bearing in mind the implementation of Article 10(c).

4. Draft recommendations 1(a) and (b) of the analysis of the information available on proposed indicators (UNEP/CBD/WG8J/6/2/Add.4/Rev.1) for the sixth meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j) be revised to read:

(a) Status and trends in land-use patterns in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities;

(b) Status and trends in the practice of traditional occupations.



*Annex*

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

**A. *United Nations Agencies***

1. UNPFII

Lars Anders-Baer (Member for the Arctic)

2. SPFII

Sonia Smallacombe

[smallacombe@un.org](mailto:smallacombe@un.org)

3. UNU TK Initiative

Kirsty Mclean

[kirsty.mclean@gmail.com](mailto:kirsty.mclean@gmail.com)

4. FAO

Regina Laub

[Regina.Laub@fao.org](mailto:Regina.Laub@fao.org)

5. OHCHR

Samia Slimane

[sslimane@ohchr.org](mailto:sslimane@ohchr.org)

6. IFAD

Antonella Cordone

[a.cordone@ifad.org](mailto:a.cordone@ifad.org)

7. UNEP

Laetitia Zobel

[Laetitia.Zobel@unep.org](mailto:Laetitia.Zobel@unep.org)

8. Annalisa Mauro

[l.mauro@landcoalition.org](mailto:l.mauro@landcoalition.org)

Mobile: +39 347 6058902

<http://www.landcoalition.org/>

International Land Coalition Secretariat

8. UNEP-WCMC & 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership

Tristan Tyrrell

[Tristan.Tyrrell@unep-wcmc.org](mailto:Tristan.Tyrrell@unep-wcmc.org)

[www.twentyten.net](http://www.twentyten.net)

9. UNHABITAT

Christophe Lalande

[Christophe.Lalande@unhabitat.org](mailto:Christophe.Lalande@unhabitat.org)

10. UNEP/GRID-Arendal

Kathrine Ivsett Johnsen

[Kathrine.Johnsen@grida.no](mailto:Kathrine.Johnsen@grida.no)

mobile: +4741234581

11. ILO

Birgitte Feiring

[feiring@ilo.org](mailto:feiring@ilo.org)

13. Balkrishna Mabuhang

Chairperson, Centre for Ethnic and Alternative Development Studies (CEADS)

Nepal

[hangmu2003@yahoo.com](mailto:hangmu2003@yahoo.com)

[ceads.nepal@gmail.com](mailto:ceads.nepal@gmail.com)

14. Jonathan Loh Living Planet

[jonathan@livingplanet.org.uk](mailto:jonathan@livingplanet.org.uk)

15. Mr. Benjamin Arsenio Y. Navarro,

Philippines Government

Regional Head, National Statistical Coordination Board-CAR,

Baguio City, Philippines

[bynavarro@yahoo.com](mailto:bynavarro@yahoo.com)

***B. Nominations from the Indigenous Working Group on Indicators***

16. Dr. Stanford Zent

Instituto Venezolano de Investigaciones Cientificas

Caracas, Venezuela

Tel. (58-2) 504 1048 or 504 1227

Fax (58-2) 504 1035

Email

[srzent@gmail.com](mailto:srzent@gmail.com)

17. Maria Eugenia Choque Quispe

Centro de Estudios Multidisciplinarios Aymara

Red Internacional de Mujeres sobre Biodiversidad

Teléfono y fax: 591 2 2 223766

Celular: 73589651

La Paz, Bolivia

[choque17@hotmail.com](mailto:choque17@hotmail.com)

18. Florina Lopez

Chairperson of the Indigenous Women's Biodiversity Network

LAC region

[florina.lopez@gmail.com](mailto:florina.lopez@gmail.com), [kuna\\_09@hotmail.com](mailto:kuna_09@hotmail.com)

19. Joji Carino

Coordinator, IIFB Working Group on Indicators

Tebtebba Foundation

1 Roman Ayson Road

2600 Baguio City

Philippines

[tongtong@gn.apc.org](mailto:tongtong@gn.apc.org)

[www.tebtebba.org](http://www.tebtebba.org)

20. Helen Valdez

Tebtebba Foundation  
1 Roman Ayson Road  
2600 Baguio City  
Philippines  
[cbdipproject@tebtebba.org](mailto:cbdipproject@tebtebba.org)

21. Maurizio Farhan  
Forest Peoples Programme  
1c Fossey Business Centre  
Stratford Road  
Moreton-in-Marsh  
GL56 9NQ, England  
[maurizio@forestpeoples.org](mailto:maurizio@forestpeoples.org)  
[www.forestpeoples.org](http://www.forestpeoples.org)

22. Lucy Mullenkei  
Executive Director  
Indigenous Information Network  
Lower Hill Duplex Apartment (Apt No. 28)  
Upperhill Road/ Lowerhill Road  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Email: [iin@iin.co.ke](mailto:iin@iin.co.ke)  
[www.indigenous-info-kenya.org](http://www.indigenous-info-kenya.org)

-----