



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/WG8J/10/5
24 November 2017

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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

Tenth meeting

Montreal, Canada, 13-16 December 2017

Item 6 of the provisional agenda*

ELEMENTS OF METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE FOR IDENTIFYING, MONITORING, AND ASSESSING THE CONTRIBUTION OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES TO THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BIODIVERSITY 2011-2020 AND THE AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

Note by the Executive Secretary

INTRODUCTION

1. In paragraph 29 of [decision XII/3](#) on resource mobilization, the Conference of the Parties recognized, in the financial reporting framework, “the role of collective action, including by indigenous and local communities, and non-market-based approaches for mobilizing resources for achieving the objectives of the Convention, including approaches such as community-based natural resource management, shared governance or joint management of protected areas, or through indigenous and community conserved territories and areas”, and decided that activities that encourage and support such approaches should be integrated into reporting under the Convention.
2. In paragraph 30 of the same decision, the Conference of the Parties recognized the importance of advancing methodologies for evaluating the contribution of collective action, and invited Parties, other Governments, and relevant stakeholder organizations to consider taking steps for development of such methodologies, such as pilot projects and exchange of experiences.
3. In paragraph 18 of [decision XIII/20](#) on resource mobilization, the Conference of the Parties welcomed the guiding principles on assessing the contribution of collective action by indigenous peoples and local communities, contained in the annex to the decision, and, in paragraph 21, requested the Executive Secretary to compile and analyse the information on collective action received by Parties through the financial reporting framework and other relevant sources. Accordingly, the Executive Secretary has issued a document entitled “Compilation of views on resource mobilization: Assessing the contribution of collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities and safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms” ([CBD/WG8J/10/INF/10](#)), which is based on submissions received from Parties and other organizations. Additionally, with regard to submissions made through the financial reporting framework, the Executive Secretary issued, for the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the

* [CBD/WG8J/10/1](#).

Parties, a summary of information received on assessment of the role of collective action, in (see [UNEP/CBD/COP/13/11/Rev.1](#), paras 25-26).¹

4. In decision XIII/20, paragraph 21, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to “develop elements of methodological guidance for identifying, monitoring, and assessing the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities to the achievement of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets”, taking into account, inter alia, the guiding principles for consideration by the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions at its tenth meeting and with a view to finalizing the methodological guidance at the second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and adopting it at the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

5. The present document is issued in response to these requests. Section I provides an analysis of the submissions received on assessing the contribution of collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities for the achievement of the objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Section II provides an overview of elements of methodological guidance in existing frameworks. Section III presents possible elements of methodological guidance elaborated on the basis of sections I and II. Finally, building on proposals made in section III, section IV suggests a draft recommendation for the consideration of the Working Group. An indicative, non-exhaustive list of methodological elements, related to the draft recommendation, is contained in annex I.

I. OVERVIEW OF SUBMISSIONS ON ASSESSING THE CONTRIBUTION OF COLLECTIVE ACTIONS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

6. Six submissions were received from Parties and seven submissions from relevant organizations² with information about national activities and other experiences relevant to the collective action by indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms.

A. Submissions from Parties

7. The submissions from Parties highlight the important role that collective action by indigenous peoples and local communities plays in achieving the objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in their respective countries, and provide information on how their pilot activities help draw lessons on elements that potentially contribute to a methodological framework for assessing such contributions.

8. An important pilot activity to advance collective action in Brazil is the Global Environment Facility-financed project for supporting implementation of the Brazilian National Policy on Territorial and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands (PNGATI), which promotes the social inclusion of indigenous peoples and the participation of their organizations in the development of public policies. Four key elements of this experience are identified as building blocks of collective action by indigenous peoples: (a) Development of financial mechanisms and tools for management and monitoring; (b) Consolidation of an indigenous network for sharing experiences; (c) Self-identification of areas

¹ A total of 61 Parties provided information on whether they assessed the role of collective action, including by indigenous and local communities, and non-market approaches for mobilizing resources for achieving the objectives of the Convention. A total of 18 Parties indicated that no such assessment was necessary while 37 had not yet started and 6 reported that some assessments had been undertaken. No country indicated that comprehensive assessments had been undertaken.

² Brazil; Canada; European Union and its Member States together with a national contribution from Sweden; Mexico; Peru and Venezuela. Submissions were also received from the following relevant organizations: Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority of Australia; Forest Peoples Programme (FPP) and International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) member organizations; Global Forest Coalition/Community Conservation Resilience Initiative; ICCA Consortium; Stockholm Resilience Centre; and Indigenous Women’s Network on Biodiversity from Latin America and the Caribbean (RMIB-LAC).

requiring priority interventions of protection, recovery and sustainable forest use; (d) Participation of indigenous peoples in competent policy and management forums and entities.

9. In Canada, in the context of the 19-target national framework to support the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets, the Government launched in 2016 the “Pathway to Canada Target 1”, a multi-stakeholder and collaborative platform that brings together all levels of government, indigenous peoples, communities and other stakeholders to work together to achieve the national protected areas target. Indigenous peoples are actively participants and contribute their traditional knowledge and wisdom. One of the key topics of work is the development of recommendations for establishing and recognizing indigenous and community conserved areas (ICCAs) by an Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE). Recognition of indigenous rights, respect, cooperation and partnership with indigenous peoples across Canada are identified as key conditions for advancing the collective action represented by the Pathway.

10. Sweden has been actively supporting the development of a collective action framework through various activities that have earlier been reported to the Conference of the Parties.³ Based on such activities and following deliberations and decisions of the Conference of the Parties, Sweden strongly supports the engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities and the application of the guiding principles on assessing the contribution of collective action by indigenous peoples and local communities,⁴ as well as consideration of the proposed methods presented therein. Sweden highlights the importance of qualitative methods for collective action reporting, as they favour the recognition of the qualitative values of community conservation. A relevant pilot activity is the assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services in coastal ecosystems and some associated wetlands implemented for IPBES; in the Kalix Archipelago, local communities practising artisanal fishing are developing monitoring systems based on mobilization of their traditional knowledge. Similar experiences have been supported by Sweden in pilot cases for revival and mobilization of traditional knowledge in Ethiopia, Kenya, the Philippines and Thailand.

11. Mexico describes important examples of collective action by indigenous peoples and local communities on substantive topics on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity implemented in 15 protected areas in 2016, with assistance from the National Commission for the Development of Indigenous Peoples. Such actions are recognized as direct contributors to the achievement of the objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets.

12. In Venezuela, a relevant pilot project on collective action, referred to as Siembra, supports indigenous peoples to strengthen their practices of biodiversity-friendly food production.

B. Submission from relevant organizations

13. Submissions from relevant organizations provide further information on specific cases of collective action by indigenous peoples and local communities, and on methodological approaches used in guiding principles.

14. The [Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority of Australia](#), through its Land and Sea Country Partnerships Programme, delivers funding to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to support their collective actions of managing and caring for their sea country, and to support sustainable use through “Traditional use of marine resources” agreements, which describe how each group will manage their marine resources and their roles in compliance activities and monitoring environmental conditions. The Government also designs and delivers specialized training to indigenous rangers.

³ See [CBD/COP/12/13/Add.5/Rev.1](#) and [CBD/SBI/1/INF/6](#).

⁴ [Decision XIII/20](#), annex.

15. The [Forest Peoples Programme](#) (FPP) and IIFB member organizations reported about a pilot project of llama (*Lama glama*) breeding by indigenous communities, given its importance for livelihoods and culture. Communities maintain a range of traditional practices that are, in essence, collective actions embodying the use of indigenous knowledge in the sustainable use of biodiversity for livelihoods.

16. The Community Conservation Resilience Initiative, coordinated by the [Global Forest Coalition](#), has undertaken to document and review community-level participatory approaches of community conservation initiatives in 22 countries in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America, which has resulted in a guiding methodology and toolkit. CCRI recommends five cross-cutting standards derived from its methodology: (a) respect for the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, including the right to free, prior and informed consent; (b) indigenous and community ownership; (c) adaptive facilitation; (d) participation and representation; and (e) recognition of gender-differentiated roles in collective action.

17. The [ICCA Consortium](#) shared information about the Global Support Initiative for ICCAs (GSI), which provides support to ICCAs and related networks in 26 countries. It has produced a document entitled “[Self-Strengthening ICCAs: Guidance on a process and resources for custodian indigenous peoples and local communities](#)” which, among various aspects of guidance, recommends five elements as “building blocks” of an effective ICCA: (a) the integrity and strength of the custodian community; (b) the connection between the community and its territory; (c) the functioning of the governance institution; (d) the territory’s conservation status; and (e) the livelihoods and well-being of the community.

18. The Indigenous Women’s Network on Biodiversity from Latin America and the Caribbean (Red de Mujeres Indígenas sobre Biodiversidad de América Latina y el Caribe) highlights the importance of understanding how indigenous knowledge and wisdom as part of collective action are generated and transmitted, and how they support decision-making and the functioning of traditional institutions. The Network also recommends plurality and complementarity of methodologies, as well as recognition of value systems.

C. Conclusions

19. The views from Parties and relevant organizations indicate that there are some commonalities in assessing the collective action by indigenous peoples and local communities, in achieving the objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. First of all, there is confirmation that the collective action of indigenous peoples and local communities is relevant for the three objectives of the Convention and for achieving the objectives of the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, as per the guiding principle 1, “importance of collective action” described in decision XIII/20, appendix.

20. Following this recognition of the value of collective action of indigenous peoples and local communities, several submissions present examples and models of activities that are implemented nationally and locally in support of collective action, including the provision of financial resources and various forms of technical support. Important elements of the approaches described for enhancing the impact of collective action are: (a) the recognition of traditional knowledge and practices as key components of community-based conservation; (b) the recognition that value systems linked to the communities’ cultures for conservation and sustainable use need to be understood and supported; (c) the need for exchange platforms and knowledge sharing; and (d) the importance of creating opportunities for policy linkages and direct involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in policy processes.

21. A fundamental consideration that runs through the submissions is that the needs and interests of indigenous peoples and local communities related to their livelihoods and cultures should be integral to the assessment of their contributions because indigenous peoples and local communities often have their own ways of conserving and sustainably using biodiversity in close connection with their holistic approaches.

This concept is linked, in particular, to guiding principles 2 (context specificity) and 3 (multiplicity of values) of decision XIII/20.

22. The importance of qualitative methods has been highlighted in some submissions, given precisely the need to recognize the multiplicity of values and the plurality and complementarity of methodologies, as per principle 4, on “Methodological pluralism and complementarity”. Qualitative methods also allow for the recognition of the specificity of contexts and knowledge systems.

23. In order for collective action (as referred to in decision XII/3, paragraph 29) to be effective in contributing to the objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and community resilience, attention must be paid to the rights regimes of indigenous peoples and local communities surrounding their traditional territories (lands and waters) and natural resources. This point has been reiterated in several submissions. Security of rights brings community ownership and facilitates commitment to partnerships and joint conservation actions.

24. Finally, most submissions highlight procedural aspects of collective action, notably the need for opportunities and mechanisms for participation, including in policy processes, and respecting free, prior and informed consent or approval by indigenous peoples and local communities for actions that are relevant to their role in conservation and sustainable use.

II. OVERVIEW OF ELEMENTS OF METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE

25. The appendix to decision XIII/20 identifies some sources of methodological guidance that could usefully be explored in order to advance the development of elements of methodological guidance for identifying, monitoring, and assessing the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities to the achievement of the objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, namely:

- (a) The Conceptual and Methodological Framework for Evaluating the Contribution of Collective Action to Biodiversity Conservation, developed by the Government of Bolivia with the support of the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization (ACTO);
- (b) The multiple evidence base approach;
- (c) Community-based monitoring and information systems (CBMIS);
- (d) The tools and methods of the ICCA Consortium.

26. Apart from the four indicative sources identified in decision XIII/20, many other approaches have been developed that are relevant to the collective action of indigenous peoples and local communities for conservation and sustainable use. However, most of the approaches seem to focus on the conditions and elements for the establishment and functioning of modalities of collective action and not necessarily on assessing its contributions.

27. A common feature of methodological approaches is that they identify and propose sets of principles that relate to policies and theories of change, much in the sense of the guiding principles of decision XIII/20. It seems safe to state that any new developments in constructing methodologies for assessing the contributions of collective action need to be based on a sound, well grounded and broadly accepted set of principles.

28. Regarding methodological elements, there is a wide range of views, which in many aspects relate to specific contexts and needs. This aspect of assessments is connected, to a significant extent, to the work on indicators for the Aichi Targets as they relate to indigenous peoples and local communities, where the need for a layered system of indicators has been identified, with a higher level of aggregate indicators and other nested indicators that descend to context-specific indicators. Indigenous peoples and local

communities, working together with several institutions, have done substantial work in identifying and developing culture-relevant indicators of conservation and sustainable use, which speak directly to the topic of assessing their collective contributions to the achievement of the objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. However, as noted above, this is work in progress, and new developments in the indicator frameworks should complement and support approaches to assessing the contributions of collective action by indigenous peoples and local communities.

29. Similarly, there is important work in progress, of relevance to the assessment of collective action taking place in the context of IPBES on matters related to approaches for working with indigenous and local knowledge and understanding the multiple values of nature. The fifth Plenary of IPBES, held in March 2017, adopted an “Approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge”⁵ which provides valuable elements regarding concepts, best practices and guiding questions for assessments. However, as the Approach was only recently adopted, its application is in the early stages.

30. The following subsection compiles and systematizes the principles and methodological elements offered from various relevant sources.

A. Guiding principles

31. The sources listed in the appendix to decision XIII/20 and other relevant approaches identify a number of principles that inform and guide their development and application or that have been proposed by other experiences. The table below presents a non-exhaustive list of the sets of principles per source:

Source	Principles
Community Conservation Resilience Initiative (CCRI) ⁶	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respect for and realization of the rights of IPLC, including FPIC regarding activities that take place on their lands and territories - Indigenous and community ownership: processes and outcomes of collective action assessments should be driven and created by indigenous peoples and local communities - Adaptive facilitation: facilitation of collective action assessments requires respect, reciprocity, equity, sensitivity, flexibility, trust, and adaptability - Participation and representation: meaningful and culturally appropriate participation of representatives of all social groups (children, youth, women, men, elders, people with disabilities or illnesses, ethnic minorities, etc.) in collective action assessments - Women and gender: since women and men have different roles, community assessments of collective action should integrate a gender “lens” or “dimension” to better understand, accommodate and support such roles
Multiple Evidence Base approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indigenous, local, and scientific knowledge systems are different manifestations of equally valid and useful knowledge systems which generate complementary evidence for interpreting conditions, change, trajectories, and causal relationships relevant to the sustainable governance of ecosystems and biodiversity. It is not about “translating knowledge into

⁵ See the [report of the Plenary on the work of its fifth session \(IPBES/5/15\)](#), annex, decision IPBES-5/1, annex II, 11 April 2017.

⁶ [CBD/WG8J/10/INF/10](#).

Source	Principles
	<p>science”, but making knowledge systems work together, or engaging with diverse knowledge systems⁷ for the best knowledge base</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognize incommensurability of diverse knowledge systems and the often asymmetric power issues arising when connecting different branches of science with locally-based knowledge systems⁸ - Ensure that holders of knowledge obtain meaningful outcomes from the process, in relation to their livelihood realities⁹ - Participation based on free, prior and informed consent - Legitimacy, credibility, transparency, reciprocity, usefulness for all involved, trust and equity as key principles of assessments, supported by the use of available ethical codes of conduct
Panajachel Workshop ¹⁰	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cooperation – actively working together, seeking to find benefits for the collective group, not just for the individual. Unity and interdependence are valued more than the differences between people - Long-term vision – commitment to the process and the group, respect for culture, traditional institutions and customary law - Voluntary, not coerced, supporting a spirit of solidarity and empathy - Beneficial and rewarding in itself - Women play an important role in collective action and in maintaining and promoting community values such as solidarity, reciprocity, taking care of each other - Ownership: who is the assessment and evaluation for? By whom is it being done? How? What will be the ultimate outcome of the assessments of collective action for the local community systems and ecosystems?
CBMIS – Community-based monitoring and information systems ¹¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rights to lands, territories and resources are respected, protected and fulfilled - Free, prior and informed consent - Respect, preserve, maintain traditional knowledge, innovations and practices - Ensure security of traditional occupations and livelihoods - Customary governance - Benefit-sharing - Gender and intergenerational dimension: ensure full and effective participation of women, youth and elders in all phases

⁷ Tengö et al., 2013. The Multiple Evidence Base as a framework for connecting diverse knowledge systems in the IPBES. Discussion paper 2012-06-04. Stockholm Resilience Centre (SRC), Stockholm University, Sweden.

⁸ Tengö et al., 2017. Weaving Knowledge Systems in IPBES, CBD and beyond – lessons learned for sustainability. In: *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 2017, 26:17-25.

⁹ Nordic Council of Ministers/ Schultz et al., 2016. Framing a Nordic IPBES-like Assessment. Introductory Study including Scoping for a Nordic Assessment of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, based on IPBES methods and procedures.

¹⁰ Edgar Selvin Pérez and Maria Schultz, 2015. Co-chairs' summary, Dialogue Workshop on Assessment of Collective Action in Biodiversity Conservation, Panajachel, Guatemala, 11-13 June 2015 (see [UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/19/INF/21](#)).

¹¹ Tebtebba Foundation, 2013. Developing and Implementing Community-Based Monitoring and Information Systems: The Global Workshop and the Philippine Workshop Reports. Baguio City, Philippines.

Source	Principles
Bolivia and ACTO Conceptual And Methodological Framework For Evaluating The Contribution Of Collective Action To Biodiversity Conservation ¹²	<p>Principles of design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly defined physical and social boundaries - Congruence between local conditions, appropriation, and provision rules - Adaptability of collective choice arrangements - Appropriate monitoring - Graduated and implementable sanctions - Mechanisms for conflict resolution - Recognized rights to organize - Nesting of local into higher-level institutional arrangements
ICCA Consortium ¹³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respect and support the custodian communities' self-determination - Accompany and support custodian communities to achieve what they wish to achieve and be what they wish to be - Recognize and respect community knowledge and capacity - Take all possible precautions to avoid doing harm - Ensure culturally and contextually respectful and accessible activities - Recognize and respect local governance systems and ways of knowing and working - Ensure meaningful comprehensible language and terminology - Ensure accurate documentation, with FPIC and confidentiality as desired
Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) ⁵	<p>Best practices to be respected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Build mutual trust and confidence between indigenous and local knowledge holders and natural and social scientists through cultural respect and sensitivity - Provide opportunities for dialogue - Acknowledge the time needed for decision-making by customary and traditional institutions - Work in culturally appropriate environments, respecting diverse and interactive styles of engagement, using effective tools and strategies to allow effective dialogue across diverse knowledge systems - Promote a participatory and empowering dialogue based on non-discrimination, inclusiveness and the recognition of social, cultural, economic and political plurality - Recognize, strengthen and promote the conservation of the in situ knowledge systems - Seek free prior informed consent, as appropriate, for accessing indigenous and local knowledge

32. This compilation of principles from different sources generally shows important alignment with the guiding principles of decision XIII/20, especially on the recognition the value of collective action, on pluralism and diversity of approaches, and on full and effective participation. Additional guiding principles proposed by the sources examined focus, among other topics, on gender-differentiated roles and contributions, building indigenous and community ownership in assessment processes, rules of

¹² [CBD/COP/12/INF/7](https://cbd COP/12/INF/7) (2014).

¹³ <https://www.iccaconsortium.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/ICCA-SSP-Guidance-Document-14-March.pdf>

engagement of facilitators and stakeholders working with communities, governance aspects of collective action such as rights regimes, actors and institutions. In conclusion, there is room for advancing the formulation of a broader set of principles that build on the guiding principles of decision XIII/20 and incorporate recommended principles from other sources, where appropriate.

B. Elements of existing methodological approaches

33. The Conceptual and Methodological Framework for Evaluating the Contribution of Collective Action to Biodiversity Conservation, developed by the Government of Bolivia with the support of the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization (ACTO) through the Amazon Regional Programme (ARP)-GIZ and the IUCN South (International Union for Conservation of Nature) – Resilience and Development Programme (SWEDBIO),¹² proposes a three-module approach, linking geospatial modelling, institutional analysis and ecological assessment. Its methodology “brings together advances in land change sciences that link — through geospatial analysis — the analysis of environmental change at different scales with the analysis of institutional arrangements that examine the underlying mechanisms of local individual and collective action to protect biodiversity and ecosystems”.¹⁴ The conceptual framework and methodology, called “Collective Action in Socio-Ecological Systems (CASES)”, aims to enable countries and stakeholders to evaluate and quantify the contributions of local people to biodiversity conservation. This framework is grounded in two established conceptual frameworks: the Socio-Ecological Systems framework (SES) and the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework (IAD).¹⁵

34. The CASES conceptual and methodological framework uses the example of the role of collective action of local communities in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of forest areas, and generates on that basis an approach to generating indicators for collective action and resource mobilization. The three proposed modules of the assessment allow for the identification of criteria and examples of indicators for resource mobilization that can be developed, either as direct, proxy or indirect indicators, as illustrated in this table:¹⁶

Module	Criteria	Examples of indicators for resource mobilization
Geospatial Modelling Module	Local resource users are able to conserve natural resources under increasing pressures from growing population and market opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area conserved by local communities (km^2) Regional environmental functions and resource inventories
Institutional Analysis Module	The active involvement of local resource users in the creation, monitoring and enforcement of rules associated with natural resource use and environmental functions improves the cost-effectiveness of conservation efforts both inside and outside protected areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labour-equivalent indicators Collective action indicators correlated to conservation Contributions to local living-well/human wellbeing Intangible cultural and social values Local environmental functions and resource inventories
Ecological Assessment Module	Local protection efforts, individual or collective, improve the condition of the natural resource base.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource provisioning and food security Species richness Conservation status

¹⁴ See [UNEP/CBD/COP/12/13/Add.5/Rev.1](#), annex, para. 6.

¹⁵ Ostrom, E. 1990. Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action. Cambridge University Press, New York; and Ostrom, E. 2009. A General Framework for Analyzing Sustainability of Social-Ecological Systems. *Science* 325 (5939): 419-422. DOI:10.1126/science.1172133.

¹⁶ Source: [CBD/COP/12/INF/7](#), p. 20.

35. This approach to constructing metrics for the assessment is an important innovation of the framework, and outlines a potential way forward for ulterior methodological developments; notwithstanding the need for qualitative methods in assessing the contributions of collective action, some indicators built on quantitative data will be always useful, especially in the context of reporting about resource mobilization.

36. Working at different scales can be considered another important aspect of the framework, as it would allow for the identification of links in the landscape and zoom-in to local level contributions and contexts. The balance between larger and smaller scales, however, requires careful consideration, as well as predictions based on the geospatial modelling, since experience shows that data available for such exercises at times does not fully reflect complex realities and problems, such as the underreporting of customary management.

37. At this stage, the framework remains experimental, and its development may face challenges, such as availability of data and the degree of resources and effort that its application would entail. As the framework itself indicates, assessing the role of collective action in other fields, such as water, environmental services, food security, is not yet addressed and should be tackled in future steps.

38. The Multiple Evidence Base approach has been built on the recognition that indigenous, local, and scientific knowledge systems are different manifestations of equally valid and useful knowledge systems which generate complementary evidence for interpreting conditions, change, trajectories, and causal relationships relevant to the sustainable governance of ecosystems and biodiversity (see subsection A above). Key methodological considerations follow from this, such as:

- (a) Different criteria of validation should be applied to data and information originating from different knowledge systems. Validation of knowledge should take place within rather than across knowledge systems, and joint assessments should be undertaken about knowledge contributions;
- (b) The approach generates an equal starting point for mutually agreed ways to proceed, including the potential for co-production of knowledge;
- (c) There is value in letting each knowledge system speak for itself, within its own context, in a parallel or concurrent approach; complementary insights will create an enriched picture of the issues;
- (d) Special attention needs to be paid to actors embodying and representing knowledge systems and the related governance contexts, in particular the institutional context and the processes for collaboration, which should be equitable and empowering with meaningful participation. The full diversity of indigenous and local knowledge in a given context should be welcome to contribute to the assessments on the basis of equity and reciprocity across knowledge systems;
- (e) The assessments should also include exchanges across knowledge systems by using non-conventional methods that contribute to free-flow exchanges;
- (f) Combining qualitative and quantitative data and working across different scales, recognizing cross-scale interactions. This leads to a nested approach that considers different types of knowledge (from very specific to more general) and different types of overlap between knowledge systems at different levels and for different goals;
- (g) Assessments should be tailored to different goals, regions, kinds of assessment and scales of investigation; assessment processes are unique to the problems and goals co-defined beforehand;
- (h) The five tasks required for successful collaboration across diverse knowledge systems are: (i) *Mobilize*: bring out and articulate knowledge into a form that can be shared with others; (ii) *Translate*: interactions between knowledge systems; (iii) *Negotiate*: joint assessment of convergence, divergence and conflicts across knowledge contributions; (iv) *Synthesize*: shape a broadly accepted common knowledge that maintains the integrity of each knowledge system; (v) *Apply*: use knowledge appropriate for decision-making for all actors involved at different scales.

39. Community-based monitoring and information systems (CBMIS) are a “bundle of monitoring approaches related to biodiversity, ecosystems, land and waters, and other resources, as well as human well-being, used by indigenous peoples and local communities as tools for their management and documentation of their resources”.¹⁷ They are essentially bottom-up methodologies that have evolved in different geographic and socio-cultural contexts, with objectives determined by the local needs; this explains why CBMIS are “very diverse and can range from technically simple and basic to very technologically advanced approaches”,¹⁸ with a variety of tools that include community mapping, resource inventories, survey-based research, case studies, eco/agri-calendars, and others. This diversity of origins, contexts, objectives, approaches and tools make CBMIS rich and dynamic, but challenging in terms of systematization of methodologies.

40. CBMIS share nevertheless a number of common features that have been identified and highlighted in various information sharing activities, starting with the principles listed in subsection A above. Among them are the following:

(a) The primary focus of monitoring is land use change, because that is where culture, knowledge and language are based, and therefore “Status and trends in land use and tenure are key indicators for both traditional knowledge and indigenous peoples’ rights”;¹⁹

(b) Other key thematic areas to monitor are traditional occupations, traditional knowledge, full and effective participation. The Global Workshop on CBMIS identified the following indicators and components for these areas:²⁰

Key Areas/Domain	Indicators/Components
A. Land, territories and resources	External threats Land rights Status of land use change Fate control Violations of rights How are rules/norms/policies observed in the community
B. Traditional occupations	Culture dimension, practice of rituals
C. Traditional knowledge	Social relationship/community interactions Indigenous languages Cultural integrity Species/wildlife
D. Full and effective participation	Role of women, men, elders, youth Effective participation depends on the format and methods How decisions are made FPIC

¹⁷ Tebtebba Foundation, 2013. Developing and Implementing Community-Based Monitoring and Information Systems: The Global Workshop and the Philippine Workshop Reports. Baguio City, Philippines. p. 75.

¹⁸ Maurizio Farhan Ferrari, s/d. Community-based monitoring and information systems (CBMIS) tools. Forest Peoples Programme.

¹⁹ Tebtebba Foundation, 2013. Developing and Implementing Community-Based Monitoring and Information Systems: The Global Workshop and the Philippine Workshop Reports. Baguio City, Philippines. p. 5.

²⁰ Ibid. p. 9.

41. Some relevant lessons from the implementation of CBMIS in several countries are as follows:²¹

(a) Data collected by people using different methodologies can be aggregated, as long as the methods used over time in each place are consistent;

- (b) Keep it simple;
- (c) Use a mix of old and new technologies;
- (d) Monitoring must be based on the needs of the community;
- (e) Communities need access to information about initiatives that affect them;
- (f) Respect that the richness of CBMIS is its diversity, but collaborate for particular purposes.

42. The Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCA) Consortium has several tools and methods with relevance to assessing the contributions of collective action of indigenous peoples and local communities in the context of their management of such areas. Among them are the following:

(a) Grass-roots discussions on ICCAs: they involve participatory processes and the use of a large variety of methods and tools, adapted to the context, and with emphasis on visual tools (e.g., mapping, trend analysis) applied by community groups. Its focus is on the status of the ICCA, its eventual threats and needs and the kind of recognition and support the communities would wish to receive;

(b) Participatory mapping and documentation of ICCAs, which include 2D and 3D maps and Participatory Geographic Information Systems (PGIS) carried out by communities for their own aims and use;

(c) A resilience and security tool for ICCAs (simplified),²² which is aimed at helping communities to self-assess their internal and external strengths and weaknesses affecting the existence and sustainability of their ICCAs. The tool focuses on assessing five essential “building blocks” of an effective ICCA: (i) the integrity and strength of the custodian community; (ii) the connection between the community and its territory; (iii) the functioning of the governance institution; (iv) the territory’s conservation status and (v) the livelihoods and well-being of the community;

(d) A toolkit to support management of ICCAs,²³ which presents selected resources for five objectives: (i) documenting the presence of indigenous peoples and local communities; (ii) management planning; (iii) monitoring and evaluation; (iv) communications and (v) financing and valuing.

43. The [Community Conservation Resilience Initiative \(CCRI\) methodology](#) provides a guiding framework to “perform a bottom-up assessment of a) the resilience of indigenous peoples’ and local communities’ initiatives and approaches to conservation and restoration and b) the legal, political, socio-economic, financial, technical, and capacity-building support that could assist in sustaining and strengthening such initiatives and approaches, and subsequently to secure those forms of support through strategic advocacy efforts”.²⁴ The methodology is comprised of nine components:

- (a) Preparation and strategic visioning;
- (b) Coordination and facilitation;
- (c) “Site selection”, including FPIC;

²¹ Ibid.

²² ICCA Consortium, 2017. Self-Strengthening ICCAs – Guidance on a process and resources for custodian indigenous peoples and local communities. Module 3.

²³ Corrigan, C. and Hay-Edie, T., 2013. A toolkit to support conservation by indigenous peoples and local communities: building capacity and sharing knowledge for indigenous peoples’ and community conserved territories and areas (ICCAs). UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

²⁴ [Community Conservation Resilience Initiative Methodology, 2014](#), p. 2.

- (d) Mutual learning and skill-sharing;
- (e) Baselines;
- (f) Designing and undertaking the assessments;
- (g) Visioning, strategic planning and consolidation;
- (h) Strategic advocacy and engagement;
- (i) Reflection, reporting and revision.

44. The component “Designing and undertaking the assessments” implies a community-based exercise of defining indicators to assess the historical and present status and changes and trends over time of a range of aspects that are part of community resilience, including its “natural foundations”, i.e. the ecosystems and biodiversity.

45. The review of some of the existing methodological approaches presented in this section shows that there is a wealth of experience and tools that are being implemented in all regions of the world by indigenous peoples and local communities with the support and facilitation of many institutions to document, understand, assess and support their collective action for conservation and sustainable use. While the contexts and specific objectives differ, the approaches share important elements that are essentially orientated to enable the communities to better address their challenges through their own empowerment, create conditions and processes for dialogue and collaboration across diverse knowledge systems, develop opportunities for continuous learning, combine the use of “old” and “new” technologies, address critical aspects of governance, unfold and strengthen the multiple links of the community and the territory, including their livelihoods and cultural management of the landscape, enable the communities to manage change at different scales and strengthen their contributions to conservation and sustainable use through securing their rights and well-being.

III. SUGGESTED ELEMENTS OF METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE

46. In the light of the overview of pilot activities and experiences by Parties and other relevant organizations, as well of key aspects of existing methodologies, the following elements of methodological guidance can be proposed for consideration by the Working Group on Article 8(j) at its tenth meeting. It should be noted, however, that many of the experiences and processes are still in progress, possibly in early stages, and that, therefore, any identification of elements is also work in progress that needs to be continuously reviewed and enriched based on the lessons extracted from experiences.

A. Key principles

47. All methodological approaches relevant for assessing the contributions of collective action of indigenous peoples and local communities to conservation and sustainable use are based on specific sets of principles that inform the conceptualization, design, development and application of their frameworks and tools. This is a very important commonality of the different approaches, because it confirms the wish of their stakeholders to develop instruments that are clear on purpose and on the conditions for effectiveness and equity. Further, the review of principles indicates that the guiding principles enshrined in decision XIII/20 of the Conference of the Parties are a solid basis on which to inform and support methodological developments, since practically all approaches reflect or integrate them in various ways. The table in annex I shows highlights of the correspondence of principles of different approaches to the guiding principles.

48. Additional principles can be identified in the methodologies reviewed, which can be generally seen as complementing the guiding principles. Additional areas of principles are, for example:

(a) Rights-related principles, which essentially state the need to design and conduct assessments in ways that recognize, respect and contribute to the realization of the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, in particular their tenure and access rights;

(b) Ethical principles that seek to strengthen the legitimacy and social ownership of the assessments, including transparency, reciprocity, usefulness for all involved, trust, equity, sensitivity, flexibility, respect for self-determination, respect for all the dimensions of pluralism;

(c) Governance-related principles, in particular the need to recognize and respect local and customary governance systems;

(d) Clear recognition of gender-differentiated roles in collective action and of the need of pathways to enhancing gender equality as part of outcomes and process;

(e) Orientation to conflict resolution in assessment processes.

49. Clearly, the indicated principles do not contradict but rather complement the guiding principles, and they could even be understood as specifications and enhancements of the scope of the guiding principles; therefore, stakeholders involved in the application of the different approaches could be invited to explore ways of harmonizing or integrating the guiding principles and their own sets of principles to strengthen convergence of the approaches towards achievement of the objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

B. Elements of methodological guidance

50. The development of “elements of methodological guidance for identifying, monitoring, and assessing the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities to the achievement of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets”, as required by decision XIII/20, has to be framed by the guiding principles, which already contain clear guidance for this. Elements of methodological guidance should have, among others, the features described in the table below:

Guiding principle	Elements of methodological guidance should:
1. Importance of collective action	- Recognize and fully include traditional knowledge
2. Context specificity	- Be context specific - Include a broad range of methodological approaches - Be applied in a tailored manner in accordance with local circumstances
3. Multiplicity of values	- Recognize the multiple perspectives and world views on values
4. Methodological pluralism and complementarity	- Use different methodologies complementarily as they may generate different data - Be multi-scale - Be tested through pilot projects
5. Process orientation	- Be based on full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities throughout the processes of development and application - Ensure participation of all groups
6. Linkages to work on customary sustainable use	- Seek to contribute to protect and promote the intergenerational transfer of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices - Recognize that collective actions are related to customary sustainable use through the intergenerational transfer of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices

51. The sets of principles from existing approaches examined earlier suggest concepts that could help frame elements of methodological guidance so that these are consistent with the principles. The table below highlights some of those concepts:

Other principles	Elements of methodological guidance should:
Rights-related principles	- Seek to contribute to security of rights, particularly tenure and access rights
Ethical principles that seek to strengthen the legitimacy and social ownership of the assessments, including among others: transparency, reciprocity, usefulness for all involved, trust, equity, sensitivity, flexibility, respect for self-determination, respect to all dimensions of pluralism	- Reflect ethical considerations
Governance-related principles, in particular the need to recognize and respect local and customary governance systems	- Include relevant elements of governance assessments, including specifically about customary governance systems
Clear recognition of gender-differentiated roles in collective action, and of the need of pathways to enhancing gender equality as part of outcomes and process	- Include assessments of gender-differentiated roles and exploration of opportunities for enhancing gender equality
Orientation to conflict resolution in assessment processes	- Include in the assessments identification of actual or potential conflicts, use the assessment processes to enhance dialogue, and explore further opportunities for resolving conflicts

52. Following the above, a key consideration is that, on condition that all methodologies used for assessments follow the guiding principles, combination and complementarity of methodologies should be recognized as strength of assessments processes, because they would allow for a better representation of the plurality of situations and approaches. The approaches of multiple method designs in recent epistemology and research is particularly relevant and confirms, from a growing body of research in social fields, the value of the concept put forward by the guiding principles and applied in the approaches reviewed.

53. Specifically, the use of a mixed-methods approach, as an application of multiple method designs, is particularly appropriate to assessments of collective action. The mixed-methods central premise is that “the use of quantitative and qualitative approaches in combination provides a better understanding of research problems that either approach alone”.²⁵ This concept has been highlighted in several approaches, such as the Multiple Evidence Base and corresponds directly to the guiding principles.

54. Area-based assessments are the predominant type of assessment because collective action of indigenous peoples and local communities occurs on their lands and in their waters and wherever the resources they use are located. However, sections or cross-sections of assessments can also focus on species occurrence or other aspects of biodiversity across habitats. For area-based (or land/water-based) assessments, the use of various forms of geospatial analysis has become a fundamental ingredient and, whenever the communities feel it is useful for meaningful outcomes, should continue to be promoted and encouraged, and the growing diversity of techniques should be made accessible to the communities. The excellent examples presented by the experiences reviewed shows the value of such tools, and the

²⁵ J. Creswell and V. Plano Clark, 2007. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*, Thousand Oaks, California, United States, Sage Publications.

enrichment that they have been experiencing when they integrate traditional knowledge and geospatial analysis techniques.

55. The development of robust sets of indicators and systems of metrics is a fundamental requirement for the assessment of collective action. Again, in this field, the combination of quantitative and qualitative, process and outcome, single and aggregate indicators is needed for the same reasons of plurality of approaches addressed before. Development of indicators that are culture-based and reflect the value systems of the communities and the particularities of the contexts needs to be combined with the use of indicators of conservation and sustainable use that can allow comparison across ecosystems and geographies. There have been excellent developments in this field, including by indigenous peoples' and local communities' own initiatives for indicator development, but very important gaps and needs remain, as highlighted by several of the experiences reviewed.

56. Assessments of the contributions of collective action should have a focus on the state and trends of change, not only on specific snapshots of the situation of ecosystems and biodiversity managed by indigenous peoples and local communities. This is not only a technical requirement of the assessments, in terms of comparing the situation between two different moments to identify what has been gained or lost, but is also a requirement for understanding processes of change and related challenges that the communities may face. The traditional knowledge about processes concerning traditional territories (lands and waters) and resource change over time, ecological successions and other aspects is particularly valuable in this field, as it will be the understanding of the factors behind positive or negative change.

57. Valuation methodologies remain also an important field where new developments are needed. There is universal acceptance that economic valuation that translates conservation and sustainable use values into monetary terms is useful in some contexts or for some purposes, including the need for the formal economic systems of societies to better recognize the enormous contribution of collective action – usually underestimated compared to investments by other sectors; but there is also universal acceptance of the need to recognize and support other forms of valuation – including, in particular, the values of conservation and sustainable use for the communities in terms of livelihoods, culture, resource security, self-determined development and resilience. These aspects of valuation are closely related to indicator systems and need to be integrated in assessments but require substantial development.

58. Assessments of the contributions of collective action also need to include elements of strength and threat analysis to allow the communities and stakeholders not only to identify and estimate the contributions but also to understand which factors allow for positive outcomes and which factors may hinder achievements. Notably in this area, the analysis of governance conditions needs to be integrated – such as the security of rights, the robustness of institutions, the stability, accountability and predictability of land and resource regimes, and the concurrence of factors that may positively or negatively affect such conditions.

60. A final point is a call for synergies while maintaining and encouraging diversity of approaches. Diversity will allow better adaptability to the varying contexts, but synergies, exchange, cross-learning and networking will lead to greater synergies and concurrent outcomes. What is of critical importance is to retain diverse approaches to assessments within the framework of the guiding principles enshrined in decision XIII/20 and other relevant principles and guidelines under the Convention on Biological Diversity, and that this framework continues to evolve and is supported and enriched by the other principles that experiences continue to generate. To summarize, methodological approaches for identifying, monitoring, and assessing the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities to the achievement of the objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should be encouraged firstly to make use of the guiding principles to frame and guide their design and application, and secondly could be invited to consider the indicative, non-exhaustive list of methodological elements contained in annex I, in their design and application, noting that, to a great extent

they are already part of many of the existing approaches and that this summary has been generated through their own lessons learned.

61. As much of the information and views received, while related to resource mobilization, are of more general relevance to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, this advice may be also taken into account when the reporting framework for the post-2020 arrangements is developed, in accordance with decision XIII/27, paragraph 9, on options for enhancing synergy on national reporting among conventions.

IV. SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATION

62. In the light of the comments and suggestions contained in section III above, the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions at its tenth meeting may wish to consider the following as a possible draft recommendation, with a view to finalizing the methodological guidance at the second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation and adopting it at the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Indicative, non-exhaustive list of elements of methodological guidance for identifying, monitoring and assessing the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities to the achievement of the objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets

The Conference of the Parties,

Recalling decision XIII/20, in which the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to develop elements of methodological guidance, concerning the contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities,

1. *Welcomes* the indicative, non-exhaustive list of elements of methodological guidance for identifying, monitoring and assessing the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities to the achievement of the objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, contained in the annex to the present decision;

2. *Invites* Parties, other Governments, and relevant stakeholder organizations to make use of the guiding principles on assessing the contribution of collective action of indigenous peoples and local communities, contained in the annex to decision XIII/20, to consider using the indicative, non-exhaustive list of elements methodological guidance contained in the annex to the present decision, when designing and applying methodological approaches for assessing the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities to the achievement of the objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and when reporting through the financial reporting mechanism.

Annex

LIST OF ELEMENTS OF METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE

Methodological approaches for identifying, monitoring, and assessing the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities to the achievement of the objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets are encouraged to make use of the guiding principles contained in decision XIII/20 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, to frame and guide the design and application of such methodologies, and are invited to consider the following indicative, non-exhaustive list of methodological elements in their design and application:

(a) Recognize and fully include traditional knowledge, ensuring the complementarity of knowledge systems, the creation of conditions for effective dialogue among knowledge systems, including science, and processes that allow the co-creation of knowledge from the start;

(b) Include a broad range of methodological approaches as required by the specificity of the contexts, taking into account the diversity of national circumstances and the cultural diversity of indigenous peoples and local communities, and apply them in a tailored manner in accordance with local circumstances;

(c) Recognize the multiple perspectives and world views related to values, including social, economic, cultural and spiritual values, attached to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and reflect them in the choice of methodological approaches and tools;

(d) Use mixed-methods for research and other methodologies that can work with different types of data, in particular the combination of quantitative and qualitative information and data;

(e) Apply multi-scale approaches, processes and tools, to capture and assess the situation at the local level and at the same time consider the links in the landscape and with national and subnational policy frameworks;

(f) Test and refine methodological approaches through pilot projects, recognizing that this is an emerging field and that they need to be developed through lessons coming from experience and from a diversity of contexts;

(g) Ensure full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities throughout the process of developing and applying the approaches, with particular attention to the involvement of women, youth, elders and all other groups that are part of the communities;

(h) Encourage intergenerational interactions in the assessment processes, through the involvement of youth, elders and other groups, in order to stimulate learning and to contribute to protecting and promoting the intergenerational transfer of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices;

(i) Include in assessments the analysis of gender-differentiated roles, and explore opportunities and conditions for enhancing gender equality;

(j) Recognize that collective actions are related to customary sustainable use and that they have enhanced and should enhance the outcomes of livelihood and food security;

(k) Seek to contribute to the recognition of rights, particularly land tenure²⁶ and access to customary resources²⁷ and their influence on the effectiveness of collective action, and through community empowerment to advance security of tenure and access;

(l) Include other relevant elements of governance assessments, specifically the role, features and vitality of customary governance systems;

(m) Include, in the assessments, identification of actual or potential conflicts affecting collective actions, use the assessment processes to enhance dialogue among groups that may have competing interests, and explore further opportunities for resolving conflicts through dialogue and cooperation, including through culturally appropriate conflict resolution mechanisms;

(n) Consider area-based assessments that focus on the lands and resources owned, occupied or used by indigenous peoples and local communities, and on specific components of biodiversity, such as species occurring across habitats and which are subject to collective action;

(o) Consider the use of various forms of geospatial analysis for area-based assessments, in a way that combines technological tools with traditional knowledge, and seek to make them accessible to the communities;

²⁶ In decision X/43, the Conference of the Parties adopted “trends in land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities” as one of four global indicators for traditional knowledge, under the Convention on Biological Diversity. “Tenure” on traditional territories of indigenous peoples and local communities, may include lands and waters.

²⁷ In decision XII/12 B, annex, the Conference of the Parties adopted a global Plan of Action for Customary Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity.

(p) Advance the development of robust sets of indicators and metrics systems for the assessment of collective action, combining indicators of different types – quantitative and qualitative, process and outcome, single and aggregate, etc. — and integrating culture-based indicators that reflect the value systems of the communities and the particularities of the contexts;

(q) Integrate approaches to analyse the state and trends of change in the assessments, as well as understanding of the drivers of change and the conditions for successful outcomes;

(r) Advance the work on valuation methodologies that are relevant and applicable to the contexts, ensuring consideration of the full range of values of biodiversity for the communities and their collective action, and use the results of valuation to make the case for greater respect, recognition and support of collective action;

(s) Consider including, in the assessments, an analysis of strengths and threats in the specific contexts, with a view to improving understanding of factors and conditions requiring strengthening or additional support;

(t) Encourage collaboration, exchange, cross-learning, networking among different approaches, and seek greater synergies and concurrent outcomes.
