

**Convention on  
Biological Diversity**

Distr.  
GENERAL

CBD/WG8J/10/INF/10  
4 October 2017

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH/SPANISH

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

Tenth meeting

Item 6 of the provisional agenda\*

Montreal, Canada, 13-16 December 2017

**COMPILATION OF VIEWS ON RESOURCE MOBILIZATION: ASSESSING THE  
CONTRIBUTION OF COLLECTIVE ACTIONS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL  
COMMUNITIES AND SAFEGUARDS IN BIODIVERSITY FINANCING MECHANISMS**

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

**INTRODUCTION**

1. As requested by the Conference of the Parties in paragraphs 21 and 27 of decision XIII/20 on resource mobilization, the Executive Secretary is circulating herewith, for the information of participants in the tenth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Inter-sessional Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions, a compilation of views and comments submitted to the Secretariat regarding:

- (a) Collective action by indigenous peoples and local communities;
- (b) Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms.

2. Submissions were received from: 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 Network on Biodiversity for Latin America and the Caribbean (RMIB-LAC). The submissions have been reproduced in the form and languages in which they were provided to the Secretariat.

---

\*CBD/WG8J/10/1.

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <b>A. Submission from Parties.....</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| Brazil.....   | 3        |
| Canada.....   | 3        |
| European Union and its Member States together with national contributions.....            | 4        |
| Sweden.....   | 4        |
| Mexico .....  | 6        |
| <b>B. Submission from relevant organizations.....</b>                                     | <b>8</b> |
| Forest People Programme (FPP) and IIFB member organizations.....                          | 8        |
| Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority.....   | 9        |
| Global Forest Coalition/Community Conservation Resilience Initiative .....                | 9        |
| ICCA Consortium .....   | 14       |
| Indigenous Women Network on Biodiversity for Latin America and the Caribbean (RMIB-LAC).. | 15       |
| Stockholm Resilience Centre .....   | 17       |

## SUBMISSIONS

### A. Submission from Parties

#### Brazil

##### SUBMISSION

Submit information related to pilot activities on assessing the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities, to develop the 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.

Indigenous people are part on councils related to Environmental Management Policies, for instance: National Biodiversity Commission (CONABIO), Genetic Heritage Management Council (CGen), The Management Committee of National Policy on Territorial and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands (CG - PNGATI), among others.

Among some pilot experiences, we can mention the Indigenous-GeF and PNGATI plan construction:

The Brazilian Indigenous-GeF has been approved by Global Environment Facility – GEF on 2010, was implemented by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and executed by Brazilian Indigenous Foundation (Funai), by Environment Ministry (MMA) and by numerous indigenous organizations. This successful initiative was a pilot experience to implement a Brazilian National Policy on Territorial and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands. There were three main activities: 1) Development of financial mechanisms and tools for management and monitoring; 2) Consolidation of an indigenous network for the exchange on conservation experiences; 3) Definition of reference areas with activities of protection, recovery and sustainable forest use. The main objective of this project was to demonstrate the efficient territorial and environmental management developed by indigenous people in Brazil, in accordance with their knowledge, innovations and practices, and consolidate it as a National Policy.

This was a successful initiative consolidated on The Brazilian National Policy on Territorial and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands (PNGATI), established by the National Decree n° 7.747/2012, promotes the social inclusion of indigenous people and the participation of their organizations on the construction of public policies. This policy works by the construction of actions plans by Indigenous organizations and Brazilian Government for each 4 years. The last plan refers to the period from 2016 to 2019.

Additionally to PNGATI, indigenous people participate on CONABIO, the competent forum to promote the implementation of Brazil's CBD commitments.

#### Canada

##### SUBMISSION

Canada has developed the 2020 Biodiversity Goals and Targets for Canada, a set of 19 targets in support of the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan and the Aichi targets. In particular, Canada's Target 1 is aligned with Aichi target 11, and states:

“By 2020, at least 17% of terrestrial areas and inland water, and 10% of marine and coastal areas of Canada are conserved through networks of protected areas and other effective area-based measures.”

To meet this target, the Pathway to Canada Target 1 was launched in 2016. The Pathway is a multi-stakeholder and collaborative platform that brings together all levels of governments, the Indigenous Peoples of Canada, communities and other stakeholders to collectively work together and agree on how to achieve this target. Through this national process, various working groups and committees have been established and through which Indigenous Peoples are actively participating and contributing at all levels, bringing their traditional knowledge and wisdom in this collective effort to achieve Canada Target 1.

In particular, one of the Pathway working groups is developing recommendations for establishing and recognizing Indigenous Conservation Areas in Canada (ICAs). With half of its members representing various Indigenous groups and communities across the country, recommendations made will be based on the review of case studies and site selected for visits across Canada and where Indigenous communities have been working to maintain and conserve biodiversity and ecosystem services along with their cultural traditions.

The Pathway is not only a process for collective action to achieve Canada Target 1, but also supports the federal government commitments to taking actions towards reconciliation and for fostering a renewed nation-to-nation relationship with the Indigenous peoples of Canada. Through the path set forward, recognition of Indigenous rights, respect, co-operation and partnership with Indigenous Peoples across Canada will help identify other specific contribution to some of the other biodiversity targets for Canada.

As part of the Pathway to Canada Target 1, the national plan to contribute to Aichi 2020 Target 11, an Indigenous Circle of Experts (ICE) has been established to develop a proposed term and definition for Indigenous conservation areas in Canada. The ICE, led by Indigenous conservation experts along with representatives

## **European Union and its Member States together with national contributions**

### **SUBMISSION**

**The Voluntary Guidelines on biodiversity safeguards** is an important progress that now needs to be piloted and implemented in practice, to address effectively the potential impacts of biodiversity financing mechanisms on different elements of biodiversity, as well as their potential effects on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities.

In terms of reporting collective action, and its contribution to sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity under the resource mobilization framework, Member States of the EU believes that it is of critical importance to engage IPLCs themselves. Given the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use (CSU) is now being implemented, and encourages collaborative projects between governments and IPLCs, implementation by governments in collaboration with IPLCs and their organizations of the Plan of Action on CSU, could be reported as collective action under the resource mobilization framework. It is important to put attention to qualitative methods for reporting and valuation in this work.

### **Sweden**

#### a) Collective Actions of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities

“The Sida funded programme SwedBio at Stockholm Resilience Centre has contributed to the development of the collective action framework, through the contribution to the initial framework proposed by Bolivia for conceptualization and measuring the contribution of collective action to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, that was the basis for the COP12 decision. Further, Guatemala and SCBD invited to a dialogue organized by SwedBio, CONAP and Asociación Sotz'il in Guatemala on the subject.

The outcomes of above dialogue formed the basis for the decisions on collective action at CBD COP13 including the Guiding principles on assessing the contribution of collective action by indigenous peoples and local communities.

In terms of reporting collective action, and its contribution to sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity under the resource mobilization framework, Sweden believes that it is of critical importance to engage IPLCs themselves, such as through the proposed methods in decision CBD/COP/DEC/XIII/20. Appendix i.e. the Conceptual and Methodological Framework for Evaluating the Contribution of Collective Action to Biodiversity Conservation; The Multiple Evidence Base approach with experiences in mobilization processes based on community research in pilot cases for revival and mobilization of knowledge in communities; Community-Based Monitoring and Information Systems (CBMIS) that are developed in many places around the world, and also being reported under the Local Biodiversity Outlooks; and The Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCA) Consortium has many tools and methods. Given the Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use (CSU) is now being implemented, and encourages collaborative projects between governments and IPLCs, implementation by governments in collaboration with IPLCs and their organizations of the Plan of Action on CSU, could be reported as collective action under the resource mobilization framework. It is important to put attention to qualitative methods for reporting and valuation in this work.

In Sweden method development applicable on collective action reporting with focus on qualitative methods is ongoing for example under the “Nordic IPBES like assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services in coastal ecosystems and some associated wetlands” In the Kalix Archipelago, local communities practicing artisanal fishery are developing proposals for monitoring systems based on mobilization of their traditional knowledge. One of the motivation for the fisher’s and holders of knowledge to contribute in the assessment is that evidence brought up may support their case for getting their local resource management system recognized. This once again put the attention to the importance of collaboration between governments and the IPLCs in upholding local governance systems. Similar experiences have been made in mobilization processes based on community research by SwedBio in pilot cases for revival and mobilization of knowledge in communities in Thailand, Philippines, Kenya and Ethiopia. An important aim for communities is to get recognition of the qualitative values of their conservation work. This is very much in line with the ambition to report IPLC Collective action under the resource mobilization framework.”

#### b) Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms

“The Voluntary guidelines of safeguards to biodiversity financing mechanisms (BFMs), and operational next steps, adopted at CBD-COP12 in South Korea was based on guidelines and a roadmap in a report on the matter developed in an inclusive process by SwedBio/SRC in collaboration with many partners and of course the SCBD, based on discussions in the Quito Dialogues.

The Sida funded program SwedBio have had discussions with SCBD on the follow up of the decision CBD/COP/DEC/XIII/20 on Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms.

In Sweden, the Government, through the policy for global development in the implementation of Agenda 2030, is relaunching the Programme for Global Development (PGU) prior to the implementation of Agenda 2030. It aims at strengthen policy coherence with regard to the perspective of the poor, human rights and planetary boundaries. The PGU should aim to take the global perspective, in which sustainability, human rights and the perspective of poor people are at the center, and should always be systematically included in the analysis, implementation and monitoring of actions in different policy areas.

The Swedish Sami Parliament is highly engaged in the work on Agenda 2030 and the three dimensions of sustainable development. The Sami tradition provides a holistic approach since the Sami has relied on nature for subsistence.”

|               |
|---------------|
| <b>Mexico</b> |
|---------------|

**SUBMISSION**

A nivel Sector Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales, en 2016 se destinaron recursos presupuestales para la operación de diferentes programas con los que se benefició a un total de 241,593 personas, de las cuales 128,943 es población indígena (71,169 hombres y 57,774 mujeres).

| Programa  | Gasto Ejercido       | Población indígena beneficiada |               |                | Total beneficiarios(as) |
|---|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------------|
|   |                      | Hombres                        | Mujeres       | Suma           |                         |
| Programa de Conservación para el Desarrollo Sostenible (PROCOCODES)   | 90,165,713           | 513                            | 577           | 1,090          | 16,222                  |
| Programa de Empleo Temporal (PET)   | 389,046,482          | 32,397                         | 38,931        | 71,328         | 107,309                 |
| Mecanismos Locales de Pago por Servicios Ambientales a Través de Fondos Concurrentes. CONAFOR                 | 48,636,557           |                                |               |                |                         |
| Programa Nacional Forestal (PRONAFOR)-Plantaciones Forestales Comerciales                                     | 106,738,462          | 203                            | 70            | 273            | 286                     |
| Programa hacia la Igualdad y la sustentabilidad ambiental-Perspectiva de Género                               | 7,056,109            |                                |               |                | 397                     |
| Corredores Biológicos de CONABIO en el Sureste de México  | 20,001,585           | 1,077                          | 944           | 2,021          | 4,420                   |
| Divulgación de la Cultura Forestal  | 52,000               | 1,244                          | 1,047         | 2,291          | 2,381                   |
| Programa Nacional Forestal.Conservación y Restauración de Suelos.CONAFOR                                      | 349,619,759          |                                |               |                |                         |
| Programa Nacional de Servicios Ambientales.CONAFOR  | 692,182,783          | 35,567                         | 16,104        | 51,671         | 95,367                  |
| Coordinación General de Educación y Desarrollo Tecnológico.CONAFOR  | 8,833,981            |                                |               |                | 2,640                   |
| Programa de Desarrollo Forestal.CONAFOR   | 10,462,447           |                                |               |                |                         |
| Programa de Sanidad Forestal  | 10,093,938           |                                |               |                | 5,652                   |
| Programa de Recuperación y Repoblación de Especies en Riesgo(PROCER)-Componente Conservación de Maíz Criollo- | 10,180,288           | 168                            | 101           | 269            | 6,919                   |
| Programa de fomento a la producción forestal sustentable  | 494,199,515          |                                |               |                |                         |
|   | <b>2,237,269,619</b> | <b>71,169</b>                  | <b>57,774</b> | <b>128,943</b> | <b>241,593</b>          |

Otro ejemplo de movilización de recursos, a partir de ejercicios institucionales de identificación de actividades de conservación en áreas naturales protegidas (ANP) implementadas por pueblos y comunidades indígenas, se detectó que, en 2016, en aproximadamente 15 ANP se llevaron a cabo acciones con la asistencia de la Comisión Nacional para el Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas, en temas sustantivos para la conservación y utilización sostenible de la biodiversidad:

- Cambio climático
- Comunicación y difusión
- Conservación para el desarrollo
- Educación y cultura para la conservación
- Manejo y uso sustentable
- Monitoreo biológico
- Restauración de ecosistemas
- Sanidad forestal
- Transversalidad de políticas públicas
- Turismo y ANP

A través de dichas acciones, los pueblos y comunidades indígenas contribuyen a la conservación de la biodiversidad, y por tanto al logro del Plan Estratégico para la Diversidad Biológica 2011-2020, así como a las Metas 1, 2, 3, 15, particularmente a la Meta 11 de Aichi para la Diversidad Biológica, al proteger las áreas naturales protegidas y contribuir a su manejo efectivo.

|             |
|-------------|
| <b>Peru</b> |
|-------------|

**SUBMISSION**

4. **Mobilización de Recursos: Acciones Colectivas de Pueblos Indígenas y Comunidades Locales y Salvaguardias en mecanismos de financiamiento de biodiversidad** (Decisión XIII/20. Consulte en particular párrafos 19, 21, 26 y 27).

*Solicitud:*

- (i) Presentar información relativa a las actividades piloto de evaluación de la contribución de los pueblos indígenas y las comunidades locales mediante el marco de presentación de informes financieros y otras fuentes pertinentes para el análisis por el Secretario Ejecutivo, a fin de desarrollar los elementos de orientación metodológica.

*Información:*

Por el momento, el Perú todavía no ha desarrollado actividades piloto, que pueda ser puesta a disposición para el análisis.

- (ii) Se solicita información, incluyendo las buenas prácticas o las lecciones aprendidas, sobre cómo, de conformidad con el párrafo 16 de la decisión XII / 3, las Partes, otros gobiernos, organizaciones internacionales, organizaciones del sector privado y otros interesados toman en consideración las directrices voluntarias sobre salvaguardias en los mecanismos de financiación para la diversidad biológica al seleccionar, diseñar e implementar mecanismos de financiamiento de la diversidad biológica.

*Información:*

Por el momento, el Perú todavía no cuenta con información sobre la consideración de las directrices voluntarias sobre salvaguardias en mecanismos de financiación de la diversidad biológica..

|                  |
|------------------|
| <b>Venezuela</b> |
|------------------|

- *Información relativa a las actividades piloto de evaluación de la contribución de los pueblos indígenas y las comunidades locales mediante el marco de presentación de informes financieros.*

Entre las actividades relacionadas con pueblos indígenas y biodiversidad que contribuyen a la presentación de informes financieros, destaca el Proyecto Socioproductivo denominado siembra: (agrícola, hortalizas, porcino, pecuario y agricultura), cuyo objetivo es beneficiar a las comunidades indígenas existentes en el territorio nacional a fin de impulsar la producción alimentaria con componente ecológico.

- *Buenas prácticas o las lecciones aprendidas, sobre cómo, de conformidad con el párrafo 16 de la decisión XII / 3, las Partes, otros gobiernos, organizaciones internacionales,*

*organizaciones del sector privado y otros interesados toman en consideración las directrices voluntarias sobre salvaguardias en los mecanismos de financiación para la diversidad biológica al seleccionar, diseñar e implementar mecanismos de financiamiento de la diversidad biológica.*

Cabe destacar, que se contempla un aporte en el Presupuesto Nacional para la ejecución de programas y proyectos asociados a la conservación y uso sustentable de la diversidad biológica, en el marco de la Estrategia Nacional para la Conservación de la Diversidad Biológica 2010-2020 y su Plan de Acción Nacional. Adicionalmente se captan ingresos por prestación de servicios, que a su vez, son dirigidos a fortalecer los citados programas y proyectos.

## B. Submission from relevant organizations

### Forest People Programme (FPP) and IIFB member organizations

Centro de Estudios Multidisciplinarios Aymara. Bolivia; Red de Mujeres Indígenas sobre Biodiversidad; Nirmanie Development Foundation- Sri Lanka; La Federación Indígenas Empresarial y Comunidades Locales de México, and Fundacion para la Promocion del Conocimiento Indigena (FPCI)

### SUBMISSION

*Information related to pilot activities on assessing the contribution of indigenous peoples and local communities* through the financial reporting framework, and other relevant sources, for compilation and analysis by the Executive Secretary, in order to develop the elements of methodological guidance.

La experiencia de Bolivia, es presentar el proyecto de la crianza de la llama en los ayllus y marcas de Corque, en el departamento de Oruro, para incentivar la crianza de la llama, su mito y ritualidad que implica. Por un costo total de 4.000 dólares americanos.

Los pueblos indígenas en base a sus normas y procedimientos propios, o institucionalidad, tiene acciones como el ayni, minqa, yanapa, formas o sistemas de acciones colectivas, donde se estructura y reestructura conocimientos y saberes indígenas, que funcionan para el tema de la economía sobre todo.

Information, *including good practices or lessons learned, on how*, in accordance with paragraph 16 in decision XII/3, *Parties, other Governments, international organizations, business organizations and other stakeholders take the voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms into account when selecting, designing and implementing biodiversity financing mechanisms.*

En los mecanismos de financiación es importante:

1. Información clara y transparente respecto a mecanismos de financiación.
2. Trabajar en metodologías con enfoque indígena.
3. Trabajos de investigación para la protección de conocimientos indígenas, desde la experiencia de pueblos.

## Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority of Australia

### SUBMISSION

#### *Land and Sea Country Partnerships Program*

Through the Land and Sea Country Partnerships Program the Authority delivers funding to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to manage and care for their sea country and ensure sustainable use of the region through Traditional Use of Marine Resources Agreements. These agreements describe how each group will manage their marine resources and their roles in compliance activities and monitoring environmental conditions.

Funded conservation activities are reported through performance and financial reporting. The Annual Report summary of the Indigenous Land Sea Country is at **Attachment B**.

#### *Specialised Indigenous Ranger Program*

Additionally, the Australian Government funded Specialised Indigenous Ranger Program designs and delivers specialised training to equip Indigenous rangers with the skills to respond to suspicious and illegal activities that rangers regularly come across as part of their work. This investment greatly enhances Indigenous compliance capabilities in remote communities.

## Global Forest Coalition/Community Conservation Resilience Initiative

### SUBMISSION

#### Collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities

1. The collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities were explicitly recognised in at least six COP13 decisions, namely:
  - **Decision XIII/1** (“Progress in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and towards the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets”), para. 15;
  - **Decision XIII/2** (“Progress towards the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12”), para. 5(b)(vii);
  - **Decision XIII/3** (“Strategic actions to enhance the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, including with respect to mainstreaming and the integration of biodiversity within and across sectors”), paras. 18(b) and 97;
  - **Decision XIII/20** (“Resource mobilization”), preamble, paras. 18-21, Annex and Appendix;
  - **Decision XIII/29** (“Global Biodiversity Outlook and Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services”), para. 1(c)(v); and
  - **Decision XIII/31** (“Key scientific and technical needs related to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and related research”), para. 6(h).
  
2. In response to the notification’s request for information about activities on assessing the contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities to the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets, we wish to share information about the Community Conservation Resilience Initiative (CCRI).<sup>1</sup> The CCRI was also discussed in our joint submission with the ICCA Consortium from

<sup>1</sup> For more information, see: [https://www.international-climate-initiative.com/en/projects/projects/details/promoting-community-conservation-resilience-413/?no\\_cache=1?b=2,0,0,4,0,1&kw=](https://www.international-climate-initiative.com/en/projects/projects/details/promoting-community-conservation-resilience-413/?no_cache=1?b=2,0,0,4,0,1&kw=) and <http://globalforestcoalition.org/resources/supporting-community-conservation/>.

- 15 May 2015 (in response to the notification requesting information on the contribution of collective action to biodiversity conservation, Ref.: SCBD/TSI/RS/YX/84650).
3. We gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Government of Germany, which is funding the CCRI through the International Climate Initiative, and The Christensen Fund, as well as the support of the Siemenpuu Foundation, Swedbio, Commonwealth Foundation and IPOs, NGOs and communities for the local assessments themselves.
  4. The CCRI was established by an informal alliance of national and international Indigenous Peoples' organisations, non-governmental organisations and social movements that shared a joint belief in community stewardship, governance and rights-based approaches to biodiversity and ecosystem conservation and restoration. It is coordinated by the Global Forest Coalition in collaboration with national and local organisations in 22 countries.
  5. The aim of the Community Conservation Resilience Initiative (CCRI) is to contribute to the implementation of the CBD's 2011-2020 Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets by providing policy advice on effective and appropriate forms of support for community conservation, including ICCAs. It involves the documentation and review of bottom up, participatory assessments in 22 countries in Africa, Asia-Pacific and Latin America of the resilience of community conservation initiatives and the support that should be provided to strengthen these initiatives. It promotes more appropriate legal, political, financial and other forms of support for community conservation initiatives that reflect the recommendations of communities themselves.
  6. A guiding methodology and toolkit, country reports and a global report from the first ten countries involved, and CBD submissions and position papers are all available online at: <http://globalforestcoalition.org/resources/supporting-community-conservation/>.
  7. At COP13, Parties adopted guiding principles on assessing the contribution of collective action by indigenous peoples and local communities (Decision XIII/20, Annex), and 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 Strategic Plan and Aichi Biodiversity Targets (Decision XIII/20, para. 21). We wish to express our support for the guiding principles as contained in the Annex to Decision XIII/20.
  8. We also wish to suggest the following five cross-cutting principles derived from the CCRI methodology<sup>2</sup> for inclusion in the CBD's methodological guidance:
    - (a) **Indigenous Peoples' and Local Communities' Rights, including the Right to Free, Prior and Informed Consent:** Respect for and realisation of the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, including their right to provide or deny free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) regarding activities that take place on their lands and territories, or otherwise affect them, should be at the heart of collective action assessment methodologies. The decision to provide or withhold FPIC is an ongoing process, not a single moment or one-off event. At any stage of engagement with external actors, a community has a right to seek more information, say "no", or withdraw entirely. Customary means of consensus building or other forms of decision-making can be used as the basis for culturally appropriate FPIC processes. By definition, FPIC processes must respect the community's timelines and self-determined processes and must not be driven or influenced by project proponents.

---

<sup>2</sup> The CCRI methodology is available online in English ([http://globalforestcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/New-Last-CCR-Initiative-methodology\\_May-2014.pdf](http://globalforestcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/New-Last-CCR-Initiative-methodology_May-2014.pdf)) and Russian (<http://globalforestcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/CCRI-Methodology-Russian.pdf>).

- (b) **Indigenous & Community Ownership:** The process and outcomes of collective action assessment methodologies should be driven and created by Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Power relations between Indigenous and dominant societies are often highly imbalanced and inequitable. The methodologies should be emancipatory, participatory, and representative of local realities. They should recognise that indigenous peoples' and local communities' relationships with their territories and areas are an integral source of their identities, cultures and well-being. The emphasis on Indigenous methodologies and approaches lays the foundations for bridging complementary systems of traditional indigenous and mainstream knowledge.
- (c) **Adaptive Facilitation:** Facilitation of collective action assessments requires respect, reciprocity, equity, sensitivity, flexibility, trust, and adaptability. Open communication and mutual sharing and learning lie at the heart of the CCRI. Facilitators of collective action assessments should ensure that both the process and outcomes are emancipatory. Communities and facilitators should also consider how they may wish to manage: (i) expectations (for example, through reflection and evaluation at different stages to ensure expectations are realistic and attainable); (ii) timeframes (for example, by planning for necessary financial and human resources, time required to engage with communities, and adapting to circumstances such as natural disasters or changes in government); and (iii) information (including process documentation and safeguarding sensitive or restricted information).
- (d) **Participation & Representation:** It is important to create space for 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. Some groups may seek their own spaces for more open discussion amongst peers, which can then be conveyed in an appropriate manner to the broader community. Other groups may prefer certain activities than others (for example, use of GPS units and cameras by youth), while others still may only have specific times of the day, week or season in which they can contribute to community assessments. The gender dimension is particularly important in this.
- (e) **Women & Gender:** Women and men have different roles in many aspects of household and community life. Further to para. 8(d) above, community assessments of collective action should integrate a gender 'lens' or 'dimension' to better enable the facilitation and support team and other key actors to understand, accommodate and support the specific rights, roles, needs, and aspirations of more marginalised groups (which often includes women). The Annex to the CCRI methodology contains further guidance and tools for mainstreaming gender.
9. In addition, the CCRI methodology contains further guidance about nine possible components of a community driven participatory assessment process such as the CCRI, namely:
- Preparation and strategic visioning;
  - Coordination and facilitation;
  - 'Site selection', including FPIC;
  - Mutual learning and skill-sharing;
  - Baselines of legal and non-legal recognition of ICCAs and other forms of community conservation;
  - Designing and undertaking the resilience assessments, prioritising Indigenous approaches and methods of inquiry and community-determined indicators;
  - Visioning, strategic planning and consolidation of community recommendations;
  - Strategic advocacy and engagement to put the community assessments and visions into practice; and
  - Reflection, reporting and revision of the methodologies, assessments and strategies.

### Aichi Biodiversity Target 3

10. We also wish to underscore the importance of fully implementing Aichi Biodiversity Target 3 as part of the strategy for resource mobilisation. In Decision XIII/20, COP13 recalled its invitation to Parties to report progress in achieving the milestones for the full implementation of Aichi Target 3 and invited Parties “*to include information on national analytical studies that identify candidates for elimination, phase-out or reform of incentives, including subsidies, that are harmful for biodiversity, and that identify opportunities to promote the design and implementation of positive incentive measures, such as appropriate recognition and support for indigenous peoples and local communities that conserve territories and areas, and other effective community conservation initiatives*” (para. 23).
11. Both ‘pillars’ of Aichi Target 3 – namely, removing harmful incentives and supporting positive incentives – are essential to its implementation. The initial outcomes of the CCRI have shown that community conservation initiatives contribute significantly to the implementation of the Aichi Targets, the SDGs and biodiversity conservation and restoration in general, but these initiatives are severely threatened and undermined by policies and projects that support unsustainable land use, climate change and unsustainable development. The co-existence of sustainable and unsustainable models of development is unfeasible in the long run. It should thus be a priority to eliminate or phase out perverse incentives that may cause biodiversity loss, in line with the agreed milestones to implement Aichi Target 3. Financial resources normally used for harmful incentives should be redirected to support positive initiatives such as ICCAs and other effective community conservation initiatives. This would be an efficient and effective way to implement Aichi Target 3 and also mobilise significant financial resources.

### Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms

12. With reference to the voluntary guidelines on safeguards for biodiversity financing mechanisms (Decision XII/3, Annex III), we wish to offer some key points based partly on a working paper on climate finance produced in collaboration with the ICCA Consortium.<sup>3</sup>
13. ICCAs and other forms of community conservation contribute significantly to the CBD and achievement of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. However, indigenous peoples and local communities face prejudices in mainstream biodiversity financing mechanisms, which continue to prioritise government-centric (and often exclusionary) protected areas as well as species conservation projects that largely ignore the positive and potential contributions of Indigenous Peoples, local communities and women.
14. Biodiversity financing – including but not only for protected areas and species conservation projects – must be subject to human rights standards and instruments such as the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (as referenced in the Decision XII/3 guidelines on safeguards) and the right of indigenous peoples and communities to give or withhold their free, prior and informed consent.
15. As stated in the Decision XII/3 guidelines on safeguards, “*Particular attention needs to be given to the impacts on, and contribution of, indigenous and local communities as well as women, and to their effective participation in the selection, design, and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms*” (Annex III, para. 1). In this respect, it is important to recognise and distinguish Indigenous peoples, local communities and women as rights-holders – not mere

---

<sup>3</sup> Lovera, S., H. C. Jonas, S. Fischer and C. de la Plaza, with G. Borrini- Feyerabend, M. E. Didane, T. Farvar, S. Saifaleupolu, and A. Singh. 2015. *Climate Finance, Results-based Payments and Conservation by Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities*. Working Paper of the ICCA Consortium and Community Conservation Resilience Initiative. Available online at: <http://globalforestcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Climate-finance-ICCA-and-community-conservation-nov-2016.pdf>.

- “beneficiaries”. Rights-holders should also be clearly distinguished from stakeholders that merely have a financial stake in certain conservation initiatives, especially in consultation, multi-actor dialogue and FPIC processes.
16. Additional concerns arise when biodiversity financing mechanisms attempt to introduce results-based payments for conservation and foreign concepts such as ‘natural capital accounting’ to indigenous peoples and local communities. The introduction of new governance arrangements to handle financial incentives tends to undermine customary institutions. Results-based payments for conservation or improved land use practices often lead to inequity, mismanagement and even corruption, especially if there are no strong governance systems in place. They also tend to target actors with secure land rights, which discriminate against indigenous peoples, local communities and women with unrecognised or disputed land tenure rights.
  17. Another problematic development is the increasing tendency to merge private sector investments with public biodiversity financing. Private sector investments need to be commercially profitable, whereas ICCAs and other forms of sustainable use of biodiversity and territories tend to provide a broad range of social, cultural, spiritual and livelihood benefits, but only modest financial profits. Meanwhile, there are clear perverse incentives for the private sector to invest in projects that are commercially attractive or otherwise serve their public relations image (for example, biodiversity offsets), despite their negative impacts on biodiversity and the livelihoods of the peoples and communities on the frontlines of biodiversity and habitat loss.
  18. We recommend the following for consideration in the CBD’s safeguards for biodiversity financing mechanisms:
    - (a) Recognise ICCAs and other community conservation initiatives as effective, holistic non-market-based approaches for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and offer appropriate legal, political, social, economic and other forms of support rather than results-based payments;
    - (b) Promote comprehensive and participatory reporting on community conservation initiatives and other land use actions, taking into account their multiple benefits and values – rather than using flawed accounting methodologies such as natural capital accounting or carbon accounting;
    - (c) Halt and reverse the corporate take-over of biodiversity policy through public-private partnerships and redirect perverse incentives to support positive initiatives such as ICCAs that serve public rather than commercial private interests;
    - (d) Redirect biodiversity finances away from ineffective and exclusionary protected areas and species conservation projects toward collective actions of indigenous peoples, local communities and women that already do or have the potential to contribute significantly to biodiversity; and
    - (e) Ensure the full and effective participation and FPIC of indigenous peoples, local communities and women in national policies, plans and programmes for biodiversity and related financing mechanisms, and address the findings of community-based assessments and monitoring in biodiversity-related decision-making.

**ICCA Consortium****SUBMISSION****Collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities**

1. The collective actions of indigenous peoples and local communities were explicitly recognised in at least six COP13 decisions, namely:
  - **Decision XIII/1** (“Progress in the implementation of the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and towards the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets”), para. 15;
  - **Decision XIII/2** (“Progress towards the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12”), para. 5(b)(vii);
  - **Decision XIII/3** (“Strategic actions to enhance the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, including with respect to mainstreaming and the integration of biodiversity within and across sectors”), paras. 18(b) and 97;
  - **Decision XIII/20** (“Resource mobilization”), preamble, paras. 18-21, Annex and Appendix;
  - **Decision XIII/29** (“Global Biodiversity Outlook and Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services”), para. 1(c)(v); and
  - **Decision XIII/31** (“Key scientific and technical needs related to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and related research”), para. 6(h).
2. At COP13, Parties adopted guiding principles on assessing the contribution of collective action by indigenous peoples and local communities (Decision XIII/20, Annex), and 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 Strategic Plan and Aichi Biodiversity Targets (Decision XIII/20, para. 21).
3. We wish to express our support for the guiding principles as contained in the Annex to Decision XIII/20.
4. In response to the request for information about activities on assessing the contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities to the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets, we wish to share information about the Global Support Initiative for ICCAs (GSI), which is providing important support to ICCAs and related networks in 26 countries.<sup>4</sup> ICCAs were also discussed in some detail in our joint submission with the Global Forest Coalition and Community Conservation Resilience Initiative (CCRI) from 15 May 2015 (in response to the notification requesting information on the contribution of collective action to biodiversity conservation, Ref.: SCBD/TSI/RS/YX/84650).
5. We gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Government of Germany, which is funding the GSI through the BMUB International Climate Initiative.
6. The GSI is implemented by the UNDP GEF Small Grants Programme, in close partnership with the ICCA Consortium, IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme, and UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre. Its objective is to improve the recognition and overall effectiveness for biodiversity conservation, sustainable livelihoods and resilience to climate

---

<sup>4</sup> For more information, see:

[https://sgp.undp.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=414&Itemid=524#.WRMFR1J7FE4](https://sgp.undp.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=414&Itemid=524#.WRMFR1J7FE4) and [http://www.iccaconsortium.org/?page\\_id=2860](http://www.iccaconsortium.org/?page_id=2860).

change effects of territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities (ICCAs). In doing so, it aims to contribute to Aichi Targets 11, 14 and 18, among others.

7. The ICCA Consortium has produced an initial draft document for the GSI partners, entitled: “Self-Strengthening ICCAs: Guidance on a process and resources for custodian indigenous peoples and local communities”.<sup>5</sup> The document offers: (a) an introduction to ICCAs and the threats and opportunities they face; (b) a flexible road map for ICCA custodian communities to define and pursue the vision they have for themselves and their conserved territories; and (c) guidance for national GSI strategic/ catalytic organisations to accompany communities in their processes.
8. It includes the following seven modules, each of which may contain useful elements for the CBD’s methodological guidance:
  - i) Enhancing ICCA awareness and planning a self-strengthening process
  - ii) Describing and documenting the ICCA – which underscores that documentation should be gathered and communicated by the custodian community, and by the Local Team in particular. No information about the ICCA should be produced, reproduced or distributed by external actors (organisations and individuals, including the facilitator) without community FPIC.
  - iii) Assessing and analysing ICCA security and resilience
  - iv) Developing ICCA initiatives/ project proposals
  - v) Self-monitoring for ongoing learning and action
  - vi) Communicating about the ICCA
  - vii) Networking and advocating for appropriate ICCA recognition and support
9. The simplified “Resilience and Security Tool for ICCAs” (as contained in the guidance document in Module 3, page 34) may provide a useful approach. It focuses on five essential elements, considered ‘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. Of particular importance is the community’s participatory analysis of change over time.

### **Indigenous Women Network on Biodiversity for Latin America and the Caribbean (RMIB-LAC)**

#### **SUBMISSION**

Consideramos importante que se impulse los beneficios no carbono solo vistos desde la importancia de los bosques como sumideros de carbono, sino sobre todo, que los mecanismos de financiamiento se dirijan hacia la conservación y uso sostenible de la biodiversidad, por la importancia de la provisión de otros servicios ecosistémicos de los bosques, como la diversidad biológica, el agua, sitios paisajísticos, sitios arqueológicos, diversidad étnica, entre otros. Las tendencias actuales, al menos en el ámbito de la reducción de emisiones sobre la deforestación y degradación de los bosques para combatir el cambio climático, sólo se ha limitado por la importancia de los sumideros de carbono, y sin tomar en cuenta las contribuciones nacionales determinadas (CND) de los bosques, a pesar de aquéllos son de mucho interés para los Pueblos Indígenas, sin desconocer los beneficios del carbono.

<sup>5</sup> The “Self-strengthening” guidance is available in English (<http://www.iccaconsortium.org/wp-content/uploads/ICCA-SSP-Guidance-Documents-14-March.pdf>) and Spanish (<http://www.iccaconsortium.org/wp-content/uploads/Autofortalecer-los-TICCA.pdf>).

Como Red de Mujeres Indígenas sobre Biodiversidad para América Latina y El Caribe, RMIB-LAC no hemos participado en programas en los cuales se apliquen mecanismos de financiación. Sin embargo, como parte de los Pueblos Indígenas hacemos seguimiento y tenemos conocimiento de los problemas que están generando estos mecanismos dentro de nuestros Pueblos, tierras y territorios, como por ejemplo existe falta de comunicación y fortalecimiento de capacidades para entender las implicancias de esos programas en las comunidades, así como en muchos casos han existido problemas con el incumplimiento de contratos firmados con las comunidades.

En este marco como RMIB-LAC hacemos las siguientes recomendaciones para ser tomadas en cuenta en las directrices voluntarias sobre salvaguardias en los mecanismos de financiación para la Diversidad Biológica:

Las salvaguardias deben ser robustas y estar en línea con las obligaciones internacionales, tener un monitoreo efectivo y acuerdos públicos de rendición de cuentas a nivel nacional e internacional para reducir los riesgos del financiamiento de REDD+

Las salvaguardias deben ser consistentes con la Declaración de las Naciones Unidas sobre los Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas, incluyendo los requerimientos para el consentimiento libre, previo e informado para todas las decisiones financieras y de inversión que podrían afectar las tierras, territorios y recursos naturales de los Pueblos Indígenas. Los Estados deben trabajar en el cumplimiento urgente de los Artículos 10, 19, 23, 28 y 32 de la Declaración relacionados con la consulta y el consentimiento libre, previo e informado que los Pueblos Indígenas deben otorgar antes de desarrollo de proyectos en sus tierras, territorios y aguas. La consulta y el consentimiento deben ser realizados de manera culturalmente apropiada mediante la utilización de lenguas indígenas, protocolos, tiempos apropiados y el derecho al veto en caso de que el proyecto no sea de beneficio para la comunidad.

#### Artículo 29

1. Los pueblos indígenas tienen derecho a la conservación y protección del medio ambiente y de la capacidad productiva de sus tierras o territorios y recursos. Los Estados deberán establecer y ejecutar programas de asistencia a los pueblos indígenas para asegurar esa conservación y protección, sin discriminación

Las salvaguardias de biodiversidad para el financiamiento REDD+ deben estar en línea con el enfoque de ecosistemas, las Guías de Ake:Kon, protocolos comunitarios, con los objetivos del CBD, con las normas, principios y elementos relevantes de los programas de trabajo incluyendo el Artículo 8j y 10c.

Las salvaguardias estarán enmarcadas en el respeto a la soberanía permanente de los Pueblos Indígenas sobre los recursos naturales, respeto al auto determinación y gobiernos propios, a los sistemas de tenencia de sus tierras, territorios y recursos naturales, al reparto justo y equitativo de los beneficios por el uso o venta de los recursos naturales.

Además, las salvaguardias respetarán el derecho de los Pueblos Indígenas a proteger y acceder en privado a sus sitios sagrados y velarán por la protección de los Pueblos Indígenas en aislamiento voluntario.

Ningún proyecto de REDD+ u otro mecanismo de financiamiento a la biodiversidad debería alterar los sistemas de tenencia de tierras de los Pueblos Indígenas y no debería regular el uso consuetudinario de los recursos naturales por los Pueblos Indígenas en sus tierras y territorios sean estos o no de su propiedad, sin el consentimiento libre, previo e informado de los Pueblos Indígenas. De igual manera los Pueblos Indígenas no deberán ser reubicados en otro espacio sin su consentimiento libre, previo e informado. Deberá existir una política que prohíba la reubicación forzada de los Pueblos Indígenas.

Las salvaguardias deberían respetar y mejorar el bienestar holístico de los Pueblos Indígenas y de la Madre Tierra y promover y mejorar la equidad de género y el empoderamiento de las mujeres.

En México la institución que la promueve REDD+ es la Comisión Nacional Forestal, mi región tiene áreas boscosas y de cerro con abundante vegetación de árboles, sobre todo, pero este mecanismo no se aplica aún. Algo que puede destacarse de esto es que está traducido a lenguas indígenas, no a todas pero sí ha sido una iniciativa que tiene esa pertinencia lingüística.

Metodología para identificar y evaluar las contribuciones de los pueblos indígenas a la conservación de la biodiversidad

En primer plano, me parece bien la propuesta de Bolivia, creo que contiene aspectos que son muy importantes en las culturas indígenas.

Una de las metodologías de aporte para identificar acciones de la conservación de la biodiversidad, es trabajar en la recuperación de los conocimientos y saberes indígenas, basado en la historia oral, las entrevistas a mujeres y hombres, de cómo generan sus conocimientos y la constante transmisión generacional. Estos conocimientos van acompañados de mitos, ritos, cultura, los cuales son practicados y multiplicados desde el cotidiano vivir. Nosotros los Pueblos Indígenas, tenemos la metodología de recuperar los conocimientos, el método es holístico e integral, como entender el mundo, es un desafío, basado en el respeto a la naturaleza y esta relación es base para entender la relación recíproca de los pobladores con Madre Tierra.

Qhip Nayra que se traduce como consulta a los conocimientos para la toma de decisiones, el restablecimiento de sus instituciones económica, sociales, culturales son necesarios para procesos de autonomía o autogobiernos indígenas, en el marco del cumplimiento de la Declaración de los Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas.

Desde mi cultura indígena nahua asentada en el contexto mexicano respecto a la acción colectiva puedo referir que existen varios aspectos que contribuyen a la conservación de la biodiversidad, como la construcción de casas que hasta no hace mucho era con materiales orgánicos, construidas con madera y barro y los techos de zacate, se trata de construcciones biodegradables y que se calculaban con base en la esperanza de vida, por ejemplo.

Especificidad del contexto: Hay una tendencia sustentada en los hábitos de no consumismo y no acumulación, tener solo lo necesario, a lo que se le da utilidad en lo cotidiano, por ejemplo, zapatos, en la sociedad citadina las personas tienen zapatos de todos los colores y los bajos, los altos, los de abiertos, los cerrados, que en fin son colecciones, mientras que en el ámbito indígena solamente los necesarios para el uso de diario.

Respecto a la multiplicidad de valores, ciertamente en esta metodología y en la filosofía indígena confluyen valores como en la práctica de la caza ya que no se caza por deporte o por gusto sino para cubrir una necesidad de alimento pero se conoce qué tipo de animales hay dentro del área, cuáles son machos y cuáles hembras, cuál es la época de veda y cuál la de celo, qué hembras están embarazadas, qué edades tienen los animales que salen al paso y de esta manera no se caza cualquier ejemplar sino solo aquel que no afectará mucho a la especie si falta.

Y en mi opinión en el aspecto de pluralidad y complementariedad metodológicas se hace uso de varios métodos o aspectos que complementan la efectividad.

Respecto de la orientación en procesos la participación es plena en un sentido colectivo y en relación a la cultura ya que no se separan roles. Solo cabe advertir en este apartado que, así como no hay separación de roles tampoco debe haberla por generaciones, el modelo debe ser tomado con las características reales de las sociedades indígenas en donde todos tenemos una función importante. En mi opinión se ejerce una vinculación con la labor sobre la utilización consuetudinaria sostenible ya que se fomenta la relación con los elementos naturales reconocidos como parte fundamental en la vida de los pueblos indígenas y comunidades locales.

**Stockholm Resilience Centre**

## **SUBMISSION**

Besides the journal publications mentioned below, we would also like to suggest revisiting the country examples provided in the policy report "[Biodiversity financing and safeguards: lessons learned and](#)

[proposed guidelines](#)”,<sup>6</sup> which includes case studies relevant to distinct aspects of the issued requested in the submission to comment on:

Ituarte-Lima, C., Schultz, M., Hahn, McDermott, C., and Cornell, S., 2014, Biodiversity financing and safeguards: lessons learned and proposed guidelines, Stockholm: SwedBio/Stockholm Resilience Centre at Stockholm University, Information Document UNEP/CBD/COP/12/INF/27 for the 12th Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Pyeongchang Korea.

This policy report is part of SwedBio’s work on safeguards, biodiversity financing and legal systems and has built on insights of stakeholders’ processes such as the [Quito II Dialogue](#) in 2014 on Scaling up Biodiversity Finance where safeguards were discussed, and is also part of the research project ‘Effective and Equitable Institutional Arrangements for Financing and Safeguarding Biodiversity’ (254-2013-130) above-mentioned.

The Voluntary guidelines of safeguards to biodiversity financing mechanisms (BFMs), and operational next steps, adopted at CBD-COP12 in South Korea were based on guidelines and a roadmap in this report.<sup>7</sup> Please find below two articles with lessons learned concerning the implementation of safeguards in specific Biodiversity Financing Mechanisms. These lessons learnt can be relevant to point 4 in the above-mentioned notification, in particular to resource mobilisation and the operationalization of the CBD voluntary guidelines for safeguards in relation to the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities. The first publication may also be relevant for the implementation of “free prior informed consent” at national and local levels under point 3 of the notification.

### ***Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms***

*Safeguards in payment for ecosystem services and climate financing mechanisms with possible co-benefits to biodiversity*

McDermott, C. L., and C. Ituarte-Lima. 2016. Safeguarding what and for whom? The role of institutional fit in shaping REDD+ in Mexico. *Ecology and Society* 21(1):9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-08088-210109>

Abstract. “This paper examines the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change mechanism Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD+), and its associated multitude of global to local safeguards, as they apply to a single ejido on the Yucatan Peninsula, Mexico. It draws on written sources and interviews to analyse the ways in which broad international norms articulated through the REDD+ safeguards, including support for human rights and sustainable livelihoods for local communities, are translated at national, regional, and local levels. Our findings indicate a wide range of perspectives on what constitutes sustainability, from strict conservation to more forest use-oriented strategies, such as community forestry and traditional Mayan shifting cultivation.

These visions, in turn, shape what types of REDD+ interventions are considered a good

“environmental fit,” i.e., that fit the environmental problems they aim to address. Fits and misfits also occur between institutions, and play a core role in determining whose visions of sustainability prevail. We found a good fit in the case study ejido between REDD+ and the Payment for Ecosystem service (PES) scheme, which sets the parameters for what counts as “sustainable livelihoods” within a strict conservation paradigm. We likewise found a good fit between REDD+ safeguards and institutions supporting local community rights to reject REDD+ projects. However, despite the strength of procedural

<sup>6</sup> Ituarte-Lima, C., Schultz, M., Hahn, McDermott, C., and Cornell, S., 2014, Biodiversity financing and safeguards: lessons learned and proposed guidelines, Stockholm: SwedBio/Stockholm Resilience Centre at Stockholm University, Information Document UNEP/CBD/COP/12/INF/27 for the 12th Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Pyeongchang Korea

<sup>7</sup> <http://swed.bio/multiactor-dialogues/biodiversity-financing-and-safeguards/>; <http://swed.bio/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Ituarte-Lima-Schultzetal2014cop-12-inf-27-en.pdf>; <http://swed.bio/multiactor-dialogues/quito-dialogue/>; <http://swed.bio/multiactor-dialogues/quito-ii-dialogue/>

safeguards, the parameters of the PES scheme constrained the choice of REDD+ activities available, including the possibilities of local people to work on the farm and in the forest, and hence the scope of its distributive benefits. This highlights the important, but also problematic, roles of institutional and environmental “fit” in determining whose rights are safeguarded and what is recognized as a sustainable livelihood strategy. It also calls for more proactive efforts to expand the range of REDD+ activities in ways that safeguard livelihood diversity.”

#### *Ecological compensation*

Koh, N., Hahn, T., Ituarte-Lima, C. Safeguards for Enhancing Ecological Compensation in Sweden, *Land Use Policy*, 64: 186–199

#### Highlights

- Two case studies reveal ecological compensation (EC) in practice in Sweden.
- Compensation legislation must apply to roads and urbanisation to achieve No Net Loss.
- EC in Sweden is ad hoc; no standards for quantitative and qualitative valuation yet.
- Compensation pools may be a promising strategy to secure land availability.
- EC social safeguards are vital and intertwined with human rights but are understudied. Abstract

“Ecological compensation (EC) is being explored as a policy instrument for the European Union’s ‘No Net Loss of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services’ initiative. EC is commonly associated with the Polluter-Pays Principle, but we propose the Developer-Pays Principle as a more comprehensive principle. Safeguards that are relevant to local and national contexts are needed when addressing social-ecological resilience in the face of risks associated with EC. The operationalisation of EC in Sweden is assessed through two case studies: the E12 highway and Mertainen mine. The institutional design and implementation procedures are investigated through semi-structured interviews as well as an analysis of legal and other written documents. Using a multi-level governance framework, we examine four key disputed issues within compensation. Our results suggest that (i) Risk of a license-to-trash can be minimised; (ii) Complementary quantitative and qualitative ecological valuation methods are needed to achieve additionality and No Net Loss; (iii) Compensation pools may be a promising strategy to secure land availability; and (iv) Social safeguards are vital for EC in high-income countries as well, where they are currently understudied. We conclude that EC cannot be the main instrument for nature conservation, but rather complementary to a strong legal framework that protects biodiversity and ecosystems in addition to the sustained and equitable benefits of ecosystem services”

In Table 7 in the publication, find lessons learned from the operationalisation of safeguards in EC in Sweden associated with the CBD voluntary guidelines for safeguards.

---