AD HOC OPEN-ENDED INTER-SESSIONAL
  WORKING GROUP ON ARTICLE 8(j) AND
  RELATED PROVISIONS OF THE
  CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL
  DIVERSITY
Eighth meeting
Item 3 of the provisional agenda[*]
Montreal, 7–11 October 2013

**COMPILATION OF INFORMATION ON THE INDICATORS ON TRADITIONAL
KNOWLEDGE AND CUSTOMARY SUSTAINABLE USE**

Global Workshop on Community-based Monitoring and Information Systems

Note by the Executive Secretary

INTRODUCTION

1.   In accordance with decisions XI/14 A and B, on progress in the implementation of Article 8(j) and related provisions and participation of indigenous and local communities in the work on the Convention, and taking into account decision XI/3 B on indicators relevant to traditional knowledge, the Executive Secretary is circulating herewith, for the consideration of participants in the eighth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Inter-Sessional Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions, information submitted to the Secretariat regarding indicators on traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use.

2.   The report of the Workshop on Community-based Monitoring and Information Systems has been reproduced in the form and language in which it was provided to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

---

[*] UNEP/CBD/WG8J/8/1.

GLOBAL WORKSHOP ON COMMUNITY-BASED MONITORING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS

April 26-28

Bonn, Germany

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In different global regions, indigenous peoples have developed their own ways of monitoring ecosystems and community health. These are based on traditional knowledge and a holistic view of people and their environment, but they also use and adapt new technologies. Today, communities use the knowledge generated by their monitoring to document external threats, to assert claims to territory, and to plan for the future.

Meanwhile, governments and international bodies have begun to recognize the importance both of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge and of the information generated through community-based monitoring. International agreements whose implementation could benefit from community monitoring include the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The global expert workshop on community-based monitoring and information systems (CBMIS) brought together indigenous peoples, governments, academics, research institutes, intergovernmental organizations and NGOs with an interest in using the information generated by community monitoring, whether at local, national or global level. The aim of the workshop was to unite the diverse participants on the importance, substance and applications of CBMIS for traditional knowledge, biodiversity and climate change, and the rights and well-being of indigenous peoples.

Overview of experiences and challenges

The opening session aimed to situate community-based monitoring and information systems in terms of the policies emerging from global agreements, the steps being taken to apply them, and how governments can work with communities.

Joji Carino of the Forest Peoples' Programme traced the development of indicators relevant to indigenous peoples' rights and well-being, the CBD and the Millennium Development Goals. Community-based monitoring is a key source of data if these indicators are to be operationalized at national, regional and global levels.

Florence Daguitan of Tebtebba Foundation described a project in the Philippines that used the community's traditional knowledge as the basis for establishing a monitoring and information system. The purpose of the monitoring was to develop a land-use plan and then to assess the effects of its implementation. The data gathered included changes in land use, biodiversity and traditional occupations. The community aims to continue monitoring land use, including tenurial arrangements, customary law and sustainable use of resources; biodiversity of plants and animals; and productivity of major crops.

Victoria Tauli-Corpuz of Tebtebba Foundation explained the safeguards agreed by the parties to the Climate Change Convention for implementation of initiatives for the reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, with conservation and sustainable management (REDD+). She then presented the domains and principles for community-based monitoring of REDD+ safeguards proposed by the Indigenous Peoples' Climate Change Partnership.

Eduardo Romero Olivero, vice-president of the North Atlantic Autonomous Region (RAAN) of Nicaragua, described the legal framework supporting indigenous peoples' rights in Nicaragua, and the need for environmental and social monitoring.

The presentations indicated that community-based monitoring provides strong evidence and information to strengthen indigenous peoples' negotiating position with governments. If this can be systematized at global level, indigenous peoples will be in a stronger position to hold governments to account in global forums, for example by challenging national reports to treaty bodies.

Community involvement and collective analysis is key to the success of CBMIS. There is a need to empower communities to act on the basis of the information they have gathered and analysed.

Traditional monitoring systems

This session demonstrated how indigenous peoples apply their traditional knowledge in community-based monitoring systems, sometimes integrating new technologies into traditional frameworks.

Tui Shortland of Nga Tirairaka o Ngati Hine explained how the monitoring framework used by the Ngati Hine people of Aotearoa-New Zealand is based on Maori spirituality, which relates directly to biodiversity. Their monitoring provides a basis for action to restore and protect their environment, to communicate the status of their territories to all members of the tribe, and to maintain their traditional knowledge by applying it in practice and passing it on to the youth. Local guardians monitor biodiversity and the quality of waters, soil, forests and coast.

Onel Masardule of the Foundation for the Preservation of Indigenous Knowledge described a monitoring program established by the General Assembly of the Guna and applied in all Guna communities in Panama. The program aims to preserve traditional knowledge. It monitors the existence of traditional knowledge holders and the conduct of intercultural education, identifies sacred sites, and records the scale and impact of tourism in Guna territories.

Joseph Ole Simel of the Mainyoito Pastoralist Integrated Development Organization (MPIDO) described the traditional monitoring systems of African pastoralists. A key purpose of these systems is to provide early warning of disasters such as droughts and outbreaks disease among people and livestock. The phenomena monitored include plants, weather and animal behavior.

The presentations showed that traditional monitoring and information systems are dynamic: they are tested and adapted over time, so that they continue to respond directly to community needs.

Traditional monitoring systems are based on traditional knowledge and all the presentations stressed the importance of passing this knowledge on to the next generation. Indicators for preservation of traditional knowledge are a unique opportunity for indigenous peoples to influence state policy. But indigenous peoples cannot maintain indicators and traditional knowledge unless they can secure their territory. Pastoralism, for example, cannot be maintained without community land.

Monitoring changes in land use and tenure

Status and trends in land use and tenure are key indicators for both traditional knowledge and indigenous peoples' rights.

Sharon Atkinson of the Amerindian Peoples' Association (APA) described a program of community-based research into indigenous peoples' land tenure in Guyana. The purpose of the research was to document the status of Amerindian lands so as to provide an evidence base to lobby for legal and policy reform, and in particular for recognition of land rights. The main focus of the research was land tenure and the level of recognition of land rights, but it also included land-related issues identified by each community.

Gathuru Mburu of the African Biodiversity Network showed how ecological maps and calendars can capture and communicate local knowledge, and how the process of creating them strengthens community cohesion and helps build local solutions to social and environmental problems. Communities can use ecological calendars to identify the spiritual as well as the economic benefits of their environment, and to identify problems in ecosystems such as signs of climate change.

The presentations showed how recognition of tenure and ecological status of their lands and territories is fundamental to indigenous peoples' rights, local livelihoods and the vitality of traditional knowledge. Thus the monitoring of land tenure and land use change provides an important evidence base, both for local development planning and for asserting rights to lands and territories at national level. Maps and other evidence of indigenous peoples' use of the land have been used to assert rights to territory.

Community maps and eco-calendars capture and present information about land in ways that are compatible with traditional knowledge. But whatever the tools used, it is crucial for information to remain with the community.

Traditional occupations and local livelihoods

Traditional occupations are fundamental to the livelihoods and culture of many indigenous peoples. The practice of traditional occupations is a proxy indicator for traditional knowledge.

Eunice Nkopio of MPIDO described how Maasai elders in Kenya regulate the practice of traditional occupations so as to preserve the forest. She also showed the participants a short film featuring a Maasai elder explaining spirituality and traditional knowledge.

Prasert Trakasuphakon of the Indigenous Knowledge and Peoples Network (IKAP) described the traditional rotational farming practices of the Hmong and Karen peoples, and presented the results of community monitoring of biodiversity and carbon storage in three areas in northern Thailand where rotational farming is practised. The purpose of the monitoring was to assess the effects of rotational farming on environment and climate. Although this traditional occupation is often misunderstood and even criminalized as a driver of deforestation and climate change, rotational farming is sustainable and supports biodiversity. The data generated through community monitoring showed that rotational farming stores more carbon than it emits, and can therefore help mitigate climate change.

Krisussandi Gunui of the Institute Dayakologi described the *dahas* system of natural resource management and the efforts of the Dayak Jalai people of Kalimantan to revitalize it as a source of livelihood.

In addition to presentations, this session included the screening of a short film showing how the Baka people in Cameroon used specially adapted GPS technology to monitor logging in their forest.

All three presentations demonstrated the interdependence of traditional occupations and traditional knowledge. They also showed that traditional livelihood systems such as pastoralism and rotational farming, which western-influenced officials and politicians often label as drivers of environmental degradation, are in fact sustainable systems that nurture natural resources as well as using them. In northern Thailand, community monitoring provided an evidence base to demonstrate customary sustainable use of natural resources and challenge myths and misunderstandings about rotational farming.

Additional tools and technologies

Community-based monitoring systems are dynamic and flexible, and can integrate new tools and technologies.

Vu Thi Hien of the Center of Research and Development in Upland Areas (CERDA) described a pilot project that aimed to demonstrate how ethnic minority communities in Vietnam could participate in REDD+ programs. The project included community monitoring of forest carbon, use of forest land and water resources, and establishing of a biodiversity inventory. In this instance the community-based monitoring was set up in response to a global initiative: REDD+. However, it offers clear benefits to the community in the form of payments for forest carbon. The project and the benefit-sharing system are subject to FPIC.

Pasang Dolma Sherpa of the Nepal Federation of Indigenous Minorities (NEFIN) explained how community radio can be an effective tool for building the awareness and capacity of communities, communicating the information generated by communities, and passing on traditional knowledge.

Henky Satrio of the Indigenous Peoples' Alliance of the Archipelago (AMAN) described the organization's SMS-based information system. The system provides a two-way information flow linking AMAN members and structures throughout Indonesia with government officials, NGOs and the wider public. This enables AMAN to disseminate information about problems facing indigenous peoples, and to take information from community monitoring and swiftly turn it into advocacy messages, helping communities to deal with imminent threats.

Information systems are also communications systems. The nationwide alliances of indigenous peoples in Nepal and Indonesia have established information systems that enable a two-way flow of information to and from communities, helping communities to defend their rights. Both systems use technologies that are accessible and affordable to many people at community level.

Working with global processes and national governments

Working with governments and international processes poses both risks and opportunities for indigenous peoples. Safeguard systems can help mitigate some of the risks. In some cases indigenous communities have shifted from opposing national governments to co-operating with them for specific purposes.

Claudia Ituarte-Lima of the Stockholm Resilience Center proposed a set of guiding principles for safeguards applicable to biodiversity financing mechanisms. The purpose of safeguards is to avoid violations of indigenous peoples' rights arising from external initiatives intended to protect biodiversity or mitigate climate change.

Manggob Masinaring of the NGO SILDAP showed how a Philippine government agency was able to achieve its environmental protection goals once officials recognized the value of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge and management systems. The Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) worked in cooperation with an indigenous community to establish a protected area without undermining local livelihoods and cultural activities.

Rose Cunningham Kain of the Center for the Autonomy and Development of Indigenous Peoples (CADPI) described the participation of young people in community mapping and monitoring, through a youth program organized by the Miskito women's organization in Nicaragua. The program aims to educate young people to care for the environment and to sustain their interest and participation in traditional knowledge and community affairs.

Joenia Wapichana of the Indigenous Council of Roraima (CIR) traced the experiences of indigenous peoples in the state of Roraima, Brazil, in working with government to achieve legal recognition of their territories. Indigenous peoples' organizations and leaders monitored the process of demarcation, and their community mapping provided information for the legal processes. CIR is now conducting studies on land use in order to improve indigenous peoples' livelihoods and their management of territory and natural resources.

Historically, indigenous peoples' experience of state activity has been linked to invasion and occupation of indigenous territories, undermining of livelihoods and destruction of culture. It is not surprising, then, that indigenous peoples opposed their governments. However, as some states and the international community as a whole began to recognize indigenous peoples' rights, relations between governments and indigenous peoples in some countries became less confrontational. This has made it possible for indigenous peoples to co-operate with governments on specific initiatives to protect the environment and promote indigenous peoples' well-being.

However, governments remain subject to competing pressures. The private sector, in particular, is often stronger than the state, so indigenous peoples still need to put pressure on governments. Moreover, in some countries governments have yet to recognize indigenous peoples' rights, and indigenous communities face severe threats. Support for recognition of indigenous peoples from the international community remains important.

Opportunities and challenges

Workshop participants were asked to state their views on the importance of CBMIS, the opportunities and challenges it poses, and how they planned to contribute to it. The responses came from representatives of governments, academia, indigenous peoples' organizations, intergovernmental organizations and NGOs.

A number of proposals and recommendations emerged from this session, including the following principles:

- Monitoring must be based on the needs of the community.

- Communities need access to information about initiatives that affect them.

- The key thing for indigenous peoples to monitor is land use change, because that is where culture, knowledge and language are based.

- Respect that the richness of CBMIS is its diversity, but collaborate for particular purposes.

- Data collected by people using different methodologies can be aggregated, as long as the methods used over time in each place are consistent.

- Keep it simple.

- Use a mix of old and new technologies.

The participants concluded that at local level, CBMIS brings the community together and provides a basis for self-determined development planning and decision making. It can also contribute to better decision-making by government. At national level, the contributions of CBMIS to national information systems can make indigenous peoples and their issues more visible to policy makers. The same is true at global level. In the current economic climate UN agencies have insufficient funds to produce global statistics, but community-based monitoring can provide reliable snapshots of trends on the ground.

Participating in national and local data generation encourages communication between indigenous peoples and researchers, creating opportunities for learning on both sides.

Opportunities for using data generated by CBMIS include conflict resolution and access to justice, whether in national courts or at international bodies. But there are also opportunities to supplement community data by using data already collected by international organizations, for example on national legal frameworks.

Community based monitoring has many uses, at community level and beyond. The challenge is to develop simple frameworks and toolkits that serve the community's information needs, but can also feed into national and global processes. The frameworks must address the needs, not only of strong communities but also those of communities under threat: those suffering human rights violations, in remote areas, with fewer links to sources of support.

In using CBMIS beyond the community, the challenge is to consolidate information generated at community level through common indicators, aggregate it, and present it to international bodies in a way that can influence their plans and decisions.

The challenges for CBMIS include comparability, recognition and sustainability. What type and degree of standardization will enable the use of community-generated information at national and global level? How to achieve recognition and acceptance of the validity of information generated by communities? How much support is needed to maintain local monitoring for national purposes and to maintain traditional knowledge?

Next steps for CBMIS

On the final day of the workshop, the participants discussed ways to strengthen CBMIS and to use the information it generates in global processes. They also outlined some next steps for building a CBMIS network:

/....

Participants identified key areas to monitor, with appropriate indicators, as shown in the table below.

What to monitor? Domains and indicators

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

Scoping

- There is a need to identify resources, experiences, and groups who are currently doing community monitoring. This will show what skills, toolkits, training expertise are available, what lessons have been learned, and what areas communities are monitoring. SwedBio wants to support this kind of scoping on a regional basis, and is looking for a person or organization to do it.

- If the scoping exercise can find out what baseline information communities have, it may be possible to agree a common reference level.

- There is a need to identify a person or organization to compile information for structural and process indicators.

Coordination and communication

- Regional coordination makes for more effective communication, because of language differences.

- There is scope for building the network at national level. For example, members of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, the 10c Network and the Indigenous Peoples' Partnership on Climate Change and Forests could coordinate in their own countries; others, for example the Andean Network, may also be interested. Co-operation with universities at national level could also strengthen the network.

- The key units in this network are communities and their authorities. They will decide how much information is shared.

- There may be a need to augment existing structures to strengthen information flows if existing listserves are inadequate.

- A small technical working group could be set up to create a CBMIS toolkit.

- It is a responsibility of participants to raise the profile of CBMIS and link it to the post-2015 process and others.

Institutions

- It should be an ambition to set up a registry or center of reference, to add credibility, because no-one is collecting data on traditional knowledge and indigenous peoples.

Processes and issues to address

- The preparatory meeting for the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples (Alta, June 2013), which will discuss implementation of the UNDRIP, will need input on monitoring.
- More reflection is needed on engaging with the private sector. To start this, FPP will prepare a short briefing paper on the limitations, risks and opportunities posed by High Conservation Value Assessments.
- An opportunity to discuss monitoring of gender dimensions is the Global Conference of Indigenous Women, to be held in Lima in October 2013.

Starting data collection

- Data collection must start now if the information is to be used in 2014.
- It would be useful to hold a technical workshop to start aggregating the CBMIS data already available.