### Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Territories and Areas (ICCAs): Contributions to the 2020 Aichi Targets

#### Gino Cocchiaro

#### Natural Justice, ICCA Consortium Member

(based on an earlier presentation and draft briefing note by Ashish Kothari, Kalpavriksh, and images from ICCA Consortium members)



Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and the Aichi Targets *"Living in Harmony with Nature"* 

The achievement of the Aichi Targets,

and therefore the **future** of biodiversity on earth,

is **inextricably linked** to appropriate recognition of and support for **ICCAs** 

#### **STRATEGIC GOAL A**

#### **Address the underlying causes** of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society



ICCAs are key arenas in which Indigenous peoples and local communities integrate biodiversity, culture, adaptive knowledge systems, livelihoods, and governance...

> They provide crucial examples of how biodiversity can be recognised and respected as a fundamental bedrock of human society

- Embody the multiple values of biodiversity and the relationships between cultural and biological diversity (Aichi Target 1)
  - They also provide inspiration, information and lessons for communities to initiate their own conservation practice or revive those that may have been lost
  - e.g. Mangagoulack community's revival of traditional taboos and fishing practices in Casamance, Senegal



- Prevent and eradicate poverty through primary production systems that sustain local economies and livelihood security (Aichi Target 2)
  - e.g. Community Conservancies in Namibia generate hundreds of jobs and millions of dollars in income, and many non-monetary benefits such as food and capacity to monitor wildlife

- Contain systems of rules with disincentives (sanctions, penalties) and incentives (awards, economic benefits) for conservation and sustainable use (Aichi Target 3)
  - e.g. 'conservation incentive agreement' between Indigenous Chachi in Ecuador and a donor and international conservation NGO to compensate for protecting 7200 ha of forest
  - The strongest incentive could be security of collective tenure and recognition of customary stewardship rights and responsibilities



 Encompass a huge diversity of systems of Sustainable use, production and CONSUMPTION (Aichi Target 4)

• e.g. Beach Management Units in Kenya develop and enforce rules to govern their fisheries

#### **STRATEGIC GOAL B**

#### Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use



ICCAs necessarily tackle and reduce or eliminate direct internal and external pressures on biodiversity...

... Sustainable use is based on locally adapted institutions taking wise and resilient decisions to respond to changes based on long-term on-site experience

- Are the basis of livelihoods for millions of people and sustainably manage and CONSERVE fisheries, agricultural areas, aquaculture, and forestry through ecosystem-based approaches (Aichi Targets 6 and 7); efforts of many ICCAs also help conserve species that are not fished, hunted or used
  - e.g. responsible and sustainable fishing practices are at the heart of customary seascape conservation systems such as Satoumi in Japan
  - e.g. rice terraces mixed with forested landscapes in South East Asia



- Adopt customary or formal rules to regulate human activities that damage coral reefs and other vulnerable ecosystems (Aichi Target 10)
  - e.g. Locally Managed Marine Areas in the South Pacific

- Have strong self-governance systems that can halt habitat loss and resist industrial degradation and fragmentation (Aichi Target 5) such as large-scale logging, monoculture plantations, dams, etc.
  - e.g. community forests across millions of hectares in Nepal and India have slowed or halted forest degradation and helped with regeneration and recovery



 Use low-input agricultural techniques and fight to reduce pollution and chemicals from nearby industries (Aichi Target 8)

e.g. campaigns to drive out nuclear waste from Pongso no Tao, Taiwan

- Use ecosystem management planning to reduce the threat of invasive alien species (Aichi Target 9)
  - e.g. Indigenous Soliga in Biligiri Rangaswamy Temple Sanctuary and Tiger Reserve (India) are combining traditional and new methods to control invasive species like Lantana

#### **STRATEGIC GOAL C**

# To *improve the status of biodiversity* by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity



ICCAs contribute tremendously to conservation of biodiversity and wildlife, even when the primary objectives are different... *e.g.* Communities conserving catchment forests for spiritual or religious reasons also safeguard ecosystem integrity

#### Are effective area-based conservation measures (Aichi Target 11)

- They may cover the same or more area than government protected areas and could help surpass the targets of 17% of terrestrial and inland waters and 10% of coastal and marine areas
  - e.g. one-fifth of closed canopy forests in the Amazon are within recognised Indigenous reserves;
    60-65% of forests in the Philippines are within registered or claimed Ancestral Domains; over
    40% of heathland in the UK are located within traditional commons



- ICCAs are found in virtually all ecological regions of the world and help connect landscapes, ecosystems, and other forms of protection; much more effective and equitable than state PAs
- They should only be included in national PA systems with the full FPIC of their custodians

- Protect and conserve Species (including threatened) and their habitats (Aichi Target 12), often as an explicit objective due to cultural, spiritual or religious association or because of local economic opportunities
  - e.g. protection of endangered sea turtles in central America, Ethiopian wolf in Guassa-Menz
    Community Conserved Area in Ethiopia, snow leopard in Tibet, Guiana dolphin in Suriname, etc.



- Maintain genetic diversity of cultivated plants, domesticated animals, and wild relatives (Aichi Target 13) through both settled and mobile agricultural systems that sustain connections with 'wild' ecosystems
  - e.g. traditional 'milpa' farm systems in Mexico help preserve native corn and bean cultivars

#### **STRATEGIC GOAL D**

#### **Enhance the benefits to all** from biodiversity and ecosystem services



Communities have a vested interest in maintaining, reviving and enhancing biodiversity and ecosystem functions...

... they rely upon them directly and indirectly for all aspects of their lives and well-being

- Restore and safeguard ecosystems and contribute to culturally appropriate health, livelihoods and well-being (Aichi Target 14)
  - Many communities maintain or enhance ecosystem functions such as watersheds
  - e.g. Wet'suwet'en Nation (Canada) opposing pipelines that would threaten their territories, watersheds and salmon spawning grounds



- Conserve and restore degraded ecosystems, enhance ecosystem resilience, and mitigate and adapt to climate change (Aichi Target 15)
  - e.g. nomadic communities in dryland systems such as Iran and the Sahel adapt with shifts in climate and contribute to soil sustainability
  - Must be careful about new initiatives such as REDD and PES, especially without clear tenurial security and community governance

- Regulate internal and external access and equitably share benefits of resource conservation and use (Aichi Target 16)
  - e.g. Tagbanwa people of Coron Island (Philippines) have strict use regulations for forest resources and freshwater lakes, with income from tourism supporting health and education



- Communities can be partners in implementation of the Nagoya Protocol if key issues relating to rights, tenurial security, FPIC, and power imbalances are dealt with
  - Customary law and community protocols can help clarify site-specific procedures and rules for outsiders to access and use their resources or traditional knowledge
  - e.g. Bushbuckridge community protocol sets clear terms and conditions for the use of the Kukula Traditional Health Practitioners' knowledge and medicinal plants

#### **STRATEGIC GOAL E**

**Enhance implementation** through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building



Localised institutions for natural resource stewardship, governance and management rely on sophisticated knowledge systems...

> Communities working to secure their ICCAs often include elements of capacity-building and participatory planning

- Are site-specific, adaptive and built on sophisticated traditional knowledge, innovations and practices (Aichi Target 18)
  - e.g. Inuit of Nunavut (Canada) have complex understanding of wildlife populations and habitats (including caribou); customary uses respect breeding and calving areas/seasons
  - Recognition of the importance of traditional knowledge systems encourages inter-generational transfer of knowledge and practices



- Engage with researchers and civil society to co-develop a knowledge and science base (Aichi Target 19), including using participatory methods
  - e.g. Indigenous Dusun in Ulu Papar and Bundu Tuhan (Malaysia) use participatory documentation, biodiversity monitoring, mapping, video, and photography with NGO support

- Are essential to achieving the three pillars of the CBD and should be included in national biodiversity strategies and action plans (Aichi Target 17)
  - e.g. four-year nation-wide participatory process to develop India's NBSAP (but eventually not accepted by government)



- Are more cost-effective than government-managed areas, often run on voluntary contributions, and can mobilise their own resources from various sources (Aichi Target 20)
  - e.g. in-kind community and NGO and government support for Indigenous Protected Areas program in Australia

ICCAs already contribute so much to the **achievement of the Aichi Targets**,

and could contribute even more with appropriate recognition and support,

particularly to realise the rights enshrined in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and the Aichi Targets *"Living in Harmony with Nature"* 

# **Gaps and Challenges**

- Lack of or inappropriate recognition in law and policy, and weak implementation – the legal system itself is a significant barrier
- Most ICCAs (by local names) are not yet identified, documented or recognised outside of their communities
- Many are threatened by forces of 'development', commercialisation, militarisation, and cultural change – as well as natural disasters and climate change
- Conservation agencies still unwilling to truly engage with communities



## **Good News: Progress in Legal Recognition**



- Multiple references to ICCAs in CBD Decisions and IUCN Resolutions
- RRI (2012): Forests under community ownership/management, up from 10 to 15% in last decade
- Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, Australia: Indigenous territories designated
- Philippines: Ancestral Domain titles to many Indigenous territories
- India: Community Forest Rights (including use/management)
- Kenya, Namibia, Tanzania: community forests and/or conservancies, with full management and use control
- Fiji: recognition of Locally Managed Marine Areas (100% of country's marine protected area system)

Secretariat of the **Convention** on **Biological Diversity** 



#### **RECOGNISING AND SUPPORTING** TERRITORIES AND AREAS **CONSERVED BY INDIGENOUS** PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Global overview and national case studies

Der stantt

**RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING CONSERVATION BY** INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

AN ANALYSIS OF INTERNALIZING, NATIONAL LEGISLATION, JUDGEMENTS, AND MATUURISHS AS THEY INTERNAL MORE TRANSPORT AND AREAS COMPRESS. RY SHOREHOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL CONMUNITES.

NATURAL JUSTICE

Revoluti No. 6

American Reservan

REPORT NES, 2 APRICA RELEMAN

REMARK NO. 1 INTERNALIZIONAL LAW AND DURING SUPERIOR



Revent Mil. 12 ALLA RESIDENT

020



# Key Resources



# The ICCA Consortium



Environmental Action Group

for more information: www.iccaconsortium.org gino@naturaljustice.org holly@naturaljustice.org ashishkothari@vsnl.com



THE

FUND

CHRISTENSEN



