

The “Resilience and Security Tool” for ICCAs

Draft for testing – version 17 October 2012¹

Indigenous peoples’ and community conserved areas and territories (ICCAs for short) are frequently under threat— of external but also internal origin. They also greatly vary, moreover, in terms of their resilience under conditions of stress. As the recent, long delayed international recognition of their value for biodiversity, livelihoods and the realisation of human and indigenous peoples’ rights has not yet percolated in many national policies and programmes, we have a relatively narrow window of opportunity before many ICCAs are fundamentally altered or disappear. Action to address threats, which can be achieved by coordinated efforts of indigenous peoples, local communities and national and international agencies and actors, is often left wanting. This makes the more urgent to understand the characteristics that contribute to ICCA resilience and security, which should be strengthened in all possible ways.

Hoping to better understand such characteristics the ICCA Consortium had developed a draft “ICCA Resilience and Security Tool”, which is currently being tested in different regions. The Tool comprises a set of questions to help indigenous peoples and local communities² self-evaluate their ICCAs’ resilience and security relative to a combination of internal and external factors. The questions could be answered by:

- the ICCA **community institution in charge of its governance**;
- different **focus groups in the community** (their separate answers are then taken into consideration by the governing institution, which compiles and summarises them);
- a **representative sample of community members** (after collective discussion and obtaining a consensus on preferred answers).

Further methodology options include the presence/ absence of a **facilitator**. In the process of testing the tools, a number of ways of using it will also be assessed.

The **internal components** of the Tool include questions related to the main defining characteristic of ICCAs, i.e.:

- **strength and solidity of the connection between the community and its ICCA** (e.g. richness of motivations, relationship embedded into culture and sense of community identity);
- **capacity of the community to govern the ICCA** (e.g. presence of respected institutions and leaders capable of taking decisions and having those implemented, accountability to the community and others, etc.);
- apparent **results of management decisions implemented by the community** for both conservation of nature (biodiversity, ecosystem functions) and sustainability of local livelihoods.

Questions also relate to internal threats to cohesion, and internal socio-political and cultural change.

The **external components** of the Tool include questions relate to **recognition and support**, as well as questions related to existing **threats** and **disruptive forces** likely to affect the sustainability of ICCAs.

For each component in the Table below the members of the community using the tool are invited to consider whether the factor is **strong; fairly strong or strengthening; medium; fairly weak or weakening; or weak**. Some suggestions about what to consider before doing that are given in parentheses, including an evaluation of tendencies (is the factor growing? Is it weakening?). Once the members of the community have discussed a question and decided on an answer they may tick or circle

¹ Please send your remarks, comments and proposals for change to Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend (gbf@cenesta.org), Juan Carlos Riascos de la Pena (jcriascos@ecozoica.org) and Stan Stevens (ssstevens.umass@gmail.com).

² In the following we will use the term « communities » to mean « indigenous peoples and local communities ».

the score that appears in the column corresponding to their answer (move from left to right to go from strong to weak and do not worry when the numeric scores for strong and weak at times do reverse). In addition, if the factor being assessed has a disproportionate power to disrupt or protect the ICCA (e.g., if it can alone counteract all or most of the others, as it could be for a dam being built that will flood and submerge the ICCA), the respondents are asked to note it on the side by ticking the **POWER FLAG (PF) box**.

Table 1. The “ICCA Resilience and Security Tool”		Assessment					
		Strong	Fairly strong/	Medium	Fairly weak/	Weak	POWER FLAG
Internal factors							
Connection between the indigenous people/ local community and the ICCA							
1	ICCA’s cultural, spiritual and other non material values appreciated by the community as evidenced by the ICCA being part of their worldview and identity and/or being culturally or religiously important (<u>strong</u> if ICCA-related values are virtually universally known and appreciated; <u>medium</u> if held by about half of the people in the community; <u>weak</u> if basically lost)	5	4	3	2	1	PF
2	ICCA’s values for the conservation of biological diversity appreciated by the community , as evidenced by endemic species & ecosystem functions being well known & appreciated/ protected (<u>strong</u> if most people in the community are knowledgeable and active in conservation; <u>medium</u> if about half of the people are concerned and active; <u>weak</u> if most local people appear insensitive to current or potential ecological change)	5	4	3	2	1	PF
3	ICCA’s subsistence & economic values appreciated by the community as evidenced by it being a well known and utilised source of food, water, income or providing protection from environmental disasters (<u>strong</u> if basically everyone benefits from the ICCA; <u>medium</u> if by about half of people benefit from the ICCA; <u>weak</u> if most members of the community receive no direct benefit from it)	5	4	3	2	1	PF
	Age of relationship between the ICCA and the community (<u>strong</u> if over 100 year old; <u>medium</u> if less than 50 years old; <u>weak</u> if is less than 10 years old)	5	4	3	2	1	PF

Table 1. The “ICCA Resilience and Security Tool”		Assessment					
		Strong	Fairly strong/	Medium	Fairly weak/	Weak	POWER FLAG
	Strength of relationship between the ICCA and the community (<u>strong</u> is both elders, youth, men and women are engaged in caring for the ICCA; <u>medium</u> if there is a strong involvement of community elders <u>or</u> the youth or only men or women; <u>weak</u> if only very few individuals seem to care about the ICCA)	5	4	3	2	1	PF
Governance of the ICCA							
	ICCA decision-making valued & respected by the community, as evidenced by strong ICCA-related institutions, champions and leaders (<u>strong</u> if respected by virtually everyone; <u>medium</u> if well respected but not by all; <u>weak</u> if management decisions about ICCAs go very often un-respected)	5	4	3	2	1	PF
	Community engagement in decision-making (<u>strong</u> if major issues are only decided by consensus by a general assembly or equivalent body; <u>medium</u> if local decisions are usually debated and taken by majority votes; <u>weak</u> if the community never has general assemblies and meetings)	5	4	3	2	1	PF
	Community cohesion and solidarity , as evidenced by a sense of common identity, mutual help and respect (<u>strong</u> if the community is proud of its identity and demonstrates in practice its own internal solidarity and aliveness; <u>medium</u> if there are sporadic cases of local destitution and abandonment (lack of solidarity) but people still participate in common festivities and initiatives; <u>weak</u> if local destitution and abandonment are frequent and common festivities and initiatives virtually nonexistent)	5	4	3	2	1	PF

Table 1. The “ICCA Resilience and Security Tool”		Assessment					
		Strong	Fairly strong/	Medium	Fairly weak/	Weak	POWER FLAG
	Effective enforcement of rules , as evidenced by local rules concerning a variety of aspects of community life (not only the ICCA) being well-known and respected (<u>strong</u> if rules are well known and infractions by members of the community virtually absent; <u>medium</u> if they are generally known & infractions infrequent; <u>weak</u> if rules are largely unknown/disrespected)	5	4	3	2	1	PF
	Transparency and accountability , as evidenced by: 1. information on local decision-making readily available; 2. technical archives and financial accounting readily available; 3. evaluations regularly performed; 4. community free and competent to discuss ICCA management issues (<u>strong</u> if there is excellent respect of agreed procedures and satisfaction of criteria such as the four just mentioned; <u>medium</u> if only some criteria are respected; <u>weak</u> if all these aspects of decision-making are unheard of)	5	4	3	2	1	PF
Conservation of nature and sustainable livelihoods							
	Status of ecosystems in the ICCA , as evidenced by indicators such as integrity of forest areas; status of soil; quality and quantity of freshwater in and from the ICCA; abundance and vigour of endemic biodiversity (<u>strong</u> if the ecosystems are thriving; <u>medium</u> if the ecological balance is uncertain; <u>weak</u> if the area is severely degraded and prone to disasters)	5	4	3	2	1	PF
	Status of ecosystems in the surroundings of the ICCA , as evidenced by indicators such as the ones noted above in areas bordering with the ICCA (<u>strong</u> if thriving; <u>medium</u> if the ecological balance is uncertain; <u>weak</u> if the areas are severely degraded and prone to disasters)	5	4	3	2	1	PF

Table 1. The “ICCA Resilience and Security Tool”		Assessment					
		Strong	Fairly strong/	Medium	Fairly weak/	Weak	POWER FLAG
	Quality of livelihoods for the community governing the ICCA , as evidenced by material indicators, e.g. food sovereignty, wealth per capita, public health, but also non-material indicators, e.g. internal solidarity and sense of satisfaction and well-being (<u>strong</u> if the community is thriving in both aspects; <u>medium</u> if the community does well in material aspects but poorly in non-material ones, or viceversa; <u>weak</u> if the community is in miserable conditions with regard to both)	5	4	3	2	1	PF
Resilience and security versus internal threats							
	Extent of community members migrating outside the areas (<u>strong</u> if basically all the youth leaves the area to work or study and none comes back (depopulation); <u>medium</u> if many leave and some do come back; <u>weak</u> if there is hardly any permanent outside migration)	1	2	3	4	5	PF
	Evidence of rapid cultural change related to national assimilation policies, influences of globalization, education curricula disrespectful of customary values and institutions, changing ethnic composition because of extensive migration, etc. (<u>strong</u> if even local languages and concepts are being weakened and abandoned; <u>medium</u> if some elements of local culture are lost but others remain alive; <u>weak</u> if local mores stay strong and able to interpret and incorporate all novelties and change)	1	2	3	4	5	PF
	Evidence of rapid changes in economic lifestyles and aspirations (<u>strong</u> if change is widespread and disruptive of culture and customary values; <u>medium</u> if new aspirations and lifestyles appear to blend with customary ones; <u>weak</u> if no change appears apparent and/or desired)	1	2	3	4	5	PF

Table 1. The “ICCA Resilience and Security Tool”		Assessment					
		Strong	Fairly strong/	Medium	Fairly weak/	Weak	POWER FLAG
	Evidence of political/ social fragmentation , as revealed by political and social differences well apparent within the community (<u>strong</u> if disrespectful behavior and violence among community members are common ; <u>medium</u> if sharp socio-political differences exist but most of them are respectfully dealt with; <u>weak</u> if the community is very united behind some common social and political objectives)	1	2	3	4	5	PF
	Evidence of strong internal inequities, conflicts and crimes , including gender-related and age-related (<u>strong</u> if internal inequities are widespread, and conflicts and crimes are frequent; <u>medium</u> if they exist but are uncommon; <u>weak</u> if they are unheard of)	1	2	3	4	5	PF
External factors							
Tenure and recognition							
	ICCA recognised and respected by neighbouring communities (<u>strong</u> if by all neighbouring communities; <u>medium</u> if only by a few; <u>weak</u> if by none)	5	4	3	2	1	PF
	Collective territorial, land, water and natural resource rights (ownership and/or use) recognised by civil society in general and national/ international NGOs , e.g. through provision of support and public acknowledgement and respect (<u>strong</u> if specific campaigns and support action have been taken; <u>medium</u> if there are uncertainties and relatively small disputes; <u>weak</u> if no recognition is apparent)	5	4	3	2	1	PF
	Collective territorial, land, water and natural resource rights (ownership and/or use) <i>de facto</i>/ informally recognised by state agencies e.g. through coordination of management activities, public acknowledgement and respect by government officials, etc. (<u>strong</u> if	5	4	3	2	1	PF

Table 1. The “ICCA Resilience and Security Tool”		Assessment					
		Strong	Fairly strong/	Medium	Fairly weak/	Weak	POWER FLAG
	collaboration is positive, respectful, has been happening for a long time and/or is also being recognised <i>de jure</i> ; <u>medium</u> if there are uncertainties and relatively small disputes; <u>weak</u> if collaboration instances are absent)						
	ICCA status formally recognised in state law and policy (<u>strong</u> if the government formally recognises the ICCA under the common property of the relevant community; <u>medium</u> if legislation is unclear but support can be argued for; <u>weak</u> if government does not recognise customary and/or local institutions, does not help to enforce customary laws and locally-agreed rules and actually does or try to impose government-managed conservation schemes)	5	4	3	2	1	PF
Balance between demanded and received support							
	Political support from outsiders , e.g., advocacy by outside actors for the rights of the community. The assessment here is delicate, as it needs to take into account whether the relevant community wishes and desires the political support or prefers autonomy and no outside interference; your score may thus be assigned depending-on a balance between desired and obtained support , i.e., the assessment is <u>strong</u> (score=5) if no support is desired and no support is received or much support is needed and much is received; the assessment is <u>medium</u> (score=3) if only part of what is needed is received; the assessment is <u>weak</u> (score=1), if the community receives much <i>undesired</i> political attention or no attention despite a strong felt need for it.	5	4	3	2	1	PF
	Economic support from outsiders , e.g., in terms of financial resources and/or in kind support provided to the community for a variety of initiatives (again, the	5	4	3	2	1	PF

Table 1. The “ICCA Resilience and Security Tool”		Assessment					
		Strong	Fairly strong/	Medium	Fairly weak/	Weak	POWER FLAG
	assessment from strong to weak depends on a balance between desired and obtained support , as for the previous factor)						
	Technical support from outsiders , e.g. for biodiversity inventories, legal advice, etc. (again, the assessment from strong to weak depends on a balance between desired and obtained support , as for the previous factor)	5	4	3	2	1	PF
	Cultural recognition , e.g., understanding and respect of the cultural and identity values motivating the community (<u>strong</u> if local language & other cultural expressions are openly valued & included in school curricula, are used in government meetings, and are well recognised by society in general; <u>medium</u> if they are unevenly respected by governmental agencies and others; <u>weak</u> if they are mostly ignored)	5	4	3	2	1	PF
Resilience and security versus external threats							
	Major economic forces coveting the ICCA , including for extractive industries, the development of major infrastructure, mass tourism, industrial fishing and agriculture, biofuels, conservation initiatives, etc. (<u>strong</u> if they exist in the area and operate in alliance with the national government; <u>medium</u> if such forces are there, but the government does not support them; <u>weak</u> if none exists at the moment)	1	2	3	4	5	PF
	Settlers, migrants and refugees coveting the ICCA’s land and resources (<u>strong</u> if they are many and with government support; <u>medium</u> if few and operating alone; <u>weak</u> if absent)	1	2	3	4	5	PF

Table 1. The “ICCA Resilience and Security Tool”		Assessment					
		Strong	Fairly strong/	Medium	Fairly weak/	Weak	POWER FLAG
	Major environmental threats to the ICCA, such as pollution, widespread invasive species or current/expected severe effects of climate change (<u>strong</u> if clearly apparent and severe; <u>medium</u> if uncertain, unclear and unspecific; <u>weak</u> if no such threats are apparent or expected to take place)	1	2	3	4	5	PF
	Threats to the ICCA related to war, violent conflicts and crime , such as because of guerrilla and counterinsurgency operations in the area (<u>strong</u> if such threats are clearly apparent and severe; <u>medium</u> if uncertain, unclear and unspecific; <u>weak</u> if they are apparent or expected)	1	2	3	4	5	PF

■ Estimate of the ICCA Resilience and Security “Index”

Once the members of the community have discussed each question and decided about the appropriate reply column (from strong to weak, moving from the left to the right), they may tick or circle the “assigned score” for that column. Also, if they believe that the particular factor under discussion has much more power than all or most of the others, they may tick the POWER FLAG. After all the questions have been examined and replied to, the users may be satisfied with the discussion and leave it that. As a matter of fact, the community discussion of the issues introduced by each question is what makes the Tool worthwhile.

If the community wishes to also have an overall numerical “Index” of the “resilience and security” of their ICCA, they can also calculate the score total. If they decide to do that, they should first of all count all the power flags they have assigned (if any). **If one or more power flags have been “flagged”, the overall Index loses much of its meaning and we advise not to calculate it at all.** In such cases, the flagged components need to be considered as strong priorities for remedial action.

If no power flags have been raised, the numerical Index can be calculated by summing up the circled scores for each component (minimum result 30; maximum 150). The Index is then calculated according to the simple formula:

$$\text{Resilience and Security Index} = \text{Total score}/150$$

In all cases, the Index has no pretence of precision and—as the relative significance of each of the factors and components can only be assessed in a local context— the Indexes of different ICCAs should not be compared.

Again, the process of asking and answering the questions and thinking about phenomena that may affect ICCAs is what makes the Tool useful. If an Index is calculated, it should only be used by the concerned community as a base-line value for self-monitoring and evaluation over time. Stability (or change) in the Index for a particular ICCA would offer a rough estimate of the variation of its resilience and security through time (note, again, no pretence of precision or comparability). Roughly, one could say that the closer the Index is to 1, the more resilient and secure one can expect an ICCA to be. If the calculated Index is larger **than 0.75**, the ICCA could be considered as *relatively* resilient and secure. If the Index scores **less than 0.5**, the ICCA situation is *not likely* to be good and sustainable, and may need attention and help. The Index thus provides another occasion for self-reflection for the communities that are caretakers of ICCAs. In addition, identifying which Index components scored very low may suggest areas where action can be taken to protect and strengthen an ICCA.

Before closing the meeting, and possibly after a tea/coffee break, the facilitator should pose the following questions to the participants in the meeting and keep a record of their answers:

Is there anything important that emerged, for you, while discussing issues of resilience and security for your ICCA?

What are, in your view, the key elements of strength of your ICCA?

What are the key weaknesses?

What could you do, individually and as a community, to build upon the elements of strength?

What could you do, individually and as a community, to remedy or counteract the weaknesses?

These questions—which crown a reflection of a variety of issues -- are likely to be the most important component of the exercise. Please leave space and time for them to be thoughtfully answered.