The ICCA Consortium

Promoting the appropriate recognition of, and support to,
Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Territories and Areas
www.iccaconsortium.org

Global ICCA Support Initiative (GSI) — Inception meeting
IUCN Headquarters, Gland (Switzerland) 27, 28 & 30th January 2015
Le Courtil Hotel, Rolle (Switzerland) 29th January 2015

Report – Emma Courtine & Sarah Ryder (with input from Heather Bingham and added comments by Grazia BF)

Participants are listed on Attendance List.

*((Comments from **participants** during presentations))*

noticeable for follow -up

Tuesday 27 January - morning

Introductions -

James Hardcastle – Programme Development Manager IUCN. We need to work together at all levels.

Sarah Ryder – Programme Manager ICCA Consortium

Emma Courtine – Programme Assistant ICCA Consortium

Delfin Ganapin - Global Manager UNDP GEF SGP. The strength of SGP is that it offers direct access to funds for local groups. Hopes that after this week we can better disburse funds to local groups for ICCAs.

Terence Hay-Edie – Biodiversity Programme Advisor UNDP GEF SGP

Heather Bingham - UNEP WCMC. Works on ICCA Registry.

Naomi Kingston – UNEP WCMC. Works on ICCA Registry.

Harry Jonas – Natural Justice

Vivienne Solis – Coopesolidar, Costa Rica. Wants to do concrete conservation work, not just talk.

Dave de Vera – PAFID Philippines – Advises on new conservation areas in the Philippines.

Nancy Chege – National Coordinator for SGP in Kenya.

Maria Alicia Eguiguren – Programme Assistant for SGP Ecuador. Works with more than 23 indigenous groups.

Yi Liu - National Coordinator for SGP in China.

Ernesto Noriega– Honorary Member of ICCA Consortium working with youth groups interested in ICCAs and human rights.

Tatjana Puschkarsky – Honorary Member of ICCA Consortium working with youth groups interested in ICCAs and human rights.

Grazia Borrini Feyerabend – Global Coordinator ICCA Consortium. We have a huge responsibility, for a long time we have asked for resources to do something for ICCAs and now the resources are there and must use them fast and well.

Taghi Farvar – President ICCA Consortium and CENESTA Iran. Believes that GEF SGP is a very powerful grant system, local communities and IP groups are now trusted to be effective.

Terence Hay Edie - The Global ICCA Support Initiative— objectives, components, implementing partners and overall desired results

(Presentation available on request)

Explained the history of the UNDP grant. SGP is a delivery mechanism for a number of initiatives – COMDECS, SIDS CBA, ICCA Global Support Initiative, Community Based REDD+, NGO Governance, and GEF FSPs. The aim is to align with Aichi Targets 11, 14 & 18. Gave brief description of the ICCA GSI. German fund is focused on 26 countries which will provide a model for how to offer funds (from regular GEF funding) to further countries, so the effect of the German fund is more far-reaching than just the 26 specified countries. *((Taghi – a lot of large grants do more harm than good. Vivienne - ICCA Consortium needs direct funds from UNDP to support it.))*

Project Organisation Structure: SGP Project Board (advised by Technical Advisory Group – UNEP WCMC, CBD Secretariat, ICCA Consortium and indigenous/CSO representatives) oversees Project Assurance (UNDP/GEF RBM Advisor, BPPS), Project Manager (Global Lead, ICCA GSI) and Project Support (Programme Associate). Project Manager oversees SGP Country Teams NC and PA (26 target countries at the global level in Africa, Arab States, Asia-Pacific, Europe & CIS, and LAC).

*((**Taghi & Vivienne** - would like this group (inception meeting) to strongly request representation on the highest decision-making body of this project, perhaps the best placed group would be the ICCA Consortium. This would need to be done without compromising the right of any representation to receive funding.))*

Outputs and Work Packages -

- Output 1, Work Package 1. **Direct support provided to community-based demonstration and action small grants in support of ICCAs**. The bulk of the funds will be delivered over the next 2.5 years. *((**Grazia** – we need to disburse funds rapidly but we need to be sure that we have time to ascertain that we disburse them truly for ICCA.))* Outlined target countries for work package 1.
- Output 2, Work Package 2. **Legal, policy and other forms of support for ICCA recognition and conservation** (including governance assessments of protected areas and landscapes).
- Output 3, Work Package 3. **Networking, knowledge production and exchange between national CSO initiatives at regional and global levels.** Outlined target countries for work package 2 & 3.

SGP will work as a grant maker +. It will do more than just making grants. The SGP consultant will help NGOs to create proposals (unclear).

ICCA Consortium will be involved with grant-making process at the local level, within countries. IUCN is the technical reference body that can help to think through the idea of governance. UNEP WCMC will record these conservation contributions worldwide.

Naomi Kingston, UNEP WCMC - Introduction to the role of UNEP WCMC in GSI

(Presentation available on request)

World Conservation Monitoring Centre. This is a charity and is an implementing agency of UNEP. Work at two levels – international agreements, and countries and country-based organisations.

- Manage the ICCA Registry – established in 2009, currently 170 registered ICCAs and website features 28 case studies from 11 countries.
- Also manage World Database on PAs (WDPA) – joint product of IUCN and UNEP, over 200,000 PAs, used by wide range of users (businesses, decision-makers, etc.) www.protectedplanet.net. Covers most of the countries of the world, including marine protected areas. Some of the data is restricted by choice of the data provider. Works on the assumption that all of the registered sites meet the IUCN definition of PA. World Heritage sites are included.

These two features overlap, but record slightly different information. Every two years they publish Protected Planet Report which measures progress towards Aichi targets. The next report will be in 2016.

From what is reported to WDPA – currently 36 countries have reported ICCAs, 91% are in just 10 countries, information is strongly biased to countries where the government recognises ICCAs (70% reported by government sources).

*((**Taghi** - governments should not be able to register ICCAs, **it should be the ICCA itself which registers** – to be discussed later in the meeting))*

WDPA also contains governance data. 30% (by area) of sites have no reported governance structure (options are: government, shared, private, IP & LC and not reported).   The role of WCMC is to integrate data on ICCAs into the WDPA and raise the profile of ICCAs among governments and policy-makers and ensure that ICCAs are accurately represented in future analyses.

((Taghi - this second role is dangerous as it means that governments have to approve data before it can be registered – to be discussed later in the meeting.))

Anyone can currently submit data, but the validation processes are such that we refer to state authorities for approval. We want to change this so that sites can submit data and it is verified by a network of alternative competent verifiers.

((Vivienne – do you collect and publish information on traditional knowledge? Naomi – we don't collect much information on this and groups can always limit what is published. Delfin – do you superimpose maps onto Google maps? Naomi - can be done but don't always use Google-based mapping as they are inaccurate. Google have been working with First Nations on demarcating their land.   Taghi – Google is very political (e.g. they will not provide data to Iran). Terence – is it possible to work with a network rather than site by site? Naomi - this is one of the advantages of working with the ICCA Consortium, they can pull together information on larger areas/regions. Terence – it would not be cost effective for WCMC to organise regional workshops, they are not a grant-making body, they are a charity. Vivienne – maybe WCMC should work with youth groups as they are often the best users of technology. James – need to be careful with technology, it is not always more powerful than simpler ways of recording/mapping))

James Hardcastle, IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme - Introduction to the role of the IUCN in GSI

Why is IUCN involved in this project? We need to frame something different within the conservation movement, we need to focus on ICCAs, not as an add-on but as a fundamental component of decisions. There is some momentum for this but we need to move it on. IUCN owns the definition of what is a PA. The big risk is governments, they can enable things to flourish or can stifle them. Want to use the project to stimulate dialogue on what is conserved and what is not. **Want to focus on 5 or 6 countries to work on ICCA recognition, then use them as motivation for others**. The choice of which country is changing all the time, this needs to be discussed further. One of the countries needs to be large and with a wide-range of issues. Want to investigate other opportunities within the programme to influence/change opinions. Want to look at marine PA, and consider resources in terms of people (regional offices need to focus on servicing members).

((Vivienne – IUCN should have broader scope, I see the ICCA Consortium working hard on CBD, Post 2015 Development Goals, etc, perhaps IUCN could support them more strongly. Grazia – ICCA Consortium and IUCN do work strongly together but often the work is destroyed by outside organisations; example: for the Global Biodiversity Outlook 4, we submitted some meaningful information jointly as IUCN and Consortium and the editors took no notice whatsoever; how is UNEP WCMC supervising this editing process? *). Grazia – the GSI should stay with people in IUCN who really understand the issues. James – we already see that we are side-lined, need to find our niche role, need to channel what we are doing more effectively.))*

Tuesday 27 January - afternoon

Trevor Sandwith – Director, IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme - joined the meeting. We are committed to working on all forms of governance and its vitality. The discussions in Sydney provided a strong foundation from which to develop.

Alejandra Pero – UNDP Equator Initiative – joined the meeting. EI best known for the prize they distribute. Here to learn what the next steps forward for the GSI are, and find out how best to coordinate with them.

M. Taghi Farvar and Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, ICCA Consortium - Introduction to the role of the ICCA Consortium in GSI

(Presentation available on request)

More of a movement than an organisation, the Consortium is about equity in conservation and the international policy recognition of ICCAs. Created in 2008, legally established in Switzerland in 2010. Created because there was a sense of danger that the wave of recognition of ICCAs was drawing attention but ways of "recognising and supporting" ICCAs can be destructive. This movement has now gelled into an institution which is becoming a bit more formal.

Mission – to promote the appropriate recognition of ICCAs, and appropriate support to them.

Membership – 76 Members (organisations), 170 Honorary Members (individuals), semi-volunteer personnel, partners (UNDP GEF SGP, IUCN GPAP, CBD Secretariat, UNEP WCMC, The Christensen Fund, GIZ).

Staff facilitate and coordinate the work of the Members and Honorary Members. Consortium is based on trust, flexibility and frugality.

Organs of the Association – General Assembly, Steering Committee (11 members) and Auditor of Accounts. The Statutes and Operational Guidelines are available online.

The Consortium works to provide support at: -

- local level (grassroots processes, analysis of problems and opportunities, registration of ICCAs in UNEP WCMC, youth groups, exchange visits, help with applying for grants, etc.),
- national level (learning networks, work at government level).   In reality, it is often difficult to work at a single country level as many ICCAs and IP cross boundaries and these boundaries are not recognised. *((Ernesto – often LC or IP groups are based on a specific landscape and this also doesn't recognise boundaries. **Taghi** – the GSI should not focus on countries but should focus on projects/units of governance.   We have unique opportunities to look at things from a different perspective. **Grazia** – what is important is the "unit of governance", we reflected on this at WPC in Sydney.))*
- international level (alert mechanism, events such as WPC, publications, policy documents on various topics and provision of opportunities for discussion -for example workshops at WPC in Sydney).

The Consortium is now expanding its interests to include cultural conservation, climate change, food security and sovereignty, IP and human rights …

*((**Grazia** explained the process of inviting Members and Honorary Members to join – not a priority for the Consortium but a greater quantity of good members leads to greater strength. **Alejandra** – have there been exchange visits between ICCAs? **Grazia** –Yes, but more occasionally than systematically. As an example, an exchange occurred between the Philippines and Taiwan, province of China this was very effective for everyone as culturally they are quite close and the aspirations of the IP in Taiwan, province of China reflected the facts in the Philippines. The outcome for inspiration, knowledge exchange and mutual support was tremendous. **Trevor** – **learning networks in ICCAs** should be an ongoing part of GSI. **Vivienne** - This happens in Central America with the fisher communities, knowledge has been shared. **Grazia** – the Consortium plan for the GSI incorporates plans for learning networks.))*

<u>Maria Alicia – GEF SGP Ecuador delivering support to ICCAs—experience, opportunities, challenges and lessons learned.</u>

(Presentation available on request)

Bio corridors for Good Living. SGP Ecuador is defined as an Upgraded Country to consolidate and boost impact. This responds to the new Constitution in Ecuador. Aiming to move from a traditional way of working to a new way of working: -

- from sustainable development to good living,
- from the national to the territorial,
- from CBO to partnerships,
- from a community to a landscape approach,
- from call for proposals to a territorial articulation process,
- from NSC to NSC local rep.,
- from a reactive process to a proactive process.

 The four territories in Ecuador are based on an ecosystem approach. A representative from each area sits on the Steering Committee. This landscape approach goes beyond an administrative system. Within these territories there are sixteen bio corridors for good living. The process works with the environmental, political, socio-cultural and economic systems of the Ecuador Constitution. A lot of things have not happened as expected. The government has changed its approach, they are focussing more on the promotion of extractive industries as they see Ecuador as a productive country. Need to provide financial support to their progressive agenda.

The project sequence was:

- design (bio corridor selection, methodology design, stakeholder mapping),
- planning (on site with local technical support NGOs, strategy design, project selection),
- implementation (local technical support NGOs with communities, direct management).

The Programme Structure: –

- National Steering Committee
- National Coordinator
- Four area working groups
- Bio corridor working groups
- partnerships

These are all supported by networks, SGP National Technical Assistance and Regional Technical Assistance, Monitoring and Evaluation Team (EQUIPATE). The Equipate facilitates people to discuss their situation and seek solutions to their problems. *((**Vivienne** – do you have any cases where there*

*has been conflict between local group conservation and extractive industries? **Maria Alicia** - the whole SGP should be behind the local group. The Equipate strengthens the group's activities. **Vivienne** - are extractors also in the groups as stakeholders? **Maria Alicia** - mostly they are well-capacitated NGOs. The communities benefit from being backed up by other activists. **Delfin** - Where would the ICCA initiatives stand in a conflict between a local group and the government? Maybe this should fall to our partners. Very important to have a dispassionate champion.   **Grazia** – we need to remember that we all benefit from mining industries and all shades of opinions must be aired. **Taghi** – you should not give these industries a voice, the situation is unbalanced and we need to give a voice to people who don't have one, rather than supporting those who easily express their opinions. **Delfin** – need to level the playing field. **Vivienne** – requested to see the composition of one of the working groups in Ecuador to fully understand how it works. **Delfin** - anyone who comes to these platforms must fundamentally agree with how they work.))*

Bio corridors are expanses of land where ecological connectivity is re-established, connecting fragmented habitats, incorporating sustainable productive activities into the landscape and fostering community partnerships. There is also a strong monitoring and technical support system (SIMONAA) which works at local, bio corridor, regional and national levels. Learning and knowledge management are promoted at the same levels, as is communication and knowledge dissemination. *((**Trevor** – what is the relationship that would make a lesson learned relevant to the land use planners of Ecuador? **Maria Alicia** - at one level there is a friendly interface of learning from one another but we need to extend that to make the learning more durable. Ecuador has a progressive Constitution so we want to be reinforcing this and therefore empowering local communities. **Delfin** –what is the extra layer that we should put into the work of SGP? **Trevor** - we want the coherence of our work to be embedded into society. **Delfin** - transfer of ideas to government is difficult as they change all the time. **Trevor** - if you can get the right to participate in processes embedded into policy/society it is more protected.))*

Main achievements in Ecuador: -

- Innovative process that effectively involved several stakeholders
- Institutionalized agreements ACBIOS/ASOCIATE
- Bio corridors are implemented based on concrete plans
- Accountability (important for local governments)
- The appropriation from civil society and local governments is evident
- Landscape approach ensures a bigger impact
- Improved management capacities under partnership/associative approach
- Direct democracy
- Landscape approach + conservation 'targets' = landscape identity
- Partnerships/associativity = more people working for the same objective
- Ecological productive practices = improved livelihoods.

Challenges remaining: –

- Institutionalization and sustainability of the BGL will require longer intervention
- Bio corridor concept is still complicated
- Include more communities to ensure scaling-up
- Different levels of engagement from other stakeholders and CSO
- Market consolidation
- Some leaders or family groups trying to control the project management

- Strengthen SGPs outreach and communication strategy to increase stakeholder participation
- Consolidate dynamic markets for community products with territorial identity
- Establish new strategic territorial partnerships to support the bio corridors for good living.

((James - need to be aware of possible problems with political decisions (eg German donors/Ecuador). Maybe SGP could pay from other funds for countries that are affected. Terence – this is possible.))

Nancy – GEF SGP Kenya delivering support to ICCAs—experience, opportunities, challenges and lessons learned

Also an upgraded country programme. When we developed programme document, we focussed on the management of natural resources. Communities had very little role in co-managing government forests. New legislation is looking to help local communities return to management. Although these laws are in place, many communities are unaware and don't know how to organise themselves. SGP Kenya has encouraged communities to organise themselves to manage these resources. In some cases we have ICCAs applying for funds, sometimes marine areas (where fisheries are depleted and ICCA communities want to establish fishing rules) and sometimes other communities (bio cultural projects). Communities are not against development and infrastructure but with the help of Natural Justice they dialogue with the relevant stakeholders. This empowers them when working with government offices.

SGP grants are $35-50k, but some are up to 100k for work on a national scale.

2013 Wildlife Act recognises conservancies as a land use. Most landowners are unaware of the provisions of the Act. SGP is bringing them together to see how they can take advantage of the Act.

Marine areas (LMMA – Locally Managed Marine Areas) are looking to see whether it is possible to establish a network for protected marine areas and learn from what is happening in the Pacific where protected marine areas have been in existence for a while.

There is a National ICCA Team made up of volunteers and professionals who work with ICCAs. They are working to understand how we can bring together ICCAs to take advantage of quite a progressive constitution (recognises 3 definitions of land use – private, public and community). The government is now in the process of developing a community land bill, we need ICCAs to be involved in this. The Constitution gives some protection from extractive industries, we need ICCAs to be aware of this. The Constitution provides for devolved government at county level, can local communities be involved in some of the decisions on this?

Different PAs are all active on their own but don't often come together to benefit from synergies. They have now selected ICCA champions to represent every category of PAs, work together and then go back to their individual groups. Ultimately they are aiming to form a national platform for discussion of issues that affect ICCAs.

((Taghi – there is a lack of history here, in the past all the things you talk about existed. Your nomadic and desert societies have a strong history of governance. You have had unwritten constitutions from before colonial times. Nancy – we bring ICCAs together so they can learn from one another, they often have very rich governance systems. In this way they can pass on knowledge. We are starting this at the coast as it is manageable, after it can be extended elsewhere. Delfin – we have to accept that the world changes and moves. We need to work on the definition of an ICCA. Grazia – a lot can be lost by setting up modern institutions even with the best of intentions; those can engender

*conflicts with the traditional way of doing that has preserved nature up to now. Let's be careful with what we call a governance structure for an ICCA. **Delfin** – where communities have changed, then we should adapt. **Taghi** – policy should be to restore systems that have worked for hundreds of years and encourage new organisations to learn from this. **Grazia** – **rule no 1 is to listen to history and experiences from the past and bring those to bear to current situations**. **Trevor** – there was a lot of good information and initiatives in Nancy's presentation. **Nancy** - communities are desperate to be able to manage their own areas (eg fisheries where they see that even though they put in more effort, they get less out).))*

Yi Liu – GEF SGP China delivering support to ICCAs—experience, opportunities, challenges and lessons learned

(Presentation available on request)

China is a new SGP Project. The ICCA concept is old and new (old because it has existed for several years, but new because we don't use the concept). In China we use CCAs –"communities conserved areas".

PA system in China: -

Government PA is in total 18% of national territories.

For the PA System, 2 Maps with a huge gap between both

> (a) priority areas (need urgent protection, some are not protected yet)
> (b) existing areas.

Challenges : -

- In many places the quality of management is very low (the very big space in the middle.)
- Conflicts. People who still live there vs PA administration. The PA Administration finds it difficult to work with LC because the government do not give them good instructions at the beginning.

SGP China supporting ICCAs

- Only in existence for 5 years
- 29 projects supported, including 7 ICCA projects. Some provide information to WCMC, depending on how open they want their information to be.
- One project supporting ICCAs in south China.
  - In this area, the local government is willing to support our community conserved areas.
  - The government discussed what they should or shouldn't do. On their side the community is thinking what they want or don't want from the government. **Surprisingly, the government is willing to give technology, support, capacity building training, and all sorts of project, like renewable energy project to this kind of ICCAs. They say they would not decide for the ICCA.**
- Support for ICCAs.
  - We want to provide support to LC to get recognized by the government.
  - At the beginning, we acknowledge the support from Grazia and Hugu and Dave to guide our work.

- For the ICCAs it takes much longer than we imagined (as for GEF, there is a clear plan, and deadline etc)
- We try to give a lot of time to the communities for them to discuss. GEF as supportive as it can be.
- Promote successful stories to the government
- They started at the provincial level.
- We thought of how we can support autonomy
- We thought of different avenues, including education

Some people in China would like to translate the Guidelines on governance of PAs.

((Grazia - let us make sure that communities retain control of their ICCA initiatives, including for tourism (some sad experiences with tourism-attractive ICCAs exist in China and Vietnam.))

Wednesday 28 January - morning

John Kasaona – IRDNC Namibia - joined the meeting. IRDNC works with indigenous local communities to help them benefit from wildlife conservation. It is responsible for more than 30% of the land in Namibia.

Julie Perrot – Operation Officer, UNOPS - joined the meeting. Handles financial, technical, legal aspects of SGP and will facilitate implementation of SGP projects.

Naomi Kingston - role of UNEP WCMC in GSI— broad outline and proposed integration with other GSI components

(Presentation available on request)

Support to the UNEP WCMC for the integration of the GSI into the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) and associated support services to the ICCA GSI. These two need to run concurrently.
Objectives: –

- convene advisory group for ICCA Registry,
- registering data on ICCAs,
- estimate the number and extent of ICCAs at the global level,
- include data on Protected Planet website,
- support to data providers (guidance, protocols, FPIC, standards),
- assess contribution of ICCAs to the protection of biodiversity,
- support IUCN GPAP assessments of the national governance context,
- mapping of national legislation.

*((**James** – there are a number of other organisations doing similar listing work. **Grazia** – it will be very **difficult to accurately estimate the number and extent of ICCAs,** need to figure out what we count and what we don't count. **Naomi** – it will have to be an estimated number as it is not possible to be exact.))*

Outputs: –

- global spatial dataset on ICCAs;
- support for an effective tracking tool for the assessment of the conservation and governance vitality of ICCAs;

- data standards, work-flow processes and rights and responsibilities for the ICCA Registry within the re-designed WDPA;
- peer-reviewed publication;
- compiling and diffusing information using a variety of media, bi-annual work-plan and budget and final project report.

*((**Naomi** – a lot of mining companies already use the database. **Dave** – Registry should give a standing to ICCAs that is similar to the standing of PAs. **Naomi** – the Protected Planet site links through to a Wikipedia page (if one exists). **Dave** – would be useful if linked through to information on policies. Communities will participate with this if they think it will help them. **Taghi** – if a community provides additional information, is it included in the Registry? **Heather** – trying to make the link between Protected Planet website and the Registry clearer. **Taghi** – there should be a mechanism for consultation on what should be included and what communities want included. What happens at the end of the project period? **Naomi** – Registry has been maintained for many years even without funding. **Delfin** – one of the responsibilities for all of us is to try to find additional resources. **Naomi** – we are well aware that the database has to continue to be relevant and useful.))*

Governance of the WDPA – joint project of IUCN and UNEP, managed by UNEP WCMC, led by a steering committee that meets once a year.

Governance of the Registry – There is a proposal – an ICCA Advisory Committee (fed by UNEP WCMC, relevant experts, ICCA Consortium), with sub-groups (peer review mechanism, FPIC process, Registry Structure) to create a Steering Committee to decide on ICCA Registry Management. This needs discussion in this Inception Meeting.

*((**Delfin** – how will this be funded? **Grazia** – **country based peer review is crucial, someone has to say whether this is something that counts as an ICCA**. **Taghi** – this must not involve governments or anyone higher than peers. **Grazia** – local networks of ICCAs would be able to do this. There are some entries in the Registry for Philippine groups that the Philippine network should review. There is a need for quality control. **Delfin** – this could be part of grant process to set up peer review at local level. **Naomi** – we do need a Steering Committee to oversee this, need to decide whether this is part of the GSI Steering Group or if it should be a separate entity.))*

Recognising ICCAs in the WDPA – other effective area-based conservation measures will be included, anyone will be able to submit data.

Heather – explained the current WDPA data standard. We are planning **changes** to make it easier to store data: -

- Will start asking whether sites meet IUCN definition of PA. Use IUCN and CBD definitions as equivalent. *((**Grazia** – **often assumed that sites that don't meet the protected area definition are of a lower standard, this is not always true**. Database should include 'effective conservation'. The ICCA Consortium Primer booklet includes important information about this. **Naomi** – **we agree completely**. **Terence** – Harry will talk about this later in the meeting.))*
- Will be accepting data from any provider so all data will have to be verified by state verification or expert verification. State verification is not compulsory, it will be offered to data providers. If State verification is not possible, then there will be expert verification. *((**Taghi** – no government has the right to tell an IP group whether their data is accurate. **Who will be the experts who do the verification?** Some people may always want to contest the validity of data. **James** – there is often disagreement within a community as to what is valid*

*data. **John** – in Namibia, communities approach the government for recognition. **Terence** – we need a solid peer review mechanism to be the foundation of valid data. There is flexibility country by country as this happens. **Naomi** – we need verification or anyone will be able to declare themselves a PA. **Grazia** – peer review mechanism could also be conflict analysis and assessment mechanism. **Tatjana** – being internationally recognised as an ICCA could provide an important layer of protection. **Grazia** – this is not always the case on the ground, but indeed it could/should be. **Delfin** - could we make state recognition a second layer of recognition, so it can provide another layer of protection? **Dave** – in Philippines, communities want recognition and a certificate to prove it. **Naomi** – let us note this as an action point – we will prepare a briefing that goes into more detail on this. **Grazia** – verification needs to be on a spectrum and there cannot be any compulsion for state recognition. We have to be clear that this is not a requirement.))*

- A lot of ICCA recognition comes from non-state expert sources*. ((**Terence** – we need a definition of the expert source. We have to be careful with terminology and meanings))*
- Another new attribute to add is 'Restrictions' – we will make it clear whether the data provider has put any restrictions on the use of information.
- We will be adding an ownership type attribute – state, communal, individual landowners, etc
- The **Status** attribute (Designated or Proposed) will be changed to include **Established**. *((**Grazia** – asked John whether Established is when you ask the government for recognition or when rules come into effect. **John** – need a distinction between Established and Practice/Embedded in Culture. **Terence** – Established has an implication of a date, this is not always possible/relevant. **Naomi** – some areas may be re-designated as they move through time. Clearly this needs thinking through again and examining the nuances of words. **Taghi** – proposed 'Customary Use'))*
- Designation type – National, International, Regional, Not Applicable (to be added). *((**Grazia** – could Local be an option? **Naomi** – this implies some local government recognition.))*

Limits and challenges –

- definitions (ICCA, OECM),
- make benefits of participation clearer,
- need easy mechanism to demarcate boundaries,
- support for validation/verification. *((**Grazia** – are we opening up to **porous borders** that change through seasons, etc? **Taghi** – there is vertical migration and horizontal migration, it is hard to define borders. **Heather** – this will be challenging as WDPA is based on boundaries. **Naomi**- there are plenty of sites without spatial data. **Grazia** – lots of changes are happening as a result of climate change.))*

Timeline for 2015 and 2015-2017 explained. We need to start collecting data as soon as possible as it takes a long time.

*((**Nancy** – for input that has already been done for ICCA Registry, will this be redone as maybe it doesn't reflect what the community wants to be included in WDPA? How can you verify whether FPIC process has been respected? **Heather** – this is unlikely to be a perfect process. If we receive information that FPIC was not respected, we will remove the information. **Terence** – peer review at national level will act as a safeguard mechanism. **Naomi** – there are potentially hundreds of thousands of sites that will come in and only Heather working on it. We have to rely on data providers to have gone through due process. We cannot be the only one doing checks. **Delfin** – Is there a document in the registration process that deals with FPIC? **Naomi** – yes. **Delfin** – everyone*

needs to be clear on the definition of FPIC, it is not always consistent. ==*Peer review group at national level should be a verification process for new submissions but also for existing submissions*==*.* ***Taghi*** *– do we need a small group to meet in Cambridge to resolve all these issues? We cannot decide it all here.* ***Naomi*** *– this has been discussed and should happen, it could also be the* ==*first meeting of the Advisory Group/Steering Committee*====*.*== *This should be* ==*added to GSI work plan*==*. Board meetings with donor organisation need to be added to GSI work plan.* ***Grazia*** *– we will have to deal with the subject of* ***overlaps***. *Need to discuss how these will be taken care of in WDPA.* ***Naomi*** *– this is a common feature already.* ***Grazia*** *– part 2 of the Governance of Protected Areas publication deals with spatial data and overlaps. FPIC should be a process and not just at one point in time.* ***Dave*** *– as we put more requirements on people, we increase their costs. This is a problem for people with limited resources. Even the simplest meeting/work requires resources. ICCAs should always be talked about in terms of territories. Need to use polygons to define territories. But is ICCAs the "sacred site" only or it includes the whole territory?* ***Grazia*** *– the definition of ICCAs is clear, it is the territory.* ***Delfin*** *– grant projects can provide resources for proper mapping and FPIC.* ***Terence*** *– use of other media to record the process of FPIC rather than just using forms.))*

Action points for WCMC (from Heather): -

- Start to draft a document that spells out the **validation and verification process**, with an annex outlining country by country specific requirements and contacts.
- Create flier/slide outlining the differences/overlap/connection between the ICCA registry and WDPA.
- Look at adding 'Customary use' to Status attribute.
- Review spatial requirements for mobile conservation areas.
- Review and simplify **ICCA SC governance structure** and coordinate with WDPA SC.
- **Organise ICCA meeting and tracking tool meeting in March 2015.**
- Prepare guidance for use at regional workshops.
- Follow up with national coordinators for further collaboration.
- ==**Use national networks to act as expert validators.**==
- Add easy way for communities to add **Wikipedia content for their ICCAs** via protectedplanet.net or ICCA registry so they retain control over the information about their site

Trevor Sandwith and James Hardcastle: role of IUCN in GSI— broad outline and proposed integration with other GSI components

Role of IUCN: -

1. **Support** to the ICCA GSI in the review, development and refinement of an effective **tracking tool** (TT)
   a) Not too many resources or time needed
   b) Many elements already exist
   c) A project that James managed personally - the IUCN Green list - a standard to design a good PA
2. **Complete** at least **six national level governance assessments**
   a) Which countries will give the best results?
   b) The framework is written in the governance guidelines.
   c) This will not be IUCN doing this.
   d) Maybe what is the visibility on the global stage?

*((**Grazia** - The work that IUCN do in-country can have results, ex - Ecuador has done a lot at the legislative level, Senegal has made changes in some practice but nothing in terms of legal changes.))*

3. **Build a <mark>small task force to help identify targeted countries</mark>** and tailor discussions based on appropriate entry points with key stakeholders.
   a) We could sit here and decide which country we want but then they would maybe not find it appropriate.
   b) Convene a pilot Governance Assessment Task Force.
   c) In April:
      i. The target: get the report of the CBD in Mexico: the idea is to have someone dedicated to this project.
      ii. We need to have someone coordinating all of these assessments.
4. **Develop country-level** implementation criteria for design, consultation and implementation of the national PA governance assessment through relevant processes.
   a) Production of white paper briefs on State of Governance in each target country.
   b) With the involvement of government.
   c) Taking the governance assessment guidelines, unpackaged, and translated in each country. Not only giving them a copy of this.
   d) Detailing timelines in each countries (until Mexico)

*((**Grazia** - It would be perfect if the IUCN could do this as part of phase 1 & 2. The IUCN comes to the country and asks "what's going on?" Then you have the main activity in phase 3. **Delfin** - how are you going to convince the government? How will you explain that it is not putting them in difficulties? **James** - I would say this is about improving sustainability, food security. I would use the Aichi reason. **Dave** - timing is crucial. **Vivienne** - for local people this is about power, she finds the language of the project IUCN component very IUCN-style, how can we make it a process that doesn't frighten the LC? **James** - if you remove the IUCN from here, it will be better. **Taghi** - it is a participatory process, it is not an evaluation. **Vivienne** - it is important to have changes in the words right now. **Grazia** - you have to look at the process. **James** - the heart of the IUCN initiative is in the Governance guidelines. **Grazia** - The Guidelines make ICCAs visible, show their value. **Dave** - the guidelines are very participatory. **Vivienne** - finishes by saying that in the field, the IUCN follows the kind of language she has heard with action that is not working for communities. Let's not forget that. She thought she was here to change things and this is part of it. **Naomi and Grazia** - In March meeting of WCMC, the ICCA Consortium could also have a meeting on tracking tool, where we could exploit lessons on governance vitality.))*

*((**Delfin** - the reason why GEF SGP is the "donor" for GSI, is because there is a need for one entity responsible of all of the funds. Consequently, we have to follow some rules and procedures. In pre-selection they have to fix something, so the practical aspect is this, how fast is this pre-selection? If we say March for all the meetings, it means that all of the funds have to go to the partners before this? **Terence** - this week the committee that selects and makes the final decision is meeting. They hope to have an answer by Friday. The question of the Tracking tool: the ICCA Consortium is leading on it. We also have to think about timing. **Grazia** - Let's try to do the TT as soon as possible so that as soon as GEF is ready to give the grants to ICCAs you can attach the TT.))*

5. **Network the** experience of governance assessments to review results and opportunities for improved PA governance in each country.

6. **Production** of case study publications sourcing documented cases from each of the 6 target countries.
7. **Support global networking** of PA governance experts and practitioners in order to help learn lessons.
8. **Share results arising** from the national PA governance assessments during big international events.
9. **Training and promotion** of joint field based learning with SGP National Coordinators, National Steering Committees, UNDP Country offices, and other relevant national level stakeholders.
10. **Bi-annual submission** to the ICCA GSI PMU of a detailed work plan and budget for annual activities and outputs under the GSI ICCA for the period 2015 – 2017. A final project report outlining the work undertaken, findings, challenges, etc.

Harry Jonas: OECM work—scope, objectives, desired results, possible dovetailing with GSI and results of meeting in Bern

"The law is to blame"

"The law is not innocent"

Two quotes to introduce law within a conservation context. Managers want to manage units, they don't want complexity but reality is different. It is social, biological, cultural connections. The law fragments reality by breaking things down into 'types' and 'definitions'.

Positive developments – increasing amount of international law, national level legal and non-legal support is growing, emerging jurisprudence at the regional and local levels. But laws and institutions continue to undermine the resilience of ICCAs.

Challenges – many communities lack knowledge of legislative and judicial systems, the way law fragments things, laws that support ICCAs can be undermined by other laws, respect for human rights is undermined, lack of recognition of customary laws, lack of respect of land rights.

Law undermines IP resilience to external threats

Suggestions - legislate & implement laws for landscapes and seascape (land rights, recognise traditional authorities, reform laws to enhance rights)

Work package 2 –

1. Country level legal reviews. Some have already been done
2. **Local/national change. ICCA Regional Coordinators work with SGP National Coordinators, IP and lawyers to use the legal reviews to develop and implement legal/policy strategies in each country**
3. Regional learning networks – convene groups to share
4. International advocacy – use learning to take to various international fora - human rights, IUCN, CBD, UNFCCC
5. Resources. Production of relevant resources at local, national regional, international level. Eg legal options for legislators

New ideas –

- breaking out of local, national, international mindset

- helping WCMC with mapping of national legislation and policies
- linking the ICCA Registry to laws and policies
- supporting IP, local communities and the WCPA with 'verification' and FPIC procedures
- forging links with the governance assessments

Wednesday 28 January - afternoon

Discussion following Harry's presentation.

((*Terence – there are three main preselected partners, UNEP WCMC, ICCA Consortium, IUCN (hopefully will receive approval by the end of this week). Any new partner (Natural Justice) would have to go through regular UNDP selection process. **Harry** - when ToR for legal reviews are developed they must respond to all the activities that are really necessary. **Delfin** – can we wrap up the ToR by end of February? **Terence** – ToR for legal options is urgent. **Grazia** – we could look for national SGP grant for a national study of legal possibilities for that country. **James** – doesn't need a big study. **Grazia** – what is the end of the package presented by Harry? **Terence** – some things can be outsourced for specific needs, regional events would be part of non-grant support from SGP. **Delfin** – will have to decide whether we move things through grant-making process, we don't need to always do an assessment. This could include a legal review at a regional level. **Nancy** – legal reviews: will they be done as a package with one organisation going into different countries? Kenya already has a legal review, can we revise it and get guidance on how best to use this review to forward the case of ICCAs? **Terence** – package 1 countries can use their grant, others use non-grant money. Should also be possible to pay for a workshop. **Delfin** – better if we have a suggested framework for review that can be shared with all SGP countries (grant or non-grant). **Harry** – worked for six months to develop questionnaire for the Review, for each country we found an in-country expert. This time this should be turned into a process, with a group, rather than having it done by just one or two people. **Delfin** – this is critical. **Grazia** – gave example of review in Senegal, chose two people who learned a lot through the process and then reported to CBD COP what the outcome of the Review was. **Harry** – working on legal recognition and support. It is not just a review but the development of an active strategy. **Delfin** – we are looking for guidance on how SGP can do this, country by country. **Grazia** – an important part of the study is that there is a reference person for questions and feedback. Asked Harry is he is willing to continue this role. **Harry** – specialist group has to be focus but need to work with more and more people. **Delfin** – can you provide a draft guideline before Feb 9 (first workshop)? **Harry** – he will do this in coordination with Ashish. **John** – Namibia may need some legal input and advice (for conflict in conservancies), do we need to go through GEF? **Terence** – good discussion item. If something is a bit sensitive in terms of a grant, how do we handle it? It depends on the sensitivities of the specific issue. **Delfin** – proposal goes to national coordinator for approval. **Terence** – prioritising first wave of grants (maybe these legal ones) should be reviewed. **Grazia** – gave example of Nepal, ICCA grant was dismissed as it was considered to be too politically sensitive. **Delfin** - shaping of the proposal is important as government is involved in Steering Committee. Maybe draw up a framework proposal that can be used each time. **James** – need to look at commonalities between law structures. **Harry** – a central group could look at this issue. **Delfin** – having governments involved means they will be resistant to any legal reviews. **Delfin** – we can top up the country operating budget and this can then be used for legal reviews. This doesn't need to go through Steering Committee for approval as it is a non-grant activity*))

James Hardcastle: GSI work plan for IUCN, including calendar and broad agenda of events

Discussion on selection of 6 target countries.

James - 8 criteria for choosing target countries: -

1. **willingness of the national PA Agency and/or relevant authority**
2. good civil society partnership/support
3. host agency/organisation to provide in-country support
4. system-wide, or equivalent scale is possible (ie marine, state of regional approach)
5. lessons from the country are likely to be scalable and replicable
6. GEF SGP and/or ICCA GSI priority country
7. Regional and thematic diversity in country selection
8. Other criteria to be determined

Some countries are more difficult than others. Maybe we want to connect the choice to somewhere with big issues.

Initial suggestions from IUCN and the rest of the group: -

1. **Iran**
2. Colombia   )
3. Peru   )   **Ecuador**
4. Vietnam
5. Kenya
6. Tanzania/Zambia
7. Pacific – there is already a lot of support from SGP and the German Government. No Pacific countries are listed in the 26 countries of the ICCA GSI.
8. **Senegal**/DRC
9. Southern Africa (South Africa/Namibia)
10. China
11. Georgia
12. Jordan
13. **Philippines** *((James – a lot has already been started here so it is a logical choice))*
14. **Indonesia**
15. **Madagascar**
16. Guatemala
17. Kyrgyzstan

*((**Grazia** - if we think in terms of clusters, we can build learning networks. Start with Ecuador as they have been successful in the legal system, and then use this to inspire Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, Brazil... **Tatjana** – work packages should support one another. Shouldn't some of these countries already have small grants? **Terence** – they all do. **James** – assessment of ICCAs should be integral to conservation planning. **Ernesto** – is it an ambition to have a range of landscapes? **Nancy** – have you shared this with the IUCN office in Kenya? **James** – yes, some difficulties with working with the IUCN office there and continuity of staff. **Delfin** – we are looking at this as creating the way to do this properly. From our side, Ecuador and Kenya would be good as we can't give grants to them. **Taghi** – could see this working for trans-boundary nomadic groups. **Terence** – all these countries are in work package 1 apart from China and DRC. **Grazia** – what about central and Eastern Europe? **Taghi** – could link Iran with Jordan. **Ernesto** – could countries piggy-back? **James** – doesn't really matter where we start, this is just ice-breaking. Don't just want small countries. **Taghi** – the next*

*presentation will look at countries again. **James** – hypothesis is that ICCAs can be placed at the highest level in decisions on conservation. **Delfin** - if the methodology here is replicable, non-eligible countries could use it for other grants. **James** – most optimistic aim is to have this list done in March. Hoping for significant progress in the 5/6 countries before Cop meeting in Mexico. **Terence** – looking at OECM being part of this governance mechanism. Swiss government are interested, no target country discussed. **James** – this work is a process that is on-going. Some will be started earlier than others, depending on resources in IUCN.))*

M. Taghi Farvar and Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend: role of the ICCA Consortium in GSI— broad outline, proposed integration with other GSI components and detailed GSI work plan for the ICCA Consortium, including calendar and broad agenda of events

Background to the ICCA Consortium: -

- ICCAs are thriving and contribute to wellbeing, self-determination, conservation of biocultural diversity and human diversity.
- In the past, it was difficult to find financial support, even for very small needs.
- Easy to forget that ten years ago ICCAs all around the world were so isolated that they could not do anything, they could not find any recognition.
- It was not that International policies were not willing… they did not really know about ICCAs.
- When you have an issue to tackle at the International level you need a network.
- We tried to promote support by GEF SGP, etc…

The work plan of the Consortium, funded by The Christensen Fund: -

- Initiatives at the international level
- Communication strategy. We have been approached by Survival International - they want a stronger approach in the countries where they work, they want to show the positive side of IPs and LCs, not just when they are wronged.
- Documenting issues with ICCAs - Policy briefs, bringing issues to the conscientiousness of the community
- Participation in International policy meetings
- **Solidarity fund for defenders of the commons and ICCAs** –doesn't exist but we will try our best to create one

*((**Taghi -** there is an international fund for rangers [green line foundation]. It would be very positive to bring the two together. It is part of our grant from TCF. **Julie** - has some funds sources to suggest to the Consortium. **Grazia** - crowd funding through Survival International could be interesting. **Tatjana** - it is an excellent idea to link the solidarity fund for the defenders of ICCAs with the fund for rangers. **James** - there is a really strong connection with the rangers. They have been fighting in the same direction. **Terence** - reminds the meeting of the National Geographic Conservation Heroes.))*

The work plan of the Consortium, with SGP: -

- Assist UNDP GEF in providing SGP and other forms of support
- Collaborate with WCMC for the ICCA registry
- Collaborate with the IUCN GPAP to deliver six assessments

- Analysis, compilation and diffusion of ICCA relevant information
- Support to ICCA local and national initiatives
- Regional ICCA Capacity development initiatives and networks. Pull together key actors from more than one country, provide them with a good occasion to kick start a learning network
- Support GSI to assess conservation and sustainable livelihoods results and governance vitality of ICCAs

Key issues : -

- What kind of processes do we need for the best possible interaction between the Consortium and GEF SGP?
- What sort of role would IUCN like the consortium members and coordinators to play?
- How do we feed the Registry?
- How do we move into round 2 of national recognition studies and support studies, inventories and legal reviews?
- How to use self-monitoring tools for conservation?
- How do we organise the regional ICCA workshops? When? Where?

Timing outlines : - The Consortium will be engaged in

- Feb – June - capacity meetings of the coordinators of OP6
- March - initial meeting with UNEP WCMC
- IUCN national governance enhancement processes (planned Philippines, Iran)
- Consortium and members engage and support ICCA caretaker communities (this is ongoing)

ICCA regional ICCA capacity building events: -

- 3-5 countries participating in each event
- 2-5 people per country
- preparing the country teams a month before the event
- pull them together, learn about ICCAs and plan together what is needed to get ICCAs properly recognised and supported
- hopefully stimulate the birth of regional learning networks
- event to stimulate/ multiply positive change
- location of the meetings? - South and East Africa (Namibia), Latin America (Ecuador), Indonesia, Senegal and Madagascar, Kyrgyzstan
- need a key local partner to do things cheaply and reliably (examples: Fundacion Fides in Ecuador, IRDNC in Namibia, Taho Mihaavo in Madagascar, IUCN in Senegal IUCN, ICCA Network in Indonesia, including its member AMAN, already in collaboration with PAFID; Youth Ecological Movement in Kyrgystan)
- appropriate participants (ICCA Consortium, UNDP GEF SGP offices, IUCN Offices, organizations that have submitted to UNEP WCMC registry)
- technical support from key local partner and possibly ICCA Consortium
- to build and harmonise together

((Delfin - the participants can be NGOs that are supporters rather than actual ICCAs. Taghi - to some extent, we have so far taken countries in isolation. Terence - if we want to change the priority

*countries, we need to talk with the donor. **Taghi** - What do we do? What is the fund for? Is it to support projects, is it to support the idea of a policy change in the whole country? Is it to turn the whole conservation world on its head? Turning it into something that is community based and participatory, and where co-management is necessary. We have to think about this programme versus the other SGP programmes. **Delfin** - if the stakeholder develops the strategy, the NC together with the ICCA Consortium regional coordinators will lead the workshop. There they will ask "where do we want to go?" **Taghi** - Iran is an example of how we turned everything around. **Delfin** - you see the workings of a country mirroring what is happening at the general scale. **Grazia** - the problem is that sometimes, when people plan something in a workshop, they come back asking how it will be funded. **Taghi** - in Iran they want to do a pilot operation with ten or more PAs that want to transform themselves into a new model. Given the fact that Iran has sanctions, and the fact that oil prices are down, they don't have the money to buy things for civilians. **Delfin** - how do we develop the strategy for grant making at three levels while at the same time taking into account all of the grants we have. **Terence** - we should translate the ICCA registry toolkit. (The WIN does it in French and Spanish now.) **Delfin** - wishes to expand the network of individuals committed to ICCAs. **Grazia** - there could be other types of meetings of broader sharing of experiences, it would be interesting to see this. Adaptation to climate change is something we definitely need to think of in terms of ICCAs. **Taghi** - we have participated in several climate change adaptation meetings. This is great but too "intellectual". However the threats are real! **Delfin** - there is a lack of partnership and networking on the margins. Maybe we have to look at the resources available. Are we thinking of one regional workshop? **Grazia** - many! I would like to suggest that each meeting has a topic. (She draws a diagram on the board). The country team meet very close to one ICCA in the first country. At each meeting they exchange knowledge, build their capacities on a specific topic, plan together what they will do and decide the next topic they want to have in the next meeting. This gives ideas on what to do in the next 6 months! Then, the teams meet again six months later close to another ICCA, in another country. There are never exactly the same group members, but there is a core that remains the same. **Vivienne** - recalled the example in Costa-Rica where the fisher folks wanted to include the young people. **Taghi** - emphasizing the learning point: once you've done it you learn from it. **Maria Alicia** - Wouldn't it be too expensive? You can do it in some countries and then join the countries. **Grazia** - if you stay in the ICCAs, you can have everything they have, sleep where they sleep, eat what they eat. With the Consortium we do it in a frugal way. **Delfin** - the Swiss have asked what happens at the end of the grant period. **Grazia** - gives the example of Congo Basin where people at the beginning where annoyed of the idea of yet another network, but finally they loved it so much that after two years they found their own donors to continue for two more years. **Alejandra** - ==how can this regional network be incorporated into WIN?== They already have these kinds of knowledge exchanges and community practitioners. **Grazia** - it could be a simpler version with only local community people. The money that the consortium receives in the GSI is not enough to sustain regional learning networks. But the real question is "do we have the energy to create it? If yes, let's find some funds". **Vivienne** – fisher folks from Costa Rica are meeting with some people in Nicaragua next week. **Grazia** - what can the GSI bring to this?   Exposure to these workshops, exposure to those who may wish to know about ICCAs, exposure of the projects available, etc. **Delfin** - I agree with Grazia. The first set should be very well designed by ourselves so that we create the foundation and continue later from it. **Grazia** – do we envisage a few regional workshops this year? **Taghi** - don't we want everybody to know what the others are doing? **Delfin** - we will be able to talk with our regional coordinator. And the GA of the ICCA Consortium? **Grazia** - in 2010, in Bali, we had a meeting for mutual learning. At the national level, if there are enough members of the Consortium and the GEF collaborators, they may want to sit together and work. **Delfin** - or the ICCA members may be the ones to spread the message. **Terence** - there will be a meeting in July in Turkey of the Satoyama initiative. **Terence** - the*

*question is the budget. **Yi** - is it possible to have a one-day or a two-day workshop dedicated to planning for ICCAs. **Delfin** - replies that this is planned - Feb 2015: Asia Pacific, Bangkok; March 2015: Latin America; April 2015: Anglophone Africa; May 2015: Arab States, Jordan; June 2015: Francophone Africa, Tunisia or Algeria. **Grazia** - what kind of person could be part of this meeting? **Delfin** - someone who can really explain what an ICCA is. **Nancy** - the GEF meetings are only attended by the regional coordinators, but they can share when they go home. **Delfin** - the thing we need from the Consortium is contacts in the ICCA Countries. **Grazia** - this will have to be compiled. **Terence** - one person could be there at the start and at the end. This session is very important. At the beginning there will be 1h30 of ICCA presentations and all day at the end. .))*

Thursday 29 January - morning

Objectives for today: - How do we label/define ICCAs? What kind of filters should be placed for GEF SGP and other partners to decide what a bona fide ICCA is? *((**Delfin** – looking for this to feedback to National Coordinators of SGP to help them with their work. There are overlaps with other work that SGP do so it is vital that the NCs know what the definition is.* ==*There are 2 ways of funding ICCAs, either through BMU grant or through regular GEF funds, the NCs need to be very clear*==*. **Harry** – this is important, we have done such a good job promoting ICCAs that we need to be sure that the support we get is correct. GEF needs to really understand what an ICCA is so that funds are not diverted to the wrong places.))*

Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend – a short reminder of what characterises an ICCA

Le Courtil is the place where the idea of ICCAs was born, on the eve of the WPC in Durban. Today ICCA is an abbreviation of **Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Territories and Areas**. This name now reflects the richness of the reality of the situation around the world. Found in all continents and they are very diverse. They all have three characteristics:

1. You have a community (IP or otherwise) and a territory (a body of resources), with a bond, a relationship, a sense of togetherness. This bond goes beyond a sense of ownership. It is a bond of identity, history, relationships and culture. The wealth of the territory is part of the wealth of the community. The bond can go back through generations, centuries, millennia.
2. The community has a *de facto* capacity/power to take and enforce decisions (functioning governance institution). This has existed for some time.
3. The decisions and practices taken lead to the conservation of nature (including sustainable use and restoration, there is a positive trend for conservation).

ICCAs relate to some type of 'commons' – land, water and natural resources governed and managed collectively by a community of people.

ICCAs possess an effective governance institution (decision making structures, relations, rules, 'local culture'…).

ICCAs are successful examples of collective decision-making about nature, they are the oldest form of conservation on earth.

In this context 'conservation' is meant in the sense of
- strict preservation
- sustainable use
- restoration

*((**Nancy** – what is the difference between de facto and de jure? Many communities were doing this de facto but this was eroded. Now they are trying to regain that. Are they considered ICCAs as they are now de jure? **Grazia** – de facto is 'in practice' and de jure is 'in the law'. But I note that de facto includes customary ways of doing things, which are very legitimate ways of doing things. It is a strength if you have both de jure and de facto, but we should not define ICCAs by de jure power as we would miss out many legitimate ICCAs. **Harry** – often a result of colonialism was the imposition of new laws which changed existing de jure rights into de facto as the old laws were removed. **Delfin** – often in the Philippines, the ICCAs are environmental refugees moving up the mountains. They asked for help to change the law so they could organise and manage their own natural resources. Is this an ICCA? **Grazia** – it depends on the bond between the community and the land. If the community has no other place to survive then I would argue that there is a pretty strong bond, it is not necessary to put a time frame on the bond. Who are we to argue that the bond is not strong enough, do they have the capacity to interact with the territory. We have to accept that there are limitations as well with the conservation aspect. It is not necessary that they conserve 100% of the environment, this is impractical, no-one can do this. **Delfin** – so in those cases **we have to assess the bond and the governance capacity of the community**. **Taghi** – Kawawana is a perfect example of an ICCA where its history was mostly wiped out and then they were helped to recreate it. **Grazia** – in the UK with the Greens there is a large movement to adopt these areas and use them for the community. This is an example of a modern ICCAs. **Terence** – reflecting on mobile hunter gatherers and pastoralists. Could argue that the ICCA is a large area in which they move. The ICCA definition has a slight hint of sedentarization, needing boundaries and fixed areas. This hasn't really been confronted yet. **Grazia** - there is an amazing complexity of situations and we need to be open to this. It is possible that ICCAs overlap. **Maria-Alicia** - in the Amazon there are more and more people coming in from outside, local practices are being lost, there is not a strong bond with the territory but the area needs to be protected. **Grazia** – if part of the area is left as **commons** (a forest, a lake a river – somewhere that cannot be divided into small pieces for private ownership) you can work on the **bond of people with this territory**. In Namibia you needed a sense of the common rules before building the whole idea of conservancies. There are many parts of communities within communities. **Taghi** – the concept of territory is not always applicable in a neat sense. Often ownership is fixed on a specific piece of land, but the territory of one tribe can also be the territory of other tribes. **There are many complex relationships within this**. You can understand it but not define it. **Harry** – is it the real conserved area that is an ICCA, or a whole area surrounding it? Notions of conservation and sustainable use are challenging. Local ideas don't always fit with standard/international definitions.   We need to have general ideas and standards but then approach things with sensitivity and intelligence. **Delfin** – these are practical issues for SGP, we need to align with what this group thinks. **Are we going to accept proposals related to reviving ICCAs? Grazia** – ==we should never ask whether something is an ICCA but we should be supporting whatever works towards strengthening and supporting ICCAs and their development==. **Vivienne** – this should not come from outside we need to support communities and what they want. Our movement should highlight what communities are doing. **Dave** – we should not have the idea of creating ICCAs. The people should teach us what their ICCA is and then we help them. How they manage it should come from them. An ICCA is not a project, it is something that is already there. **The important thing is that governance stays with the people**.))*

Tatjana Puschkarsky & Ernesto Noriega - Successful initiatives to strengthen ICCAs and provide them with appropriate recognition and support

(Presentation available on request)

Work experience strengthening youth and elders in different places in Africa, South America and Asia.

Over time, IP & LC have developed an intimate, synergic relationship with the territories they rely on. There is a close interaction that defines values, culture, etc. Sophisticated environmental knowledge and understanding have led to effective governance systems and management practices. Thus it makes sense to engage with these communities for nature conservation, but very often the cultures which uphold these management practices, protection efforts, etc are eroding.

Many communities are under great pressure from:

- Rapid and radical change
- Introduction of the market economy/monetary system
- Incoming settler migration
- Outside interests preying on land and resources

Leads to discrimination in:

- Centralized educational system
- Legal system
- The media etc.

The consequences:

- Interruption of cultural transmission, erosion of values, loss of knowledge, including traditional mechanisms for protecting their territory
- Caught in an either/or fallacy: discard tradition to belong to the new order or retreat into a defensive position
- Individualism and fragmentation: social, generational, psychological
- Vulnerability to external forces that divide them: politics, economic interests, churches, insensitive government programmes, sometimes NGOs
- Effect on youth: -
  (i) Identity crisis
  (ii) See no application/use of traditional skills and knowledge today
  (iii) Become disconnected from knowledge carriers (elders)
  (iv) Diminished cultural self-esteem and personal self-confidence
  (v) Aspire to belong to the wider world; uncritical idealization of modern/urban life
  (vi) Exodus of youth
  (vii) Can become self-destructive: alcohol, drugs, violence, and suicide

Challenges :

- How to keep their culture alive and relevant?
- How to heal the generational gap?
- Uphold or adapt governing mechanisms in accordance with traditional values
- How to foster a new generation of leaders?

- They have never had a space where they can reflect on their issues
- The mainstream culture and official education system does not provide any space for reflection
- They have concerns but it does not feel "cool" to talk about this with their friends, especially for men.

It is worth creating a space to allow for:

- Reflection and open debate
- Transmission of knowledge and reactivation of memory, but also creation of new knowledge
- Access to information
- Acquisition of competences and skills
- Dynamics furthering creativity and innovation
- Reconnection to historical and culturally significant places
- Opportunities to actively become involved in the development of solutions.
- Generation of future visions for their communities

*((**Delfin** - this is something we should think about for the GEF. **Ernesto** - the community has to be the one which asks for help. **Vivienne** - the community has to be adequately informed. We have to think about ways to guarantee that the community wants to do the project. **Yi** - for practical reasons, we need a strong NGO to receive the money, this is an SGP request. Before they submit a proposal they have to stay with the community for several months.))*

General working principles :

- In depth diagnosis of the situation. Each one is VERY complex and unique
- Invest time in a careful selection of youth and elders: gender balanced (women carry different knowledge than men), cross-section of community, various ethnic groups, plurality of talents
- Immersion workshops: retreat experience, variety of dynamics
- Emphasise positive contributions
- "Beyond survival": don't just salvage culture but project it to the future

Benefits of working with youth:

- Youths are well-placed to become the repositories of ancestral knowledge and they are refurbishers for contemporary life
- Creative, curious, open to new concepts, tolerant, committed, independent and courageous
- Great multipliers
- Work with youth goes "under the radar", often not perceived as a threat by conflicting parties

Cases where working with youths could make a difference:

- ICCAs confronted with an erosion of traditional knowledge and values, exodus of youth, weak leadership
- ICCAs with divided and fragmented communities
- Potential ICCAs

*((Grazia - **if we look at** <mark>strengthening ICCAs, there are important roles where youths and elders can work together to reflect and plan for action</mark>. **Taghi** - very often youth are educated and the educational system has screwed them up. We should take care not to sell the elders cheaply. **Ernesto** - these projects were built on the strength of the elders. This link is fundamental.))*

Vivienne – <u>Successful initiatives to strengthen ICCAs and provide them with appropriate recognition and support</u>

(Presentation available on request)

Called TICCAs to respect the territorial aspect. Representatives in groups can be associations, people who work for particular organisations, people from local communities, lawyers. This leads to a mixture of strengths.

Threats to TICCAs in Central America: -

- Nicaraguan dry Canal that transverses the whole country.
- Rights of IP are not respected in the region – Nicaragua, El Salvador, Costa Rica
- TICCAs are located close to big water sources
- Productivity and food security
- Access to the sea and human rights of the coastal communities
- Dissociate from the MPAs agenda and move to the rights based approach to marine conservation
- Use the TICCAs in a wider planning process
- ICCA could be the backbone for sustainable fisheries
- Implementation of the FAO guidelines

Vivienne showed a video 'A Festival of the Sea' from the Honduras, a fisher community. Looked at the position of women fishers, problems with pricing and taking the catch to market, legal recognition of the organisation, problems of the advent of large fishing companies, youth.

What can we do?

- We need to show positive experiences and share capacity.
- We need to advance towards the recognition of TICCAs by the authorities as a legitimate and important model for conservation and wellbeing.
- Methodology is important, how can we facilitate encounters rather than directing to our goals?
- We also need to work on materials concerning governance and TICCAs adapted to our region.

*((**Vivienne** – discussions have to happen in a relaxed atmosphere. We have to promote people learning from one another. Inexpensive events can have important results. **Networking is very empowering.** Important to let communities negotiate for themselves as they will have to take their issues forwards. Often a meeting will be predominantly NGOs with only one fisher present to represent their views. **Maria Alicia** – need to work also with consumers to support small scale fishers, and explain why fish costs more, and the philosophy behind it. **Vivienne** – need to go into conservation using local knowledge rather than through distant and theoretical learning. When*

*resources come back, youth come back and the community is strengthened. Local markets buy a wider range of fish than is normal in large scale production. **Delfin** – is an LMMA also an ICCA? If not, what is the difference? **Grazia** – I propose that we don't discriminate, rather ask the question 'does this project strengthen the relationship between the community and the territory, and does it help conservation?' **Delfin** – so we need to ask whether a project fits with the three characteristics of an ICCA. **Vivienne** – the project also has to be working to have vitality and reinforce the three characteristics. **Delfin** – we can use the three characteristics but it will be too hard to incorporate the idea of vitality. **Grazia** – there is a good definition of vitality in the primer publication. **Vivienne** – projects need to be looked at really carefully to see that they are working up from the community.))*

John Kasaona – Successful initiatives to strengthen ICCAs and provide them with appropriate recognition and support

(Presentation available on request)

In Namibia there are 84 different Conservancies:

- Before independence, there was poaching in Namibia just to feed the family, not to get rich
- After independence, people started to feel proud of wildlife
- A Conservancy is - natural resources management, increasing wildlife populations and landscape connectivity
- There are 84 elected governance structures, landscape level management structures
- They are business enterprises and produce livelihoods
- The Himba tribe - women would not stand up and speak so, they had to work on gender empowerment
- Opportunities offered by conservancies:
    - Hunting
    - Tourism
    - Enterprises
    - Livelihoods
- Showed a graph, some species started to multiply when communities got control of the land. Lion land extended and lion numbers multiplied. There is a risk for life and livestock. Now the LC have the right to kill the lion, or sell the right to kill the lion, the money goes to conservation.

((Grazia - what is important in conservation is a governance institution able to understand varying conditions (ecological, social, etc) and make the right decisions to respond to their on-going changes. Also, having the capacity to be flexible, and change decisions as needed.))

Benefits of having communities forming conservancies:

(1) Creation of employment and stimulation of a range of business opportunities for both conservancies and the private sector
(2) Improvement of local schools, clinics, rural water supplies
(3) Improved nutrition
(4) Revenue from human/wildlife conflict
(5) Creation of a voice to improve advocacy
(6) Training opportunities
(7) Indirectly improved access to land

(8) Creating more wildlife species (they can move more freely!)
(9) Expansion of PA beyond National Parks
(10) Wildlife territory expansion
(11) Strong institutional structures to improve PA governance
(12) Anti-poaching support

Challenges :

1) Improve the viability of conservancies
2) Weak institutional conservancies
3) Namibia's gains are based on progressive legislation that increases community users rights over natural resources
4) Community user rights over natural resources are directly tied to responsibilities
5) The Government of Namibia has applied similar principles of expanded community ownership and management to include tourism and hunting with concessions
6) Trust and relationships take time
7) Building capacity does not happen in workshops
8) Mentorship is critical (even more than workshops)
9) Conservancies per se don't give collective rights to land, forest and pasture

Dave de Vera – Successful initiatives to strengthen ICCAs and provide them with appropriate recognition and support

What has happened in the Philippines in the past four years?

- There have been extensive consultations – developed an ICCA database (where, what type, etc.), had to prove that these places still exist. Learned about threats that people face. Developed maps that are very powerful at showing key biodiversity areas, where National Parks are, where ICCAs are. Shows that it is not the parks that are providing governance.
- Formulation of Manila Declaration of principles which define what an ICCA is and the terms of engagement of the IP community.
- Process for mapping documents and community conservation plan developed. This was the consolidation of years of work with IP communities.
- Main guiding principle – all these processes should not be extractive (just for an individual's PhD) but useful for local needs and purposes – for funding, problem solving, and conflict resolution. Should state that people have power of governance so it becomes an advocacy document.
- Following Manila Declaration – a gathering of IP elders organised BUKLURAN – UNDP want them to be a formal partner but they need to be a legal entity.
- Guidance provision to the government and donor community in implementation of Biodiversity Conservation Programmes to adopt the recognition of ICCAs. ICCAs are common ground to resolve conflicts with park management
- Worked to get various organisations to act as ICCA champions.
- Draft ICCA bill has been filed in parliament and was passed at committee level in 2014.
- Local and international declaration of ICCAs. Dangerous but important. We use markers to show where the ICCA is.

Key points

- IP have struggled for the recognition and protection of ICCA. For many it is an issue of survival.
- ICCA Recognition is rooted in the full recognition of tenure in their territory.
- Demand is not externally introduced.
- IP see the reorientation of donor projects, government policy and attitudes adopting recognition of ICCAs as one of their victories, a source of pride and self-esteem.

((Grazia – without PAFID none of this would have been possible. There is a need for a national level movement to facilitate. Dave – very few of the people in PAFID are non-indigenous. Have to go in with sincerity and not look at them as beneficiaries. This requires long-term dedication. Grazia – is there a parallel in Namibia? John – we have agencies working in two regions. There is coordination of NGOs and government at national level. Dave – all activities should be useable by people in their own situation. Delfin – SGP grant making looks to give grants that will lead to something bigger. You have to deal with power relationships and see where openings are. This is the strength of people like John and Dave.))

Taghi – Successful initiatives to strengthen ICCAs and provide them with appropriate recognition and support

(Presentation available on request)

Nature conservation in Iran - Merging traditional wisdom, national priorities and international commitments. Explained the situation of a specific ICCA.

Main reasons for seasonal migration (women go first, followed by men and the animals) and the process of the migration. There are many types of ICCA in Iran.

The ancestral territories of indigenous nomadic tribes of Iran have been under attack since the 1920s through sedentarization, land grabbing…

15% of the territory of Iran is used by CENESTA as ICCA groupings. Used participatory GIS maps to shock government into accepting the ICCAs, when they saw that ICCAs were protecting more area than they were. Obligations accepted by the government - Aichi targets, POWPA, IUCN protected area matrix.

The main task of the government is 'support', including financial, where appropriate – engage right holders and stakeholders, revise the Protected Area System, transfer Protected Area governance to ICCAs, recognise ICCAs.

Current project – ICCA recognition, biodiversity conservation, sustainable livelihoods, re-empowerment of indigenous nomadic tribes. All this results in poverty elimination and sustainability.

ICCA Recognition process – ecological integrity, governance integrity, territorial integrity. This is self-recognition that then goes to UNINOMAD who maintain a national database. Then it is sent to the government and UNEP WCMC. Government interested in recognising ICCAs as helps to achieve Aichi targets.

The success of this process is down to CENESTA facilitating it.

*((**Grazia** – when you go to a new community, what do you usually do? **Taghi** – it is usually the indigenous tribes who tell one another what is going on. If we do start with a new community, we are led by them. They tell us their problems, we encourage them to talk about all problems, of all importance, and then help them to classify them into locally relevant categories. They prioritise them which helps them understand the complexity of their issues, and often what starts as the biggest problem becomes irrelevant. **Vivienne** – within these large areas, do you have conflicts over what people want to do in terms of conservation? **Taghi** – no, indigenous people must conserve nature or they will not be able to live tomorrow. IUCN definition of conservation is preservation, sustainable use, restoration. This does not conflict at all with what local people naturally and willingly do.))*

Alejandra – Equator Initiative - Successful initiatives to strengthen ICCAs and provide them with appropriate recognition and support

(Presentation available on request)

Shared an initiative that may be of use to the work of people in the meeting. Equator Initiative gives a prize which brings global recognition to local initiatives, this has included some members of the ICCA Consortium.

Also developing capacity workshops to generate knowledge. Out of these workshops come networks.

WIN – areas of focus for their work.

- knowledge exchanges,
- capacity development,
- support to community leaders,
- informed participation in international processes.

ICCA learning networks could be hosted as part of WIN network.

Produce publications on tool kits and prize winners.

Here to facilitate processes such as this.

*((**Vivienne** – are you thinking about doing long-term follow up for some initiatives? **Alejandra** – we try to maintain contact with the prize winners. There is a network of winners. Try to bring prize winners together in various groupings and at various events. The next prize is 2016. **Grazia** – would you please ==consider a specific prize to support ICCAs==? At the moment the Prize is still given for the usual "category" such as forestry, marine, gender… and the like))*

Thursday 29 January - afternoon

Delfin Ganapin - role of GEF SGP in GSI— supporting initiatives that strengthen ICCAs, provide them with appropriate recognition and support and set in place a suitable framework for monitoring and evaluation

- We need to understand what "ICCA projects" should be like, who should implement those projects and how? He wants to get enough material to bring to the NCs during the regional workshops.

- The BMU is allowing work in 26 countries when they are usually work with 128 countries. Regular GEF SGP core funds are 140 million and the BMU money is 10 million, so we have to be strategic.
- In some countries, like China, the government is willing to give a lot of money so maybe the BMU money should go to other countries.
- OP 6: we have to think of creating something even bigger
    - The key word is scalability
    - Everything should be integrated/holistic
    - Social inclusion, democratic governance
    - Scope
        - Landscape/seascape conservation
        - Climate smart agroecology
        - Energy access
        - Local global coalitions about chemicals
    - The ICCA work is significantly linked to landscape and seascape
    - The approach must be community based *((Grazia - the gap between community based and landscape is large, how do we reconcile those? Delfin - we want to promote alliances.))*
    - The landscape and seascape have to be selected in a very democratic way.
- The Grant Makers :
    - There are no more obligations such as "only ten percent can be used for management costs". There is more flexibility in the grant management
    - Things that can be funded now:
        - CSO government dialogue platform *((Grazia - when would that start? Delfin - definitely within the year (we are rushing the regional workshops).))*
        - South-south cooperation
        - Indigenous people fellowships (national or global).
- We have to look at the link between work package 2 and 3:
    - For example, WCMC said the problem is demarcation. Maybe at the country level we can help in overcoming this
    - Peer review is something we could find at the national level
    - For the governance assessment, the GEF could help to do follow up
    - Legal review follow up
    - Regional Learning exchange follow up.
- We should deal with:
    - **Well-defined ICCAs** - Recognition and respect of the ICCA - New issues (adaptation)
    - **Disrupted ICCAs** – revival, healing, adaptation, youth
    - **Desired ICCAs** - organisation, healing, utilising new laws.
- In practice, the way Delfin looks at it:
    - 1st step is to look at partners. ICCA Consortium members in the countries sitting down with NCs (this is the initial concept) *((Grazia - it may lead to a conflict of interest. Let's be careful!))*
    - This quickly leads to the basic grants. After several years of operations you know what you need to do fast, for example, you know that you need a capacity building workshop.

- This leads to the ICCA Strategy. Now, the SGP is responsive grant making. The problem is that it takes time. Those who want grants do not always come to you. The GEF wants to act PROACTIVELY
- This goes to the National Steering Committee (NSC). If there is a programme such as ICCAs that requires special knowledge, we can include new members in the NSC. *((Grazia - it could be interesting if some experts come from other countries because sometimes people who are too involved may not see relevant things.))*
- This leads to the expanded partnership.
- This leads to TAGs (Technical Advisory Groups), and their recommendations go to the NSC.

*((**Tatjana** - can't we develop some kind of guidelines to tell the NSC what should be considered an ICCA and what shouldn't? **Grazia -** members of the NCS should come from another country. **Taghi -** warns about guidelines in general to choose ICCAs, these can be dangerous. **Grazia** - let's make sure that with this methodology we do not kill the birds, all of this could deliver effective grants.))*

Grazia BF: Advice on ways to recognize and support ICCAs

(Presentation available on request)

Lessons already learned.

1. **Community integrity and strength are essential to any ICCA**.
2. Friends and allies from civil society can and do play crucial supporting roles.
3. National governments have international obligations vis-à-vis ICCAs – and international organizations, instruments, and projects can help them fulfil such obligations.
4. Governments have a variety of avenues to officially recognise collective subjects possessing collective rights and responsibilities (and respect customary institutions, which should evolve at their own pace).
5. At best, they would recognise **ICCAs as coherent land, water and natural resource units governed by self-identified IPs or local communities (legal subjects) under a common title (property or right of use) that is inalienable, indivisible and established in perpetuity**.
   *((Long discussion on the need/danger of formal titles. **Taghi** – suspicious of government involvement in these things. **Delfin** – have to recognise that we live in the modern world and have to deal with government. We can move step by step towards our goal. It is not possible to get there in one go. **Dave** – we cannot achieve the end result without going through certain steps first. In the Philippines we could not have succeeded without going through the process of obtaining titles/rights first.))*
6. FPIC should be obtained in all matters regarding ICCAs.
7. Under appropriate conditions, and provided they maintain their own governance institutions, ICCAs can benefit from being officially recognised as PAs.
8. ICCAs that have been incorporated into official PA systems without FPIC of concerned communities should be recognised as ICCAs and provided respect and support as appropriate, positive collaborations should be sought between the relevant PA authorities and communities.
9. The relationship between ICCAs and PAs is complex and different cases are possible - ICCAs tucked within protected areas, PAs that basically overlap with many ICCAs, ICCAs that actually include PAs.

10. In all cases ICCAs should be recognised and supported.
11. What support has proven helpful?
    i. Support to enforce rules and provide fair and coherent judgement and sanctions for violators
    ii. Capacity development to respond to threats and manage conflicts
    iii. Joint learning and advocacy
    iv. Social recognition (eg praise, awards, media coverage)
    v. Financial incentives… only with caution and safeguards to maintain and strengthen community independence
    vi. Promotion of good governance at all levels.

What do Consortium members consider as good support initiatives for ICCAs?

- Legal recognition of collective rights to ICCAs in all ways included in the national legislation.
- Legal recognition of community/customary organisations in charge of managing their own ICCAs and/or federations of ICCA communities.
- Networking and capacity building among ICCA communities, including via exchange visits and joint advocacy for national recognition.
- ICCA dedicated legal advice to file and follow up ICCA cases on land issues and conflicts and support legal recognition of specific ICCAs (this can offer a layer of extra protection for collective rights).
- Enhancing self-awareness and capacities, including ICCA inventories, mapping, documentation, videos, demarcation & analyses, surveillance and protection from threats.
- On-going assistance for ICCAs to register (WCMC Registry).
- Promotion of youth groups for ICCAs.
- Training on technical skills (advocacy, paralegal issues, basic financial management, mapping and video capacities, etc.) so that people confidently play key roles for their own ICCAs.
- Small and punctual financial support for ICCA governance institutions and coordinators elected/appointed by their communities.
- Specific action to conserve biological diversity and wildlife, and to enhance the sustainability of management and land resource use, and livelihoods and uphold the cultural non-economic values that sustain ICCAs.
- Specific action to assess, monitor and improve governance, including of ICCAs.
- Specific action to strengthen the interaction of ICCAs with food sovereignty and income/wealth generation activities.
- Community cultural archives and infrastructures to maintain them 'in situ' for cultural revitalization and transmission of local knowledge.
- Specific action to combine initiatives (eg COMPACT for WHS) and to repair wrongdoings.
- Specific action to adapt to climate change, reduce the risk of disasters on the basis of local knowledge and skills.
- Implementation and recognition of bi-cultural educational curricula for IPs, so that classes take place with flexible schedule within ICCAs.

General recommendations : -

- Specific capacity building of GEF SGP personnel
- Think about sustainability, continuity, broader picture, systemic needs…
- Larger grants covering coordinated support to several ICCAs over a long time frame

- ICCA activities initiated by third parties should enter into a clear memoranda of agreement with the concerned communities ensuring effective community empowerment, on-going monitoring and transparency in all financial transactions and direct links with GEF SGP decision-makers
- Initiatives should not reify, alienate, commoditise or monetise ecosystem functions nor cultural values.

*((**Vivienne** - maybe knowledge building was a little bit lacking. In the case of fishers they started to produce information on what they fish and how they fish, 7 or 8 years ago. Now they are able to make decisions. **Grazia** – indeed, this is one of the first priorities for support. **Ernesto** - the youth are very good guardians of knowledge. When they realise that the knowledge is endangered they have sense of urgency, and they have more familiarity with new technology. **Grazia** - database is always delicate because this gathering of knowledge can be threatened when compiled. Youths are good at keeping the information.))*

Group work (3 groups): a typology of GEF SGP initiatives to strengthen ICCAs and provide them with appropriate recognition and support. Group work reports and discussion.

GROUP WORK: What are the crucial initiatives that the GEF SGP could support and should not support? The meeting split into groups for an hour of discussion.

Reports from the group work:

First group/ Tatjana -

- General ICCA initiative should be supporting core funding, maybe within the 26 country it should enhance a federation of ICCA to do advocacy work.
- Regional networking, imp for ICCAs.
- There should not be a huge drive to establish ICCA but see what is already there, and how it can be strengthened.
- Allowances or meeting cost salary should be possible so that people who are involved in the core governance get remuneration.

*((**Grazia** - if you start having a salary it is difficult to maintain in the long term. **Taghi** - it is not a salary, it is a punctual allowance. **Grazia** - be careful because it can degenerate very quickly, instead the conservancy model that you represent is a good alternative. **Delfin** - in the SGP, you can compensate the travel cost, that could be given, but when you start giving an allowance, or consultancy, everybody will start to panic. **Terence** - you can maybe change the name.))*

- Supporting spaces where cultural knowledge/ eco was transmitted.
- So many organizations want to promote ICCA, maybe at the end of this process, the ICCA Consortium should reflect what the modalities should be.
- If the ICCA Consortium could not fund a program, help them.

*((**Taghi** - IUCN has become place where they take any project and do it. But when you have projects such as the Houroum, the GEF SGP could do it. **Delfin** - there are so many legal requirements that it is a very sensitive criteria. **Grazia** - the thing is that we need things fast. What we need is better reactivity. Examples of things that need to go fast: Group in Petén in Guatemala want a workshop in June; in Nepal they would like to start it tomorrow; in Senegal they want to do radio programmes. **Delfin** - planning grants exist and they go faster. They have to contact NSCs. In the Philippines they decided that the National Coordinator can make a decision and report to the NSC. **Grazia** - not all of the NCs are the same! Often people cannot go to the meeting because there is no way of knowing*

Second group/ Yi -

- The regional workshops should involve different levels to **bring the supporters of ICCAs together**. People from different countries would bring ideas back to their countries. After that, they would have their own local level learning network.
- For package 1, how to select NGOs and proposals? How can we guarantee that the NGOs are really working for the community rather than controlling the resources?
- We should support more projects at the country level rather than just individuals. This would borrow experience and eventually show and share.
- **The database is very important** (it could be a starting point that the country programme supports the creation of this database). China will do it province by province. With FPIC. Communities want to be recognized by the government.

Third group/ Nancy

One of the first activities of the NC is to link with an ICCA Consortium member or HM, in order to talk about ICCAs and most of this training should be done by LCs. First work of the NC would to be on the ICCA Consortium website.

NC could use a methodology: -

- Split country
  - See where the ICCAs are. It is not up to NCs to say where there are ICCAs, it has to come from the ICCAs themselves, internalize this process
  - Ask what are the challenges, the issues, the locations. The ICCA representatives themselves should come up with this
- Importance of the landscape approach and seeing what is already available. The CPS would be formed starting from what already exists.
- It would be good to work with the ICCA to see what could be important for the government (Aichi targets, CBD, etc) to meet these international requirements.
- Important for the NCs to be careful about who travels. We need to find a way to get REAL representatives.

*((**Delfin** - Dave has promised to share their methodology. In many countries, this could be very useful. **Dave** - no self-respecting NSC would deny the outcome of a good process. **Taghi** - some communities are used to a particular style of process. **Grazia** - many types of project fit the typology we discussed before and can be supportive of ICCAs. It works to ==encourage communities to be self-aware, and strong in uniting and developing a network.== All these things have to do with the characteristics of ICCAs. **Dave** - it will all depend on how carefully you plan what you are doing. The community owns the process, they own their ICCAs. Just need to help them to discuss the subjects that come up. He suggested running workshops. **Grazia** - this is your own context of the Philippines, but there are other countries, like Vietnam. **Dave** - the most important thing is who the core organising group is. If the selection is credible, all of the national reports will be very powerful.))*

Friday 30 January - morning

Grazia – Assessing the conservation and livelihoods results and governance vitality of ICCAs

Helping communities and GEF SGP "track" progress in supporting ICCAs: -

Once an ICCA project is running it is important to monitor and determine its **conservation results**, **livelihood results**, **governance vitality** results.

The Consortium has experience with a variety of methods:

1. Grassroots discussions on ICCAs-- developed and tested in 20 countries. Have to invest time in this, they involve community workshops, not just a list of questions. *((**Dave** – we get the youth to lead the discussions and conduct interviews as it encourages them to talk to their grandmothers and grandfathers. It is a very participatory exploration process for the youth. You need to reserve one day to talk with the youth and teach them the methodology. **Vivienne** – we do the same thing and decide on different teams to conduct discussions. **Grazia** – the discussion and self-analysis concern the history of the community and also the three "characteristics" of an ICCA.))*
2. Resilience and Security Tool for ICCAs (tested in a variety of languages in Spain, Senegal, Indonesia, the Philippines…).
3. Participatory methodology for the development of video and photo stories on threats to ICCAs and community responses.
4. Environmental monitoring and threats/impact assessment tools (as in Bolivia).

Lessons learned: –

- Exercises are a source of self-awareness, inspiration and commitment to ICCAs
- Facilitation and technical support is needed as well as support for community gatherings
- Use visual tools
- Technical skills are needed for photo stories
- Recording and storing of indicators is tricky
- Internal communication is crucial, and external as well
- Champions and incentives are needed for continuity

Proposal : every ICCA initiative at field level supported by GEF SGP is accompanied by a process of self- monitoring and communication. Any methodology can be used, Consortium is willing to provide advice and support, could there be a specific financial line to accompany this so that self-monitoring is possible outside GEF SGP.

*((**Dave** – no monitoring is possible without good mapping. Use good methodologies of participatory mapping. **James** – seconded this, the community needs to have the ability to defend their territory with their own maps. Stressed the importance of the local area for the proliferation of ideas and encouraging others coming to copy good ideas. **Grazia** – it is as important to know what to do with the data as it is to collect the data in the first place. **Yi** – is there a step by step handbook for this? **Grazia** – yes.))*

Terence – ICCA Resilience and Security Tool

(Copy available on request)

Explained the tool, looking at internal and external factors. It covers 30 subject areas and is very comprehensive. Each area is given a mark from 1-5.   It gives a 'bill of health' for a community.

Includes a section for using all the information to reflect and decide what the areas of priority will be for the community. The value of the score is limited, it serves to indicate areas of interest rather than to be used too literally. The question is who works through this process. *((Grazia – it should be done as part of a process. The question must be whether this is useful for the community itself. James – seems to be quite threat based and lacks information on what is working. Grazia – this tool is designed to look at resilience and see what needs to happen to respond to threats.))*

SGP have a 'Preliminary Indicators Resilience in Socio-ecological Production Landscapes' tool, Satoyama. This has been tested in 20 countries. There is an element of overlap with the Consortium Resilience and Security Tool. Feedback on this from the field is that there are too many questions but it could be useful as a check list. *((Delfin – when you talk about resilience you are talking about the future more than the present. The measurements you use now will not be relevant in the future. It is important not to rush communities, it can take a whole year to get answers.))*

Grazia gave the questions at the end of the Resilience and Security Tool: -

- Is there anything important that emerged for you while discussing issues of resilience and security for your ICCA?
- What are the key elements of strength of your ICCA?
- What are the key weaknesses?
- What could you do to build upon the elements of strength?
- What could you do to remedy or counteract the weaknesses?

((Taghi – deeply suspicious of the Resilience and Security Tool. There are certain things that cannot be short-cut. You cannot impose a tool like this that comes from outside. Nothing can substitute for developing a methodology from within the community. Maria Alicia – we have a system called SIMONAA. It requires a lot of work. You have to first build capacities to use it but it is useful to see the improvements you have made. You choose from a list of indicators, which ones are relevant in a particular community. The community works together to extract lessons learned. Vivienne – you have to be in a community long enough before you can measure things. The issues that a community wants to change will develop over time. I like the idea of broad questions, but we must be clear on what and how we are measuring. Grazia – This tool offers a starting point for communities to develop their own monitoring system. Delfin – you have to devote years to this. The question is how to implement this. You are bringing to the community an alien system of communication, they have their own systems. It must be adapted to their way of gathering information and communicating. This requires our partners to really be with the community over time. Nancy – when we worked with the Satoyama system, it was an exciting exercise. It is really a process. It is good to have something to start with but then it can be developed to the desires of the community. James – you need to be able to link the process with the community to something that can be reported. Dave – all this monitoring can only happen if the community needs your intervention. The community only seeks help when they want something to change. If you are working with a community that has been created, then this tool will not work. Communities can develop their own methods. Monitoring systems must also work for them. But we need to explain that we need this information to help other communities in the future. We need something to measure and show to outside organisations that things are changing. Grazia – the issues on the Resilience Tool are an occasion for discussion that can enable a community (and their partners) to open up issues that are meaningful for them. John – the Tool is needed. The question is how to implement it. You need the time to sit, talk and discuss, notes can be written later. Ernesto – I agree that these tools are dangerous in principle. The questions will deform what the community say. However it is important to have a method to

encourage discussion on what a community needs. This will come out while using the Tool. *Taghi* – *I have seen the Tool applied in Niger. It was only accepted by the community out of loyalty to the outside partner who wanted to use it. Yi* – *for us this is only an entry point. I would translate it to local language in a way that they could understand. Grazia* – *the "Tool" is an outline of questions for a facilitator of community discussions; the communities can then have better awareness of issues, decide priorities, decide what they want to change, and take action.* ==The tool should be combined with communication—the discussions can be basis for community video and photo stories.==*))*

Time line of events 2015/2016 for IUCN, ICCA Consortium, UNEP WCMC and UNDP GEF SGP

Each of the four partners put up their key events on the timeline.

The CBD COP in November 2016 and the SBSTTA 19 in November 2015 are key moments for everyone.

((James – *we need to recruit someone dedicated as governance network lead, if you know anybody suitable, let James know. Vivienne* - *suggests doing some training sessions in the regional offices before the process starts. Nancy* - *can we link the people from the IUCN with the GEF NC? Terence* – *in July, the meetings will start with Ecuador. Grazia* - *the problem in Madagascar is that it has been a playground for NGOs and a laboratory for the government so it is very vulnerable, we could think about doing things before Vololona leaves. James* - *can also work with other parts of IUCN: Blue Solutions ; Panorama Solutions ; the Green List will be released in September 2015.))*

For details see Timeline 2015 – 2016 document.

Telephone call with Axel Benemann (BMU) to feedback the outcomes of the meeting. Terence, James, Grazia and Delfin.

Discussion following telephone call *((Grazia* – *is the timeline clear for everyone? Terence* – *need ultimate agreement within UNOPS before the contracts can be signed and everything can start. Grazia* – *people have been working on this with no resources. Grazia* – *raised the issue of the financial interest on these funds that have been sitting in UNDP for 13 months. Julie* - *understand the frustration but hope this will be resolved next week, the committee is meeting to agree to this. Following that, it will take some time (2 -3 weeks) for contracts to be drawn up before they can be signed by the partners. James* – *thanks to Terence for all the work that he has done to draw together all the necessary documents to get us to this position of being ready to start the GSI. Grazia* – *we have all done well to get things to this stage. Now let us move to work.))*

Global ICCA Support Initiative (GSI) — Inception meeting
IUCN Headquarters, Gland (Switzerland) 27, 28 & 30th January 2015
Le Courtil Hotel, Rolle (Switzerland) 29th January 2015
Timeline 2015 – 2016 (revised Feb 2015)

2015	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
UNDP GEF SGP	Inception meeting, Switzerland	SGP Asia-Pacific regional workshop - Bangkok 9 – 14 Feb. Review draft legal review framework & financing modalities at Asia regional meeting.	ICCA GSI Board meeting 'plus'. SGP LAC regional workshop - Dominican Republic.	SGP Anglophone Africa regional workshop - Zambia	SGP Arab States + CIS regional workshop - Jordan?	SGP Francophone Africa regional workshop - Morocco 8 – 12 Jun.						
ICCA Consortium		With GEF, NC capacity building.	With GEF, NC capacity building.	Latin America Prep. workshop ECUADOR With GEF, NC capacity building + prep visit Zambia	With GEF, NC capacity building.	With GEF, NC capacity building.	Regional ICCA EVENT ECUADOR.	Regional ICCA EVENT INDONESIA.	ICCAs/ Extractives wkp – Bolivia.	Regional ICCA EVENT NAMIBIA.	Regional ICCA EVENT MADAGASCAR	
IUCN		Sensitize regional offices & commissions.	Recruit governance network lead.	Begin engagement in priority countries (2) – Iran & Philippines.	Coordinate with NC in target countries.		Begin engagement in other priority countries (4) – see note.					
UNEP WCMC		Draft overall country by country verification process.	26-27 March Inception Meeting (FPIC verification & Tracking Tool, etc.)	Adapt database & develop workflows.		Set up network of verifiers.		Current ICCA Registry sites reviewed by data providers.	System in place for community input to pp.net. Wikipedia content. ICCAs into www.protectedplanet.net (where appropriate).		SBSTTA	

Note: - Proposed clusters: Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam;   Ecuador, Peru, Columbia;   Kenya, Tanzania, Zambia;   Madagascar

2016	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
UNDP GEF SGP												
ICCA Consortium	ICCA event in China											
IUCN									ICCAs on IUCN Green List. Governance vitality. IUCN WCC in Hawai'i.		COP – Mexico. Post 2020 agenda ICCAs.	
UNEP WCMC			ICCA Registry Steering Committee/Advisory Group meeting.							Governance/equitability review in 2016 Protected Planet Report.	CBD COP.	

Global ICCA Support Initiative (GSI) — Inception meeting
IUCN Headquarters, Gland (Switzerland) 27, 28 & 30th January 2015
Le Courtil Hotel, Rolle (Switzerland) 29th January 2015
Attendance List

	Tues 27th am	Tues 27th pm	Wed 28th am	Wed 28th pm	Thurs 29th am	Thurs 29th pm	Fri 30th am	Email address
Trevor Sandwith IUCN	Absent	X	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Trevor.SANDWITH@iucn.org
James Hardcastle IUCN	X	X	X	X	Absent	Absent	X	James.HARDCASTLE@iucn.org
Delfin Ganapin UNDP GEF SGP	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	delfin.ganapin@undp.org
Terence Hay-Edie UNDP GEF SGP	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	terence.hay-edie@undp.org
Yi Liu UNDP SGP China	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	yi.liu@undp.org
Maria Alicia Eguiguren UNDP SGP Ecuador	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	maria.alicia.eguiguren@undp.org
Nancy Chege	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	nancy.chege@undp.org

UNDP SGP Kenya								
Julie Perrot UNOPS	Absent	Absent	X	X	X	X	X	juliep@unops.org
Naomi Kingston UNEP WCMC	X	X	X	X	Absent	Absent	Absent	naomi.kingston@unep-wcmc.org
Heather Bingham UNEP WCMC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	heather.bingham@unep-wcmc.org
Alejandra Pero WIN	Absent	X	X	X	X	X	Absent	alejandra.pero@undp.org
	Tues 27th am	Tues 27th pm	Wed 28th am	Wed 28th pm	Thurs 29th am	Thurs 29th pm	Fri 30th am	Email address
Taghi M. Farvar ICCA Consortium	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	taghi.farvar@gmail.com
Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend ICCA Consortium	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	gbffilter@gmail.com
Dave De Vera ICCA Consortium	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	devera.dave@gmail.com
John Kasaona ICCA Consortium	Absent	Absent	X	X	X	X	X	kasaona@africaonline.com.na
Vivienne Solis ICCA Consortium	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	vsolis@coopesolidar.org
Harry Jonas Natural Justice	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	harry@naturaljustice.org
Emma Courtine ICCA Consortium	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	emma.courtine@gmail.com
Sarah Ryder ICCA Consortium	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	sarahryder@bluewin.ch
Tatjana Puschkarsky (ICCA Consortium)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	t.puschkarsky@gmx.de
Ernesto Noriega (ICCA Consortium)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	e.noriega@posteo.de