

## **XIth General Assembly of the ICCA Consortium**

**Saturday 25 and Sunday 26 November 2017  
Geneva, Switzerland**

### **Minutes day one: Saturday, 25 November 2017**

Members, Honorary members and observers sat by regional groupings

**decisions still to be taken into effect**

**decided and – since then -- already done or in progress**

**to be noted by the Council and Secretariat**

**08:50 Welcome by the President.**

**Agenda for the two days read, reviewed and adopted by acclamation.**

#### **President's report since the General Assembly of December 2016**

- Many around the world now understand what ICCAs are and see them as phenomena to promote and defend.
- Thank you to Grazia, Emma and Sarah. They have spared no effort in fundraising, logistics and planning.
- We now have a new draft Strategy that needs to be discussed and approved by members at this meeting - content of the work will continue, but the institutional aspects and internal governance and communications will continue to be improved/ enhanced
- Now starting a new effort to shape our own policies; such as the NO GO policy for destructive activities in ICCAs.
- We finally have a new website-- most important for our movement.
- Solid advances in many countries. For example, in West Asia, Central Asia and the Caucasus. Held a regional meeting in Kyrgyzstan, involving the four countries in that region that have the GSI programme for ICCA support. In Georgia, it was predicted that there would be no ICCAs due to Soviet rule, but we found out that it is actually teeming with ICCAs, and with fantastic NO GO zones.
- We recently had some successful fundraising. We need to do a lot more in the future.

Questions and contributions - None

**Motion to note the President's Report – Approved by acclamation**

**Round call of Consortium Members and Honorary members -- highlights of ICCA situation, work accomplished, perspectives and priorities**

Facilitated by **Patricia Mupeta** – interim Chair of the Programme and Policy Committee of Consortium Council (previously Steering Committee, see later in these notes for the decision to change the name) and **Maurizio Farhan Ferrari** - Forest Peoples Programme.

- **AFRICA**

- **Yannick Ndoinya** – Tanzania, representing Pastoral Women Association and Ujamaa Natural Resources Trust, two Members of the Consortium– After 26 years of on-going struggles, a **conflict between the Tanzanian government and the Maasai has been resolved** and confiscated land and animals have been given back to the communities.
- **Alexis Kaboré** – Burkina Faso, Coordinator for the Sahel Region – right now they are collecting information on 5 types of ICCAs: sacred groves, sacred ponds, community zones, ZOVICs and villages forests. There are **more than 50,000 ICCAs in only one part of the country**. Work directly with them until they are confident and able to be recognised as being in charge of their area. **Next step is the federation of these ICCAs into a network**. It is the first time that he has participated in the GA and he wishes good wings to the process.
- **Salatou Sambou** – Senegal, Coordinator for the Marine and Coastal Ecosystems of West Africa and representing APRCM and KABEKA, two Consortium Members. Working to **identify ICCAs in Senegal**. Some are already registered in the ICCA Registry and they have to continue this work. They have held national workshops to allow communities to exchange amongst themselves. They are working with the ICCA **self-strengthening process** (GSI initiative). Several organisations are leading a plea for **legal recognition of ICCAs at a national level**. This committee has had meetings and more will come in 2018. They hope to be one of the first countries in West Africa to have real legislation on ICCAs.
- **Joseph Itongwa** – DRC, Coordinator for Forest Ecosystems in Central Africa. Represents ANAPAC-- **National Federation of ICCAs in DRC** and Consortium’s Member. Working with a strategy -
  - a. ICCA identification
  - b. creation of national laws for recognition of ICCAs
  - c. **communication** – produce a newsletter every semester
  - d. work at the sub-regional level

Wants to thank the GEF SGP for supporting the process. In the Congo basin ICCAs are a good opportunity to support communities.

- **Vincent Ziba** – Zambia, Regional Coordinator for East and Southern Africa.
  - a. Kenya – ICCA work started in 2010 with support from WWF, UNDP and Consortium. Looking now at policies to support them with legal tools.
  - b. Zambia - encouraging self-strengthening of ICCAs. 60% of lands still de facto in hands of traditional communities. Work to identify communities who are conserving territory. Have US\$50,000 grant to identify specific chiefdoms like those at the source of the Zambezi. Issues seem to oppose government and communities in that area. Trying to **revive community laws**. In western part of Zambia near Namibia – traditional

leadership manages wetlands of Zambezi River. Seasonally, fisher folk leave the land (for about 6 months) and then come back...

- c. Namibia, in most areas, rights to wildlife conservancies are given to communities. Actively exploring ICCAs in the conservancy models. Threats are mining and large-scale agriculture in this region.
- **Robert Chimambo** – Zambia. Honorary member. Many threats in Zambia but the ICCA potential is there. There is new legislation and a **Forest Act that recognises community forest planning**. There is potential to see how to incorporate ICCAs into this legislation. This will require help from legal experts.
- **Zealelem Tefera** – Ethiopia, member of Consortium Council. CCAs have been recognised by government. Next step is ICCAs. Government is reviewing conservation laws. Chance to add the “I” into the CCA system. There may be **many ICCAs in the Horn of Africa countries**, but South Sudan and Somalia are NO GO for anyone.
- **Dominique Bikaba** – DRC, member of Consortium Council. Executive Director of Member Strong Roots Congo. Developing an **ecological corridor** in forest landscape 30,000 sq. km between protected areas. The corridor, composed of 7 community forests and including two PAs, is homeland for critically endangered gorillas. The challenge comes from mining. The government wants to take the community forests and put them into government PAs, but if they do, they will not be managed well. So, we are fighting the government and their allies IUCN and WWF to keep them as **community forests**.
- **Vololoniaina Rasoarimanana** – Madagascar, Consortium Treasurer. Represents 2 networks – one is local communities managing natural resources (Tafo Miihavo, Consortium Member) and the other is a network of supporters of ICCAs in Madagascar (Fanonga). In 2017 we continued work to support 15 emblematic ICCAs with **cartography and advocacy** for securing common resources. With support from GSI and GEF SGP we also have the opportunity to promote **sustainable use** of natural resources and livelihoods in ICCAs. With an EU programme through GIZ we can have advocacy and communication between communities.
- **Christian Chatelain** – Co-coordinator for Africa. Main work for Africa Region as a whole is **networking** for the purpose of communication. Just hosted in his house all the coordinators from francophone Africa for a coordination meeting.
- **ASIA**
  - **Giovanni Reyes** - North Philippines, member of Consortium Council and representing Members KASAPI and Bukluran. Already working to implement the law that has yet to be adopted. **Mapping of ICCAs to be fully in the hands of the indigenous people**. This is the project financed by GEF, complementary to official policy. Just formed a registry committee in 10 project sites. Other government agencies involved. Registration is another layer of protection for indigenous territories. Signed a statement to support the enactment of the 33 sections, 6 chapters and 20 prohibited acts for the NO GO zones. Even without the legal ICCA Bill have been able to convince government to use **ICCAs as an indicator for the official biodiversity plan**. Noted by Consortium that it is an honour to have a congressman with us at the GA.
  - **Teddy Baguilat Jr** – Philippines, Member of Parliament. Considers himself as an ally of the Consortium. His support of women’s, children’s and Indigenous rights makes him unpopular

- with his President. Author of **ICCA Law** (draft) in the Philippines that will recognise ICCAs as part of the legal system. Hopefully to be approved on December 14<sup>th</sup>.
- **Dave de Vera** – Philippines, member of Consortium Council of Elders. Works on ICCAs and represent founding member Philippine Association for Intercultural Development (PAFID), which has for a long time worked on **claims for ancestral title**. Have 5 groups with identifiable focal points in the country.
  - **Femy Pinto** – Philippines, representing Coordinator for South-East Asia and Consortium Member NTFP-EP. Strong working group in Indonesia and Malaysia. Recently facilitated an exchange visit with Myanmar and they want also to set up a working group. There is more happening in Indonesia and Vietnam. Hopefully the **forestry law** will be revised and ICCAs will be included in the revision, this give an **entry point for ICCAs** to be recognised. Also started a round of consultation of the common needs of the network. Maybe set up a common project like a **mapping hub** in the sub region. Are also **building capacity in SE Asia to respond to human rights offences**.
  - **Aman Singh** – India, member of Consortium Council, representing Member KRPAVIS. Work with ICCAs (Orans) in the desert state of Rajasthan. Orans are also known as sacred groves. There are 25,000 Orans in Rajasthan. Have been documenting them to exact area and status. Over 1,500 have been documented. Government also recognises them. Brought in Rajasthan Forest Policy in 2010 and are currently working to implement it. In India there are another 2 Acts that do not use the term ICCAs, but CCAs. Problems with mining. Legally the government does not need to consult communities before distributing land for mining and to the landless for cultivation. Recently, rights are getting better recognised. There is good pressure from NGOs working together. Recently we conducted a national workshop and came up with a plan for different states. Presented apologies from Neema Pathak-Broome, Regional Coordinator for South Asia, who could not attend the GA.
  - **Sutej Hugu** – Taiwan (Province of China), Coordinator for East Asia (including Taiwan, China and Japan), represents Members Tao Foundation and TICTU.
    - a. Taiwan – have about **800 tribal communities**, their ancestral land covering about 52% of the territory. There are overlaps with the national forest and the state protected area system. Only 2.3% of the population lives in this area. Recently the government announced that this area is important, although it contributes only 3% to the GNP. Land is important to Taiwan for **biodiversity, fresh water, forests and culture**, which are all in this territory. After 30 years of IP movement, and since the lifting of martial law in 1987, the new president (elected last year) has issued a formal apology to IP for 100 years of colonial persecution and accumulated crimes. There is now a Union to promote the rights and responsibilities of traditional communities. 300 tribal communities are organised in a council to negotiate collectively.
    - b. China – A totalitarian one party country. ICCA Working Group established in 2013, working in SW minority regions. In the past 2-3 years, the approach has been to actively assist provincial government in recognising small natural protected areas (small, so not in government budget – community takes responsibility). Developing administration and implementation guidelines for small PAs. There are about 10,000 in China. Recently with the support of Grazia we have issued a special issue for the China Weekly on ICCAs featuring 5 ICCAs in China and 4 case studies from around the world. **China Weekly**

- issues 5 million copies to Communist youth leaders.** Information on the case studies are found at the bottom of the first page of the new Consortium web page.
- **Ghanimat Azhdari** – Iran, member of Consortium Council and representing UNINOMAD and UNICAMEL. Working on sustainable livelihoods of IPLC and overlap of ICCAs and PAs, **rangeland management, food security and sovereignty**, in west and central Asia region. Working in countries including Georgia, Jordan and Tajikistan and **transboundary ICCA workshops**. Some countries are challenging such as Iraq, but now there is a good network with Iran and Arab Middle Eastern countries. Looking also at agro-ecology systems. In Georgia and Turkey looking at transboundary ICCAs in 2 or 3 countries. In Iran 5 communities have had a **peer review** and are ready to register for the ICCA Registry.
  - **Ruben Khachatryan** – Armenia, Foundation for the Preservation of Wildlife and Cultural Assets, a Member of the Consortium. Challenges in Armenia region – it is a landlocked country and has 2 major enemies on either side. Iran and Georgia (possibly) are friends. Transboundary issues create great tension. Glad to know about ICCAs as it opens opportunities for the region. The main activity for the past 15 years has been the establishment of an **eco-corridor, including more than 50 communities that are remote and poor**. Gave the example of a community with 10,000 ha of land which was under pressure from mining. They worked to become an eco-village and refused to allow mining. There are losses in income, but this is compensated in terms of sustainable agriculture and ecotourism. Trying to bring law and different approaches to land conservation into parliament to be recognised.
  - **Taghi Farvar** – Iran, Consortium President. Representing founding member Cenesta. Great things are happening in the region. Many countries are former soviet colonies which are now independent, there is a **movement back to ICCAs**. Despite years of soviet occupation in Georgia, there are fantastic ICCAs (for example forests that are big and every community has them). They do not have a formal governance system but the community believes the forests are important and nobody enters them. Even the forestry bureau leaves them alone. **The forest has survived and the community is the governance system**. In Arabic a “Hema” is a protected area. Reviving these in Iran – the whole country is moving toward ICCAs.
  - **Thomas Jalong** – Malaysia, member of Consortium Council. Honorary member. First time attending GA. From Borneo and Sarawak – Malaysia. National umbrella of IP that include almost 100 community organisations. ICCA term is new. SE Asia has been focused on **territorial domains**. Basis for struggle, seen as a way of conserving resources for community. Process is based on **rights of communities**. Fight along that line against timber and plantation companies and land grabbing. Over the past few years, the courts in Sarawak have had about **400 cases filed**, based on territorial domains of IC. **Highest court of country made some bad judgement** on the rights of the ICs by virtue of customary practice. December of last year, said that rights of IP to land through customary practice has no force of law and rights cannot be sustained. This has negative implications for struggle for ICCAs. Since 1960s did provide some areas to be set aside for community forest needs, but from 1970s until now there is no formal recognition of this. The law says a different thing from what our people have been doing for many generations.
  - **Kasmita Widodo** - Indonesia, represents Working Group on ICCAs in Indonesia. In February, they held a national workshop in Jakarta. They explained their ICCA and launched registry

- for ICCAs. In May training was held in management of ICCAs. In October working group and ministry of forestry had a conference. November – secretariat and members together with the ministry of forestry discussed **recognition of customary forests**.
- **Elaine Hsaio** – Taiwanese, lives in USA, representing CEESP. Works on transboundary ICCAs and PAs and conflict resolution. IUCN CEESP has a number of themes relevant to ICCA work including theme on governance equity and rights. Working on different knowledge baskets including people and nature, and sustainable resource management. **Land defenders** and a strategy for IUCN governance category for IPLC – hoping for some input on that.
  - **Holly Jonas** – Malaysia, Consortium International Policy Coordinator. Supporting PACOS Trust which is a Member. She is trying to connect local, national and regional work with **international policy**.
  - **AMERICAS**
    - **Carmen Miranda** – Bolivia, Coordinator for the Amazon Region. President of small NGO working in conservation in different ways including IPLC (Savia- member of the Consortium). Regional coordinator for Amazon region. Many IP in Amazon Region, **threats** are active. Some countries have active recognition such as in Colombia and Ecuador and Bolivia. Main problem is now in relation to **extractive activities** in the entire Amazon basin. Mining and oil exploration is going into protected and indigenous areas. Trying to organise better. Bolivia has a **National Committee for ICCAs** and has just produced a map of violations of Human Rights in ICCAs. The Report is on the Consortium website.
    - **Emma Courtine** - In Ecuador the network of ICCAs is getting stronger. Members of the Consortium in Ecuador are showcasing **emblematic ICCAs** in the country. GSI is the supporting infrastructure. The pressure from mining is strong. Also working on fishing in several places. There is a diversity of communities and many languages in the country.
    - **José Aylwin** – Chile, member of Consortium Council. Part of the Chilean Citizen’s watch. A Consortium Member. Attended the GA with Honorary member Felipe Guerra. Under coordination of Lorena Arce, the Regional Coordinator – been working in Chile, identifying ICCAs, mapping and promoting the concept. They have identified **6 really motivated ICCAs** which are under threat from mining, salmon farms and forestry. Confronting legislation and trying to enact legislation and **challenging the bill** that allows for public and private conservation and denies community conservation. Successful in promoting a consultation process of the bill. The government included in that bill a reference to Indigenous lands of conservation meaning lands owned and registered as owned by IP. Struggling for land and community conservation. Also working on the ICCA Registry – no ICCAs registered yet.
    - **Albert Chan Dzul** (read by Emma Courtine) – Mexico, Coordinator for Mesoamerica. Working on **strategy and workshops for ICCAs** in the context of GSI in Guatemala. In December will gather people to exchange ideas - how to find funds, how to recruit Members, following the ICCA Strengthening policy with CEESP. Also fighting against GM soya.
    - **Monica Mulrennan** – Canada, CICADA (a partner organisation to the Consortium). Works with IP protected areas in Canada. The change of government has led to big changes. Pathways to target 1 includes national designation of IP PA. ICE includes Eli Enns being mandated to provide recommendation on how ICCAs can contribute to meeting obligations towards Aichi targets. Had **4 meetings recently** – there is a very long history so have to

- work to reconcile relationships. Government has affirmed that they will recognise UNDRIP, FPIC. Positive times in Canada.
- **Kim Sanders Wright** – Canada, Strategy Advisor for Coastal, Marine and Island Environments. Part of ICE process, invited by Canadian council to meet to discuss how to use IP databases to contribute to Aichi targets. Several government ministries have written documents to say that they **support ICCAs**, this is **because** of rising pressure to meet the **Aichi Targets by 2020**. Experts want this to be a slow process based on reconciliation, it cannot be forced to happen by 2020.
  - **EUROPE**
    - **Sergio Couto** – Spain, Regional Coordinator for Europe. Represents Member Iniciativa Comunales-- a federation of ICCAs in Spain. Europe is slow with ICCAs as it is not a well-known concept, usually related to **The Commons**. Focussed on Spain and have identified ICCAs (generally known under other names). 1 month ago, had participants from twelve European countries meet to draw up a common strategy to identify ICCAs. Have commissioned a review of the situation on ICCAs in Romania. Peer-review process for ICCA Registry in Spain is being established. Working to promote products of these areas (for commercial support) to build resistance to development. Have applied for large amount of funding from EU Life project.
    - **Iris Benes** – Croatia, represents Member Brod Ecological Society. Tradition of 50 years of socialism which destroyed most of the Commons, then 20 years of capitalism which destroyed the rest. My village has a common grassland and my NGO is trying to preserve the combination of **nature and culture**. Preserving **old breeds of animals**. Policy work to follow legislation and **advocacy for common use of land**. Land Act changes frequently so there is no stability. Have included collective management of common land into legislation and removed it from state control.
    - **Aili Pyhälä** – Finland, member of Consortium Council – represents north Europe and Russia. This is an important year in Finland as it has chairmanship of Arctic Council and is celebrating 100 years of independence. Sami are now speaking up and claiming that they have been colonised. Have established a **truth and reconciliation committee**. In northern Europe, ICCAs are mostly sacred sites and IP governed areas. Snowchange has managed to get recognition to an ICCA. Posts on developments have been made in recent issue of Consortium newsletter. Russia – need to move carefully because of security and language barriers. Planning a report for the whole region. Took part in European meeting in Spain. Looking to recruit many more Members to the Consortium.
    - **Chris Madine** – UK, represents Member Snowchange, which promoted the first ICCA in Finland. (Taghi – in 2014, Snowchange pleaded for help to protect an old growth forest patch in Keralia. The Consortium signed a protest letter and the forest was protected. It is now one of the few primary forests in the country. Good to see that this campaign worked).
    - **Ted Karfakis** – Greece, representing Member Terra Sylvestris. - in middle of 2<sup>nd</sup> largest marine protected area in Greece – there used to be a local council chosen by the people who managed the area. 1994 became **Natura 2000 protected area**. Believe our area is a **disrupted ICCA**. I am from one of the families who were part of the governing council (destroyed in the 1970s by the military government). **Trying to reconstruct the ICCA as a bubble in a sea of private land**.

- **Bertrand Sansonnens** – Switzerland, Honorary member of Consortium. Works with Pro Natura which is not a Member of the Consortium, but part of FoEI. We heard a lot about the situation in Switzerland at the Museum event yesterday. A lot of **communities in the mountains** manage their own areas.
- **Andrea Finger-Stich** – France, Honorary member of Consortium. Was involved in forest policy at IUCN. There is no formal recognition of ICCAs in Switzerland, but there are many **local community collectives**, involved in pastoral, forest and irrigation systems.
- **Anne Golay** – Switzerland, independent. Works on biodiversity and forest conservation in the government of the Canton Vaud. They are committed to achieving Aichi target 11.
- **INTERNATIONAL**
  - **Heather Bingham** – UK, UNEP WCMC. They manage the **ICCA Registry** and world database on Protected Areas. Both platforms recognise ICCAs at international levels. Encouraging peer review processes at the national level – will talk more on this later today.
  - **Claudia Ituarte Lima** – Peru/Kenya, Swedbio. Swedbio is a knowledge interface programme and a collaborative programme. The webpage gives all the necessary information. 2 processes highlighted – 1) Kenya meeting focussing on human rights and biodiversity. 2) Developing a report on SDGs, **human rights and biodiversity**, want this to be interactive and part of a toolkit. Requested any tools that exist to be fed into this.
  - **Nele Marien** – Mexico, FoEI. Network of 75 national organisations working on environment and justice – mostly food sovereignty, forests, biodiversity. Need to identify what you are for when you are fighting against things. Feel **close to the Consortium and happy with our alliance**. **Human rights defenders** – FoEI are trying to step up, not just for one person but for a whole territory or community.
  - **Terence Hay-Edie** – Thailand, GEF SGP Programme Advisor. Programme works in 125 countries. **Preparing another 4-year phase**. Works on GSI. CBD is a partner to this – looking at what comes after the Aichi targets. New funder founded in US with millions of dollars of funding – will talk with them on Wednesday.
  - **Colin Scott** – Canada, McGill University. In Montreal, CICADA has been a Member of the Consortium for 2 years. Knowledge building partnership of first nations globally. Work in a participative way on **customary tenure, lifeways and livelihoods**, food sovereignty, global growth model, resource extraction, community governance, land grabbing on IP territories. Use video to document conflicts and involved with community territorial mapping. Moving towards an enhanced funding base and now have 2.5m \$ for next 4-6 years. Have many global partners who are hungry for support. Many of **our partners have a history with the Consortium**.
  - **Marcos Cerra** – Spain, Honorary member of Consortium. Writing a report document on the **peer to peer** review systems.
  - **Susan Crosby** – USA, Consortium Editor in English. Also does some Spanish translation.
  - **Tilman Jaeger** - Germany, Honorary member of Consortium. **Governance** of protected areas. Interested in **NO GO policy**.
  - **Felipe Guerra** – Chile, Honorary member of Consortium. A lawyer from Chile.
  - **Cristina Eghenter** – Indonesia, Honorary member of Consortium. Works with WWF Indonesia which is a member of the working group on ICCAs in Indonesia.



Powerpoint Presentation available [here](#)

During Grazia's report, people were invited to note what we can learn from this year and what we can do better for next year on post-its. These suggestions will be used to plan for next year (**See document entitled 'Key points from GA suggestions for 2018 work plan' at the end of these Minutes**).

History of the Consortium rooted in the movement for equity in conservation. New Consortium Strategy now being implemented, we have started to define the policies of the Consortium (NO GO, Gender ...), we are communicating effectively and achieving solid advances in many countries, and make a major effort to provide all our information, as much as possible, in three languages. Our partners for this event are GEF SGP, TCF, Swedbio, Tikva and Pro Natura. We have no core funding.

We work at 4 levels:

- local (support grassroots processes of self-strengthening of ICCAs),
- national (aims at a critical mass for solidarity and effective advocacy),
- regional (focussing on sharing inspiring experiences and capacity building) and
- international (enhancing the international recognition of ICCAs for the variety of results and contributions they bring).

### **What have we accomplished in 2017?**

#### **❖ Implementing a new Strategy -**

Supporting action on the ground  
Influencing global policy  
Building communication  
Supporting institutional growth of Consortium  
governance  
regionalisation  
human resources  
communications  
fundraising

- ❖ **Assisted Members and partners**, not just in the 26 countries of GSI (see presentation for full details)  
– there have been some delays and some conflicting views, but in some situations results are wonderful. We are keen to do more.
  - Crucial role of ICCA national networks

#### **❖ Capacity building events**

Kyrgyzstan  
South cone  
Commons in Europe  
National events in Tanzania, Zambia, Kenya, Georgia, Iran and Ecuador

Capacity building on governance with IUCN in several countries

❖ **Support and advice to CBD, UN and international policy in general**

- Written submissions to CBD
- Several meetings with Prof John Knox, UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and the Environment
- OCEAN conference, IMPAC 4, Treaty alliance in Geneva

❖ **Events we organised**

- ICCAs in Africa
- ICCAs in Switzerland
- This General Assembly
- Roundtable for partners and friends of the ICCA Consortium

❖ **Partnership with FoEI**

- several lines of work, including SAFE (stalled a little)

❖ **ICCA Alerts (on-going)**

- Nigeria: Ekuri superhighway
- Finland: moratorium on fishery ban
- Ecuador: Cordillera del Condor
- Tanzania: Uvinje and Loliondo

❖ **Publications and research**

- Self-strengthening document in three languages, guiding GSI implementation process
- research on governance vitality ongoing
- ICCAs in Asia report being updated
- work ongoing on various policy briefs

❖ **Governance of the Consortium**

- New Council with nineteen members
- New Membership Committee, chaired by Aili Pyhälä, worked on a review of the membership policy and processes
- New Policy and Programme Committee, with Patricia Mupeta as interim chair, working on NO GO policy and gender policy
- Council meetings (e.g., one full week Skype meeting in May due to the need to hold the meeting in various languages and time zones)

❖ **Decentralisation process**

- Global secretariat engaged
- Need to identify suitable National focal points in each country
- Members need a stronger role
- Council created and approved a road map to decentralisation in their meeting of 24 November, which will unfurl in the next two years

#### ❖ **Human resources**

- High praise for Anne Meier, Senior Accountant, who successfully took the Consortium through a first financial audit
- Communication Assistant appointed – Deborah David
- The Strategy recommends the appointment of a fundraiser but we don't have one yet

#### ❖ **Communications**

- Website – fantastic piece of work by Emma Courtine and Tiphaine Dalmas - for inspiration, knowledge, sharing, regional pages
- Newsletter
- Some drone filming
- Major plans on the way, events to take place in these days of meetings

#### ❖ **Fundraising**

- 5 successful grants, some very small but all take time
- Outstanding proposals waiting for approval
- Tikva Grassroots Fund: interested in funding small initiatives in Africa

### **Regional Coordinator Reports – best thing about 2017**

**Taghi** (West Asia on behalf of Cenesta) – past, present and future are linked best through ICCAs.

**Vincent Ziba & Patricia Mupeta** (Zambia) – awareness creation in communities of ICCAs thanks to the Consortium. Leading to communities getting organised. Very rich, one-day meeting of experts (chiefs, councillors, ...)

**Carmen Miranda** (Bolivia) – Amazon basin – we work to mobilise ICCA philosophy in many countries. Looking for resources and have an engaged group working on this. Brazil – used to give a lot of support to IP but recently this has been a disaster, we will begin working with Raphaela again next year. Thanks to GSI we have opportunities in Colombia and hopefully in Peru.

**Sergio Couto** (Europe) - system for peer review process for the ICCA Registry. Means there is no need for 'experts' or governments to be involved. Currently registering new ICCAs in Spain, this is growing fast.

**Joseph Itongwa** (DRC) – identified emblematic ICCAs and worked on awareness in the region. Working group of legal experts specialising in recognition – helps to convince the state that ICCAs contribute to conservation. Called for next African meeting to be held in DRC and for Consortium to focus on this area as DRC is not part of GSI.

**Salatou Sambou** (Senegal) – relates to West Africa – developing strategy for region for ICCAs, we can exchange knowledge, secure ICCAs in the area. In Senegal we have an informal network already.

**Christian Chatelain** (Africa) – used to be considered as a latecomer but be prepared to hear more and more about Africa. People here are ready to deliver concrete results. Maybe we could hold the next GA

in Africa. **Grazia** - It was decided in Council meeting yesterday. Each region will develop a proposal on how to regionalise, these will be synthesised and passed to the Council and Members for review before going to the GA 2018 for approval. Probably, as part of this we will have regional meetings next year instead of a large GA.

**Sutej Hugu** (Taiwan, province of China) - have clear national strategic plan. China - 2-day conference on ICCAs (small nature protected areas). Both Taiwan and China have developed their own peer review procedure.

**Femy Pinto** (SE Asia) – biggest achievement is strong national networks in the Philippines, Malaysia, Vietnam and Indonesia. Had regional exchange and developments in several countries in the region. 60 ICCAs are now recognised in the region.

**Kim Wright** (Global Coordinator for Coastal, Marine and Island Environments) – key issues internationally –

- dialogue about ICCAs and OECMs (publication due out soon and a task force to recognise marine as OECM category)
- rights of small scale fishers (rights tightly tied to IP rights, Lorena Arce lead IP groups to participate in International Marine Protected Areas Congress 4),
- providing CBD with case studies of marine areas and how to designate them for conservation
- too many conservation organisations have no understanding of IP or community issues.

**Aman Singh** (India) – held national workshop on Orans, many people invited, wanted it to be technical and based on solid knowledge to lead to publication to be used with supreme court. Documentary on Orans developed, not completed but advanced.

### **Final comments**

**Ted Karfakis** – certain countries can access funds and support more easily than others purely because they are ‘fashionable’ or ‘interesting’. Greece is too often overlooked. The Consortium should work on developing tools that do not draw from governments or ‘big’ experts. They should be aware of the ‘con’ in conservation. Greece needs to be identified as an environment conflict zone.

**Carmen Miranda** – Consortium needs to strengthen its help and support to ICCAs in danger.

**Dominique Bikaba** – CBD COP happens every 2 years, how do we ensure their policies are reflected/implemented on the ground. Emblematic ICCAs – how do we decide what counts as emblematic?

**Grazia** - this definition is in the self-strengthening document – an emblematic ICCA does not need to be perfect, it could be damaged or disrupted, but its community should be actively engaged to improve. Basically: it needs to be inspiring to others. How can we share the experience of emblematic ICCAs with other ICCAs?

**Motion to note the Programme Report – Taghi Farvar asked if there are any objections to the Programme Report – No objections raised. Approved by acclamation.**

**Communications report: strategy adopted so far, assessment, perspectives, new tools (in particular new ICCA Web site) and desired ICCA communication results**

**Powerpoint Presentation available from Emma Courtine**

**2017 accomplishments presented by Emma Courtine -**

- This meeting is happening on-line as a way to get the Members who could not attend to participate in the GA.
- Communications: Team Growth – five new associates:
  - Emma Courtine (translation into French),
  - Deborah David – Communication Officer
  - Susan Crosby (editing in English)
  - Carolina Amaya (editing in Spanish)
  - Tiphaine Dalmas (IT Manager, based in Cenesta in Iran)
  - Grazia helps with guidance.
- Communication in three languages.
- Improvements in regionalisation – e.g. dedicated Facebook and mailing list in Latin America.
- Website:
  - Green side dedicated to ICCAs-- including history, local, national and regional information and international policy. There is action information (e.g., legal and policy work) and we reach to the point of “joining the Consortium”
  - Orange side dedicated to the Consortium: Who we are, governance, organisation and what we do, where we work, publications, events and how to contact us. There are regional pages for the Members and Secretariat. Please share here information on your region. The six symbols at the bottom of the regional pages include Consortium Members, Council, events, resources, stories and alerts.
  - At the very bottom are featured resources.
  - The whole site is in the process of being translated into French and Spanish.
  - On the home page there is News and Action, and how to sign up for the newsletter.
  - Below that are emblematic ICCAs. We want to highlight some cases with video or press releases and beautiful photos.
  - The website belongs to the Members, and you must give us the information.
- Publications
  - 4 newsflashes and 1 Newsletter this year.
- Social Media
  - 400% increase in page views since January 2016 – 400 Facebook followers.
- Accomplishments
  - Provided support to Members in creating their own website – Ecuador and Senegal.

**Plans for 2018**

- Revise the strategic communications plan to include more specific goals, activities and evaluations.
- Conduct survey of Members to determine effectiveness of communications.
- Keep working towards **regionalisation** including working more closely with Regional Coordinators to gather information.

- Social media improvements (especially Twitter and YouTube) although Twitter is just for campaigns and YouTube is for keeping videos. Want to strengthen this. Want information from the regions and Members so it can be shared with the world. Internationally Facebook is used lots.
- Publish 10 newsflashes and 3 Newsletters each year.
- Production of **several videos on ICCAs with LifeMosaic and The New Media Advocacy Project.**

### Questions and discussion about communications

- In terms of communications, Regional Coordinators can play a significant role. Because of the volume of emails we all receive, newsflashes could get overlooked. Role of Regional Coordinators and Members in the region. Regional Coordinators can ensure that Members receive information and follow this up.
- It is possible for virtual meetings on Skype. Maybe to improve information with Regional Coordinators we should hold Skype meetings every three months with the Global Coordinator.
- **Webinars** should be held every so often about interesting things. Every time a new Member joins, they should demonstrate what they are doing and what they can contribute. Can have more than one person in the organisation participating. Tools and strategies could be shared. Good way to get people together who live far away, to learn, and to introduce new people.
- The issue of environmental and human rights defenders – is it a priority? Are there networks that provide support on this issue? - *In the website there are ICCA alerts. There is a policy that states that Alerts come through the Members. The policy is available on the website. All the Alerts we have had to date are there. NO GO policy is also there.*
- Is there a way for a pop up on the computer if there is an Alert? It would bring it to the attention of people in the region.
- The newsletter is interesting for receiving information from other parts of the world. Senegal for example, communication on the ground is difficult because not everyone has electricity for days because of storms.
- I like the shorter newsflashes rather than the long newsletter as it is easier to read a newsflash than the whole newsletter.
- Media releases? Mass media opportunities? Is that part of the plan? Do we want to send information out to non-Members? Otherwise we only communicate with ourselves - *We hope the videos will support what we want to say, they will be a tool to get information from the ground to the rest of the world.*
- Is there a part of the website that counts the number of times someone has read an article? - *Had one tool that showed who was going to the website. Don't have a real grasp who is going to which page. But at the bottom it shows who has visited the web page by flags of the countries they come from.*
- It may be good to put our ICCA models that are featured in the UNEP WCPA on our website – *there is a page on the Registry with links to the ICCA Registry.*
- **Taghi** - currently the Consortium is governed by a 'Steering Committee', but after its enlargement it seems appropriate to change its name. The Steering Committee is now made up of 19 people representing different regions and Members, there are women and men, IP and LC. They are elected at the GA and often have meetings on Skype and sometimes face to face. Propose to call it hence-forth the 'Council' of the Consortium. This is just a matter of changing the name and not the function of this body. The specific powers of the Steering

Committee/Council are listed in the Statutes in three languages. If this is approved, we will change the name in the Statutes.

**Motion to change the name of the current Steering Committee to Council ('Conseil' in French and 'Consejo' in Spanish) – proposed by Aman Singh, seconded by Sutej Hugo (TICTU). Approved by acclamation.**

## Membership Report

Powerpoint Presentation available [here](#)

**Aili Pyhälä (Chair of the Membership Committee) presented the Membership Report 2017 –**

Acknowledged Emma for her work. We now have 116 Members and 277 Honorary members. This is up 12 and 38 respectively on last year. Some Members are in the process of leaving. Half of the Members are NGOs, half are IPLC.

Most work at national level, then local, regional, international.

There are Honorary members in all regions and their numbers have gone up. Gender balance – 65% men, 35% female.

The membership policy has been shared and is online, please refer to it. Main change is that the application process happens more frequently and is shorter but is more rigorous (there are now forms to fill).

Past issues, future procedures-

1. How do we resolve complaints?
2. Should avoid making hasty decisions on sensitive cases
3. Prioritising caution over speed
4. Careful procedures on conflict management
5. Getting deeper into the issues at hand
6. Respect the views of the Members and Honorary members

Future procedures-

1. Get enough information before making a decision, even if this means waiting for the next round of decisions.
2. Increased reliance on Regional Coordinators for information sourcing, promoting engagement and ensuring a balanced, fair representation.

A membership review is underway – aim: to improve knowledge of membership, take membership seriously, keep them active and committed. Want to avoid losing Members because of a lack of attention. We have sent out questions as part of this review. Started in September and have a 30% response rate. There are some useful findings and we will do a second-round review. Gave some examples of responses received. Will now send targeted messages for responses.

One important change that has happened is the suggestion (from the Chair of the Membership Committee) that we remove the possibility to have membership applications heard directly at the GA – this is because the process is now more rigorous, there is a shortened application time and this would be more fair to non-attendees at the GA. Suggestion is that people can approach the GA and make their case, present themselves, be discussed but that approval cannot be given instantly (people would be encouraged to make a regular application).

Discussion on this suggestion – **Taghi** - do not want to limit the supreme authority of the GA. **Grazia** – a way out could be that the GA makes a strong recommendation to the Membership Committee, if there are no objections. **Sergio Couto** – Grazia’s proposal is more complicated. Can be awkward to decide on membership on the spot, people may regret decisions later, people may feel pressured. Supports the suggested change. **Robert Chimambo** – we are operating in a highly contested space, as we go forward there will be people who try to undermine us. Need to decide how to protect ourselves from this. Membership Committee should have the final word. **Ted Karfakis** – the way to destroy an organisation is to assign provocateurs as members and then destroy it from the inside. We have a lot of experience of this in Greece, it happens systematically. Democracy can be corrupted and biased. Keep the decision-making core as safe as possible. **Nele Marien** – in FoEI we have membership committee, when they are confident about an organisation they take it to the GA. The GA takes place every 2 years, the first time they are presented they can be approved on a provisional basis and then the second time (2 years later) they are permanently accepted. **Grazia** – this works well for FoEI as you have only one Member per country. Same process could become a heavy burden for the Consortium because we aim to have many Members in each country. We have only rejected Members so far when we have seen that an organisation has little interest in ICCAs but is focussed on self-aggrandisement and funding. **Bertrand Sansonnens** – it is important that the GA is the supreme authority. Having 2 systems is not a good idea. **Aili Pyhälä** – there has been a suggestion that before we propose new Honorary members to the committee, it has to go through the Regional Coordinators because it is hard to object to a proposition once it has been made. **Joseph Itongwa** – need to investigate Members and learn what the Member will bring to the Consortium. Next year, could you present a diagram to show what and how the Members have contributed to the Consortium during the year? **Giovanni Reyes** – membership is based on idea that we will not bring in people who will harm us. Must be sure not to bring anyone in who has association with destructive industries. Applications should be cleared at local level as they have the knowledge of who the applicants are. **Vincent Ziba** – need an aspiration as a Consortium. What do we want to see as a membership in next 10 years, do we want more IP groups or more NGOs? If we make it too difficult, we will limit the Members at grassroots level. Maybe should have graduated membership level from local to international level. **Sutej Hugu** – now we have national networks as Members. These are hidden Members, e.g. TICTU has 800 communities as members but it is *one* Member of the Consortium. This could become a problem that we will need to address in the future. **Carmen Miranda** – trying to understand Aili’s proposal. We have some Honorary members who are listed in our region, but they do not live in the region. Very difficult to work with them. For Members – we did accept a Member at a GA in Ecuador...but since then we have had no contribution from it. **Dave de Vera** – statistics are useful, can we use them to provide guidance – they could be used to help us decide on accepting new Members. We could accept or refuse based on what type of Member we have decided we need. Regional Coordinators should facilitate the membership drive in the region but should not make the decision themselves. Global Coordinator could play this role for international organisations. **Dominique Bikaba** – we must respect our values, we cannot lose them or we will lose ourselves.



Sending the applications to all Members means they have all been consulted. Regional Coordinators may be considered as staff but they know their region. Applications to Membership Committee should be reviewed by the Regional Coordinators before being sent to the whole membership. **Aman Singh** – could ask for endorsement letters from other Members in the region. Committee should take the decision after consulting the Members. **Sergio Couto** – best to put up barriers before you have an internal fragmentation. In Spain, we were worried that academics could dominate the discussion in Iniciativa Comunes, so we have weighted numbers of votes given to different organisations. This way we are sure that there are fair decisions made that favour the opinions of the communities. Membership Committee should take all these suggestions and discuss them in a more dedicated workshop. **Grazia** – it is important to remember that we work on consensus. One dissension can block a vote.

Aili summary of this issue – no one opposed the suggestion to **end the option of being accepted at the GA so we will make this change. Accepted by everyone.**

**Motion to note the Membership Report – No objections raised. Approved by acclamation.**

#### **Proposals for new Members and Honorary members: discussion of eventual undecided cases**

GFC was not consulted on the inclusion of peasant organisations in a workshop that happened in Paraguay. Now a Federation for indigenous people has applied for membership of the Consortium. GFC considers that it has been ignoring the peasant societies in Paraguay and collaborating closely with an unsupportive government. It does not favour its application as Members.

The application of this group is now suspended and is being investigated. The Membership Committee is investigating it. It is an important issue and we do not want conflict between Members. The Membership Committee is not respecting the one-month limit for this organisation.

#### **Final Treasurer's Report for 2016 and Preliminary Treasurer's Report for 2017;**

##### **Treasurer's Report 2016 – Vololoniaina Rasoarimanana**

- In 2016 the Consortium underwent its first external Audit, for the 2016 accounts. There were no major anomalies noted, but some small suggestions were made, such as changing the accounting software. It was also recommended that the Consortium accounts be maintained in US dollars because it is the main currency of Consortium operations. Exchange rate fluctuations can be better managed if we maintain our accounts in US dollars.
- The main sources of funds are a two-year grant from The Christensen Fund, a three-year grant from UNDP (the GSI grant) and a smaller Swedbio grant.
- Main expenses in 2016 were related to COP 13 and the General Assembly in Mexico.
- Restricted use accounts are based on funding agreements. These restricted funds are for specific projects.
- Unrestricted use accounts are funds which we can spend for activities as we wish.
- Bank fees and audit fees.

**Motion to approve the Treasurer's Report 2016 - Motion proposed by Aman Singh and seconded by Iris Benes – no objections. Approved by acclamation.**

#### **Preliminary Treasurer's Report 2017 – Vololoniaina Rasoarimanana**

- Report for the first two quarters of 2017.
- Due to exchange rate calculations, the starting totals for 2017 and the end totals for 2016 are marginally different.
- At the end of June, it was deemed better not to keep cash on hand so the balance was reduced to zero.
- Accrued expenses from 2016 are incurred expenses in 2016 that were paid in 2017.

**Members noted the Preliminary Treasurer's Report 2017.**

#### **Report of the Auditor of the Accounts.**

- Stan Stevens is the Auditor of the Accounts, but he was unable to attend so the previous Auditor – **Maurizio Farhan Ferrari** read the report to the GA:
  - Report of the Auditor of Accounts on the full year 2016 and January to June 2017. I concur with the Treasurer's Reports and am satisfied that the financial records are in good order. I would like to remind the GA that these are the first Treasurer's Reports for the new Treasurer. I commend everyone involved for the achievements of the past year.

**Grazia** – it is difficult to judge accounts such as these without all the background information. I encourage Members to understand the meaning of it. In the next year we have (so far) much smaller grants than in the past. Because of these natural funding fluctuations, it is important to save some funds, and this is why we are parsimonious and don't spend everything we have. It is for our own **autonomy** and to **prepare for funding cycles** that are **not always aligned with our work**. Right now we are happy that we have saved enough resources to continue for the next year without major changes, so that we can do more fund raising. So, in the Treasurer reports I encourage to look beyond the numbers. The numbers add up, but we should consider, question and appreciate the basic approach and attitude.

**Members noted the Report of the Auditor of the Accounts.**

#### **Key issues for future work of Consortium on ICCA national networks and Peer-support & peer-review processes for listing ICCAs nationally and internationally**

**Grazia** – at **national** level we stress the importance of having **ICCA networks**. The Consortium itself is a network. A network can be

1. A **working group** (individuals, organisations, federations....). Flexible and ad-hoc. Key examples come from Asia.

2. A **federation** – more formal, representative. e.g. BUKLURAN in the Philippines, UNINOMAD & UNICAMEL in Iran
3. A **coalition** – dedicated to a task at hand. e.g. CALG in the Philippines

Networks exist to identify ICCAs in a given country, understand them and their characteristics in some depth, understand their problems and issues, what is a way forward? where are the threats? where are the problems? They need to work out a strategy (analysis of the country, find common goals to pursue the goals of the Consortium, sharing of tools, meetings and knowledge exchange). **ICCA network should act as a group of peers to provide support and review.** If one wants to be registered in the ICCA registry they should be supported and reviewed by a network of peers.

What do we understand as ICCAs in our country/region? The network/peer group needs to decide –

**Sergio Couto** – important to have support from outside an organisation. The Registry should only be of ICCAs but this cannot be ensured if *anything* could be listed. People could list an area for the wrong reasons and this would weaken the legitimate ICCAs. The approach of UNEP WCMC was to propose a team of experts to check whether a proposed community is an ICCA or not. We cannot talk about self-determination and then give ‘experts’ the power to decide. Every entry in the Registry has a vested interest in ensuring that it only includes legitimate ICCAs. We started with the scientific process of peer review of papers and data. Then we returned to communities to decide how to put this into practice. Different approaches were proposed and we now have a well worked out process in Spain.

The Consortium idea is not to propose one approach for all countries, but to let each country work out its own approach. During the past three years we have seen how communities can use the Registry to support themselves. In Spain it has been used to protect a territory from destructive exploitation. People are reluctant to take advantage of something registered by the UN, but where there are problems of recognition with local authorities, registration in the Registry gives provides credentials. There are always risks – do not create false expectations in the communities, this is an experiment in a way, we are at the beginning of the process.

**Heather Bingham** – UNEP WCMC also manages the WDPA. The ICCA registry is only for ICCAs. WDPA documents ICCAs who wish to be documented alongside other types of conservation areas.

**Taghi** – in Iran, tribal ICCAs have a peer review process, the communities have completely accepted it. It involves a process to help communities to come up with 1. a community territorial assessment; 2. an ecological assessment; 3. a governance assessment (including eventual governance evolution). Based on these three assessments, we helped communities to produce their community bio-cultural diversity protocol. We recently held a summit workshop of tribal leaders and went through the necessary forms. Part of this is peer review and at the end they passed a resolution to say they had undertaken a peer review process and approved the ICCAs they had examined.

**Dominique Bikaba** – we have a poor law on community forests – but process is similar to that in Iran, we have to go through processes before we can be recognised a community forest.

**Dave de Vera** – Philippines. Our process has been tested in 15 sites over the past 6 years. The ICCA Self-strengthening document has been translated into local languages. **We reinvigorate what has always been there.** We use the self-strengthening document and support them to talk between the generations, make maps, gather data in a systematic way and this is analysed to understand the

situation and they produce a community conservation plan (policies, rules) – this is part of the new law that is being adopted at the moment. In the National Commission of Indigenous People, 20 employees have been trained by us.

**Sergio Couto** – in Spain we have a similar approach. We explain the ICCA concept to communities as a tool or opportunity, if they are interested they have to fill in the ICCA Registry forms which are very detailed. Ask communities how they define their community, governance system, territory .... Iniciativa Comunales is responsible for facilitating this process. We take the reports, send to WCMC and take them to peer review process, which implies looking for two similar evaluator communities. They produce a report based on the three characteristics of ICCAs (we have done work to understand how these relate directly to the situation in Spain). These peer review reports are collected and once a year, our members who have already an ICCA in the Registry meet to review them. We have already registered two ICCAs and there are more in the pipeline.

### **Discussion**

**Ghanimat Azhdari** – we need more linkages between organisations working on ICCA issues (LandMark, ICCA Registry, other ICCA databases). **Ted Karfakis** – should be a strong ecological assessment component to avoid non-genuine ICCAs from being registered. **Aili Pyhälä** – would like more details on risks of registering. Also, has anyone been denied the right to register? **Sergio Couto** – there is the possibility to be registered without making this information public. Some communities do not trust UN. Hugu – TICTU is a national network which guides the peer review process. By product of self-declaration of rights. This process needs input of neighbouring tribal communities. Use collective memory to understand territories. In China they support the Registry but there is no review process. Based on rights and institution, knowledge and wellbeing of people. **Robert Chimambo** – ideas of thinking in terms of territory rather than land are good. Country has been cut into small bits for one hundred years. Tribes cross national boundaries. The challenge is to see how to use the idea of territory. **Taghi** – you have to resist and move ahead step by step and continuously. **Joseph Itongwa** – must be careful with registration but there is no other mechanism than the Registry for protecting our territories. Two elements are key to the process: quality of the ICCA and the engagement of the communities. **Dave de Vera** – to respond to Ghanimat. Strong demand to make sense of all these international databases. Convened meeting last year of local communities who decided that local platforms should be strengthened before then moving to regional or international platforms. **Emma Courtine** – which organisations have started this process in other parts of the world? **Sergio Couto** – Taiwan is an example. Marcos has been working with Consortium to do study on how different countries are implementing a peer review process. This will allow people to learn ways that may work. **Grazia** – let us not underestimate the WDPA. Ministries care more about WDPA than about a self-declared registry. **Terence Hay-Edie** – WDPA has an expert review and needs a peer review. This intersects with NO GO policy.

**19:00 President closed the meeting for the day**

**20:30 Resisting damaging developments and strengthening ICCAs by using videos-- presentations/ conversation/ mini-workshop with The New Media Advocacy Project and LifeMosaic**

**Michael Braithwaite** ([New Media Advocacy](#), based in New York) and **Serge Marti** ([LifeMosaic](#), based in Scotland) each presented their video series, which were filmed in several countries in South America, Africa, Haiti, Indonesia, and others. In the videos, Indigenous people and local communities tell of the events that led to the exploitation and destruction of their traditional territories by extractive mining and petroleum industries. Each video focuses on a different topic: cooption, false promises, FPIC, legal recourse, etc. The videos are screened to communities in towns and villages, to inform and involve communities, and to motivate them to defend themselves, their ways of life, and their territories. These short films have had considerable success—after seeing the videos, the communities have been more proactive, and have contacted legal and environmental advocates to engage their support in defending their lands.

The presentations were followed by a discussion of the videos and the process adopted by New Media Advocacy and LifeMosaic.

## **Minutes day two: Sunday, 26 November 2017**

**decisions still to be taken into effect**

**decided and – since then -- already done or in progress**

**to be noted by the Council and Secretariat**

**08:30 Welcome by the President.**

**Towards a Consortium policy for “ICCAs as NO GO zones for destructive industries and safe havens for environmental and human rights defenders”. Presentation of a policy proposal shared and pre-discussed on line prior to the GA**

Draft Policy: “ICCAs as NO GO Zones for Destructive Industries and Safe Havens for Environmental and Human Rights Defenders”

**Holly Jonas -**

- Most of the planet’s remaining biodiversity is found within ICCAs. ICCAs are however under increasing threats from industrial activities such as monoculture, plantations and mining as are their custodians and defenders.
- IPLC are on the frontlines of many struggles.

- At the GA in 2016, many Members asked us to focus more on ideas to respond to threats to ICCAs.
- Lots of reports are available on this issue. Global Witness have produced reports on Defenders of the Earth, Frontline Defenders also does an annual report on human rights defenders; [www.environment-rights.org](http://www.environment-rights.org) is a new website setup by Kohn Knox. Many other organisations are working on these issues. We are familiarising ourselves with the issues and organisations that address them.

#### Patricia Mupeta –

- Policy and Programme Committee of the Consortium is comprised of Emma Lee (who is on leave) as chair and includes Taghi, Grazia, Holly Jonas, Thomas Jalong, Felipe Gomez, José Aylwin, Aman Singh, Jorge Nahuel and Patricia Mupeta.
- A draft position paper was submitted to team after discussions. The P & P Committee have edited and reviewed it over the last two or three months.
- Draft prepared for the GA was shared with membership. Feedback to be shared at GA.
- Goal of document is to:
  - Clarify position
  - Discuss key messages and priority actions,
    - ICCAs fundamental for individual and collective human rights
    - IPLC should be protected from any destructive industrial activities (unless IPLC give their FPIC)
    - Achievement of SDG goals and Aichi Targets crucially based on this work
    - All public and private sector actors should adopt a zero-tolerance approach
    - An international list of ICCAs as a basic reference for NO GO zones, an international registry for these destructive industries, with FPIC of those IPLC
    - Both voluntary commitments in specific situations as well as legally binding obligations at national, regional and international levels are potentially relevant. There are many communities where voluntary mechanisms have been successful. Non-binding commitments to leverage and assert their rights. Need to actively pursue a treaty at the same time. In any given context, one or both could be useful and need to determine this for each case.
  - International legal and policy context for declaring and protecting ICCAs as
    - NO GO zones for destructive industries
    - safe havens for environmental human rights defenders
- Main parts of the draft
  - ICCAs and destructive industries at the nexus of the global trends in biodiversity loss and threats to environmental and human rights defenders
  - Key messages
  - Core elements of the ICCA Consortium position, why, what, how, and when
    - Why: Self declaration is the key
    - What: Supporting defenders of to strengthen capacity
    - What: Providing legal or non-legal tools
    - How: Prevention, Protection, redress
    - When: 2017-2018

- Annex – international legal and policy context in brief
- Summary of feedback from the membership.

**Advice on the policy from the UN Rapporteur on Indigenous Peoples' Rights (Ms. Vicky Tauli-Corpuz, video message for the ICCA Consortium)**

Some points from the video -

- broad context about indigenous rights and conservation issues.
- In 2016 made a report about Environmental and IPLC rights.
- Expanse of PAs nearly doubled over 2 decades to 16.1 million in 2000. Increased considerably since then. Overlap between PAs and IPLC territories. 22% of the land surface is IPLC territory, which is 80% of the world's biodiversity.
- Proportion is highest in the Americas: All have high percentages of PAs overlapping with IPLC territories.
- Conservation efforts were state centric and included expropriation and displacement, deprivation of resources and traditional access denied.
- Conflict and friction resulted.
- Loss of guardianship of IPLC of lands and in hands of government, has left lands exposed to destruction.
- Even where there is strict protection, mining, oil gas, logging, dumps and other activities in conflict with conservation.
- ICCAs to protect rights of IPLC from these type of developments
- Recognising collective rights and growing awareness of biodiversity conservation of IPLC leads to shift in IPLC rights in context of conservation.
- New paradigm in conservation and IPLC rights. But significant gaps remain between policy and implementation
- Challenges continued to be faced by IPLC especially in areas declared protected. National legislation is often contradictory. International UNDRIP not implemented and lack of coordination between levels of government.
- Durban Accord – noted key points that were agreed upon in that action plan – need to be implemented. Three points in the Durban Accord and commendable and ICCA Consortium should adhere to these.
- ENGOs need to use their positions to support IPLC rights
- Durban action plan which states that all existing PAs should be managed with FPIC of IPLC.
- Sydney Agreement also supportive.
- Need to operationalise rights of IPLC. As recognised in international law. Advocate for recognition of IPLC rights within conservation.
- Training in conservation community to respect IPLC rights.
- As part of due diligence ENGOs need to improve compliance with IPLC rights and ensure reporting is transparency and reputable.
- Ensure FPIC in the designing, monitoring and implementing conservation initiatives.

- IPLC learning from each other. What the ICCA Consortium should engage effectively with IPLC to support and engage. This work that really leads to the protection of land and marine areas.
- Call on ENGOs to ensure mechanisms for complaints for IPLC exist and ability to voice when conservation infringes their rights.
- ICCAs only if it does not infringe on rights.
- Framing ICCAs in the conservation framework is risky. Should not frame IP rights within the conservation framework. ICCAs should reinforce IPLC to protect their rights to their territories and to enforce capacity to continue doing their own conservation work, wisdom and knowledge.
- Look into the issue of human rights and conservation initiatives including ICCAs so we can see Durban and Sydney vision implemented, as they should.

### Response and comments from the participants

**Joseph Itongwa** – congratulate the Rapporteur for these important and valued comments. The Rapporteur does not have to be concerned by anything because ICCAs are fully in line with the rights of IP. Conservation by IP and the struggle against destructive industries is in line with ICCAs. She said conservation organisations should support IP in achieving their rights. **Reinforcing IP rights on their territories IS conservation.** Our own culture is always territory based. When we live, we are automatically conserving the territory. I believe this is a fundamental element of the work of the Consortium because we strive to understand culture and activities in the territory. This proposed NO GO policy is extremely important. What we are doing now is to **ask the Rapporteur to support this policy of the Consortium – we will work at ground level, but we need her support at an international level which she can influence so well.** The declarations and dialogues are not as important as conventions, but we need this back up.

**José Aylwin** – the Rapporteur stresses the rights in which conservation should be grounded (e.g. FPIC). The Rapporteur doesn't focus much on extractive industries but focussed on state and private industries as the main threats. Her concern is on private conservation and traditional conservation NGOs but her final remarks on ICCAs are confusing. She encourages IP conservation but reflects on how ICCAs can be used to promote alien conservation. **We need to inform her better so she understands that the ICCA movement is not a traditional colonial conservation movement, but focusses on human rights based conservation.**

**Yannick Ndoinyo** – the Rapporteur truly believes in IP rights, she could be a useful person to defend these rights because of the strength of her conviction. National parks have proved to be a failure because they are not really conserving the areas. They use park rangers with guns and they do business. **The only people capable of true conservation are the IP communities and this is what ICCAs and the Consortium are all about.** I am worried that NO GO zones could become the only places where biodiversity remains but that would only be because no one has exploited them yet, there will be a scramble to exploit them in the future (particularly extractive industries). Happy to have a Rapporteur who believes in IP rights and communities, but this work is huge. We need people, like the Congressman who is with us today, to stand for the people against governments and protect them. In Tanzania they are looking for more places to extract oil, gas and minerals on traditional lands.

**Teddy Baguilat Jr** – Talking about NO GO is really talking about activism. I am the author of four environment bills in the Philippines. We identify prohibited acts rather than designating NO GO zones.



This allows for traditional activities and development. We mandate local government units to **identify different types of zones**. If you have only NO GO zones, where will you put tourism, economic development or plantations? You have to be careful to define what you mean. Policy is important to force government to listen to IPLC. **If you want them to recognise ICCAs, you have to explain the nuances.**

**Taghi Farvar** – speaking as an IP. The Rapporteur has had access to our information, had lots of occasions to hear us and understand what we are saying but she has some kind of impenetrable barrier that she does not want to realise that the very principles of the Durban accord are what was created by those of us that formed this organisation. We are actually following those. **I support her because she is the only UN Rapporteur on IPLC issues, but she fails to understand how to use us to help her.** I would also like to comment on the difference between voluntary guidelines and binding treaties – ICCAs can decide to close off or not close off to destructive industry, but still need prohibited acts at a UN level for industries. There is no comparison between the two.

**Advice on the policy from the UN Rapporteur on Environment and Human Rights (Prof. John Knox, video message for the ICCA Consortium)**

**Video Presentation** [available here](#)

Some points from the video -

- Appreciate opportunity to be speaking to the Consortium GA.
- Appointed 2012 to report on the specific issues of human rights and the environment. Asked me to clarify the obligations of human rights to ensure the enjoyment of a safe, clean environment.
- March 2014 presented mapping report on what human rights existed. There is no globally accepted human right applied to the enjoyment of a safe, clean environment.
- The following year, a best practices report was presented and my mandate was renewed for a further three years. They made me a Special Rapporteur which was an indication that they believe states should respect and implement human rights in relation to the environment. Asked me to look also at climate change and biodiversity.
- Issued reports on these in 2016 and 2017. In 2018 will present report on children's rights.
- Have looked at implementation of the findings of these reports. With help of UNEP, set up judicial workshops at regional level to look at how judges can implement these rights.
- Guidelines will set our existing obligations in light of human rights – procedural human rights law says that governments must do environmental impact assessments including human rights impact. The most important **obligation is to provide a safe space for civil society organisations to be able to speak out about their issues.**
- Environmental human rights defenders are amongst the most threatened of all human rights defenders. Governments must do more to protect these people. Standards once set should be applied. There is an obligation to those in vulnerable situations, and these are often IP and LC (dependence on natural eco systems, already marginalised and discriminated against).
- I try to make clear that governments have heightened obligations to you –
  1. To provide **land under communal title**

2. **Not to take actions that will adversely affect your ancestral territories**
3. When destructive and extractive actions do take place (with your proper consent), you should be **properly compensated**.

Wants to stress that **ICCAs have the ability to exclude destructive industries under international law and you have the right to demand that this is respected**. Thank you for all the work you do to protect the environment on behalf of all of us who benefit. We are prepared to help you in any way we can.

### **Response and comments from the participants**

**Claudia Ituarte Lima** – it is a pleasure to see this. What the Rapporteur does is distinguish substantive, procedural and specific provisions to those in vulnerable situations. Our policy talks about environmental and human rights defenders, should we speak only of environmental human rights defenders? NO GO makes sense as a policy. **Idea of safe havens is worrying, it implies that other areas are not safe havens**. Destructive activities may be legal (under certain conditions), but **violation of human rights defenders is never acceptable**. Global issue not only because it happens all over the world, but because financing for projects comes from all over the world and the response to this needs to be global.

**Giovanni Reyes** – the Rapporteur talks of human rights law and obligations. As an IP, international law is less than 100 years old, customary laws are much older. Respecting human rights depends on the **protection of knowledge systems**. These knowledge systems thrive where forests thrive. IPLC life will not be satisfactory only when food is available but when we have access to and control of our natural resources. NO GO means access to our own natural resources. Human rights cannot be understood without understanding traditional IP knowledge systems.

**Terence Hay-Edie** – in Hawaii, both Rapporteurs were there, I listened and was unsure what their roles really were. John Knox made this clear in his presentation here – it reflects the increasing importance of the environment for the UN. All Rapporteurs have their own styles and backgrounds. Vicky did not criticise the Consortium but was warning about other organisations who are out there. There are Foundations and groups now interested in supporting ICCAs and she is concerned about this. Other groups approach her for her endorsement. The evolution of these Rapporteur mandates in the future is unsure. Both Rapporteurs need to continue to work effectively with one another. **We need to decide how the Consortium will provide continuity and support new Rapporteurs**.

**Grazia** - **Last part of John Knox video needs to be transcribed. Need to share it with the whole membership and Vicky**. Consortium is about supporting appropriate recognition and support of both IP and LC. John Knox understands this, he often refers to the bond between a community and a territory (this is natural for IP but is also felt by many LC). That **bond is actually the heart or the roots of a collective right to not being kicked out of that land or seeing it destroyed**. It is fundamental for so many rights to maintain this connection. Must prevent damage to these rights in all ways. Fundamentally want to thank John beyond words, he articulates the reason why we have this organisation.

**Advice on the policy from the UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights Defenders (Mr. Michael Forst, UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights Defenders)**

Had hoped to have his comments for the GA, he wanted to send them but could not manage in time. He would like to meet with the Consortium during the UN Forum on Business and Human Rights.

**Advice on the policy from the IUCN Protected Areas Programme - Trevor Sandwith, Director, IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme**

Trevor introduced himself and his role here – provide insight to activities in IUCN leading to our NO GO resolution agreed in Hawaii last year. Gave some perspective – the IUCN Council reviewed policy gaps, one was the issue around industrial activities that affect conservation. Trevor had to identify the scope of the issues facing IUCN-

- First perspective was what is required for Aichi Target 11. Omnibus goal about the effectiveness of PAs and scope.
- Any activities/industries that affect biodiversity and culture are incompatible with the definition of conservation. How can you say you want to conserve traditional values, but you want to allow destructive activities under certain circumstances?
- Do you say no to everything or do you evaluate everything individually? The IUCN Council absolutely wanted to deal with the legislative issues of safeguards for IPLC. Can we be more **enabling and strategic**? How do you get governments to be on-side and have proponents not proposing incompatible ideas? What would be the role of the Consortium in this?
- The IUCN Council was saying ‘let’s come up with new guidance’, and we ended up in Hawaii with one of the strongest resolutions that we have ever put in place.
- This was an interesting resolution to work with. Analysing the resolution to understand what it really means.
- Flagged a few issues for the Consortium:
  - **What is it that we are trying to conserve?** Is it conservation of biodiversity only or is it the IPLC conserving a variety of resources - culture, intangible knowledge, etc.?
  - **What activities are compatible/acceptable or not?** Maybe this is dependent on intensity or time.
  - **How are those potential impacts going to be assessed** and who will assess it?
  - How do you make a judgement about this? **How do we reach conclusions?**
  - **What is the ICCA Consortium role?** Is it to create a policy environment “out there” or is it to support the actors/defenders? Who are we and what are we setting out to do?
  - Right to self-determination – if the community wants the activity, how can we put constraints on that? If it is their right to approve something, but it will destroy them, how is this addressed?
  - Only two states opposed the NO GO resolution in Hawaii: South Africa and Australia. Australia said this was in response to the wishes of the IP population.
  - ICCA Consortium is a very appropriate place for this discourse. Not sure you will arrive at an easy definition. John Knox gave a thoughtful approach. **What are you trying to achieve and what are the mechanisms for achieving this? Not always black and white.**

## Questions and discussion:

**Question:** To what degree does the Hawaii resolution already cover what we want to do? **Answer:** It is easier to answer the opposite way – what does it not do that we could do? There is an opening in there that says we need to support the work of IPLC to define role – how do you do that? It is not an activist resolution. It says governments need to prohibit activities. Calls on investors to de-fund activities that are harmful. How to give effect to these – missing pieces.

**Comment:** What should be the role of Consortium? In the Philippines we have done lots for the negotiations of the bill in Parliament. Used publications of the Consortium to support our arguments, this shut down naysayers about ICCAs existing. **We should continue with the recognition of ICCAs as an indicator and a target for biodiversity.** Also, we are advancing in giving IPLC what they want. **What the Consortium discusses, creates the agenda of the IPLC.** The new government does not care so much about international agreements and norms. The old government listened to the CBD but the new president did not allow Vicky, the UN Rapporteur, to come. Gains may be lost with this new government.

**Ted Karfakis** - Looked at the NO GO document – problem is definition of what is indigenous, what is local. What is not recognised is that governments move people around. Like in Brazil and Greece. There are other people brought in by the government to act as catalysts. **If you want NO GO, you really need to sort out who is local and who is not local,** and you cannot trust the government to provide that information.

**Maurizio Farhan Ferrari** - 1) What are we trying to achieve in the long term? What is the relationship of policy with implementation of rights i.e. FPIC? How do the two relate? **Is there a risk of side-lining FPIC?**  
2) Self-determination and destructive activities. Consortium is based on self-determination – we need to inform to help communities make decisions, but not to force decisions upon them.

**Colin Scott** - There is a risk of co-opting of ICCAs by BNGOs. Also, the co-option of indigenous rights by business. In the Canadian context, there are issues with IP rights no longer being the portal for self-determination, capital is becoming the portal instead. This struggle/problem is strategic for the Consortium. **Within the heart of some of these nations, this is being played out and the rights battle is being lost – indigenous negotiations on multibillion dollar deals in home territories that are not compatible with the territory of life vision.**

**Carmen Miranda** - many things that we heard are true. This policy that the Consortium is developing has to clarify what we are talking about. What does NO GO mean? What activities are permitted inside? What type of use of resources is possible inside? What this last professor (Colin) said is true. We have been fighting these processes for more than 10 years. Half of the IP in the resistance processes are courted by industry. For example, the government courted the formal IP organisation for the Bolivian lowlands. One of the arguments was: you want to be an untouchable area? – then you cannot fish or use natural resources either. This is in the context of a National Park.

We have a situation where some groups are trying to defend their territory, but there are some resistant IP in the territory. We are waiting for national policy. How does national policy implement self-determination? At the CBD COP 13 In Mexico, we spoke to John Knox and he gave us some steps to follow at a legal level. At the international level there are definitions.

**Grazia** - there are no international tribunals. Nations are like free electrons that can do what they want. There is no way that a national government will have a fear of making mistakes or being called accountable to international law. There need to be CSOs inside the country to make international law to be accountable within the country. This is why we work in international law. Body of evidence and recommendations of IUCN and UN Rapporteurs have as much power as CSOs can give them.

**Carmen Miranda** – a few weeks ago, two community leaders from Bolivia had the opportunity to be at Bonn. They denounced what is going on in Bolivia and the international body gave them support and will go to Bolivia to see what is going on. They also invited Vicky Tauli-Corpuz to visit the country, but she needs an official invitation before she can accept.

### **Introduction to the history, role and track record of the UN Forum on Business and Human Rights - Andres del Castillo, DOCIP**

[DOCIP](#) is the IP documentation and research centre. Started 40 years ago. Gave a recent timeline of DOCIP work with the UN.

1. 2005 - Ruggie appointed, came up with framework of respect, protect and remedy  
2011 - During a working group on business and human rights, the Forum was established  
2014 – Ex president of Ecuador – Correa -- came with proposal for binding instrument on human rights - OEIWG  
2017 - session 3 of OEIWG produced draft report of the legally binding instrument on business and human rights which will be adopted next year. Clarifies duties of states.
2. UNFBHR is world's biggest event on business and human rights, 1000 participants in 2012, 2500 in 2015, 2000 in 2016 – recommended participants try to attend meetings that are not specifically talking about IP to raise awareness of the issues. Participation at this event by businesses is increasing, need to keep up the participation of CSOs and specifically IP to keep representation vital and effective. Academia is also a large, active group.
3. NAP – National Action Plans – way to implement principles. Only some states have adopted NAP for business and human rights. More are working on it. EU have adopted 2 - non-financial disclosure and business and human rights in the destructive industrial sector.
4. DOCIP services during the Forum are available in Room E 3001 – translation of documents, interpretation, computers & printer.
5. One day before the Forum, there is a meeting facilitated by DOCIP on how IP will engage with the Forum. IP draw up the agenda and run the meeting.
6. IP and the Forum key moments relating to IP -
  - a. 2012 session on business affecting IP.
  - b. 2013 session IP and business operations implementing the Guiding Principles.
  - c. 2014 session spotlight on effective strategies by affected stakeholders and advocates.
  - d. 2015 impact of investments on IP, looked at groups at risk.
  - e. 2016 taxation and corruption consequences for human rights. Looked at responsible, land-based investments.
7. Presented the 5 members of the working group and gave advice on who to approach.
  - a. OEIWG 2015 deliberations on content, scope and nature.

- b. 2017 elements for the draft legally binding instrument – relationship with other instruments such as UNDRIP, principles and access to justice.
- 8. Accountability and remedy project (title of Forum this year is access to remedy – includes redress which has a prevention aspect).
- 9. Meeting with EU and UNEP consultation. UNEP working on a paper for a social licence to operate. EU have asked DOCIP to arrange a meeting between IP and them during the forum. Asked for a representative from Consortium to be present on Tuesday or Wednesday lunchtime.
- 10. China will be present at the meeting and will lead some sessions.
- 11. 14% of stakeholders in the meetings are from governments.
- 12. Schedule for the three days is available from the DOCIP website.
- 13. 2014 adopted resolution on binding treaty – stated that **there is no contradiction between voluntary guidelines and binding treaty**. Nor is it contradictory to the guiding principles of the Forum.

**Bertrand Sansonnens** – countries use the existence of the GP to say that binding treaty is not necessary.  
**Andres** – international law can be used to work at several levels to put pressure for change.

**Claudia Ituarte Lima** – when we talk about human rights obligations we talk about respect but the framework of Ruggie does not include fulfil. **Andres** – this is under protected.

**Robert Chimambo** – nice to have something legal but we need to hear that we are moving from a bad place to a good place. I don't hear that here.

**Andres** – DOCIP is neutral and impartial, we provide support to IP but do not get involved in strategy or agenda.

**Ted Karfakis** – mentioned land grabbing but there is **marine grabbing** as well. In Greece, the government ignores where people have been for generations. What happens when we have no tools to address these issues?

**Andres** – they do not define 'land' when they talk about grabbing, it would be good to talk in the Forum about territory which has a much wider definition.

**José Aylwin** – protect, respect and remedy frame and the nature of 'binding'. Protect is totally binding. Respect - nothing can force business to follow due diligence.

**Alexis Kaboré** – what about LC? How can they enter this framework?

**Andres** – there is talk of LC or communities in general in the documents, also extended to minority communities. The Forum often uses the word community to mean IP.

**Joseph Itongwa** – this is a UN Forum. How can this Forum link with other conventions of the UN?

**Andres** – the Forum is a platform for change, it is not designed to deal with specific cases or specific countries. There will be a report which is presented to the Human Rights Council. This is not binding.

**Taghi** – there is confusing terminology – IP, LC, IPLC.... communities in the international sphere are the lowest level and can have their rights compromised by states, but IP have rights. This is why they avoid the term IP.

**A policy for “ICCA as NO GO zones for destructive industries and safe havens for environmental and human rights defenders”—where to beyond the Consortium? Facilitated discussion**

**Powerpoint Presentation [available here](#) – compiled by Holly Jonas**

- 1- What are we trying to achieve with this policy?
- 2- How do we want to use this draft during this week at the Forum?

### **Big picture issues**

Internal policy v external strategy – how do we communicate this outside the Consortium?

- **Internal** – do we have a position on the issue of self-determination by IP who choose to engage with the private sector? Should we just support IPLC who are still in line with ‘territories of life’?
- **External** – how to put it into practice (IPLC, government, companies, financiers, CSOs, media, academics...)?
- To what extent are we trying to
  - **support specific situations** of ICCAs under threat?
  - **influence the broader system?**
- **How does this relate to FPIC?**
- Do we have a specific position on engaging in negotiations towards the binding treaty?
- Do we have a specific position on engaging with non-binding instruments and voluntary mechanisms (e.g. investors’ policies)?

### **Comments and questions**

**Taghi** - We need to define the terms more clearly, including the term “voluntary measures”. Voluntary goes back to the companies. Say tomorrow there is a voluntary commitment by mining companies to never set foot in the ICCAs on the Registry. A company wouldn’t be able to uphold this if their financing was threatened.

About sovereignty – whether state or IPLC. **If IPLC want destructive industrial activities, they become just like governments that want destructive industrial activities – I will fight them the same as I would fight governments.** I believe that-- if a government or if an IPLC want to do destructive things-- we have to fight them. We are committed to a sane world. If IPLC has corrupt leadership, I will fight.

**Heather Bingham** - The Registry is in the text as a suggested list to describe where NO GO areas are. I understand the need to be able to show where they are, but the Registry is not fully public. This will

disadvantage those IPLC who want privacy. I do not want to give the impression that those IPLC not listed do not count, or those who choose to not be listed do not count.

**Ted Karfakis** - Supporting specific situations rather than approaching the broader system. From our situation if we did not have someone like the EU or UN, we would not have anything to work on at ground level. It is a double faceted approach – need it on the ground and also national/international. Need national legislation to have specific principles from international legislation, with a feedback loop from the communities. Focus needs to be on the ground with the communities.

**Teddy Baguilat Jr** - First question I ask about identifying NO GO zones in ICCAs – are we violating the right to self-determination and FPIC? In the Philippines, ICCAs can be closed or open depending on what they want. IPLC may want or not want mining in their areas. Since we are using ICCAs as a conservation measure, we need to declare ICCAs as not necessarily NO GO in case IPLC want it e.g. tourism. NO GO zone may be something we understand, but in policy we need to use more astute language because people may not know what we mean. In the Bill we propose about mining, all levels of the mining process must undergo FPIC to IPLC. How do you build capacity in the IPLC to undergo FPIC? Industries offer scholarships and health centres and then the IPLC give consent. How can we enable the IPLC to negotiate what they need and want from the government? A binding agreement is a good first step, but the most important step is prodding parliament to enforce it in law.

**Carmen Miranda** – this is a complicated issue. The Consortium has had success in other arenas by reflecting on how an issue can be taken on. **I propose that we try to organise a group to follow the work in the coming months.** This new arena is very different from things we have worked on until now.

**Robert Chimambo** - Self-determination is important, a community has the right to accept any industry but, this could have **consequences for other communities** and may even destroy them. We need to determine what the definition of self-determination will be. There are lots of things that we hear here that are not percolating into our nations. As Members we must take this information home to influence policies under consideration. **Not many governments take this information and go and empower people. Rather, they keep them in the dark. We have to empower the communities. Corporations have corrupted and wiped out our governments.**

**Aman Singh** - Concerned about adoption of the policy. Internally, it looks good but externally, unless it becomes part of a treaty or adopted into national laws, it may not be effective. We need there to be pressure to adopt it internationally and then nationally.

**Tilman Jaeger** –

- The idea of industry and the private sector is an abstract concept. There are many other actors - investors, funders and governments. However, there are fuzzy lines between all these. Target audience and situational analysis is needed to better explore this.
- **Safe havens** – it takes away the need for security for human rights defenders elsewhere. This is **not a spatial issue.**
- What is a destructive industry? unease with the term NO GO, notion of respect for self-determination - we all know there is destructive development. We are talking about mechanisms to determine acceptable levels of development in an abstract way. In other areas



NO GO means off limits to everyone, full stop. It is part of the idea of ICCAs to permit certain activities. We need to make an effort to find ways to make FPIC the best it can be in ICCAs?

- By saying that one area is particularly valuable, other areas lose value. By accepting mining in an ICCA, you impact those downstream. But by going upstream outside the ICCA, the impacts will affect the downstream ICCA. This would draw arbitrary lines. If you cannot build a dam in an area, there is pressure to build it just outside the area or change the boundary.

**Vincent Ziba** - Thinking through NO GO we should start with this as the base and FPIC next. How do we define destructive industries? Need to think of the **original purpose of the ICCA** (cultural, spiritual.... It may not primarily be for biodiversity), **would the industry destroy that purpose?**

**Maurizio Farhan Ferrari** - Impression is that this is great work. Feel that **we are not able to adopt a position.** Need to use rest of our time today determining what next steps we want to take. We are due to make a presentation tomorrow morning at the Forum. There are issues both internally and externally. On the issue of self-determination, difficult to assess the question of whether to fight IPLC that do not want conservation. Discretion to take decisions is in their hands, but we need to inform them on sustainable use. As an organisation we need to stand behind self-determination.

**Nele Marien** - The dichotomy of NO GO and self-determination. If you have a NO GO zone and still allow an FPIC on it you are telling companies that they can ask. NO GO means NO GO. **In Central America Friends of the Earth works with larger territories that they define as free from mining.** Once they define it as NO GO, they refuse FPIC, they do not need to negotiate. They do not have the language, or power to fight these companies using FPIC.

Binding vs. voluntary. In Friends of the Earth we are doing a study on a specific voluntary agreement about palm oil. Wherever you have voluntary agreements they are still violated. Those with certification think they are the good guys. This is only a tool. Need binding legislation that prohibits companies from behaving incorrectly.

**Dave de Vera** - In Philippines tried to come up with compromises. **Don't use words NO GO, but the prohibited activities list makes it practically NO GO.** Suggest making the Declaration itself –say what is allowed and declare the right to self-determination. Sustainable resource rights – to sustainably manage and protect land, air water, plants fishing, and hunting.... In accordance with indigenous knowledge belief practices. If there is an activity that is outside the sustainable resource uses and prohibited list, then it goes to FPIC.

**Taghi** - Thank you to contributors. **The ICCA Consortium is – territories and areas of IPLC that are CONSERVED. The very acceptance of a Member is dependent on them agreeing that they are a conservation territory. Forever.** If they decide they want destructive industries – then they are no longer conserving their territories. From the very beginning an applicant tribe or group declares themselves as for conservation. If they become anti-conservation, then they can be kicked out.

**Work plan & Budget for 2018, including: Implementing the new Strategy for the ICCA Consortium: review of new membership policy, gender policy, progress on governance and leadership transition, enhanced regionalisation, communications and fundraising**

1. **Aili Pyhälä – new membership policy** –

- Main decision taken yesterday was that GA will no longer be a forum for making decisions on new Members and Honorary members.
- More rigorous as now asking applicants to complete a membership form – so we know more about them for the application but also, so we understand the membership and can better respond to their interests.
- Applications are considered every 3 months and the Members are given 30 days to raise any possible objections.
- Comments and suggestions that came up yesterday will be taken account of within the membership committee and then brought to the Members or the next GA as appropriate. Thanked everyone for their contributions during this meeting.
- New membership committee is Dominique Bikaba, Ghanimat Azhdari, Taghi, Giovanni Reyes and Aili Pyhälä, all helped by Emma Courtine.

**Taghi** – can we include a definition of conservation in the membership form and require organisations to commit to this? Can this be created by the Membership Committee and then put to Council for approve and implementation? **Sergio Couto** – to send a definition of conservation to the membership committee to help them. **Aili Pyhälä** – we only talked yesterday about Members but we should then move on to a review of Honorary members. **Ruben Khachatryan** – maybe good to look at applicant organisation’s charter to see what their mission is. **Grazia** – we need to be more specific about what we mean when we talk about ICCAs.

2. **Emma Courtine - Gender policy** – Consortium was asked by Swedbio to present our gender policy, so we formed a group of volunteers from the Consortium, led by Vivienne Solis (responsible for gender issues), with Albert Chan Dzul, Emma Courtine, Patricia Mupeta, Susan Crosby, Grazia and Holly Jonas (with contributions from others). Started with a draft with definitions from the FAO and refined it, including removing some of the definitions. When we work on gender we are not just talking about “promoting women”, we are working on promoting **equality between all genders**. But equality cannot be imposed on all cultures. **Holly Jonas** – the international human rights framework is a western product and women’s rights sits within this framework, so we need to acknowledge cultural relativism. **Emma Courtine** – would like to have Members’ input. Consortium will not accept gender violations and should be prepared to sanction transgression. How do we assess the policy implementation inside the Consortium?

3. **Grazia – progress on governance and leadership transition** - At end of 2019 both Global Coordinator and President of the Consortium will step down. We need to start process of identifying people to take on these roles. Strategic review asked for Grazia’s role to be split between Strategy Advisor and Global Coordinator. The Council will decide who can take the role

as Secretary of the Council, who can take over the Secretariat role and who can take over as President. **The Council will appoint a Search Committee** (these do not all have to be from within the Council so people can step forward to be on the Committee).

**Taghi** – need to implement some of the governance styles of some of the IP of this world. For example, in South Ethiopia and Kenya, the Gadaa have a great governance system based on an eight-year period. **Zealelem Tefera** – Under the Gadaa system in Ethiopia, the elders move on to be with the children. This creates a circular system – the elders make the upcoming generations ready to be leaders in the future. **Kim Wright** – greatest respect for both Taghi and Grazia, and uncomfortable with changing both of you at the same time. There should be a policy to stagger these changes. **Sergio Couto** – one of our communities had a problem getting younger people in the governance system so they made it so that half the positions were for the young and half for older so there could be a transmission of knowledge. **Ted Karfakis** – when people remain in power over the course of their lives, they build power and influence, this is not good and they may become inefficient but powerful. **Maurizio Farhan Ferrari** – what is the modality of the Search Committee? **Sergio Couto** – happy to contribute ideas – need to decide whether you accept the Council candidacy (a closed system) or those made by individuals. **Taghi** – decisions should be made by this time next year to allow a period of handover. **Aman Singh** – will these two people come from within the membership or come from outside? **Grazia** – President should not be parachuted in from outside. I recommend that the President must be an IP. **Emma Courtine** – need experience, people with a broad view. Should use anonymous voices of the Members to provide suggestions. **Holly Jonas** – not in the Operational Guidelines but the President should be from the membership. The Global Coordinator could be found by an open call globally to find a professional. **Sergio Couto** – we respect your decisions, you must both have a role in the Council of Elders. Agree that the President should be IP (particularly in light of the comments of the Special Rapporteurs). Decentralisation means that we should reflect regional diversity in the new leadership. **Maurizio Farhan Ferrari** – agree that President should be IP. Global Coordinator should be IP or LC also to add strength to the Consortium. We need representatives of IP and LC in governance body. **Grazia** clarified language – President is part of Council. Global Coordinator (including Secretary role) is part of Council. Strategy Advisor is a Secretariat role. Both roles are currently played by Grazia. Secretary has strong connection to membership, so **Chair of Membership Committee could play this role and could be IPLC**. **Maurizio Farhan Ferrari** – **the issue is the public face of the Consortium**. Both Taghi and Grazia have done fantastic work but the public face of the Consortium should be IP. **Sergio Couto** – Council has to be fully separated from the Secretariat. This needs to be clearer than it has been. Council should be more representative of IP and LC but this is not necessary for the Secretariat. All these changes need to be reflected in new Operational Guidelines. **Iris Benes** –reinforced the need for a division between the Secretariat and Council. Hard to see who can fill the shoes of Grazia.

4. Intervention because Aili Pyhälä had to leave the meeting – brief overview of suggestions made yesterday for the Consortium plans for 2018 (see document at the end of these Minutes).

Several new points were added –

- **CICADA** offered to collaborate on, not coordinate, global/regional meetings for the Consortium
- **Maurizio Farhan Ferrari** wrote that work at the national level should receive more focus
- **Grazia** – there was a question on what we could do more/emphasise

- **Heather Bingham** – could be stronger on promoting documentation at global level
- **Vololona Rasoarimanana** – either at national or global level – there is a definition of IP, usually minorities in countries. LC are often the majority, so would like to propose we put energy into a definition of LC, what are the limits of self-determination? **Taghi** – this is a question of policy and we could review this in that Committee.

## 5. Returned to Governance and leadership transition

**Taghi** – on issue of candidates for President and Global Coordinator, there is also the issue of language. For past years we have both been here and both speak all three languages of the Consortium. May have difficulties if we have people who are mono-lingual for the Consortium languages. We don't have unlimited funds for translation. **Candidates could work with Elders.** Need to go through procedure and Council should govern this issue. Before next June we need a **face to face meeting of Council to discuss this and maybe conduct interviews.** **Sergio Couto** – Operational Guidelines are important. Decisions of Council will have a huge impact. We should have the search process explained in the Operational Guidelines before we make this decision. **Taghi** – this is a test case for a procedure and the change in the Operational Guidelines will follow and be approved at the next GA. **Sergio Couto** – unhappy that it is this way round. **Holly Jonas** – Sergio is correct but we could have an EGA next year to do this, so we don't have to delay the GA. **Taghi** – Executive Committee should be part of Search Committee with others. **Grazia** - **June/July 2018 – EGA to approve the procedures for choosing next leadership. Maybe at same time as SBSSTA 2018.** **Iris Benes** – can the EGA be done electronically to facilitate participation? **Grazia** – **Search Committee will be decided by Council with the participation of volunteers.** **Taghi** – **people can volunteer to Sergio Couto before the end of the year.** **Grazia** – **message should be sent to whole membership list to ask for any volunteers to Search Committee.** **Terence Hay-Edie** – Kim Wright's point about twin moment of transition is important. Governance part of this role will remain more or less stable, but the Secretariat role will need to be more flexible depending on resources we find and the work plans we have.

## 6. Grazia - Work plan 2018

- To accomplish in 2018
  - meet our obligations, ongoing initiatives GSI, TCF Swedbio
  - continue to consolidate and develop our international association towards its vision and by adhering to its new strategy.
  - continue working at the local level, national level, regional level, international level
  -
- What is new:
  - GSI initiative is finally running for national GEF SGP priority countries (++) national catalytic initiatives in more than 20 countries; related ICCA support to specific communities is happening; great opportunities and a great danger for ICCAs. If we do this badly it is their kiss of death. They are precious situations, and by arriving with money for a project we could kill them.

- We have CBD Decision XIII.2. Sec7 – for the first time the ICCA Consortium has been requested by the 194 members of the CBD to do something. We should listen and take action
- We have a strategy and are developing our own policies which we will need to pursue – for example gender policy and NO GO policy
- Have a larger and stronger membership and we are better known
- Decision says: to develop voluntary guidance and best practices on identification and recognition of ICCAs including situations of overlap with protected areas and their potential contribution to the achievement of the Aichi biodiversity targets.
- Can make suggestions of what we want to see adopted.
- Proposed priority
  - **Supporting self- strengthening of emblematic ICCAs** in as many countries as possible **including as appropriate international registration.** From awaking self-awareness to figure out initiatives, communications, national networks, registry or maybe more (already has funding base of the GSI).
  - **Promoting a critical mass in national ICCA networks** in as many countries as possible and consolidating the networks that do exist (already has funding base of the GSI).
  - **Pursuing leadership, partnerships and impact about our own policies** e.g. NO GO and gender. (Christensen fund)
  - **Pursuing advances in understanding ICCAs** (governance vitality, policy briefs, historical regional analysis...). (Christensen fund)
  - **Responding to the CBD invitation and developing guidelines to ID and recognise ICs including in overlap with PAs** (could be an IUCN best practice series for COP XIV. Could be two – and both would be complementary to provide solid advice to CBD and IUCN members. (Swedbio)
  - **Enhancing communication to take the full ambition- in particular vial ICCA videos but not only.** Professional punctual advice. Local language radio and National Geographic (Swedbio)
  - Pursue **SAFE** – Solidarity Action and Fund for the Defenders of the Commons and ICCAs pursues MOU with partnership with FoEI, Front Line Defenders and others.
  - More work on **sustainable livelihoods**, adding value and using sustainably the natural resources (autonomy of ICCAs, food sovereignty....). Need to promote this
  - Your suggestions go here. Not a closed box, but these are priorities with signed commitments, based on our own assessment of what is crucial. You all are encouraged to make suggestions.
- Institutional development: internal governance, regionalisation, human resources, communications, fundraising
  - Search Committee for new President and Global Coordinator
  - Be serious about new membership policy – what to do with inactive members? Promote members interaction and engagement
  - Move GA to every two years? Transform into regional meetings? Maybe next year have regional meetings and a GA only every two years?
  - Pursue regional decentralisation, stronger systematic plans, fundraising, reporting and stronger support

- Communications: refresh engagement with local language radio and national geographic and TV programs.
- Budgetary Considerations. Estimated costs in 2017 – US\$ 243,400
  - Largest expenditure – regular consultancies for staff
  - Next biggest: travel and meetings [[get graph](#)]
- Budget for 2018
  - Proposed to increase to 325,000 US \$
  - 3x enhancement for communications. [[Get graph](#)].
- Propose fundraising in 2018 to step up the work time, compensation and resources for the consortium personnel. Regional coordinators should estimate needed activities and needs of compensation and submit requests by Jan 20 2018
- This way we have our finances secured for 2018 and we still have money left over.
- Meeting on OECMs with the CBD in Montreal in February.
- CBD SBSTTA Meeting in July 2018 in Montreal
- Next CBD COP 14 in Egypt – have to participate because biodiversity policy for following after Aichi will be discussed this year.
- Next GA may be in Egypt? Unless we have a EGA in Montreal in July and Regional Assemblies in the regions.
- Documents and Policy Briefs to be presented for CBD COP 14. Need to submit them to be approved by parties, and not documents prepared quickly. **Need to start as soon as possible.**
- Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues is May 2018. Including guidance on Conservation and Indigenous Rights.
- UN High-level Forum, overlapping timing with SBSTTA in July 2018. SDG 15 on terrestrial conservation will be reviewed. Consortium should be part of the review process.

### Discussion on work plan

**Dave de Vera** – there is an opportunity for SAFE. Within the ILC, there is a land defenders fund that has been barely spent. We should focus on using this. **Grazia** – when we developed SAFE we worked with ILC amongst others, after a certain point it became clear that FoEI was not comfortable with continuing with ILC (and some of our own Members were also unhappy). We decided to continue with FoEI and no longer actively with ILC. The process of this initiative has slowed. Strategic approach of SAFE has been developed and approved. **Taghi** – why is it so slow? **Grazia** – we hired Dario Novellino to lead this, he was maybe over ambitious as to what he could deal with and after a certain time he had to stop. We decided a team would take over responsibility including Sutej Hugu, Tanya Conlu, Dario Novellino, Holly Jonas and Giovanni Reyes – they were due to link with FoEI and move things forward working with a team approach. This has not moved as fast as anticipated. **Nele Marien** (from FoEI) – it has not been me that has coordinated this so cannot give whole picture. There have been questions about institutional capacity in the Consortium. Also questions about views on binding treaty. There is no clear decision from ExComm at this point. Still feel close to the Consortium. **Grazia** – we have Members and others who would like this relationship to develop with FoEI in their region. **Taghi** – suggestion: this is the highest body of the Consortium; **I propose that we do all in our power to support the binding treaty. We can also continue with other lines of action. Does the GA accept this as our position? - no objections**

were raised so this position is adopted. You can take this position back to FoEI and request that they send us any other doubts, etc so we can respond to them. Propose that the team approach doesn't work and we need this team to designate a leader/coordinator. There has been enough foot dragging on both sides and this is a vital issue to us because people are dying.

**Grazia** – who wants to work on sustainable livelihoods? We need commitments on this.

**Ted Karfakis** – I am willing to contribute to this and believe I have vital knowledge that I would like to share. **Ruben Khachatryan** – I would like to contribute to sustainable livelihoods.

### Round one of comments/questions

**Ruben Khachatryan** – There are possibilities for synergies with ILCN (International Land Conservation Network) and GEN.

**José Aylwin** – several points to make -

- Perspective on private conservation – we have had recent reflections on this from the human rights perspective. Kim Wright is preparing guidelines on marine areas. Private conservation should not infringe on rights of IP or human rights. This information can be presented by Ruben Khachatryan (who will represent the Consortium) at the ILCN meeting in two months' time.
- Council elaborated a mechanism for decentralisation and this should be explained more in this meeting.
- Resolution on ICCAs and overlaps. This deserves more elaboration; how can we get involved? We need the involvement of different regions of the world.
- Sustainable livelihoods, it would be relevant to have a working group with perspectives from different regions and IP perspective. (Taghi - this is an issue for the Policy and Programme Committee, can you take this up there please.)

**Elaine Hsiao** – several points from CEESP –

- helping to facilitate strategy on how IUCN can include IP organisations in their membership, does Consortium want to be involved in developing this strategy and who will be focal point?
- Environment and peace theme – deals also with conflicts with conservation organisations. Would like to see Consortium participate in this.
- Natural resource use
- CEESP would like to know how to better support the work of the Consortium. (Taghi – please write these points up and send them to the Policy and Programme Committee. Can you be our link with CEESP? Elaine agreed.)

### **Grazia's response**

- **Sustainable use and sustainable livelihoods** - have been in discussion with Rosie Cooney as Chair of sustainable livelihoods in IUCN.
- Let's link with **GEN**.
- **Private conserved areas** – motions have been proposed. We could do a policy brief on ICCAs and private conservation. This may be controversial; in some countries we are lumped with private conservation.

- Regionalisation** – Regional Coordinators have plenty of ideas on how to regionalise, they have been asked to identify national focal points in all the countries in their region. They will decide what it would mean for them to regionalise (structure, roles, process, responsibilities). All Regional Coordinators’ proposals to be sent to Committee of Council by May 2018. Council will synthesise the proposals and pass them to all Members as proposed process for regionalisation. There will be time for Members to comment and then plan will be approved at the GA next year.

**Carmen Miranda** – in Mexico last year we discussed regionalisation with Latin America Regional Coordinators and Members – did you discuss this more in the Council? We are trying to obtain resources to support a first meeting in the first semester of 2018 – we have elaborated some notes through skype meetings. **Grazia** – I remember suggestions to have regional assemblies rather than a large GA. We can work with CICADA and others to find support for this. Last year we didn’t have enough representation from other regions at the GA, so we cannot just follow the recommendations of Latin America. **Sergio Couto** - regional meetings should not be an alternative to the GA, they should be a working groups. Decisions taken there cannot be binding because it is not an assembly of the Members. **Grazia** – then you have to do fundraising for your own meetings. We cannot support both regional meetings and a GA. **Taghi** – regional meetings are a great idea, but they cannot take the place of the GA (assent from the floor). We could encourage the region to take the bulk of the task of raising funds for regional meetings.

**Joseph Itongwa** – congratulations the Global Coordinator for her professional proposals. Concerned about priorities for legal monitoring on the ground. In the DRC we are in the process of legal reform, if we fail to take this opportunity to influence the process we will regret it in the future. **Vincent Ziba** – related to Joseph’s point, the IUCN meeting on Thursday looked at Africa. Are you thinking that the global work plan will support the African network? **Salatou Sambou** – when I saw the proposals I thought I was looking at magic. People on the ground have a great desire to work on ICCAs but do not have the experience. What Joseph says, applies to the whole region. Would like to add a proposal – the Regional Coordinators would benefit from a reinforcement of their capacity and having more tools (e.g. projectors, etc.). **Terence Hay-Edie** - responded to Joseph Itongwa – explained three work packages of GSI – 1. Emblematic ICCAs receiving small grants (lots of activity will happen on the ground next year – catalytic organisations will have to work with the Consortium to get this going). 2. Work Package 3 on exchange has used resources for regional exchange meetings. There are still opportunities for follow up. 3. Work Package 2 - Natural Justice have received a grant to conduct legal reviews in 15 GSI countries, but there are opportunities for us to work with other countries (e.g. DRC) to link to this work. Legal reviews will lead into a publication in 2019. Also working on a WCPA publication, looking for case studies and chapters. **Grazia** – is this the same as guidance on recognition and support to ICCAs overall? **Carmen Miranda** – working (in a group with Terence Hay-Edie, Delfin Ganapin, Ruben Khachatryan, Aman Singh, Dominique Bikaba and Carmen Miranda) on a manual on PA overlapping with ICCAs - looking for case studies. This will be presented to the next IUCN conference. **Holly Jonas** – about legal support. We have been talking to different law faculties and networks on human rights and the environment, several are keen to partner with us. My vision is to have an army of lawyers around the world to support ICCAs, particularly in-country. Need to work with law students to teach them about ICCAs before they disappear into the corporate sphere. Working on this and developing specific partnerships in countries where there is definitely a need (e.g. DRC). **Claudia Ituarte Lima** –



Swedbio also talking to international law development organisations to develop training for lawyers and judges and peer to peer learning exchange focussing on human rights specialists. **Colin Scott** – supplementary resource is a CSO, FPP, they have lawyers on staff working on Whakatane Mechanism. Project in CICADA is institutional canopy of conservation project looking at overlap issues between various areas, there may be areas of possible collaboration in Africa. **Grazia** – there is a need of training for Regional Coordinators, meetings of Regional Coordinators, resources for Regional Coordinators. Try to pull this together to have a regional meeting with capacity building, etc to maximise results from limited resources. **Robert Chimambo** – good to pull all efforts together. As we are speaking here now things are happening in the field. We need fast track support to bring in resources, cannot afford to wait two years before things happen. We need lawyers and capacity to go to court.

- Response to Vincent Ziba’s comment on the African meeting at IUCN - wish we had the resources to pull together African network on regular basis but travel is extremely expensive, it is easier to come to Europe and there are difficulties of language. Maybe necessary to have meetings on francophone Africa and separate meetings on anglophone Africa. What support do you want? **Vincent Ziba** – we have similar issues and threats across Africa and the challenge is capacity. Need help with mapping, capacity building and tools. **Patricia Mupeta** – need to focus on emblematic ICCAs.

#### **Round two of comments/questions**

**Ted Karfakis** – there is a danger of focussing on national level but in the case of Greece this has broken down and we need international legislation. Need to find what works for you at national level and also find what works at international level.

**Ruben Khachatryan** – all kinds of policies and recognition takes time. Sometimes there is urgent need to save an area. There is an organisation - World Land Trust ([www.worldlandtrust.org](http://www.worldlandtrust.org)) who support local organisations to buy land for conservation (biodiverse rich areas, sacred sites) – please consider this option. There is also IUCN NL which can help with urgent conservation needs.

**Joseph Itongwa** – to support Africa, the Consortium is a large family with lots of Members and partners on the ground. There is support that comes in many ways without it being money e.g. FPP has many activities to support our local work, how can this organisation as a Member boost and support the activities that we are doing? We have to get support from the Members to do work on the ground. WWF has organised a large meeting in the sub-region with IP representatives to raise awareness and we will take this opportunity to talk about ICCAs.

**Patricia Mupeta** - TNC role is also to link with networks of IP. There are many opportunities for me to be a resource.

**Vololona Rasoarimanana** - I agree with the 2018 Budget as proposed by Grazia.

**Consortium Members approve Work plan & Budget for 2018 by acclamation.**

**Consortium Members approve the new Strategy in general and give authority to the Council to modify it if necessary.**

Short Minutes signed by all present Members and Honorary members.

19:13 The **President** thanks everyone for their contribution to the meetings and closes the XIth General Assembly.



*Minutes gathered by Sarah Ryder and Kim Wright, consolidated by Sarah Ryder, edited by Gbf*

## Annex 1

### **Key points from GA suggestions/ideas for Consortium Plan 2018 – based on post-it notes completed by all participants**

**Geneva 25 November 2017**

#### **Local level long-term sustainability**

- Tools for sustainable livelihoods, customary knowledge, leadership, and generational transmission and documentation thereof
- support local level governance
- Helping ICCAs realise they are ICCAs before they get turned into something else, including strengthening participation of youth.

#### **National level**

- Awareness raising of ICCAs at the national level
- Step up national level ICCA strategies

#### **Regionalisation and Regional Networking**

- connecting national ICCA networks Regionally, through Regional meetings/assemblies
- strengthening regional networks
- Review & learning of governance through regional exchange, developing regional strategies
- Regional analyses/publications/communication
- CICADA could collaborate on & co-finance combined regional ICCA network meetings with indigenous partners/researchers' meetings
- Thematic national & regional meetings

#### **Connecting land/sea territories of ICCAs**

##### **Global (internal)**

- keep up inspiration, sharing, strength & analysis also at global level!
- Cicada could collaborate on a plenary international conference alongside ICCA General Assembly

##### **Global (external) Policies**

- scale-up knowledge sharing in policy making, more engagement with finance
- engage with Agenda 2030 SDGs + Paris agreement on Climate Change
- strategise for complementary and positive approach policies (in addition to no-go, climate change)...
- expose conventional conservationists to ICCAs/ develop guidelines for conservation organisations and their work with IPLCs
- more documentation

### **Tools & Support for ICCAs**

- technical & financial
- improved monitoring of ICCA status & health
- Participatory mapping

### **Legal Support:**

- Human rights awareness raising and legal support of
- preparedness at national level for legal assessments related to ICCAs
- partnerships with law schools/legal networks at national & regional level
- legal support for self-strengthening of ICCAs

### **SAFE**

- early identification of & response to ICCA threats & conflict & prevention of!
- funds targeted to critical areas

### **Fundraising:**

- develop checks & safeguards
- link strategy to fundraising (donors & partners)
- core group for fundraising and resource mobilization only
- Joint research funding proposals from the membership – more coordinated action!

### **Communication**

- Internal: strengthen communication strategy: tools & team; use multimedia; positive stories, solid research outputs...
- External: engage international media (press releases etc) on ICCA stories/issues
- at GA, more time for discussion, fewer powerpoints