

XIIth (Extraordinary) General Assembly of the ICCA Consortium

Saturday 30 June 2018 - Montreal, Canada

Members, Honorary members and observers sat by regional groupings

decisions being noted/ and currently followed-up by the Secretariat and Council

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

08:45 Welcome by the President, reading, comments and adoption of the Agenda

The President (Taghi Farvar) was not able to be present because of health reasons. Dave de Vera, as a member of the Council of Elders acted as chair of the meeting.

Best wishes were sent to our amazing President.

Agenda adopted.

Chair proposed that decisions during the EGA would be made using the Isang Bagsak system of acclamation. Approved by acclamation.

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

Asia

- **Sutej Hugu** – East Asia Coordinator - reports 3 pieces of good news: i) Taiwan - on July 14 there will be an ethnic group confederacy meeting, which will also discuss issues of mutual validation and self-strengthening; ii) China – greatly developed the procedures of communities for self-validation; iii) Regionalisation – China should be a region in its own right. Taiwan should be with SE Asia and Madagascar in a socio linguistic group of Austronesia – subdivided into east and west.
- **Neema Pathak Broome** – South Asia Coordinator - Mainly focusses on India and Bangladesh. In Bangladesh an Hm is working on a photo story for an ICCA in the Chittagong Hills. In Nepal our ICCA network has problems with funding. India – already been documenting ICCAs for a long time with hundreds of recorded cases. Very little support for ICCAs, no access rights, no resource rights, but the Forest Rights Act (FRI) opened up an important space for ICCA work. Community forest rights' learning and advocacy network has been established. Government is trying to dilute the provisions of this Act, but many positive results have happened as well. Communities map their forest territory and use this to claim their rights. Of the total potential for implementation of this law, only 3% of the possible 50% of forests under FRI have been processed... Example

of Mendha Lenka as a success story and to show what can happen once a process of self-strengthening has been gone through.

- **Cristina Eghenter** – Southeast Asia - WGII organising Southeast Asia regional assembly at end of July. One day for capacity building, two days for discussion and one day for experiences of ICCAs. Tanya Conlu attended the community conservation meeting in Halifax which looked at how to open markets to community products. Great opportunity in Indonesia is that customary forests have been mapped and process of recognition has started.
- **Paul Sein Twa** – Burma – will take part in Southeast Asia regional meeting. Trying to set up ICCA network – meeting with groups working at village level. Want to establish this for peer review before application to the ICCA Registry. Trying to influence government policy to recognise ICCAs. There are many in Burma. Need to showcase what we can contribute. Established Salween Peace Park. There are many communities that want to claim their rights and hope to have the support of the Consortium for this. We honour Saw O Moo who was assassinated recently while working to oppose the construction of a military road through indigenous territory.
- **Dave de Vera** – Philippines – have many ancestral domain titles. Filing more claims to include up to 25% of land territory. People have rights to declare their claims but this should be reinforced by an ICCA bill, due to be approved by the end of this year. Revising process for ancestral domain management, planning to expressly include ICCAs. Looking at overlaps with national parks. Have convinced the government that ICCAs documented and recognised strengthen conservation. Imminent launch of Philippine registry of ICCAs. Currently implementing new ICCA programme of GEF, including a pilot run of the proposed ICCA bill and training of government officials on how to do ICCA documentation.

Latin America

- **Lorena Arce** – Cono Sur Coordinator - discussing the regionalisation process, will keep Latin America as one region but with sub regions with ecosystem commonalities. Organising a regional assembly for October/November 2018. Planning participation in Latin American congress on national parks. Important as there is a lot of discussion of ICCAs and indigenous territories.
- **José Aylwin** – Chile – mainly monitoring process of legislation to acknowledge ICCAs as a separate category from public/private. Frame that we pushed for was not included, the most we could achieve was the inclusion of a category of lands protected by IPs. Providing legal advice to potential ICCAs that are threatened by salmon farms and other. Trying to make use of international processes – UN, Special Rapporteurs.
- **José Gualinga** – Ecuador, Sarayaku people in the Amazon. Since 2012 they have been considering what the relationship with ICCA Consortium could be. Six days ago, there was a council meeting of the Sarayaku and they sent an application to become Members. Kichwa people have a territory of 1.5million hectares, 254 000 are for Sarayaku people. Struggling on several issues and for many years. Years ago, won a court case against Ecuador at Inter American court of human rights. Won the right to FPIC before anything

happens to affect their territory. Asked and obtained judgement that a large quantity of explosive material brought in by a mining company should be removed— although this is yet to actually happen... The Sarayaku do not just fight against things but also *for* things – their current “declaration of living forest” is not made just for Sarayaku but for all ip, it is a new category of land use. State of Ecuador is one of the most advanced in terms of legislation. It is pluri-national and recognises the rights of nature and mother earth. However, this is not properly translated into reality. In early July there will be an international declaration so that the whole world recognises the Sarayaku territory as “living forest”. Calls for whole ICCA movement to support and amplify their declaration.

- **Michel Laforge** – ALDEA of Ecuador, a new Member of Consortium - very interested in process of recognising community territories. In Ecuador we have had a big offensive of mining and oil companies. On paper, Ecuador is very advanced, but the government is giving new concessions. Working with other Consortium Members in Ecuador to document territories for nine other groups, now happy to have met the Sarayaku as well. Looking for international recognition for these territories. Initiative to make exchanges with ip groups around the world.
- **Albert Chan Dzul** – Mesoamerica Coordinator and representative of U Yich Lu’um - Guatemala—Oxlajuj Ajpop, a Consortium Member, has been appointed as GSI ICCA strategic national organisation, now have 6 self-strengthening processes happening. Belize – GSI – have some ICCAs being registered in ICCA registry. Mexico - working without GSI to create national network of communities involved in conservation.
- **Vivienne Solis Rivera** – Lorena Arce read out a message of greetings from Vivienne.

Africa

- **Vololona Rasoarimanana** – Madagascar - responded to regionalisation questionnaire, working on regional meeting either in Ethiopia, DRC or Madagascar. Working to define sub regions. Madagascar – important to be in a network to oppose many government decisions to give mining concessions. Tafo Mihaavo worked to fight against these decisions. One of our members was imprisoned because of his work. Government wanted to create special economic zones for agri-business, network also fought against this. She works in both Guinea Bissau and Madagascar – both GSI countries. Now have fourteen emblematic ICCAs in Madagascar which will start the process of self-strengthening. Guinea Bissau – working to empower people who live within protected areas.
- **Dominique Bikaba** – DRC - encourages regions of the Consortium to work together for knowledge exchange. In DRC, there is a conflict between international laws and local laws. Locally there is recognition of community territories. Need to have access to sacred areas and be able to protect animals in our territories. Consortium could help us – in DRC we have community forests, in the Registry we have ICCAs which could create a conflict with DRC laws. We are pushing the government for another law as the Forestry law is not enough to appropriately recognise ICCAs. ANAPAC needs to work on this.
- **Cécé Noel Kpoghomou** – President of wetland network in Guinea - pleased to be here, recently joined Consortium. Working on appropriate recognition of ICCAs. For two years

they have been working on this. Started mapping ICCAs – need to learn much still. There is a lot of potential and there are still natural resources in Guinea, but they are threatened by extractive industries. Struggling together with local communities to protect their land.

- **Zealelem Tefera** – Ethiopia – a lot of initiatives to get ICCAs registered and recognised. Threatened by many phenomena. There are also initiatives in Somalia, South Sudan and Kenya.

North America

Stan Stevens – a lot is happening in Canada because of the drive to meet the CBD targets - four tribal parks have been established; Eli Enns was invited to be part of indigenous council across Canada and was co-author of recommendation report (very interesting with case studies and lots of recommendations for government on how to move forwards). Too soon to know where this will go.

USA – five IP tribes in south western states were concerned about territory and sacred sites not on reservations. They had decided that the way to protect the sites was to declare the area as a protected area. Their declaration was recognised by B. Obama and territory was listed as a national monument (Bears Ears National Monument), but this has now been downsized by 80% by D. Trump and opened to extractive industries. Only two tribes will still be involved, and the governance body has to be elected by the government and approved by President. This is now a test case of the executive power of the American President against ICCAs...

- **Holly Jonas** – Canada - there is a large financial commitment from the government of Canada to support the process of ICCA recognition. Potential for Canada to lead the way globally.
- **Colin Scott** – Canada - indigenous peoples' conservation areas are being developed in a complex landscape with many different layers, different levels of buy-in, different capacities and will to engage from indigenous groups. Money is available to support self-determination. There is some scepticism as to whether the ICCA concept would add value in Canada. Some groups want some areas of development in their territory. The Consortium will have a challenge interacting with indigenous groups.
- **Mike Ferguson** – Canada - national organisation for Inuit has not joined the initiative co-led by Eli Enns. All Inuit have settled their claims regionally and consider themselves apart from other first nations. They could potentially collaborate with the Consortium as they don't have to buy-in to federally sponsored legislation. Inuit in Nanuvuk have created land use plan, indigenous owners of land identified some areas of strict conservation. But those were considered by territorial and federal government agencies as being "too strict" and "too detailed" and the plan was rejected.

Europe

- **Aili Pyhälä** –advances in Spain and Southern Europe. Aili met colleagues from Eastern Europe at workshops in Finland which have resulted in several potential new Members.

Finland has hosted many events including chairing Arctic Council this year. Three seminars on biodiversity and land rights. Snowchange is very active – currently working on rewilding Finland. Most exciting news is case of young Sami activists who had claimed back their traditional fishing rights. This has inspired a movement of moratoria (4) on traditional reindeer herding areas and others to claim back rights. There is support (legal and financial) available for these processes.

International

- **Tina Rai** – Global Forest Coalition – GFC are hosting their second global conference on community conservation in parallel to SBSTTA which is the last meeting of SBSTTA prior to the COP. Showcasing and presenting second CCRI report. Looking at how good practices and experiences could contribute to negotiations within CBD. Encourage people to join IIFP preparatory meeting prior to SBSTTA. They will provide a statement to the official meetings.
- **Colin Scott** – Cicada – Sophie Beier is the new Programme Manager. Lots of work continuing with research in thirty IP communities globally, mainly Canada, Latin America, East Africa, Australia, New Zealand. Have now defined a new subpolar region to focus on. Strengthening intersection with Consortium through work with specific individuals. Planning some regional meetings in conjunction with Consortium – Colombia, Ethiopia, North America. Hope to bring together groups of people who are working with indigenous partners. Looking at ways to collaborate with Consortium on several issues, notably defending the defenders and livelihoods. Have people working in community video and mapping.

Towards a Consortium policy for “Defending ICCAs and ICCA Defenders” – presentation, discussion and advice for final draft to be approved at XIIIth GA (International Policy Advisor)

Powerpoint Presentation available [here](#)

Holly Jonas - Background – this is a draft policy on defending ICCAs and defenders of ICCAs against the growing threats posed by industrial-scale extractive operations, infrastructure, “development” plans. Growing global attention to these issues, reports prepared by several organisations. At the GAs of 2016 and 2017, Members asked the Consortium to focus on threats to ICCAs. Currently we have an Alert Policy, proposed SAFE Initiative with MoU with Friends of the Earth International (FoEI), we have drafted a No Go policy and we are engaging with other organisations and networks working on the same issues.

Process so far – led by Policy & Programme Committee, draft position on ICCAs as ‘No Go’ areas for destructive industries (discussed at GA 2017), many inputs from Members, Council and Secretariat. Second version of policy – revised to be clearer and wider in scope.

Parts of the draft policy:

1. Context – international legal and policy basis
2. A Policy for the ICCA Consortium
3. Operational provisions
 - Actively defend ICCAs from harm
 - Actively support and defend ICCA custodians and defenders and stand in solidarity with them
 - Enhance the capacities of Members
 - Highlight and demonstrate (economic and livelihood) alternatives
 - Advance global, national and local systems of rights and responsibilities
4. Overview of Proposed Action Plan
 - Securing and monitoring compliance with existing rights in specific situations for ICCAs and ICCA defenders at risk
 - Advancing global systems of rights, responsibilities and mechanisms to support ICCAs and ICCA defenders at risk
 - Building the ICCA Consortium’s institutional basis and capacities to support ICCAs and ICCA defenders at risk

Proposed next steps:

- Comments to the ‘Defending ICCAs and ICCA Defenders’ policy gathered today
- Circulation of draft policy in 3 languages
- Discussion of draft policy in the regions + development of action plans in the regions
- Revision of policy in Sept/Oct and circulate next draft
- If possible, table revised draft for adoption at GA in November 2018

Discussion

Colin Scott – what resources are available to implement the policy?

Holly Jonas – will build on existing work of Members and Secretariat will help to support this. Collaboration with other networks eg Defending the Defenders who have access to a lot of resources and financial support.

Jessica Campese – are there any policies in the Consortium on partnerships?

Holly Jonas – there is some guidance in the Operational Guidelines, but it may need to be expanded.

Albert Chan Dzul – what about the MoU with FoEI and ILC?

Cristina Eghenter – in defending ICCAs you need alternative forms of development, how is this reflected in the next steps? Maybe it should be noted that it should be discussed in the Regional Assemblies.

José Aylwin – can you explain the expansion of the approach from defending the defenders to defending ICCAs?

Dave de Vera – if you start from defending ICCAs, you automatically defend the defenders. This will keep the focus on ICCAs.

Grazia – also looked at comparative advantage of the Consortium compared to other organisations. If we act with foresight, we will provide protection to an ICCA prior to an acute need to defend a particular defender. This will maximise use of scarce resources.

Motion to approve next steps as proposed by Holly by Neema Pathak Broome (Kalpavriksh), seconded by Paul Sein Twa (KESAN). Motion approved.

Review of SAFE initiative and MoU with FoEI and proposal for a dialogue with the Defending the Defenders coalition (International Policy Advisor)

See Powerpoint Presentation under previous section

This is a collaborative initiative that has been discussed since 2013 – 3 regional scoping reports were commissioned, and a concept note on a potential solidarity fund was written. FoEI involved in first meeting and expressed interest in being part of the initiative. Main objective – to protect and promote the rights of the defenders of the Commons and ICCAs who are at risk and/or experience a threat.

November 2016 - Memorandum of Understanding signed by both parties- included collaboration on a feasibility study on initiative and pilot in Southeast Asia region.

2017 - drafted Terms of Reference for the feasibility study and worked on an indicative methodology.

April 2018 - FoEI sent a letter to explain their challenges in relationship building and communication, that they don't have funds for any of these activities, they are not ready to take on a joint fund but still hoping to cooperate positively.

Executive Committee decision – set aside the FoEI collaboration for now, revise the MoU at country level where relationships are already promising and in UN negotiations towards a binding treaty on transnational corporations and human rights. Explore other partnership options (Defending the Defenders Coalition) and develop broader programme of work on these issues.

Grazia – the Executive Committee were disappointed by FoEI decision, still believe they are a very strong organisation and we support them, but they seem to have challenges working with partners.

Dave de Vera proposed the approval of next steps as set out by the Executive Committee - approved by acclamation.

New Consortium work theme on ICCAs & sustainable livelihoods – report of meeting of 28 June 2018 and proposal for consideration and approval (Paul Sein Twa + Global Coordinator)

Grazia – The initiative to set up a Theme on ICCAs and sustainable livelihoods has been discussed several times in Council and there is a lot of interest in the topic. Council recommended creation of the Theme. We worked to identify two willing co-chairs to lead initiative – approached Rosie Cooney (international champion of sustainable use of wildlife and rights of IP to use, chair of specialist group on sustainable use and livelihoods in IUCN) and Paul Sein Twa (Honorary member from Burma, engaged in maintaining and enriching livelihoods of his people with a very practical approach). We had a one-day ‘thinking group’ meeting just a few days ago here in Montreal (with Rosie on Skype) and examined the issue in detail. Defining ‘sustainable livelihoods’ is a complex endeavour in itself (many interpret “livelihoods” as focused on economic issues alone... also “sustainability” may actually be a term to mean “resilience” ...).

Proposals

- Sustainable livelihoods definition should be left to individual Members to develop their own understanding.
- Members who are interested in the theme should be called to collaborate. A small lead team should set out to motivate this work. They could use some Consortium funds to call for specific case studies, possibly including extreme cases (eg in Philippines, support to a specific water-producing ICCA has resulted in so much financial inflow that it is undermining the basic ethics of the community and is now threatening their very existence).
- Team would define ToR but it is important not to fix a path that is too narrow. Some have discussed in Secretariat meeting that IPs have story telling as a way of learning, maybe this could be useful here to pass understanding from one community to the next.

Discussion

Paul Sein Twa – what are our expectations in proposing this Theme?

Dave de Vera - we need strong evidence of effectiveness of ICCAs to gain recognition of ICCAs. And we need to make sure that ICCAs maintain indigenous culture or all will be lost.

Aili Pyhälä – we should not reinvent the wheel but try to collaborate with the work of others (eg Cicada). While doing a case study review, it is important to identify the challenges faced by our Members in achieving sustainable livelihoods.

Grazia – there are challenges in maintaining the core values and capacities that sustain ICCAs. Eg China – an IP community had always done rotating cultivation on steep hillsides, but the government decreed that cultivation not allowed on steep hillsides... Community was given free rice for ten years. At end of the ten years the community had lost a good part of their knowledge on cultivation, their adapted seeds and tools, but also lost its internal relationships,

the passing on of knowledge and skills among the elders and the youth, as the teaching and working together had been suspended...

Neema Pathak Broome – there are 2 very different objectives being talked about here. Paul and Dave are focussed on policy and Grazia is focussing on livelihoods as ways of living. Kalpavriksh has looked at these kinds of issues with communities who wish to maintain their lifestyle while the rest of the world is fast moving in opposing directions.

Grazia – the Consortium has been calling attention to communities who govern their own territories by using their own capacities in the midst of change. We should understand what makes this possible in a broad way while keeping our advocacy for ICCAs intact.

Dominique Bikaba – don't see how an ICCA would live without providing resources for the livelihoods of its custodians.

Mike Ferguson – would these case studies be restricted to ICCAs recognised in the database and to Members of the Consortium?

José Gualinga – this is very interesting for the Sarayaku people. We talk about these issues, we have not let in extractive industries for more than 40 years, but there are a lot of threats coming from outside and we feel very weak in defending ourselves against an invisible system that is around us and is affecting us. We have to consider on the one side economic autonomy and on the other financial autonomy. Our economic autonomy goes through many different ways – different ways of living that interact with each other, nourished by the knowledge we have of plant and animal resources. This is a way to confront globalisation. But we also need local consensus and our own plans to obtain the financial resources we need. This needs to be developed from within and not imposed from outside. Financial mechanisms are part of our life plans. The Sarayaku are proposing their own ICCA system that they call a living forest, with this goes new indicators of wealth that are not only monetary - healthy rivers and land. But we cannot say no to monetary income because we have many things for which this is needed, eg to educate our children in our own ways.

Sutej Hugu – there are financially successful but unsustainable livelihoods in some communities which end up destroying the community... Disrupted ICCAs are in crisis and under threat. Suggested that this should be further discussed in all the Regional Assemblies.

Michel Laforge – this should not be a discussion about case studies. We need sustainable livelihoods to have an ICCA. Livelihoods are a condition for an ICCA. They are constantly evolving with time. We need cases that show some solutions that work now for some communities even if they may not remain relevant or sustainable in the future.

Grazia – cases would embed wisdom in how to go about achieving this.

Zelealem Tefera – when we talk about sustainable development and talk about economic wellbeing, we cannot ignore culture, society, tradition.

Mike Ferguson – the Consortium should appropriate what José Gualinga has just said. We could call the theme “ICCAs and the good life”. The Consortium could develop and apply a set of indicators to assess the good life.

Colin Scott – see John Altman's work re: Northern Australia where land-based livelihoods and ranger movement looking after countries (IPAs) and complex economy really highlight realities

of what we could mean by sustainable livelihoods or “good life” in all its complexity... But unless we do something about capitalist growth there is no way to conceptualize solutions at local level. We have to put together the local level food sovereignty concept together with the macro systems that can undermine them... but also identify the opportunities to find balances and solutions.

Tina Rai – it is worth discussing this as it is relevant for SDGs. There should be a holistic approach to development for wellbeing and transformative change. How do you integrate this holistic vision to an indicator within SDGs and CBD?

Cristina Eghenter – in the call, drop the word ‘study’ and use initiatives or stories to open the space for more energy and resistance.

Proposal by Grazia:

- Grazia will prepare minutes of the ‘thinking group’ meeting and a proposal to further discuss and finalise with a small group of interested people who agree to move forward the work of the Theme on ICCAs and sustainable livelihoods/ good life.
- There should be self-selection of areas where we document initiatives on ICCAs and sustainable livelihoods/ the good life as defined in various locations.
- The topic should be discussed as part of the agenda of all Regional Assemblies.
- Resources should be made available to fund this work as part of the 2018 budget.

Approved by acclamation.

Steven Nitah– Honorary member of the Consortium for seven months-- joined the meeting Works in land protection and agreements on land related issues.

Isis Alvarez – Honorary member of the Consortium -- joined the meeting.

Advice about “inclusive conservation” to WWF International—presentation, discussion and advice collected from the participants (Global Coordinator)

Grazia: This is one of the most complex relationships the Consortium has ever considered. Context – the Consortium works like a family and links with people as much as with organisations. There has been big change in leadership of WWF International and Delfin Ganapin has taken responsibility for the governance practice of WWF. We have a very long relationship of working closely with Delfin (Hm). We also have a very long history of working with our Honorary member Cristina Eghenter and she works for WWF Indonesia. She was directly involved in establishing the Working Group on ICCAs in Indonesia (WGII - a long time Consortium Member in Southeast Asia). This represents a new opportunity. Delfin is trying to change the organisational culture of WWF. WWF have a bad reputation in some places for its approach of “fortress conservation”. Delfin has asked for the advice of the Consortium on how to steer WWF to inclusive conservation. Understanding of what this means is open. At GA in

2017, Delfin and Cristina and representatives of WGII with the Consortium started to look at what this advice could be. With resources from WWF, we convened 10 IP delegates to UNPFII in April in New York and discussed these issues. Since then, we have elaborated ideas and decided to have a second meeting. We have prepared a draft document of advice (see draft [here](#)) and a [video-message](#) that was specifically prepared and offered to the board of WWF at their recent board meeting. The video message was very well received. Would like to ask EGA to consider the relationship with WWF proposed in that document and the content of the advice offered.

Content of the advice offered:

1. Working with people with whom we have had a long relationship is crucial.
2. The Consortium is always to maintain a level of independence.
3. There are two rather opposed types of conservation – fortress and indigenous peoples/ community- led.
4. Inclusive conservation should be about ICCAs; it should be indigenous peoples/ community-led
5. We have lessons learned synthesized into list of do's and don't's... but all this remains advice on paper...
6. If WWF wants the Consortium to provide advice it better be *on the ground and with the strong involvement of willing Members of the Consortium in specific countries.*
7. WWF staff should be involved in learning. If they are willing to do this and do it for some time, this relationship will result in vital learning for all involved.
8. Only careful learning and action together in concrete settings (as it was the case for the WGII) will succeed in defining “inclusive conservation”.

Discussion

Ted Karfakis (on Skype) – work on marine conservation. I didn't hear any mention of conservation by local communities (LCs). IPs are very important, but LCs are relevant too. There have been a lot of problems with WWF but we should give them the benefit of the doubt.

Albert Chan Dzul – in Mexico, I have inquired with some of our local partners and they said it is possible to collaborate with WWF but not now because the President has just given some controversial concessions for water exploitation, and those were supported by WWF.

Aili Pyhälä – congratulations to Grazia on this excellent document. Have growing fears and discomfort to share. Even if we don't call this a partnership there is a huge risk that it will be interpreted as such and this is too big a risk as so many IP groups see WWF as “the enemy”. On the other hand, if we don't want it to be explicit that we are involved, there is a risk that our work will be appropriated... The countries that need our input the most are not in the pilot cases. Are we interested because of the potential for huge funding?

Sutej Hugu – we have invited WWF to join us in China but they have not yet. What is inclusive conservation? We could use our own definition, but this should be very clear.

Mike Ferguson – we have some experience with WWF Canada. They were making similar overtures to the Inuit in Nanuvuk. When it came to work on agreements to receive funding it became clear that WWF staff wanted to be in control of what happened to the money. Recently they gave us \$30k for travel and let us run the meetings. Now we are reporting, WWF want to release the results before our communities and regional organisation have had a chance to review it. We have refused to accept this. I would advise caution on the part of the Consortium.

Jessica Campese – appreciate the interest and motivations for this. Are there examples with WWF or other large organisations we could use to see how to structure this arrangement? Will this set a precedent on similar requests for advice?

Steven Nitah – some experience with WWF from Canadian North. WWF had profound impact on community incomes through their campaign against hunting in the north. If they are serious about asking IPs for advice, they should start with a genuine and profound apology to the people impacted.

Colin Scott – wonder if beyond apology we should look at process. Are we in the Consortium clear about what we want? Is there willingness to engage WWF in a public way in a consideration of its past actions?

Neema Pathak Broome – need to reflect on what kind of relationship we are thinking of. WWF India are a strange creature, they engage with Forest Rights Act but they always side with the State against communities.

José Aylwin – we have a bad experience with WWF in Chile. If we're working towards regionalisation there should be possibility for some Members or regions to work with whoever they wish. If some want to work with them, we should have a framework for them to work within.

Grazia – Consortium objectives – WWF is not a pot of money. We are currently engaged in serious fundraising in several directions and WWF is not among the most important. Our main consideration is the great opportunity to work in solidarity with the many communities that – whether we like it or not – are dealing with WWF today and will deal with them tomorrow. We see the amazing things that WWF Indonesia have done, and we consider that we have today (through Delfin) the possibility of affecting one of the crucial world players in conservation. We should be driven by our mission – appropriate recognition and support to ICCAs. WWF international does not exist as a monolith, it is a complex structure with internal elements that vary so widely as to not even be similar, let alone the same. This does not solve problem raised by Aili. It is true that we would be dragged into controversies through any perceived allegiance. We should not have a “partnership” with WWF but remain autonomous and continue our regular work. But my advice is to engage with capacity building of WWF staff on the basis of ICCA examples and agree to provide advice as part of concrete initiatives, and by engaging our willing Members... I don't know if WWF will accept our proposal.

Dominique Bikaba – We are basing this on individuals – know that this is vitally important but what happens if these people are no longer there, do we stop our relationship? I would

encourage a relationship between WWF and our Members. We need them in DRC but am worried that we don't know how honest they are.

Zelealem Tefera – we should ask questions – why are we approaching WWF? Is it because they will give us money? Is it because they have introduced the new idea of 'inclusive conservation'? what does this mean? Are they serious? Are they in line with our objectives? WWF are rich and could support many ICCA projects, but this is not a strong enough reason to work with them.

Isis Alvarez – reminds me of discussion we had about threat of co-option of the term ICCA. There is a huge imbalance between what WWF is and what the Consortium is.

Grazia – relationship between WWF and the Consortium has been in existence for many years. This is a leap of faith to think about working with them more broadly, admittedly based on one person on their Board. But that person is in an important position of power. Unless we, or others like us, support such person(s), the organisational culture of the WWFs of this world will never change...

Paul Sein Twa – although we are talking at international level, there are partners working at country level with WWF. We work on advocacy at international level. Would this new WWF be willing to partner with our advocacy work? We need to engage with large organisations if we want to do successful advocacy.

Steven Nitah – we have relationships with states and government. When governments apologise, we can move forward and work with them. The same is true of WWF, this demonstrates that they have learned from the past and will not repeat their mistakes. This should be done on a country by country basis.

Albert Chan Dzul – in Mexico I am concerned that we could lose the trust of our communities.

Mike Ferguson – example with Greenpeace – launched protests against seal hunting in Canada, they abandoned it but they are still blamed by Inuit groups. One community recognised that they did abandon the protests and needed an ally to go to court. They used the money of Greenpeace to pay for litigation. WWF is a many headed creature and is different in all parts of the world. I would suggest that the Consortium should not partner with WWF or take their money at a global level but leave it up to local groups.

Albert Chan Dzul – they must apologise in Mexico for their actions.

José Gualinga – Sarayaku people are part of a regional organisation and have never heard of WWF supporting us. We know they work with governments and come up with new concepts such as 'responsible mining'. Experience with WWF is that they gave a prize to a young woman to recognise the struggle of the Sarayaku people, but this came as a surprise, people were unsure why she had been selected and this created more divisions and unhappiness. Historical leaders were angered...

Ted Karfakis (on Skype) – Let us understand how WWF works. Some branches are acting in acceptable ways, but this may be without the knowledge of the central administration. Let us start by finding cases where they need to provide answers and see what response we get from them.

Cristina Eghenter – part of WWF Indonesia. WWF is a network rather than a monolithic organisation. We have excellent social policies, but they are not always implemented. We need

organisations like the Consortium to tell us what we are doing wrong and teach us to be a better conservation organisation. However, you have to be sure how you want to change WWF. I took notes of all your comments. I would advise you to start slowly. Avoid the misuse of language – we don't want a partnership, but you can't stop others from referring to it as such. We are a network that needs to learn to be humble. Maybe best to start with local collaboration but how will you interact internationally? WWF is an unbalanced network; some countries have a lot more power than others. Will we be able to cope with individuals moving on if we rely on individuals within WWF?

Grazia – would stress the final point of Cristina. Is it possible for an organisational culture to change? Maybe we don't need to wait for the whole organisation to change before working together. And if we do independent work that encourages that change it is a good thing. I agree that there should be pre-conditions for working in any country. I propose that, if some of you feel strongly about this issue, please join the meeting we will have on Monday with WWF and Delfin and Taghi on Skype.

Cristina Eghenter – it is critical for us to learn. WWF has no voice as a network, you could help us change this.

Steven Nitah – globally biodiversity is being lost at a scary rate. We know where the IPs are and we know that in these areas there is strong biodiversity. WWF should apologise and adopt UNDRIP. This will trickle down through their network.

Grazia – on Monday we will hear what Delfin thinks of this proposal. If he accepts it, I will pass it on to all of you for comments and then we can put it to the GA if it is appropriate.

Cristina – we should ask WWF to come back with a concrete plan in writing about how they propose to implement this throughout the network.

Proposal by Grazia:

- Receive feedback from WWF about our latest proposal, including a concrete plan on how they will implement this throughout their network.
- If our proposal is accepted, we will canvas our own Members on the terms of the common possible work.
- If appropriate, we will present this as a more detailed proposal to the next General Assembly.

Approved by acclamation.

A gender policy for the ICCA Consortium – presentation and discussion of the draft policy (Programme & Communication Officer)

Powerpoint Presentation available [here](#)

Emma Courtine: This was team work with other Members of the Consortium who provided input. Discussed concepts and agreed on definitions. Considered the importance of gender

considerations for ICCAs. Key elements: role of women is extremely important in ICCAs; there are more than 2 genders; gender roles are a source of social and cultural wealth. The policy is oriented toward action and good practice sharing.

Implementation:

- Voluntary committee on gender
- Gender considerations to be part of annual work plans
- Avoid collaborations with organisations that don't respect our principles
- Tolerate no gender-related violent action
- Appoint gender security keeper
- Have a relevant response in event of violations
- Analysis of gender sensitive indicators during the GA
- Comment on gender issues in the Annual Report

Council suggestions:

- Deliberately high standard policy, recognising the diversity of visions across the world
- Regional assemblies need time to review the policy
- The implementation indicators for the programme will have to be detailed and go further than the policy

Following steps:

- Revision during the regional assemblies
- Revision by the membership
- Approval here at the EGA, but with reserve of further discussion at the 2018 GA to offer a chance for review because of time constraints with circulating drafts. Would like a trial period of 18 months and then for policy to be implemented.

Dave de Vera - this is not to be approved now but is for information and to ask for input from the regions before the GA 2018.

Further input requested from the regions prior to the next General Assembly.

Outline of a regionalisation process for the ICCA Consortium -- presentation, discussion and approval of preliminary proposal for submission to the Regional Assemblies (Chair of the Regionalisation Committee)

Powerpoint Presentation available [here](#)

Operationalisation process:

- 2-year process 2018 – 2019

- A number of regional coordinators have canvassed Members and given input
- Regionalisation Committee made preliminary recommendations to Council yesterday
- Still to take place
 - Regional Assemblies (2018)
 - General Assembly approval (Nov 2018)
 - Implementation (2019)

Committee consolidated the input and produced a list of current regions, proposed regions and identified grey areas that need further consideration. Council debated the criteria and decided that **regions should self-define**. Criteria to be considered – membership, culture, language, history, ecosystems, political context, proximity, operational and financial considerations.

Key topics/recommendations

- **Structure/governance/membership**
 - Should be a regional structure
 - Regional assembly
 - National focal points
 - Secretariat
 - Regional structure should be defined by the regions
 - Relationship with the global structure should be through regional representation on the Consortium Council

- **Regional functions important for all regions (while ensuring little unnecessary administrative burden)**
 - Reviewing policies and strategies to ensure they respond to regional needs
 - Fundraising and resource mobilisation
 - Capacity building
 - Research/generating and exchanging knowledge
 - Supporting/recruiting Members
 - Building/strengthening national networks
 - Working on specific advocacy/supporting Members
 - Developing and maintaining regional data base of ICCAs
 - Identifying regional priorities/plans
 - Engaging actively in policy definition and implementation
 - Facilitating communications at all levels

- **Funding**
 - Membership fees to be collected centrally but partially distributed regionally
 - Fundraising – intensify regional fundraising efforts, develop protocols and guidelines, certain minimum budget (tbd) to be allocated to each region from global level

- Annual budget – should depend on work plan and need, to include regional coordination time, administration, communications, travel, assemblies and other initiatives
- Annual remuneration – Regional Coordinators should be remunerated fairly, and work either full time or 50%, drop the idea of semi-volunteering

Proposal is that we summarise this and feed it back to regional assemblies for comment before approval at GA. Will be some challenge because not all regions will have their assembly before the GA. So, can postpone start or can start with a few regions.

Discussion

Neema Pathak Broome – apologies for not responding before. When we talked earlier about regional meetings they were informal meetings with people interested in ICCAs... but now we talk about Regional Assemblies, which sounds more formalised... so is it necessary now that we have only Consortium Members there? In South Asia there are relatively few Members, but it could be very useful to bring together interested organisations.

José Aylwin – this was not discussed in the questionnaire. Each region should decide its own structure and define its own terms and composition of meetings.

Grazia – the spirit of the Consortium is one of adaptability and getting maximum results from minimum resources. There is no problem in inviting many representatives from the region if you can find funding. Any decisions should be made only by the Members as we have statutory obligations which must be respected. But assemblies are good to enhance the Consortium as member-based organisation, and to recruit new Members. Today, the Regional Coordinator role is played by individuals, but we could have more (already have some) Consortium Member organisations who can act as a Regional Coordinator hub, and other Members as focal points in each active country in each region. In this way the Members would share the mission of the Consortium and reduce bureaucracy.

Lorena Arce – many regions believe that this would be good, but we have not yet agreed on it.

Isis Alvarez – like the focus on regions, what are the considerations for sub regions in Latin America?

Lorena Arce – this is to be discussed in the Regional Assembly.

Zealelem Tefera – why do we need regionalisation? There seems to be no sense to how regions are defined.

José Aylwin – some regions may decide not to move ahead. All our recommendations are based on the input of regions that chose to participate. We believe that we should not define the regions from a global perspective, but this should be done by the regions themselves.

Michel Laforge – wonder what happens at national level? How do we communicate between all these levels? Like the idea of regional responsibility rotating within the region.

Lorena Arce – in Latin America it is clear that national focal points are crucially important to strengthen national networks. Members could take the role of “national focal points”.

Regarding communication, it was suggested that regional secretariats should have a communication person. When communications come from global level many Members get lost because there is a lot of information that comes that they cannot access or understand.

Emma Courtine – we are strongly focused on building national networks in the Consortium and the national focal points can be an opportunity to advance that.

Dave de Vera – these are preliminary proposals/ starting points for discussion for further consideration.

Grazia – recommend that the Committee should use their experience and be more ambitious and propose something concrete, rather than just compile the findings. You should be inspiring, and you will surely hear from the regions if they don't agree with you...

José – We need more inputs first from the Regional Assemblies before we can make more concrete proposals.

Proposal by José Aylwin:

- Regionalisation Committee summarised the results of the regionalisation questionnaire. The summary to be shared with the regions.
- Wherever possible, this will be discussed at Regional Assemblies.
- The regions will provide further comments to the Regionalisation Committee prior to the General Assembly and the Committee will have a further compilation to be offered there.

Approved by acclamation.

Final Treasurer's report for 2017 (Treasurer)

Powerpoint Presentation available [here](#)

Vololona: The Consortium is not a millionaire organisation in terms of money but in terms of Members. We have restricted funds that must be used for specific projects only and some unrestricted funds that we can spend as we wish/ need. Presented the 2017 Accounts and gave an indication of the January to June 2018 interim accounts. Thanked the Consortium Senior Accountant, Anne Meier, for her hard work in preparing these accounts.

Grazia – we are operating with a very small budget for a relatively large number of people. This is only possible because people have been willing to work as semi-volunteers.

Stan Stevens – as the Auditor of the Accounts I should receive these accounts, review them carefully and submit a report on them. However, the Treasurer's Report has only just been completed, so this will happen at the General Assembly in November 2018.

Chair of the meeting noted this and thanked the Treasurer for her work.

Trevor Sandwith– Honorary member of the Consortium-- joins the meeting.

Report on Search committee for new President, Secretary and Global Coordinator (Holly Jonas)

Powerpoint Presentation available [here](#)

Sarah Ryder: Background - Grazia and Taghi will step down at GA 2019. We have no protocol or experience for how to search for replacements as this has never happened before. Have established a Search Committee which has proposed questions to be considered by Council. Council started considering the questions yesterday and preliminary responses are contained in the Powerpoint Presentation (presentation for information and discussion only.)

Discussion

Trevor Sandwith – Need clarity around roles and responsibilities of the Committee so that the governance of the process is clear. What is appropriate is to find and screen potential candidates against basic criteria, and then it will be up to the GA to decide who is the most suitable. If someone doesn't meet the criteria, you can kindly tell them they're not eligible before it becomes a public problem.

Dominique Bikaba – are we planning to have a Vice-President? What happens if President is absent? Need system of overlap when one team leaves and another arrives, there may be a period of empty management, how do we deal with this?

Stan Stevens – there is no provision for Vice-President in the Statutes.

Emma Courtine – what is the timeframe for this?

Grazia – initial thinking was that in the next weeks the Search Committee would develop ToR for the positions to be circulated and talked through so that initial criteria can be developed and potential candidates can be screened and solicited prior to Nov 2018 so that at next GA the Search Committee can provide an update including possibly some identified candidates. This would give some time for transition in 2019.

Aili Pyhälä – who will decide the ToR for roles?

Grazia - We (the current Secretariat) can provide them with an initial draft, the Search Committee will comment upon them and the Council/ ExCo will decide the names that will be put forward.

Lorena Arce – why do we need a Search Committee if we have a Council, why are they not doing this? Search Committee is not very representative.

Grazia - we solicited requests for participation in the Search Committee several times to whole membership in three languages and got only a few volunteers from the global North. We have then individually solicited help from others, privileging IPs.

Lorena Arce - these emails are not always the best way to communicate when it is something so important because many people, including some IPs, do not always access emails.

Sarah Ryder - questions Holly proposed come from first meeting of Search Committee and related discussions, including who should develop the ToRs. I believe it shouldn't be current Secretariat to draft ToRs. Please note that there is clear guidance in Operational Guidelines on

how people in Council (President and Secretary are members of Council) are nominated and there is no mention of vetting or screening.

Holly Jonas - it may mean that we need more development of Operational Guidelines.

Grazia – all Members have a screening power, as they decide who they do or don't want to nominate, and they elect.

Sarah Ryder - what if Members want to nominate someone who doesn't get through the screening of Council?

Grazia – Members can nominate whoever they want according to our Operational Guidelines! But if Council knows they will vote down a candidate, then it doesn't make sense to put that person in front of the GA to only have them voted down... so screening makes sense.

Trevor Sandwich - this process has never been done before and therefore we have to clarify what needs to be done and then Council should approve this process. It can't be a general discussion. I like the idea of Search Committee as a team with a clear task to help figure out the best course of action. Consortium is a special organisation and there are key people in it (like Grazia and Taghi) and this transition requires a sensitive process... Simply having an election doesn't guarantee good results.

Tina Rai - I don't see the Committee as decision maker, but rather facilitator and support to help Council come up with and see through the process. What we do is make recommendations to Council and then GA decision would be made. So, Committee shouldn't finalise ToRs or decide final list of names ... It's a transparent process that includes some Council members, some Honorary members, and this can help make sure there is no bias. It's also a lot of work if you have a lot of applications, so the Committee can help facilitate this.

Steven Nitah: Not knowing the history of the rules or how decisions were made to get us to where we are today, and recognizing that it is a small, flexible family organisation that has grown, has there been any thought about advancing Regional Coordinators who have been doing well because then you're drawing on individuals who have proven themselves but you also know they have understanding of the Consortium and it's roles and mandate?

Grazia - anyone can be nominated. Anyone who has played Regional Coordinator or Council roles, or anyone who wants to become President, they can present themselves to the Search Committee or Council to receive backing from two Members. A very interesting proposal would be the idea of, instead of having a Global Coordinator in charge of running of the Consortium, having a collegial global coordinating function, like all the Regional Coordinators together carrying out the terms of reference together with some rotational basis and some division of responsibilities. To my knowledge this hasn't been discussed in the Regionalisation Committee. Committee coordination of the Consortium is an option to be considered.

Neema Pathak Broome - Search Committee is great idea but perhaps some recommendations of potential candidates to Search Committee can come from the regional meetings to take place.

Lorena Arce - this is a good idea. This is the first time we're having this change in leadership and it would be interesting to link this regionalisation process to the leadership change process.

Zelealem Tefera – The Consortium has Statutes and this should give an idea how this process should take place.

Grazia – Our Statutes only specify that the GA elects the Council, including President, Secretary and Treasurer.

Dave de Vera – The Search Committee is not defined in Statutes.

Zelealem Tefera - then the role of this committee should be included in the Operational Guidelines.

Tina Rai - good idea to discuss selection in regional meetings but the timeline is a concern because process should be ready by November and regional meetings will take place later in some cases. Also, since we're still working on what the regions will be (which will take time) is hard to have nominations from all the regions.

Grazia - but the global positions can come from any region... regional meetings proposing names is in addition to other pathways. Some names will probably be identified before November, and some later... You should consider that we're going to have a hard time finding people who want to volunteer for these time-consuming roles.

Holly Jonas - picking up point about building leadership from the regions, have discussed different organisational models that can draw more explicitly on IPLC leadership. So we don't have to assume current roles and processes are the ones we need to retain. There may be completely different models and ways of working and building teams that can inform the next phase of the organisation.

Dave de Vera - there are a lot of unknowns, but we have a Committee who are going to prepare the groundwork and then we have Regional Assemblies to further discuss and define and then we need one or two Council meetings before the GA. There are concerns about timeline for all of this.

Forthcoming General Assembly (Zelealem Tefera and Global Coordinator)

Proposal has been made to hold the 2018 General Assembly in Ethiopia, in conjunction with the first Africa Regional Assembly. **Zelealem Tefera will report by August on whether this is feasible.**

Grazia: We have meeting with Cicada next Friday at 8:00 am and want to have Vololona and Dominique there so we can confirm whether there will be a Regional Assembly in Africa this year. If Ethiopia proves to be impossible, we need to have a Plan B, not too far from Ethiopia and Egypt because of the COP14.

Review of progress on the new membership policy and report on controversial cases (Chair of the Membership Committee)

This was a short update report, a comprehensive report will be given at the GA 2018.

- Consortium has a new membership policy

- The membership review is ongoing
- Sending out communications on membership fees is ongoing
- At the GA 2017, it was proposed that the Consortium consider adding a declaration into the application process. The Membership Committee has discussed this and don't think it is necessary. For us to do it retroactively seems unnecessary since we have already so many documents that clearly portray who we are. But there is a need to have a short summary of who we are and what we're about on the website and we're handing this to the communications team
- Do we want small local Members? Yes, if Regional Coordinators are prepared to be the linking person
- Do we want to take more active role in membership drive/campaign? Not in line with the new membership policy because we have to screen all applications with a one-month review process so would be embarrassing to invite someone and then potentially decline them, so instead of invitation letters we propose strengthening our information and dissemination procedures. Handing this also over to the communications team
- Have defined new role: increasing number of global scale Members like FPP, CICADA, GFC... who don't have a dedicated Regional Coordinator. For them, the most appropriate coordinator / focal point would be Grazia and Holly backed up by the Membership Committee.
- Unrelated, informed EGA about process of membership application decision: An indigenous federation in Paraguay applied and there was a complaint against them lodged by an existing Member. Three days ago, the Membership Committee decided to accept the indigenous federation membership application. There will be a meeting with the Member that raised complaint to explain the reasoning behind it and this will take place tomorrow morning.
- Have had difficult cases and some conflicting cases and issues presented from various countries and have discussed them at length. In response have revised Operational Guidelines to specify how we should deal with complaints and conflicts. Current section 4.6 "Consortium-initiated termination" lays out current process. We have found there is lack of clarity in how these complaints should be presented so we propose that a statement be added at the end of the section (please see annex 1 for the approved wording)

Approved by acclamation.

Change of physical address of the Consortium (Programme Manager)

The ICCA Consortium is a global association legally registered in Switzerland. As part of the registration, we have to give a headquarters address. To date this has been Grazia's personal address because the Consortium has no physical offices. The address cannot be a postal box and there is a charge each time we change the registration details of the Consortium. Grazia

has recently moved to a new house so Sarah Ryder presented the options for a new address for the Consortium:

- Re-register as Grazia's new address (but Grazia *must* step down as Global Coordinator at the GA 2019)
- Re-register as Sarah's personal address

Proposal that the registered address of the Consortium should be changed to Sarah Ryder's private address in Switzerland.

Approved by acclamation.

José Maria Gualinga of the Sarayaku People shared a declaration made by his people on their Living Forest

José Gualinga read a Declaration by the Indigenous Kichwa People of Sarayaku on The Kawsak Sacha - Living Forest. For the full Declaration, please see annex 2.

The Kichwa People of Sarayaku requested the solidarity of the Consortium for this declaration, support for communications to put it on the Consortium website, for the declaration to be passed on to Members and for the EGA to sign it as a solidarity statement.

Chair of meeting proposed accepting this request.

Approved by acclamation.

Closing of the XIIth (Extraordinary) General Assembly

No new Members of Council were proposed.

Agenda for the weeks of CBD SBSTTA and SBI was discussed, including Consortium side events and Consortium internal meetings.

19:30 Chair closed the XIIth (Extraordinary) General Assembly



Minutes gathered by Sarah Ryder and Jessica Campese, consolidated by Sarah Ryder and edited by Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend

Annex 1

Proposed last sentence to section 4.6 of Operational Guidelines:

"These requests should be presented in either written or oral form to the respective Regional Coordinator, National Focal Point, and/or directly to the Chair of the Membership Committee. These statements should provide all necessary context and available evidence and clearly explain the reasons, according to the criteria outlined above, for the review of, or suggested termination of, another Membership or Honorary membership. The Chair of the Membership Committee then makes a recommendation to the General Assembly or the Council as applicable. The identity of the complainant will be kept anonymous if so desired."

Annex 2

Declaration by the Indigenous Kichwa People of Sarayaku

The Kawsak Sacha - Living Forest is a living being, with consciousness, constituted by all the beings of the forest, from the most infinitesimal to the greatest and supreme beings. It includes the beings of the animal, vegetable, mineral, spiritual and cosmic world. These worlds are in intercommunication with human beings, providing what is necessary to revitalize their emotional, psychological, physical and spiritual aspects, and to restore the energy, life and balance of native people.

[The Kawsak Sacha - Living Forest] is in the waterfalls, the lagoons, the marshes, the mountains, the rivers and the trees that the Kawsak Sacha's protective beings inhabit and develop a life similar to that of human beings. The Kawsak Sacha transmits knowledge to the yachaks for them to interact with the world of the protective beings of the forest [in order to] maintain the balance of Pachamama (Mother Earth), and to heal the people and society. This knowledge is methodically maintained and transmitted to the new generations by the yachaks.

The natural balance of the universe, the harmony of life, the cultural perpetuity, the existence of living beings and the continuity of the Kawsak Sacha, depend on the permanence and transmission of the powers of the protective beings of the forest. To keep a respectful and balanced relationship between human beings and the beings of the forest depends on the continued existence of these beings and the yachaks.

Objective of the declaration of Kawsak Sacha

The Kawsak Sacha declaration aims to preserve the territorial spaces of native people, relate with them in a sustainable way, and to maintain the material and spiritual relationship established by native people with the forest and the beings that inhabit the forest. Our living territory is, and will continue to be, free of any type of extractive activities such as oil, mining, wood extraction, biopiracy or others similar activities. Therefore, we propose a life model based on our rich culture's criteria, that includes uncontaminated rivers abundant in fish, family life (ayllu) and social organization.

The Kawsak Sacha is where our kallari rukukuna (ancestors) apayayas and apamamas (grandfathers and grandmothers) lived. It is where our parents and we live. It is where our future generations will live and where the protective beings of the forest and all native people will remain.

The Indigenous Kichwa People of Sarayaku