

## XIIIth General Assembly of the ICCA Consortium

12-13 November 2018 – Bishoftu, Ethiopia

Minutes Day One: - Monday 12 November 2018

Minutes written by Sarah Ryder & Kim Wright, with input from Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend

suggestions or **decisions** to be taken into effect  
decided and – since then – already done or in progress  
to be noted by the Council and Secretariat

### Welcome by Interim President

08:50 Meeting opened. Agenda read and adopted.

Pictures and memories shared to remember and honour M. Taghi Farvar who left us in July 2018.

### President's report for 2018, Interim President

Dave de Vera -- This was a special, intense and productive year. The Consortium continued the process of defining ICCAs as Territories of Life. The Consortium also took the lead in the current debate on moving from “fortress conservation” to “inclusive conservation”. This is a shift to a more real situation where communities decide whether to invite others to be involved in what they do as custodians of territories. More details are contained in the recently published Policy Brief 5 - **Wrays calls for it to be translated into Spanish.** The Consortium has been a major contributor to a definition of OECMs. In our efforts to be more efficient, inclusive and closer to our roots we have initiated a process of regionalisation.

2018 was a sorrowful year as we had to contend with the extreme sadness of the passing of our beloved leader, elder, father, friend - Taghi. He left us too early, but we must continue with our important work and recommit ourselves to moving forwards. Taghi was stable and strong and we should be the same for ICCAs.

### Consortium Members note the President's Report

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

#### Africa

**Ethiopia** – Zelealem Tefera – welcomes everyone back ‘home’ to Ethiopia. Lots of interest in ICCAs. Would like to develop a body which would be responsible for ICCAs and advocating for their recognition and protection. Three ICCAs have been officially recognised in Ethiopia.

**Kenya** – Elias Kimaru – there is a requirement for public participation in decisions which provides an avenue for IPLC to protect their rights. We see instances where IP have challenged infringements of their rights. Groups are submitting proposals for funding to protect their territories. Exciting year and looking forward as we have some new resources.

**Tanzania** – Makko Sinandei. Many pastoral communities in Tanzania. Policies in country are complex. Village Land Law is an opportunity to secure territories, but wildlife law and land laws contradict one another. Ministry claimed our land (Loliondo) which resulted in eviction of local community. We map our areas to formalise recognition. We seek legal protection through Certificate of Customary Right of Occupancy (CCRO). Government is amending land policy, so we are monitoring to see the effects of this.

**Tanzania** – Sarah Alakara –our laws enable the government to take our land because they give too much power to the President and ministers. Lack of understanding of the bond between communities and territory.

**Zambia** – Hammer Simwinga – identifying and mapping territories and mobilising communities in Zambia.

**Zambia** – Robert Chimambo – HM, SGP chose CBNRM as catalytic organisation. Zambia Natural Resource Forum (ZNRF) is housed in WWF. ICCAs programme started 2 years ago. Wanted to do scoping, focussed on high potential western and north western area. Potential ICCAs have been identified there. ZNRF is trying to create network of identified ICCAs and support capacity building of communities. Many threats from open cast mining which is leading to massive deforestation. We need to identify and protect these ICCAs before they disappear.

**DRC** – Dominique Bikaba – Strong Roots Congo, support IPLC to defend their territories. This is the territory of gorillas – government have imposed National Parks and also given mining concessions. Work with community to protect their territories for them and the great apes.

**DRC** – Joseph Itongwa – working to reinforce territories to protect the rights and identity of IPs. Have identified 8 ICCAs. Are building a network of ICCAs. DRC is in a period of land reform. Important report on biodiversity in DRC, minister invited us to include ICCAs in the report. We were invited to international conference in DRC to explain ICCAs and managed to convince the delegates of the importance of ICCAs. Sub-regional forums are good method to promote and advise on ICCAs. Next year it will be in Nairobi.

**Central African Republic** – Martial Betoulet – ICCA processes are just starting in CAR. My association works to promote and valorise traditional knowledge and culture. Work to stop illegal fishing that doesn't respect traditional rules.

**Cameroon** – Samuel Nnah Ndobe – personal knowledge, no formally recognised ICCAs in Cameroon but lots of aligned initiatives – governance systems of communities in management of their landscapes. Hope to return home and be able to identify ICCAs.

**Guinea** – Cécé Noel Kpoghomou – there has always been conservation by communities. Problems come from the richness of the country in terms of mineral deposits, as there are about 40 countries doing open-cast mining in Guinea. Around 40 ICCAs identified in Guinea. Working to support them to obtain recognition.

**Guinea** – Mamadou Diawara – have advanced somewhat in recognition of ICCAs. Currently revising the environmental codes, working to get ICCAs and community conservation included in this. Were approached by state to help them to integrate the contribution of communities to achievement of Aichi targets. Next step: creation of national network. Dangers are very present. In mining, for instance, compensation does not take account of the community's right to their land.

**Senegal** – Salatou Sambou – KABEKA, APCRM and Consortium Coordinator in Senegal -- trying to develop an ICCA network in Senegal. High concentration of communities who conserve. Communities are becoming more aware of their rights. Many problems because of lack of recognition of community contribution, but we have identified 18 ICCAs in Senegal which gives us strength. In January will organise a workshop with representatives from Consortium, Kabeka, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Fishery – to look for solutions and create a law to protect ICCAs. We are advancing slowly with the network to be sure that we do not make mistakes. Looking to create zonal networks and national network. Will work with local focal points. Looking for funding support for this work. Did exchange with Gambia to share knowledge and experience. The new forestry code could have an impact and get ICCAs taken into account.

**Senegal** – Florent Bassene – KABEKA documenting work is continuing to build a rich database of information on traditional and cultural knowledge.

**Benin** – Barbara Lassen – many organisations active on ICCAs and three Members of Consortium in Benin; GRABE is GSI catalytic organisation. Training traditional ICCA guardians to protect sacred forests.

**Burkina Faso** – Alexis Kaboré – important advances have happened for the national ICCA network. Have adopted an action plan to reinforce communities and given them tools to defend their territory. Found many ICCA—territories of life; working to support training for self-strengthening process. Next year want to strengthen the national organisation so they can offer more legal support and support at grassroots level.

**Madagascar** – Henri Rakotoson – Tafo Mihaavo – Treasurer.

**Madagascar** – Mihanta Bakoliarimisa – Technical Secretary – 530 LCs who govern their territories are united in Tafo Mihaavo. Work to reinforce rights and capacity of communities to advocate for protection against mining, “economic development”, bad fishing agreements... Have 14 emblematic ICCAs. Doing self-strengthening, held workshop this year with Christian Chatelain.

**East Africa, Madagascar and Indonesia** - Rupert Quinlan – Blue Ventures – community based marine conservation. Partner in Madagascar with MIHARI. Government recognises MIHARI and is drafting legislation to support their work. Blue Ventures want to extend this success to other countries in East Africa and Indonesia.

**Uganda** – Elaine Hsaio – no official ICCA Members but community wildlife area in the north that is working to strengthen their governance system. There is more wildlife in the community area than in the national park, so the park is supporting this strengthening. Tourism is picking up as well, resulting in more “development” in the region.

### South-east Asia

**Indonesia** – Cristina Eghenter – Working Group on ICCAs in Indonesia (WGII) – 10 organisations led by one of them dedicated to the mapping and registration of indigenous territories. Hosted the recent Regional Assembly. Have 10 million hectares of IP territories that have been mapped but less than 10% verified. Working group focussing on Borneo to claim recognition of customary forests. Governance assessment with support of IUCN of one national park – aim is to force government to recognise ICCAs within PA – and government IS starting to do so.

**Philippines** – Giovanni Reyes – mapped 118,000 hectares of ICCAs in recent months. Law passed on IPs to do resource inventory to establish state of the environment. Work with GEF advisory group on IPs.

**Philippines** – Tanya Conlu – Regional Assembly held in August with participation of seven countries.

**Taiwan** – Sutej Hugu - in response to formal apology to IPs by President in 2016 and transitional justice commission, IP movement organisations claim invaded territories as community territories. We lived there before there was any empire or kingdom. Treaties exist between ICCAs. TICTU is promoting this in order to obtain the right to self-determination, this gives you sovereignty. Taiwan is under pressure from China, so we are happy to collaborate with SE Asia and West Austronesia region.

**Burma** – Paul Sein Twa – Continue to map and strengthen IP territories and governance regardless of government recognition. Vacant Fallow Land Law is an attempt to criminalise communities that occupy a territory without having registered it under this law. Engaging with Ridge to Reef project on expansion of PAs which overlap with IP territories.

**India** – Neema Pathak Broome – in past two years had a lot of eviction of people, even those who have been protecting their areas, in response to mining and development in the region. Finally recognising that this was unjust so there is a national alliance of organisations working on implementation of law on recognition of LC rights. Many communities are resisting with FPIC demands, many communities are federating to assert rights – want to rethink economy, wellbeing, everything. This is a threat to the government who have reacted with atrocities and implementation of draconian laws that imprison activists.

**India** – Abhay Sagar Minz – new to ICCAs – have to conserve activists before we can conserve ICCAs.

**India** – Aman Singh – supreme court passed order on sacred groves (Orans), all deemed to be forests so they will somehow be protected, but this limits the rights to access for communities. Challenge to geo map Orans.

**Iran** – Ghanimat Azhdari – working at different levels with communities and government. Rangelands – trying to include ICCAs in national strategy on this. Peace park in Turkmenistan region. Agricultural project to empower LCs by informing them on laws, now know more than government officials do on laws. Mapped ICCAs in 8 pilot areas. Finding it hard to work without the charisma of Taghi. Had regionalisation meeting in Bishkek recently.

**Armenia** – Ruben Khachatryan – have undergone a velvet revolution for peace and love. Working to create migratory corridor for wildlife species. Trying to connect important conservation areas with Azerbaijan and Iran. Around 50 communities in these corridors are potential ICCAs. Also working with Global Ecovillage Network. Wife of new Prime Minister is ambassador for ICCAs and wildlife corridors. Four levels of work with communities – conservation, social, economic, cultural. Work with conservation organisations and EU funding – on organic farming and sustainable livelihoods.

## Europe

**Italy** – Marco Bassi – strong movement for commons – legally recognised under different types of law which were unified under one law last year. Law associated idea of conservation to ICCAs/communities. Workshop in December to discuss the implementation of this law and how to make it work.

**France** – Emma Courtine – IUCN French committee asked for comments for their report on Aichi targets in France.

**Circumpolar north region** – accepted as new region in ICCA Consortium at the EGA in June 2018. Transregional collaboration between East Asia and polar region.

**Finland** – Antoine Scherer – Snowchange is focal point for Consortium regionalisation. Two ICCAs in Finland held meeting in September on northern fishing traditions. Collaborations with Sami and British Columbia but looking for more.

**Canada** – Colin Scott – CICADA – Indigenous Circle of Experts. In subarctic and arctic, all projects since 1970s have been the result of treaties with IPs. In south it is still fortress conservation. Trying to mobilise IPCAs using Aichi targets. Applying for large scale funding to work with IP groups towards IPCAs. In May there will be a North America regional meeting, will invite Australia and New Zealand (as they are also European settler states).

## Latin America

**Peru** – Wray's Perez Ramirez – thanks the spirits for bringing us all to Africa. We need them to go forwards with energy. The Wampis are in the north of Peru, 15,000 Wampis, 7,000 years of living in our territory. Self-proclaimed as an indigenous government with own governance system. We are not an organisation but a government. Our governance system is thousands of years old. **If we ask for government recognition it will never come, so we self-proclaimed as living on ancestral lands**, we do not seek state recognition. You have to define your own territory and claim it not with state titles but as a people with rights. Lots of threats to our territory - oil and mining. We ask the Consortium for help to resist these threats. We need to form alliances to strengthen ourselves and stand together for mother nature.

**Chile** – Lorena Arce – four years ago started working on legal project for recognition of ICCAs. Some advances have happened. Conducted study in Patagonia – biggest threat is land grabbing for conservation. Situation with IPs is that they are sometimes involved in co-management.

### **Report on implementation of new Strategy and 2018 Work Programme, Global and Regional Coordinators and International Policy Coordinator**

[See full presentation here.](#)

Grazia BF -- This is the year of farewell to Taghi and also the year that a number of conceptual issues came to the fore: ICCAs as OECMs; working toward regionalisation; developing our own policies; and developing a financial future.

With Taghi, we lost the inspiration and the soul of the Consortium, but we must continue without him. He was never motivated by hate but always by love and I hope that this is what the Consortium will always be.

Grazia introduces the Consortium and its work. It is an organisation with the mission to promote the appropriate recognition of territories of life and appropriate support to them. It has an innovative work style and works at the:

- 1. local level** - to promote self-strengthening and the capacity of the community to truly maintain their territories of life. We have a lessons-learned compendium in three languages – currently being reviewed and re-designed to help people advocate for what they want. Assisting Members, partners and GSI catalytic organisations.
  - Examples given from emblematic ICCAs in Colombia where declaration as an ICCA has helped communities protect themselves from threats from outside.
  - In Senegal, radio programmes explain about ICCAs in a marine context and allow an on-air interaction between the public and fishermen from ICCAs.
- 2. national level** – aims at developing a ‘critical mass’ for solidarity and effective advocacy in support of ICCAs.

- Promotion and support to national ICCA networks.
- Advocacy for appropriate ICCA recognition and support.
- Reports on legal options to recognise ICCAs need to be communicated to help national networks with their work.
- National network workshops were supported in 2018 in Tanzania, Peru, Columbia, Iran Burkina Faso.
- Peru national workshop - indigenous peoples from all over the country came together to exchange their experiences and ended up writing a powerful declaration. They are committed to mapping their territories & networking among themselves and want the right to govern their *integral* territories, from the sky to the centre of the earth.
- Alert in Myanmar in opposition to the Ridge to Reef project (a multi-million-dollar project that is to bring protected areas into the south of Burma/Myanmar, Ridge to Reef projects are common to many countries). Project was approved without following an ethical process with IPs. The IPs filed a complaint and are now in negotiations with UNDP. Not against conservation, but want the project re-designed from below to integrate ICCAs. The design of the protest and the alert came about when Members came together at an international Consortium meeting and shared information.

**3. regional level** – aims to share inspiring experiences, provide mutual support and joint capacity building.

- Regional events and exchange visits. Four Regional Assemblies were organised in SE Asia, Latin America, Africa and in Central & West Asia – aimed to pool ideas, build capacities and share inspirational stories.

**4. international level** – aims at enhanced international recognition of the ICCA multiple values and contribution to conservation.

- Being present at international meetings where policy is being shaped
  - CBD OECM workshop in February
  - UNFPII in April
  - CBD SBSTTA in July
  - ILC Congress in September
  - SSF Congress in October
  - CBD COP 14 in November
- Putting effort into expanding beyond IUCN and CBD (where ICCAs are already known).
- Language in SBSTTA recommendation 22/5 (Annex 3, h) protected areas and OECMs. Recognition of OECMs should be supported by measures to enhance the governance capacity for their legitimate authorities and secure their positive and sustained outcomes.
- Paper on OECMs and ICCAs published in Parks Journal.

- Project to provide advice to WWF International about inclusive conservation – gathered IPs & LCs for EMRIP and SBSTTA and held numerous discussions.
- Publication of “*Whose ‘Inclusive Conservation’?*” which will be launched at CBD COP 14.

**ICCAs - Territories of life** – 2018 is the year that we recognised the push that came from Latin America to call these areas “territories of life” and “autonomous territories of life”. If we are to live as a community, we need a secure territory of life.

**Governance Vitality** – decision making actors and institutions should be functional, responsive and thriving, meeting their role and responsibilities in timely and appropriate ways.

- Empowerment is not just about authority but also integration and connectivity, adaptability, wisdom, innovation and creativity.
- Trying to create a primer on governance vitality and a paper for an academic journal.

**New work relationships, collaborations and partnerships** are unfolding with:

- National Geographic
- WWF International – providing advice for ‘inclusive conservation’. Relationships vary widely between countries.
- CICADA – this is the second major meeting that we have organised together, and we are looking forward to more events together. Crucial to have a good relationship with CICADA, because they are a Member who is actively supporting other Members. Our themes overlap so much, even though our functions are different.
- CBD Secretariat and others - toward reaching Aichi Target 11 by 2020. CBD want the Consortium to help identify ICCAs and work with governments to make sure those ICCAs are included in the National Reports for 2020. This may be good for the Parties, but is it good for the custodians of the ICCAs? Consortium has agreed to be part of the partnership, but the Members will decide on a country by country basis and are not at all “requested”, let alone obliged, to be involved. **ICCAs should be recognised as OECMs, and count towards Aichi targets**, but only with FPIC and respect for the IPLCs, and **with a counterpart of enhanced security for the conserved area or territories according to what the relevant IPLCs ask for**. CBD Partnership does not yet know what this will look like, they have asked for funding and if they get it, they will contact ICCA Consortium Members in any country that is being considered for the partnership.

**Support received in 2018** – GSI, TCF, Swedbio, Tikva and a donor that prefers to remain anonymous.

**Strategic approach of the ICCA Consortium** –

- Supporting local, national and transnational action
- Influencing global policy, law and discourse



- Building communication bridges and support materials
- Supporting the growth of the organisation
  - Governance of the Consortium – 19 members of Council with 4 sub-committees
  - Management/Secretariat – 23 people in 19 countries, working in 3 languages as volunteers or semi-volunteers
  - Regional decentralisation – full report on day 2 of GA
  - Communications – full report later in the GA
  - Donor relations and fundraising – this year we raised only around US\$ 120,000, from several small donors which was very labour intensive. We have several proposals waiting to unfold in 2019.

Discussion following report: -

**Kim Wright** - working to see how small-scale fisheries guidance can overlap with our work on marine ICCAs. Lucky to find funding for 15 people to travel to Thailand. Many synergistic conversations and will evolve further at international level.

**Joseph Itongwa** - a comment on CBD Secretariat partnership – the Congolese government should collaborate with communities and ICCAs in Lomami National Park. ICCAs should demand recognition by demonstrating their contribution to conservation through mapping and documentation. **Cicilia Githaiga** – issue is with the extent of the partnership with the CBD. What advice would you give for capacity building prior to speaking with CBD? **Holly Jonas** - we take the lead on territories of life issues but not all CBD themes. Please provide us with suggestions on what the Consortium can do to help understanding.

**Robert Chimambo** – this is a fantastic amount of work for a small team. We must always know where we are getting our funding from. Relationships with large international organisations need to be discussed.

**Lorena Arce** – the territories of life concept and expression still needs to be discussed.

**Makko Sinandei** – how do we see international conservation groups in terms of ‘inclusive conservation’?

**Grazia**: There is a good example of inclusive conservation where community organisations and actors decided what was needed with the backup and support of WWF. This took place in Indonesia with WGII.

**Nancy Chege** – there are positive and negative aspects with inclusive conservation, some large ICCAs can end up awash with money which is detrimental for the community and the thriving and future of the ICCA.

**Consortium Members note the Programme report**

**Communications report: strategy adopted so far, assessment, perspectives, new tools and desired results, Programme and Communications Officer**

[See full presentation here.](#)

Emma Courtine -- Many people have played a role in the Communications team: Emma Courtine; Susan Crosby (English editing); Carolina Amaya (Spanish translator); Océane Biabiany (French translator); Tiphaine Delmas (IT Specialist); and Déborah David (who has now left the Consortium).

**Accomplishments –**

- **Newsflash** – sent out monthly with reports from around the world. Needs input of high-quality stories and comments.
- Social Media – also increasing substantially.
- Website - **new emblematic ICCA cases are being added** (with map, details of governance structure, specifics of the place and photos).
- **Webinars** – conducted in English, Spanish and French on five different topics, with over 100 participants.
- A Privacy Policy for the ICCA Consortium – required under European law and written in three languages.
- Videos on ICCAs – in collaboration with LifeMosaic – a short video to capture the spirit of ICCAs and a longer one that looks at ICCAs in more depth. Based on filming and interviews with Members.
- Internal Communications - monthly Secretariat meetings, regionalisation and membership strengthening using an online membership platform.
- Deck for fundraising – in development.

**The General Assembly considers the following questions and makes the following suggestions:**

- Do you receive the information you want?
  - Would like **more interactive social media.**
  - Difficulty accessing information if it is through links for those with patchy internet connections.
  - Would like **a Consortium App to receive information more quickly.**
  - Would like **more information in languages other than English.**
- Do you communicate what you want to communicate?
  - Need to **communicate more about emblematic ICCAs, that are sources of inspiration.**
- Are you overwhelmed by the mailing lists?
  - It is difficult if you get 100s of emails a day.
  - Can use search functions to find an email on a specific topic.

- Should work more with social media rather than email as it is quicker and easier. **Email should be kept for really important information.**
- Topic specific or thematic e-mail lists maybe a good idea.
- There is a challenge with providing information in 3 languages.
- The emails are good but how can we control all the replies?
- Good information in the subject line make it easier to sort emails.
- one list with only official information like announcements of GA (that one cannot reply to), and then another mailing list which is more informal that promotes discussion.
- **Decision to have two lists:**
  - one from international Secretariat and Council, to be a no-reply list for announcements, in three languages, through Mail Chimp
  - one to act as a discussion forum, where people can reply and hold discussions
- How will regionalisation be supported by communication?
  - The regionalisation of **mailing lists would have to be in the relevant language for the region.**
  - Be careful that the regionalisation of the sharing of information doesn't fragment the Consortium. Should also keep the global Consortium as one unity.
  - Will information have to be passed through the central Secretariat before being posted in a region? Hopefully no!

### **Membership Report and key issues for the Membership Committee, Chair of Membership Committee**

[See full presentation here.](#)

Membership committee: Aili Pyhälä, Dominique Bikaba; Ghanimat Azhdari; Vivienne Solis; and Emma Courtine.

Aili Pyhälä -- A new Membership Policy was adopted last year, including requirement to complete an application form. There were also changes to the amount of the membership fees and the introduction of the possibility of paying with an in-kind contribution. **Will draw up clearer guidelines to help Regional Coordinators.** There are 140 Members, who all have the right to vote, and 308 Honorary members. From the comprehensive statistics shown on the composition of Honorary membership, the proportion of people who identify as IP is very low. Would like to build a better database of information on HM. There is contact with Members on an annual basis for membership fees, but this does not happen for HM. HM should be asked if they want to retain membership if they are no longer involved with ICCAs. Members who do not pay their fees have their membership terminated.

Discussion:

- Should prioritise the quality of the Consortium rather than just the number of Members and HM.
- Should not allow the Consortium to be burdened with many inactive Members and HM.
- Basic principles and guidelines of what is expected of Members and HM should be clearly laid out – ...although please check, as this is already in the Statutes and Operational Guidelines.
- Would be good to have a **list of the fields of interest/expertise of HM and Members to help collaborative work.**
- Should clearly **focus on attracting more IPs and a better gender balance as HM.**
- This presentation should be translated into other languages and made available at country level to advise the Members there.
- **Need to remember that all Members are not the same, some are federations or large groupings of organisations. This may affect the statistics. In East Asia there are federations that are Members (TICTU has 800 communities but is only one Member).**
- Need to be clear to potential new Members that the Consortium doesn't offer an access to funding.
- When potential HM are nominated, they should be asked whether they have a positive history with ICCAs, what have they worked on, what have they achieved? **Need to review the 'checklist' for being nominated as HM.**
- Should never accept Members who are involved in extractive industries.

### **Consortium Members note the Membership Report**

#### **Final Treasurer's Report for 2017, Preliminary Treasurer's Report for 2018 and Report of the Auditor of the Accounts, Programme Manager**

[See full video presentation here](#)

Accounting team: Anne Meier (Accountant); Vololona Rasoarimanana (Treasurer); Stan Stevens (Auditor of the Accounts); and Sarah Ryder (Programme Manager).

The Treasurer is unable to be present at the General Assembly, so sent her report in as a video message which was played.

The 2017 Accounts are approved and final and cover the period from 1 January 2017 to 31 December 2017. The Interim 2018 Accounts are for information only and cover the period from 1 January 2018 to 30 June 2018.

The Consortium has two types of funding:

- Restricted-Use grants – received for a specific purpose and have to be used only for agreed expenses as per the grant budget
- Unrestricted-Use grants – not received as part of a specific grant and can be spent in line with the Statutes and Operational Guidelines of the Consortium

The Consortium has 6 bank accounts (the major grants are held in separate, dedicated accounts):

- GSI grant in US\$
- The Christensen Fund grant in US\$
- Grand Houroum grant in US\$
- Consortium core funds in US\$
- Consortium core funds in CHF
- Consortium core funds in Euro

The **positive Report of the Auditor of Accounts is read**. Stan Stevens will step down from this role at the GA 2019. His replacement should be a representative of the Members of the Consortium who is trusted to audit the accounts.

**Consortium Members approve the Treasurer's Report for 2017 and preliminary Treasurer's Report for 2018**

**Consortium Members note the Report of the Auditor of the Accounts**

#### **Fundraising activity 2018 report, Programme Manager**

##### **Ongoing funding**

- SwedBio – for producing videos on ICCAs, continues to early months of 2019
- The Christensen Fund – this grant ends at the end of June 2019
- GEF SGP Global Support Initiative for ICCAs – this grant was extended and will end at the end of 2019

##### **New Proposals 2018**

- Anonymous Foundation successful proposal to cover some costs of GA in Africa and some core costs for 2019
- Tikva Grassroots Empowerment Fund of Tides Foundation successful proposals for ongoing small projects
- WWF International Inclusive Conservation successful proposal – to provide advice on the People Protecting Landscapes High Impact Initiative
- SwedBio marine proposal - unsuccessful
- Conservation as Reconciliation proposal submitted – in partnership with University of Guelph, Canada

- Oak Foundation marine proposal submitted - large proposal involving many Members, for SSF/livelihoods and biodiversity
- One Ocean Hub marine proposal submitted - Large proposal in partnership with University of Strathclyde
- Environmental Defenders Collaborative invitation to submit a proposal for a first grant
- CBD Secretariat Partnerships – for reaching Aichi targets 2020. Unsure of full details but it will not come without funds
- Joint CICADA/Consortium seed funding proposal to Helsinki University for sustainable livelihoods – new proposal

### **Future possibilities**

- GSI Phase II – with partners and Members. At discussion stage, expect GEF SGP to take the lead. May include different countries from Phase I.
- Large scale funding around inclusive conservation – e.g. WWF International, GEF. To involve Members on a country-by-country basis.
- Nia Tero - a few private foundations working together with a few prominent IP on the Board. They are not ready to give grants yet because they are developing a strategy in consultation with IP in different countries. We are also not ready to work with them.
- International Funders for Indigenous Peoples
- Anonymous Foundation – for multi-year core funding
- The Christensen Fund, late 2019 +
- Invited to join other academic proposals
- Looking at a range of other funders for both core and programmatic costs
- IUCN joint proposal for an Africa based set of projects (Rightscapes) – application submitted in 2017

### **Discussion and Comments**

- We must team up with Members to do joint proposals, so we don't compete with one another.
- Regional Coordinators need support from Global Coordinators when they submit proposals.
- The Consortium designs its own initiatives for funding and then finds interested donors.
- Once Regional Assemblies get stronger, they will develop their own proposals
- We have put more time into fundraising this year than before, both to be able to support the Consortium core staff, and to be able to help Members find the support they need.
- Under the GSI, the Consortium has helped identify a national catalytic organisation that works with communities that are custodians of emblematic ICCAs for self-strengthening.

If the community identifies a specific need that could be satisfied with money, the national organisation helps develop a project proposal to be submitted to the GSI.

**Terence Hay-Edie** – the GSI (2014 – 2019) was supported by the German Government and worked in 26 countries at the national level. The German Government wants to see a phase II. They are aware of the Consortium but are very interested in work at the national level, so we need to position the Consortium in a compelling way. GEF also supports ICCAs. GEF 7 starts in July 2019, so between now and then all the countries are updating their strategies. We need to think if we should partner with one or more agency that works with the GEF for inclusive conservation – e.g. WWF and/or UNDP. **Will discuss this more in the Partners Round Table Meeting on 14 November 2018.**

### Relations with new collaborators and partners, International Policy Advisor

[See full presentation here.](#)

Holly Jonas—Our partners include:

- **CICADA**
- **International Land Coalition**
- **Defending the Defenders Coalition** – informal group of organisations working around environmental rights (Global Witness, Human Rights Watch, etc.).
- **Environmental Law Alliance Worldwide** – aiming to build a team of organisations working in law and legal support. No process yet established for Members to contact them.
- **IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme** – GPAP has fully embraced a programme of work that involves governance at its heart. Frame of reference is governance, equity, rights and livelihoods and ICCAs are one form of this. Jenny Kelleher leads this component of the programme. Systematically trying to address these three components in everything we do. Responsible for tracking all resolutions that come from IUCN congresses – most of them concern governance, rights including in relation to IPLC conserved territories. OECMs – working as a taskforce on this in GPAP. Will work with whoever we can to maintain the good parts that we have constructed. We should be shining a light on initiatives that are good and effective and using this to illustrate examples from around the world. Should also look at threats. One of the best forms of defence is to promote how good something is. There should be nothing on Green List that does not meet high standards.
- **WWF International** – we are providing advice for ‘inclusive conservation’.
- **Partnership with CBD** – have seen many requests to partners to support Parties to achieve Aichi targets.
- **National Geographic Society** – there is a distinction between National Geographic and the Society which is a non-profit involved in grants. We are looking to develop a long-term relationship. Have encouraged some Members to apply to their grant making facility.

- **Mongabay** – first mainstream media coverage we have had with coverage of ICCAs in Senegal.
- Growing engagements with **academics and universities** – many HM are academics and they could help build an evidence base around ICCAs.
- **NAMATI** - offer support around legal issues to Consortium Members and other organisations. Information on this is communicated through email.

**Consortium Members note the fundraising report and report about new collaborators & partners**

**18:00 Interim President closes the meeting for the day**



**XIIIth General Assembly of the ICCA Consortium  
12-13 November 2018 – Bishoftu, Ethiopia  
Minutes Day Two: - Tuesday 13 November 2018**

**Welcome by the Interim President**

08:30 Meeting opened. Agenda read and adopted.

Brief review of issues covered on Day One of GA.

**The Consortium Policy on “Defending territories of life and their defenders”, video message by Chair of Policy and Programme Committee, report by International Policy Coordinator**

[Brief Video message](#) from Patricia Mupeta, Chair of Policy and Programme Committee.

For latest version of the draft Policy, [see here](#).

[See full presentation here](#)

Holly Jonas –

- Much of the planet’s remaining biological and cultural diversity exists within territories and areas governed, managed and conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities.
- However, these territories and areas are under increasing threat – particularly from industrial activities such as mining, infrastructure, and agribusiness.
- Indigenous peoples and local communities are on the frontlines of struggles to resist these threats ... they are both the first and the last lines of defence to protect and defend their territories and areas.
- There are existential threats to both ICCAs and defenders. However, there is growing global awareness thanks to UN mandates, NGOs, journalists, people like ourselves.
- There have been some advances – such as government policies on human rights defenders and a significant effort from the EU to support organisations on the ground, but much more remains to be done.
- We have a responsibility to stand up to these issues and support our Members and Honorary members.
- The Policy aims to lay the foundation for a more explicit and coherent strategy and programme of work, in collaboration with strategic partners.
- March 2016 – summary document was produced with specific objectives to protect and promote the rights of the defenders of the commons and ICCAs who are at risk and/or experience a spectrum of human rights violations.
- November 2016 – the Consortium signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Friends of the Earth International to carry out a feasibility study.

- 2017 – 2018 – decided to focus more on developing broader partnerships. Further iterations of the draft Policy.
- Latest draft Policy contains 5 operational provisions
  - Actively defend ICCAs- territories of life from harm
  - Actively support and defend the custodians and defenders of territories of life and stand in solidarity
  - Enhance the capacities of our Members
  - Highlight and demonstrate how ICCAs – territories of life embody sustainable self-determination
  - Advance global, national and local systems of rights and responsibilities.

Break out groups are formed to discuss the Proposed Action Plan:

- **Securing and monitoring compliance** with existing rights in specific situations of threats to ICCAs – territories of life and their defenders;
- **Advancing global systems of rights, responsibilities and mechanisms** to support territories of life and their defenders at risk: promoting reform and advancement of legal and institutional frameworks;
- **Building the ICCA Consortium’s institutional basis and capacities** to support territories of life and their defenders at risk.

Each group discusses:

- What are you already doing to address these issues? Who are you working with?
- What are the main needs and priorities of Members and Honorary members?
- What should be the ICCA Consortium’s role?

Colin Scott -- Shares the experiences of CICADA, which has been requested to help in situations of targeted assassinations and deaths on protest lines. The situation can be very volatile and sometimes action is needed within hours. The Consortium will develop guidance on who to call in certain situations and how to react (including for physical and social media attacks). Some Members may already be familiar with rapid response and we will need to build partnerships.

- Next Steps
  - **Update and circulate the Policy and draft action plan in English, Spanish and French**
  - **Further develop the action plan with the membership + Secretariat**
  - **Work on implementation**
  - **Review Policy ahead of the GA in 2019**

**A Working Group is established and is made up of – Holly Jonas, Rupert Quinlan, Sutej Hugu, Neema Pathak Broome, Elias Kimaru, Celia Githaiga, Cenesta, Natural Justice**

## Consortium Members approve the Policy by consensus

### Ongoing work on GSI-supported legal reviews coordinated by Natural Justice, Natural Justice delegates

[See full presentation here.](#)

Barbara Lassen and Cicilia Githaiga -- Global support initiative for ICCAs through UNDP SGP and IUCN and WCMC to support ICCAs in 26 countries around world. One work package is to conduct national legal reviews in some of the countries and draw lessons from that regarding what works for legal recognition of ICCAs.

- 2012 Reviews of Legal and non-legal recognition
  - Looked at national laws, ICCAs are not only impacted by protected area laws, but also human rights, forests, livestock, education, healthcare. Needed a full picture of how the legal frameworks impact or support ICCAs.
- The GSI legal reviews
  - Some reviews are in the same countries as were done in 2012 so they will be updated and enlarged.
  - National Justice is coordinating the reviews. Every one of the GSI programmes did a call for an application to do these reviews – organisations that will talk to stakeholders about their concerns about the laws. Looking for gaps. Stakeholder workshops to generate policy guidance.
- Content of the reviews
  - Looking for the conditions that give rights or participation rights to communities.
  - Options for non-legal recognition, or court decisions, or implementation of the laws. Give proposals for reform, and a few local level case studies on how ICCAs use laws or are impacted by them or use own customary laws.
  - Community governance of the territory of life.
- Main outputs
  - Reviews are a bit behind with timelines but will have all of them next year.
  - Where possible supporting a few countries.
  - There is a quite extensive questionnaire - and if you are a non-GSI country and want to conduct a legal review – the questionnaire can be shared if you want to conduct your own legal review.
  - Need to include local strategies, municipal-level laws and bylaws
- Questions to be addressed
  - What kind of outputs would be most useful for Members to draw from (national, regional, international)?
  - What kind of guidance/support would you need for legal recognition in your countries? – let us know, so we can think about how to provide more of that to certain countries.

## Discussion and Comments

What does non-legal recognition mean?

- could be that ICCAs are included in national databases, incorporated in biodiversity reports which recognises they are there without a legal status. Providing technical support is another way to recognise they exist and are supported without legal status.
- self-recognition and social recognition should be looked at, not just state.

There is a lack of information for people about human rights.

Blue Ventures is undertaking mapping for coastal community conservation areas in the western Indian Ocean. This will finish in six months.

The first round of legal reviews was useful. New reports should be concise if they are to be useful. Maybe make a shorter brochure that sums up the points with references to the larger document. Needs a page on international law. Currently there will be a section on gender, but there is nothing specifically about women.

This will be a future strong point for the Consortium. It is not just about what exists for recognition of ICCAs, but also the idea of ICCAs themselves. **There is a sense of the integral territory – not just the surface but from sky to below ground.** In the Philippines they have worked to create a tool that legally recognises ICCAs. All our actions have something to do with changing, amending or introducing policy. Learning existing laws so we know what can help. There is a new PA law that recognises governance of IPs. We have been able to insert in provisions that IPs are recognised, participate in the board, are represented, and that the state recognises traditional governance. Do not yet have a mechanism to resolve conflict between the board and the IPs. The same people who lobbied for governance of IPs in PA law are also lobbying for an ICCA law to complement the new PA law.

Sometimes universities, NGOs, consultants and legal teams are involved in different reviews. This is a work in progress and advice is welcome. Each country is at a different stage. Some of the teams doing the reviews do not know a lot about ICCAs, so please find out if you are in a country that is having a review, get connected with the people involved to bring awareness of ICCAs and the issues.

Natural Justice is not doing this alone. Harry Jonas is doing the Asia reviews. Lorena Arce and José Aylwin are doing the Latin America reviews.

Work in Greece is challenging, as the Greek government tried to pass a draft bill for the governance of protected areas that would impact ICCAs by making it difficult to legitimise real systems, but thankfully there is something in international law that blocked it being implemented.

## The regionalisation process for the ICCA Consortium, member of Regionalisation Committee

[See full presentation here.](#)

Lorena Arce and colleagues -- The Regionalisation Process of the Consortium so far is explained, with an outline of the Regional Assemblies that have taken place to date. Key issues to be decided in each region include:

- Regions and sub-regions
- Structure and governance
- Functions of regions
- Funding

### **West, Central Asia & Caucasus Regional Assembly Report and discussion of issues**

There are several countries in the region in situations of conflict which is bad for the territories of IPs. Iran is central to the region but there are various possible subregions based on different criteria. Due to the relatively small number of Members in the region, decided to **work on the expansion of networks and an increase in collaboration between Members and other actors**. Working on transboundary ICCAs may cause political problems. Potential partners are International Land Coalition and Global Forest Coalition. Working on concept notes and proposals to funders.

#### **Discussion:**

Pakistan overlaps Central Asia and South Asia. It should be left to Pakistan to decide which region they want to be involved with, or even remain in both regions.

If there are Members in Mongolia, CICADA would be interested as they have a doctoral student studying the area.

Cenesta is currently the Consortium Secretariat representative in the region. The organisation operates as the point of focus rather than an individual.

### **South East Asia Regional Assembly Report and discussion of issues**

Sixteen Members of the Consortium took part in the Assembly. Only Members of the Consortium have voting rights. There was much discussion of the definition of the region and whether it will include West Austronesia (either with or without Madagascar). The proposed structure incorporates the **Regional Learning Network formed in 2015** (members of this RLN will be encouraged to become Members of the Consortium where possible. There will be a **Regional Council with one seat per country**, and out of that **one woman and one man will go to the global Council**. A Regional Coordinator will be appointed and there could be other regional counterparts to the global Secretariat positions. **Each country will have a National**

**Focal Point** and many people/Member organisations are already in place for this. Would like to have **an exchange in the region on sustainable livelihoods next year.**

**Discussion:**

Legal personality is important, particularly in relation to defending the defenders. Who will assert whose rights? If the region applies for a grant, who will be legally liable? Maybe this should be decided by a General Assembly of the Consortium. Establishing separate offices in each of the regions will make the Consortium heavy and slow. **Having Member organisations as regional Secretariat means they can use their structure for this.** The Latin America region did not propose creating a structure with legal personality.

Fundraising issues. Globally the Consortium submits many proposals, will also have regional level proposals and at grassroots level. How do we avoid conflicts and destructive competition? Members at the ground level are concerned that global proposals may impose donors' obligations on them. The Consortium sits between Members and funders. An example of how things could work is if the Secretariat of the Consortium and several Members submit large proposals for funding together to minimise administrative work, funds would then be diffused to Members who are from different regions but topically connected. **In recognition of the need for a Consortium Policy on Fundraising, a group is formed to start this work - Holly Jonas, Kim Wright, Dominique Bikaba, Ruben Khachatryan, Emma Courtine.**

**Africa Regional Assembly Report and discussion of issues**

Divided the region into five subregions and will advance based on readiness in each of the regions. Also, to advance on basis of subsidiarity (when a lower level can do something, the higher level stops doing it). Each subregion will send one representative to the **Regional Council**, this structure **should be represented in global Council**. There will be a technical Secretariat for the whole of Africa which will support the coordinators (who should be paid). **National Focal Points should be Member organisations rather than individuals.**

**Discussion:**

Council representatives – have proposed one from each of the subregions but this may be too many to sit on the global Council (currently this is limited to 21 but it could be changed if deemed necessary). Could possibly **elect two of the Regional Council members to represent Africa at global Council, this could even be possible on a rotating basis.** What matters is how good the individuals are at representing the needs and views of Africa as a whole. To select members for the Regional Council, a caucus could make nominations, this way all Members have the chance to choose. **Perhaps**, there should be a **guaranteed number of women representatives.** Currently some African Members feel very disconnected from the global level

and would like this connection to be strengthened in the future. Will need to be mindful of language needs. The ultimate organ of the Consortium will remain the General Assembly.

Practical considerations – although regions can define what they want, they should be realistic about practical and logistic restrictions and not be overly optimistic. The proposed structure is very bureaucratic with many steps between the community and the global level. **Any regional plans should be flexible to avoid complicating restrictions.**

### **Latin America Regional Assembly Report and discussion of issues**

It was not hard to define the region because of similarities of language and history. Guyana and Suriname were left out and three subregions were defined – Mesoamerica, Amazonia, South Cone. At local level there will be **National Focal Points**. A Regional Council was established with five elected members. **For the Secretariat, proposed that a Member organisation takes responsibility rather than an individual.** This would be for a period of three years and then be rotated at the Regional Assembly.

**Presidency of Consortium – we propose a college of Presidents, from each of the regions. This system would be adopted after the completion of the regionalisation process.**

#### **Discussion:**

College of Presidents - may be difficult practically and operationally. One solution may be to not have a fixed President but have a rotation of presidentship within the council.

All but two Members from Latin America were present at the Regional Assembly, so decisions were truly made by the Members. The region decided to reach consensus and make proposals to the General Assembly.

Latin America has already decided on a governance structure and elected representatives, what happens if this proposal is not accepted by the General Assembly?

It is very difficult for Latin America to be properly represented in the global General Assembly – the region represents 25% of the Members of the Consortium but at this GA there are only two people from Latin America supported to be in Ethiopia. Due to the time differences, it is also impossible for Members to be present electronically.

The General Assembly has never resorted to voting on any issue in ten years. It works by **consensus because this avoids the problem that all Members are not equal (some are very small, individual organisations and others are large federations representing many organisations).**

Must be aware that when a region goes through reorganisation, it has implications for the culture of the organisation. Some proposals here are quite bureaucratic, this will limit the capacity to be flexible and react in solidarity.

### **Oceania and East Austronesian, East Asia update**

There are Members in this region, and approaches are being made. There should be a first gathering of the Oceania and East Austronesia region alongside the Species on the Move (SOTM) Conference in July 2019. A Regional Assembly for East Asia could happen in parallel with WILD 11 in China, late in 2019.

#### **Proposed regions:**

Oceania & East Austronesia Region:

- Australia
- Hawai'i (KUA)
- LMMA-International Network - Fiji, Palau, Pohnpei, Papua New Guinea)
- Solomon Islands
- Taiwan
- Rapa Nui (to be contacted)
- Marquesas islands (to be contacted)
- New Zealand (to be contacted)

Circumpolar North:

- Sami peoples
- Siberia indigenous peoples
- Peoples around the Sea of Okhotsk (Chukchi, Udege, Ainu, etc.)
- Nunavut peoples (Greenland, Canada, Alaska)

East Asia – China Region:

- China
- Inner Mongolia
- Khazak & Uighur in Xinjiang
- Tibet
- Southwest China minorities (20+ minorities) (Organisation Members, Honorary members, Working Group, Learning Network)
- Korea?
- Japan?



### **Europe Region update (Emma Courtine on behalf of Sergio Couto)**

- A regional gathering happened in 2017 in Spain and first discussed the issue of regionalisation.

### **North America Update (Colin Scott on behalf of Eli Enns)**

- A proposal is going to the SSHRC (Canadian academic funder) for an academic partnership grant with indigenous governments. It would be a joint initiative of the Indigenous Circle of Experts and the federal government to consider IPCAs for meeting Aichi Targets. North American Coordinator Eli Enns and Member Steven Nita are centrally involved.
- The Consortium will organise a Regional Meeting in May with CICADA.

### **Key considerations to be upheld in the Regionalisation Process**

- respect the complexity and diversity of ICCAs
- aim should be to make our work more efficient and connect us more
- encourage inter-regional exchange, collaboration and joint work
- definition of regions should be porous and overlapping should be allowed
- regional structures should be defined by each region with clear ways to communicate, both internally and with global structure
- keep up a dynamic process that depends on the active input of Members

### **Proposals from the Regionalisation Committee to the GA**

- support regions with ongoing regionalisation process
- support regions that want to start process
- approve proposed structure and governance
- Presidency of the ICCA Consortium – one President or a collegiate of presidents from the regions?
- fundraising at global, regional and national levels
- Consortium legal frame is currently based in Switzerland, may have to be adjusted. Need to decide on a regional legal frame.

### **Outstanding issues for consideration by the regions and for feedback at the next GA:**

- College of Presidents instead of one person
  - Is this possible in an Association registered in Switzerland?
  - Do the Statutes allow for this?
  - Could there be a collegial presidency but with leadership rotating on an individual basis?
  - Recommendation of GA was to wait until the regionalisation process is much further advanced before considering this possibility.

- Individual or Member organisations to act as Secretariat in a Region
  - Need to consider the influence on the Consortium of being associated with a Member organisation – could be positive or negative.
  - May be better for Secretariat representative to be chosen by the Members rather than by the global level as now.
  - Recommendation of GA is that it should be a Member organisation but we cannot foresee all possible problems with this so it should be at the discretion of the region.
- Representation and decision making
  - What is quorum when we speak of consensus-based decision making? Currently it is 3 Members for the GA in order to be as flexible as possible. There is also the provision for electronic meetings. The definition of quorum needs to be agreed by the region.
  - Members are the decision makers in the ICCA Consortium– role is clearly articulated in the operational guidelines for the Consortium.
  - Recommendation of GA is that each region needs to articulate for themselves whether Honorary members contribute to the quorum in their region.
- Representation of regions on Global ICCA Consortium Council
  - The number of representatives can evolve as regions evolve.
  - Many regions are still evolving their boundaries, some regions have not yet started the regionalisation process.
  - There is a maximum number of representatives that can be on the Council whilst still functioning.
  - The regions should define what representative means but should choose their Council members based on legitimacy – cultural distribution, gender representation, linguistic groups, hunters/pastoralists/agriculturalists, indigenous or community members.
  - Regions should decide whether their representatives in the Council can be Honorary members or must represent an actual Member organisation.
  - Regions should consider thematic concerns.
- Countries will all choose for themselves which region they wish to be a part of based on their own considerations.

**Proposal of next steps:**

- 1. Draft a fundraising policy**
  - 2. Regionalisation Committee continues to encourage regions to select representatives for global Council and prepares a document of guidance to be sent to regions**
- Consortium Members approve the next steps in the regionalisation process**

**The Consortium Policy on Gender, Programme and Communications Assistant**

[See full presentation here.](#)

Emma Courtine -- Concerns all people – all genders. E.g. Mapuche recognise 5 genders. Do not seek to impose this on Members (repeated this several times during the presentation - have to start from the base, from each community, to know how they want to work on this). Want to raise awareness, do not want to impose anything on Members.

Additional comments to the presentation:

Implementation at the programme level:

1. identification of good practices has already started with a webpage of experiences and examples from within the Consortium
2. Annual action plans – the gender dimension should be incorporated at the discussion stage.

Implementation at Consortium level:

1. Gender security keeper to be a point of contact for people affected by gender security related issues.

### **Discussion**

**Mamadou Diawara** – thank you this is a good policy, but I have a concern about promoting this in ICCAs. This will not work in all communities as there can be discrimination. There are certain ICCAs where women or men can be excluded from the decision-making process. How will the Consortium implement this policy at the ICCA level? **Emma Courtine** – we have discussed this many times and it is clear that we will definitely take into account what happens at the local level. The policy makes this very clear. Nothing needs to be imposed on communities.

**Makko Sinandei** – gender component is so important. ICCAs have to take account of the gender component, even at the local level. Men may have challenges in a lot of communities, but we need to explain what there is to gain by all people coming together and working together.

**Elias Kimaru** – there are some traditional cultural systems that define who does what, often based on gender.

**Sarah Alakara** – good to have a Gender Policy. Have to be careful.

**Dominique Bikaba** – We are Members of the Consortium because we know that this is one organisation where we can work together to protect our cultures. Happy that this policy is implemented in the Consortium itself, but it cannot be implemented in ICCAs, as many communities have their traditional, culture-based practices. Do we have to ask communities to sign this policy before they can join the Consortium?

**Alexis Kaboré** – this is a positive thing, but I would encourage it to be extended to include other groups – migrants, youth, older people... who also experience difficulties.

**Neema Pathak Broome** – it is good to acknowledge that there are injustices and we have to start working towards finding solutions. There are voices coming up from communities that should be heard and included in the work of the Consortium. This is not about requiring people to sign things. It is about recognising that there are injustices and we need to work towards resolving them.

**Emma Courtine** – we are working towards the dignity of everyone in the community.

**Sarah Alakara** – may also need to see what the context is and what the situation is, if women are not being included, we need to consider this.

**Salatou Sambou** – in Senegal we have chosen to work with ICCAs that take into account both men and women. The question of gender should be central but there are ICCAs where this is not the case.

**Cécé Noel Kpoghomou** – ICCAs are a form of voluntary conservation. There are areas where women are not allowed to go but there are places where men are not allowed to go.

**Barbara Lassen** – there is a confusion here. We are not aiming to change traditional practices we are trying to eliminate suffering. It is possible to have different practices for men and women that are acceptable, it is a question of whether one gender is being excluded from benefits.

**Florent Bassene** – it is complicated, in some communities you cannot gather men and women together. We are here to conserve ways of life not impose things. It does not seem that there is a balance here. We need to have these discussions.

**Terence Hay-Edie** – in general this is a good policy. In the UN there are different conventions on the rights of indigenous people, the elimination of discrimination against women and one on cultural rights, --- there is a balance between these different conventions and sometimes a contradiction, Consortium policy is a mix of all these, with, perhaps, cultural rights being most important.

**Dave de Vera** – from all the discussions, it seems clear that there is still a lot of work to be done on this Policy. We do not seem to be in a position to approve the Policy as it stands.

**Robert Chimambo** – do not understand – is the question whether we are ready to accept this within the Consortium or also on the ground? People are sensitive to this sort of thing being imposed from outside. We need to be very careful.

**Neema Pathak Broome** – do we accept any of this policy or are we completely against the policy?

**Dave de Vera** - are we against a Gender Policy per se or just this policy as it has been presented?

**Robert Chimambo** – there is a lot of language here which can mean many things. I suggest we take the Policy back to our countries and discuss it there.

**Grazia** – proposal – approve Gender Policy for Consortium when it meets and works together. In this way we can test it out before presenting it to communities. So, we approve it for within the Consortium but not at a programmatic level.

**Emma Courtine** – would like to know who the Members are who are opposing the policy and what are the specific points they object to.

**Dominique Bikaba** – not opposed to the policy, we are saying it can be implemented in the Consortium itself for when we meet, but it is too difficult to implement this with the Members because they have their own traditions and culture. The Consortium is made up of Members with their own cultures and traditions. Within the Consortium we really need the policy to guide us and help us to work together.

**Emma Courtine** – implementation at local level – where are the problems? Where do you see that ICCAs are threatened? Looked again at the slide on Implementation at the Program Level – maybe the issue is the annual action plans incorporating gender dimensions?

**Dave de Vera** - lets limit our discussion to the slide on implementation at Program level as this seems to be where the problems lie.

**Colin Scott** – this is a classic problem without a quick resolution– mirrors what happened in Canada, indigenous rights and gender equality were both entrenched in the Constitution, under the banner of indigenous rights there were certain things that were expected of the general population but weren't expected of the indigenous population. In practice the first nations generated their own Constitutions and Codes of Human Rights and there was **little difference between what evolved and what was already there. However, it has to come from the ground up.** The only solution here is to have the regions reflect on these principles and translate them into something that works for them.

**Cicilia Githaiga** – at organisational level this should be accepted but if we try to implement it with ICCAs, we may cause huge problems as it runs counter to some of their cultures. We should not agree on implementation. Is it possible to have the document without the implementation at program level?

**Dave de Vera** – can we agree that the Policy should be implemented at Consortium (organisational) level? **Proposed by TICTU, seconded by BUKLURAN.**

**Dave de Vera** – have heard the suggestion that at the programme level we should refer this to the regions to help define what is a more appropriate programme-level Gender Policy, is that something we can agree on?

**Robert Chimambo** – I am very worried, are people trying to push this down our throats? We have been very clear, you are trying to get around it and it makes me worried. Do not accept that we split the Policy up and decide which bits we accept and which bits we don't. Let's take this to the people themselves.

**Dave de Vera** – we have to resolve this now. Is there an opposition to accepting this at the organisation level?

**Makko Sinandei** – the issue is we are trying to set policy that overlaps with initiatives on the ground.

**Paul Sein Twa** – South East Asia region has already approved this in their Regional Assembly at both organisational and programme level.

**Wrays Perez** – the Gender Policy has also been approved in the Latin America Regional Assembly. This is not written in stone, we approved it, but we can always improve it and it does not say that it has to be imposed on ICCAs.

**Dominique Bikaba** – what Colin suggested is good, we should ask the regions to advise and see what they have to say.

**Emma Courtine** – as a member of the group that drew up this Policy, I would like to underline that there is a trial period of 18 months so there can be discussions and review back and forth. South-east Asia and Latin America have agreed on the Policy. The African Regional Assembly did not agree on the Policy. We could ask if specific organisations are against the Policy.

**Dave de Vera** - calls for someone to make a motion.

**Terence Hay-Edie** – this process started because we were requested by SwedBio, do we know what their reaction would be if we don't approve a Policy?

**Dominique Bikaba** – we have to move, we need a Gender Policy. Donors have their own way of doing things. There is a reason why international conventions are not implemented in our countries, it is that our governments want to avoid discussions and diplomatic clashes, so they sign policies that they do not agree with and then they do not implement them. I propose that we approve the Gender Policy but under reserve that Regional Assemblies will provide input. All countries have Gender Policies that are being implemented, based on their culture. Can we look for ways to harmonise this with our local cultures.

**Elias Kimaru** – have to move forward, as an organisation we must have a Policy. Some regions have already approved it.

**Proposed by TICTU, seconded by Bukluran and Strong Roots**

**1. Consortium policy on gender is approved at Consortium level**

**2. Regions to help define a more appropriate implementation policy**

**Consortium Members approve the Proposal by consensus**

## Proposed outline of 2019 Work Programme and Budget, Global and Regional Coordinators and International Policy Coordinator

Grazia BF -- [See full presentation here.](#)

**CBD decision xiii.2.sec 7** – the Consortium was invited to develop guidelines, including in the case of overlap, to identify and recognise ICCAs and their potential contribution to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. **Trevor Sandwith** – this invitation is already from 2 years ago, we should be aiming beyond Aichi and 2020. **Holly Jonas** – brief guidance by mid-2019 would only become a decision at 2020 COP. However, it would still be relevant as implementations will continue beyond 2020.

### **Continue or initiate work relations, collaborations and partnerships:**

- CICADA
- International Land Coalition
- Defending the Defenders Coalition
- Environmental Law Alliance Worldwide
- IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme
- WWF International
- CBD Secretariat
- National Geographic Society
- Mongabay
- Other journalists and media platforms
- Academics and Universities

Further suggestions were made:

- Latin America Congress on Protected Areas in 2019.
- African Parks Congress in November 2019.
- LandMark is interested in developing a partnership with the Consortium.
- World Conservation Congress in France 2020.
- **Need to stress the issue of livelihoods more.**
- Can we work on the **disintegrating culture of indigenous youth**? Maybe we could call for action. Should look to build links with others such as UNESCO. Intergenerational transmission is very important.
- Reinforce partnerships with the UN for the defence of ICCA territories.
- Suggestion by Grazia to approve **a working group to look into ICCAs and cultural vitality, as a possible new theme.** Motion is proposed by Kalpavriksh, seconded by TICTU. Consortium Members approve the Proposal by consensus.

**Consortium governance, regionalisation, human resources, communications, fundraising...**

**Grazia explains that she will step down at the GA of 2019 and her role will be split into: Secretary of the Consortium Council (a voluntary, governance role); Global Coordinator (a paid, Secretariat role).**

Further discussions:

- Three-year gap between GAs suggested because the Council term is three years.
- In Philippines, there are local leaders who speak on local radio. In Senegal too, radio is very important with many people understanding ICCAs, or realising that they have an ICCA, thanks to radio.
- Can we include **a member in the Council to be responsible for fundraising?**

**Budgetary considerations:**

- In 2018, a large proportion was for travel – GA, SBSTTA, UNPFII – this was mostly funded by specific grants. We worked with people in 21 countries for US\$322,000.
- In 2019, the proposed budget is slightly increased. We are trying to increase the level of compensation for the Secretariat. Funding for National Focal Points is not included at global level so should be foreseen in regional initiatives.

Further suggestions:

- May need a larger budget for communication.
- There will be some funds globally that contribute to the regionalisation process, but funding must also be found at regional level.
- As a partner, the Consortium has a unique heritage and experience in the world. Should reach out for different levels of support with varying partners. Maybe advisable to change the language from ‘fundraising’ to ‘developing strategic lines to resource directions to follow’.

**Motion to approve the 2019 Work Programme and Budget proposed by Bukluran, seconded by Strong Roots. Consortium Members approve the Proposal by consensus**

**Report from ExCo about the evolving governance of the Consortium, ExCo members**

Covered throughout the General Assembly.

**Election of new members of Council**

Election of new members of Council. Nominees present at the meeting are requested to leave the room before discussion of their nomination and decisions on their election. Nominations are read out by the Programme Manager, including comments received in advance of the GA. Each nomination is discussed and then the nominee is elected (or not) by acclamation.



Desire of Antonino Morabito to step down as Council member is noted and he is thanked for his work. Antonino notes that Marco Bassi could well take his role. Nomination of **Council Member with Special Responsibility for Southern Europe: *Marco Bassi***

**Proposed by TICTU, seconded by Strong Roots. Approved by acclamation for three years.**

Desire of Raul Petsain to step down as Council member noted and he is thanked for his work.

Nomination of **Council Member with Special Responsibility of Amazon region of Latin America: *Wrays Perez Ramirez***.

**Proposed by Cenesta, seconded by TICTU. Approved by acclamation for three years.**

Motion regarding the stepping down of Council Member with Special Responsibility for North America: ***Joe Martin***.

Despite repeated efforts from the Consortium, no communication has been received from Joe since his election to Council in 2016. **Motion made to make Joe Martin's position vacant.**

**Proposed by TICTU, seconded by Kalpavriksh. Approved by acclamation.**

Motion to **pass the responsibility of nominating a new Council Member with Special Responsibility for North America to the North American Regional Assembly in May 2019.** Register a vacancy for this position and request the North America Regional Assembly to identify a replacement for the position.

**Proposed by Observatorio Ciudadano, seconded by Kalpavriksh. Approved by acclamation.**

#### **Report from Search Committee on nominations for President, Co-chair of Search Committee**

Ghanimat Azhdari -- Co-chair of Search Committee explains the process undertaken to identify possible nominees for the position of President. Several candidates were considered and consulted but only one nominee was ultimately retained for presentation to the General Assembly.

The nomination of **Teodoro Brawner Baguilat Jr.**, is read out by the Programme Manager. Giovanni Reyes, Bukluran, introduces Teddy – he started as a public servant in his 20's as Mayor of his district for nine years. He then served another nine years as Governor of Ifugao region. Following this he was elected as a Congressman; his term comes to an end early in 2019. He comes from a World Heritage site in Cordillera in the Philippines, where extensive rice terraces are located. It is his connection to this site that has shaped his ability to represent IPs in parliament and around the world.

Teddy answers the questions put to him by as detailed below by the Members and Honorary members present (or online) at the General Assembly.

**Paul Sein Twa** – are you an Honorary member of the Consortium? **Teddy** - Yes, since 2014.

**Robert Chimambo** – congratulations on your nomination. You have much experience in Asia, but the ICCA movement covers the globe. How do you see your leadership inspiring these new areas? **Teddy** – acknowledges that a lot of people will have had conflicts with politicians and might think that his only expertise is politics and only in the Philippines, but he is involved with several international organisations. He points out that the Consortium works on shaping policy, locally, nationally and internationally and this is what he has been doing for the past nine years. He is aware that he may lack some experience in other regions, but he is excited to contribute to promoting ICCAs throughout the world.

**Wrays Perez Ramirez** – congratulations on your nomination. For the future of the Consortium, the Latin America region have proposed a collegial presidency, what do you think about this?

**Teddy** – open to this idea but feels that the Council very much fulfils the collegial role. Most decisions are taken by the GA but if there is a way to rotate the leadership, I would be open to this. We need to stabilise the regionalisation process first and then we can consider changes.

**Dominique Bikaba** – you will be replacing someone who has left us physically, so he will not be able to advise you, how will you get close to the Members? **Teddy** – Taghi is irreplaceable and I am not him. I am not Dave, either, who has magnificently stood in as Interim President. I accept that I will need to travel and communicate with people to create connections. Despite the limitations to my travel time because of my other commitments, I will ensure I get to know you and would like to attend regional meetings. I will do everything with passion and dedication.

**Neema Pathak Broome** – very happy to have your nomination. Concerned about time availability as you are standing for Governor in 2019. Do you see that some of your decisions as a politician could conflict with the interests of ICCAs? **Teddy** – elections are in early May, but I would be free to travel from mid-May to early July. Conflicting interests is always a problem with politicians, but you need to understand the issues I fight for – ASEAN Parliament for human rights, Asian Parliamentarians for Reproductive Health, IP rights, author of a new Bill on mining.

Teddy then leaves the room to allow a free discussion of his nomination among all the Members and Honorary members present (or online) at the General Assembly.

**Grazia** – this nomination is for 3 years but there may be calls for a change prior to this depending on ongoing discussions in the regionalisation process. It would be better to have staggered elections to Council rather than changing the whole Council at one time.

**Emma Courtine** – can we know more about the other people who were suggested for President? **Grazia** – some decisions were made based on the characteristics of the individuals discussed. This is a voluntary position and is quite burdensome. Teddy would be a strong indigenous President, but he is also committed to local communities.

**Cristina Eghenter** – have we thought through all the implications of having someone who may have strong conflicts of interest due to his position in politics?

**Trevor Sandwith** – Teddy will be a President in a Council that makes decisions rather than someone who has total individual responsibility for making decisions. There has to be a strong regional process so that the President can stay aloof from regional matters when there is a conflict of interest.

**Ghanimat Azhdari** – during the interview with Teddy, we asked about his motivation to be President of the Consortium, he replied that his life has been dedicated to the service of others.

**Dominique Bikaba** – he could be very supportive of many of our processes to try and get legal recognition for ICCAs.

**Aman Singh** – have we checked that a government official can be President of the Consortium? This may also affect Wrays.

**Grazia** - this point was checked and there don't seem to be any limitations in the Operational Guidelines or Statutes. We are electing someone who is an IP and has used his indigenous soul in a government position to have his values implanted there.

**Election of Teodoro Brawner Baguilat Jr as President of the ICCA Consortium.**

**Proposed by TICTU, seconded by Strong Roots and Pastoral Women Council. Approved by acclamation for three years.**

Teddy comes back to the room and thanks everyone for his election. He never expected to be nominated and feels that there may be people who are better qualified than him, so he appeals for mentoring and guidance from the Elders. Unsolicited advice would also be welcome. His first task as President will be to attend the CBD COP 14 in Egypt where he will represent the Consortium. Teddy ends by offering the Consortium his energy, passion and commitment.

The Interim President (Dave de Vera) formally hands over responsibility for the General Assembly to the newly elected President (Teddy Baguilat) who closes the meeting.

**20:45 Newly elected President thanks everyone for their contribution to the meetings and closes the XIIIth General Assembly.**

