

WORKSHOP STREAM 5, Session 3A, 12/9/03 0900 to 1200

Evaluating Management Effectiveness: Meeting the needs of indigenous communities in management effectiveness evaluation.

Chair: Hanna Jaireth. Rapporteur: Sherrie-Lee Evans

Record of the workshop discussion on the draft Durban Accord and Action Plan, CBD statement and WPC recommendations.

These comments were provided by approximately 12 participants - from Africa, Latin America (Costa Rica, Columbia), Australia (Qld, ACT and NSW), South East Asia (Cambodia, Philippines), and the UK, who discussed these issues for 3 hours.

The comments reflect a consensus view except in relation to which rights should have priority in a situation of conflict between cultural values and biodiversity conservation.

Comments on Durban Accord

General comment: A review of the language used in the Accord needs to be done in relation to the use of terms “local community” and “indigenous community” – a suggested standardized term for use is “indigenous peoples and local communities” which should be used throughout the document. At the moment stakeholder is used which is inappropriate and not consistent with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). This is important because indigenous peoples and local communities have different rights, and governance/legal/political institutions and processes. [This could be reflected in a new dot point under Action 2 on p.2].

General comment: more cross-referencing is needed between the Accord, Action Plan and WPC recommendations.

General comment: all the WPC output documents need to better recognize gender issues, and intergenerational obligations (consistent with Nelson Mandela’s plea at the opening ceremony for better recognition of the role of youth in conservation).

Page 2, No. 2 - the Accord needs to recognize that indigenous peoples and local communities can be conservators (i.e. shareholders not stakeholders) – and recognize their contributions in managing Community Conserved Areas (CCAs) and PAs.

Page 2, 3rd dot point – after “sustainable use of natural resources” add “and equitable benefit-sharing”, consistent with the CBD.

Page 2, Action no. 2 heading: amend to indigenous peoples and local communities and other stakeholders.

Page 2 No. 2 – the Accord needs to recognize the intellectual and other property rights of indigenous peoples and local community members, as primary shareholders. These rights need to be acknowledged, respected, accounted for and protected, consistent with the CBD. This is important for Key Target 10 also where revenue streams from watersheds, genetic resources, images etc. should not be generated just for PAs but should also be shared equitably with indigenous and local communities, again consistent with the CBD.

Page 3, Action no. 4, dot point 1: replace “loss of species and habitats” with “loss of cultural and biological diversity”.

Page 3, Action no. 4, dot point 6 – add after “management” “and will monitor, evaluate and review of the effects of PA management on indigenous and local communities”.

Comments on the draft Durban Action Plan

Page 10, Outcome 1 – insert “and equitable” before development.

Outcome 1 pages 10-11 – need to add that countries should be encouraged to avoid conservation actions which enhance impoverishment, including cultural impoverishment.

Outcome 2 page 14 – identify local actions and resources which enhance/increase biodiversity.

Page 18, Outcome 4 – add “indigenous and local communities” after “authorities”.

Page 18, outcome 4, Key Target 5, dot point 8 – In relation to capacity building in local communities, and consider the issue of accreditation / competency evaluation for indigenous and local community organisations in relation to PA and/or CCA management. Organisations need to work in a coordinated, bioregional way to ensure a better management of resources.

Action Plan page 19, Outcome 5, Key Target 7 – add after “equitable” “and specifically address the particular complaints or grievances felt by indigenous peoples and local communities about PA management”.

Action Plan page 19, Outcome 5, paragraph 1: Insert a sentence recognizing that indigenous peoples usually have customary law obligations for caring for country, which can include the management of specific species, burial grounds and site custodianship.

Pages 19-20, outcome 5 – The reference on page 19 – key target 7 - to the distribution and costs and benefits of PAs being equitable is too soft. This outcome needs to recognize the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities to access and manage resources and to mitigate impoverishment. Within this context, the question was asked: how does the action plan provide for access to basic (protected) resources OR PROVIDE ALTERNATIVES/COMPENSATION FOR ECOLOGICAL SERVICES to sustain life for impoverished indigenous and local communities?

The Action Plan needs to recognise the need to facilitate/redress past dispossession (or other actions) and the need for a sustainable income source (e.g. payment of indigenous peoples and local communities for the provision of environmental services) is necessary in order for communities to manage effectively.

Comments on the draft message to the CBD

Page 2 – there was discussion about a suggestion to replace “scientific-based approaches” with “community-based understanding” so that CCAs can be recognized as PAs and not “gaps”. A suggestion was made that “scientific-based approaches” needs to be replaced with “values-based approach” which include aesthetic, scientific, social, historical and spiritual values. There was discussion on the need for cultural impact assessments, and a suggestion of the need for a specific IUCN category which recognizes cultural values conservation and/or a better recognition of cultural values through all IUCN categories. [We understand that work is underway on this].

Page 3 dot point 3 – This dot point should be moved up to page 2 as a priority activity. Currently it is a lesser “key action”. Add “where there is not already a CCA or sustainably managed area” after “protected areas in the bolded heading of the dot point. There is an identified need better recognize CCAs in the document, including an agreed definition for CCAs.

There was recognition of a tension between different world views – all cultural – for example between the primacy of the western scientific values and various indigenous/local community values – and the need to recognize interculturality and promote dialogue amongst different value-holders.

Comments on draft WPC Recommendations

Page 61 paragraph 3 – The word “helpful” needs to be replaced with “It is essential that the objectives of protected areas do not contradict but are supportive of.....”.