



## WORKSHOP SUMMARY REPORT

<b>Event co-leaders:</b>	Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, Sergio Couto, Taghi Farvar and Leah Talbot
<b>Time and date:</b>	15 November 2014, 08:30-12.00 (double session)
<b>Rapporteurs:</b>	Grant Murray, Fred Nelson and Gina Cosentino
<b>Presenters:</b>	Leah Talbot, Zelealem Tefera, Eli Enns, Sutej Hugu, Onel Masardule, Peter Kitelo, Karine Nuulimba, Salatou Sambou, Martial Kouderin, Yingyi Zhang, Heather Bingham, Neema Pathak, Aman Singh, Sergio Couto, Juan Bezaury-Creel, Vololona Rasoarimanana, Annas Radin Syarif, Taghi Farvar, Teddy Baguilat, Dave de Vera and Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend

This session was designed to discuss ICCA exemplars from different continents, societies and biomes and their recognition by state governments in diverse legal and policy ways, within but also outside protected area systems. Crucial “DOs and DON’Ts” in recognizing and supporting ICCAs are at the heart of the global ICCA movement; the workshop focused on two main questions: what is the broad long term vision? What are the strategic directions to get there? The session included short presentations from Ethiopia, Canada, Taiwan, Panama, Kenya, Namibia, Senegal, Benin, China, India, Spain, Mexico, Madagascar, Indonesia, Iran and the Philippines. The presentations included examples where ancient or newly created ICCAs are thriving, others where ICCAs are being reinvigorated, and others where they are under threat. The UNEP WCM representative introduced the Global ICCA Registry.

After the presentations, small groups (mostly language-based) captured the most salient issues to be recalled for the Promise of Sydney. Preliminary recommendations were captured on sheets of paper and posted in the room. Those were later refined and incorporated in the Stream final recommendations.

### **Key emerging lessons:**

Presenters discussed the challenges faced by ICCAs as well as some of their growing opportunities for recognition and support, and the benefits thereby realized in such cases. Threats to ICCAs (both internal and external) were prominently discussed. Many presenters offered recommendations to strengthen ICCAs.

Emerging lessons can be summarized as follows:

1. There are a number of inseparable connections between indigenous peoples and their territories (e.g., spiritual, cultural, economic, livelihood) that all created opportunities for ICCAs.
2. ICCAs are diverse, and feature a wide range of rules, regulations, norms and other social institutions. This diversity is important in terms of fit and context specificity, leading to efficacy.
3. IPs and other communities have a number of strengths that enable self-governance of ICCAs including knowledge, social capital, and connections to the land.
4. Robust local capacity to govern/manage is essential and, in the best of cases, it has existed for a long time.
5. Governance of ICCAs exists along a spectrum, and at one pole one finds community sovereignty over land, water and natural resources. Many "ICCA success stories" described cases where responsibility and authority approached that.
6. Governance processes work best when they are participatory and inclusive at all scales/ levels (e.g. including within communities).
7. Scale and social agreement on boundaries are important in the overall functioning of ICCAs
8. ICCAs face a number of common challenges, including: the presence of outside economic pressures and/or co-optation; eroded local social capital; community out-migration, particularly youth; community capacity to govern/manage; lack of and/or inappropriate recognition/support from government; and capture by powerful interests both from outside (including NGOs) and inside (elites).
9. Collective rights (tenure, access, etc) are a critical component of social and legal recognition.
10. Emphasizing both rights and responsibilities is important (some suggested that establishing/ assuming collective responsibilities often does and should precede the recognition of collective legal rights).
11. There are a number of existing policies and other instruments at a variety of levels (national, international) that can be used to support ICCAs. These include UNDRIP, POWPA, CBD Decisions at large and the FAO Voluntary Guidelines.
12. Outside recognition can both enable and constrain ICCAs. Self-recognition is an important first step.
13. Outside support (NGOs, Government, alliances, etc.) for community decision-making and implementation capacity as well as technical and financial capacity is usually important but has also the potential to lead to undesirable results (governance capture, undesired co-optation of , conflicts within the community people).
14. Establishing an enabling policy/legislative environment is critical for the sustainability of ICCAs.
15. ICCAs have a role to play in meeting all Aichi targets and generally enhancing global conservation efforts, but this should be on terms controlled and approved by communities.

16. Many participants saw utility in a robust alliance of ICCAs to gain critical mass and power through collective voice.

**Exemplary case/s and other useful links:**

There was significant and notable evidence of ICCAs having a national impact on conservation coverage at large scale in countries such as Iran, India, Mexico, the Philippines, Spain and Namibia, and the need to scale up recognition and support to larger areas in countries such as Senegal, Benin, Ethiopia, Canada and China.

Many exemplary cases—including Kawawana (Senegal), the Tla o qui aht Tribal Parks (Canada), the Kuna territory (Panama) and, more generically, the Ancestral Domains of the Philippines, the Adat Forests of Indonesia the and Comunales of Spain – were described and noted.

*See also:*

[ICCAs & Aichi Targets -- The Contribution of Indigenous Peoples' and Local Community Conserved Territories and Areas to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-20 \(Aichi Targets\)](#)

*Original presentations and report are available in the event's folder (see link in annexed "Repository of original Powerpoint presentations and Rapporteur reports").*

**Key recommendations:**

This event has been instrumental in shaping the following recommendations of the Stream final document:

<b>Rec#</b>	<b>Title</b>
3	Voluntary conservation
4	Collective rights and responsibilities
5	Governance overlaps
6	Governance for sustainable use
16	Innovative legal guidance
20	Governance for the conservation of nature and human well being