

**The ICCA
Consortium**

Professor John H. Knox
UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and the Environment
Henry C. Lauerman Professor of International Law
Wake Forest University School of Law

30 September 2016

Dear Professor Knox,

This document provides responses to the questionnaire circulated as part of the preparation of your thematic report on biodiversity and human rights. It was compiled by the ICCA Consortium, an international association dedicated to promoting the appropriate recognition of and support for territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities (ICCAs).

Thank you in advance for your consideration and we wish you the best in your important work. Please be in touch if you require any clarifications or further information.

Sincerely,



Holly Jonas
International Policy Coordinator,
ICCA Consortium

1. Good practices in the adoption of biodiversity-related legislation, policies and programmes that incorporate human rights obligations

Recognizing, respecting, and appropriately supporting positive connections between collective rights and conservation, including ICCAs

Biodiversity and human rights are inextricably linked. While there are very real conflicts that need to be addressed, there is also **demonstrated capacity for human rights and responsibilities for biodiversity to be mutually supportive, particularly with secure communal / customary tenure**. Indeed, indigenous peoples and local communities have succeeded in many environments in maintaining and even and even locally “enriching” biodiversity by, inter alia, conserving lands, territories, and critical resources; developing new agro-biodiversity; promoting habitat connectivity; and creating and maintaining special habitats. **Territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities (ICCAs) powerfully demonstrate such positive linkages**. And likewise, appropriately recognizing and supporting ICCAs – which Kothari et al. (2012) estimate may cover upwards of 13% of the Earth’s terrestrial surface¹ - is a powerful, effective approach to incorporating human rights in biodiversity conservation.²

Indigenous peoples, local communities, and their allies throughout the world actively self-strengthen and defend their ICCAs. Many international policy instruments also recognize and/or support ICCAs³, as well as some national laws, e.g., in the form of recognition of communal/ customary tenure.⁴ Fully respecting rights in the case of ICCAs also goes beyond securing tenure. It involves respecting and appropriately supporting self-determined identities and local knowledge and governance systems, as well as the interconnections between nature and peoples. Individual and collective human rights of many indigenous peoples and local communities are inextricably linked to such systems.

*The **Constitutional Court ruling no 35 in 2012** accelerated the process of documentation and registration of Indigenous Peoples’ lands in Indonesia. This landmark ruling states that customary forests (or forests claimed, cared for, governed and managed by Indigenous Peoples – via protection, sustainable use and restoration) are not ‘hutan negara’ or state forests but another, rightful and separate category of forest land. This ruling has opened new strategic opportunities to promote the rights and conservation capacities of local communities and Indigenous Peoples to access land and natural resources, and to promote forest and land tenure reform in Indonesia.*

*The **basic law on the Conservation of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services** is under revision. The concept of community (adat or indigenous) conserved areas is adopted in connection with connectivity and ecosystem services. Moreover, the principle of ‘community participation’ in the form of collaborative management and shared governance in protected areas is reinstated.*

*The **land use planning process** also allows for the needs and rights of local and indigenous peoples are recognized and respected through the inclusion of the maps of Indigenous territories, development of management plans and integration of ‘important places’ for indigenous peoples in existing government spatial plans to safeguard their resources and rights. This is clearly illustrated in the provinces of Papua and several districts in Kalimantan (Borneo).*

Box 1: Good practices in the adoption of biodiversity-related legislation, policies and programmes in Indonesia

Supporting more inclusive rights-based and community-centred conservation regimes, policies and programmes

In addition to specific recognition and support for ICCAs, efforts to integrate or address human rights obligations in biodiversity and natural resource conservation should involve **promoting and implementing more inclusive conservation approaches at all phases** – from conceptualization and planning to monitoring. Approaches and considerations include:

- Recognizing and appropriately supporting indigenous peoples' and local communities' land and resource governance systems
- Supporting co-production and the appropriate recognition and incorporation of diverse capacities, knowledge systems and world views - going beyond inviting rights-holders to participate in externally conceived and driven conservation regimes
- Increasing focus on understanding and improving conservation governance, including its qualitative aspects
- Supporting rights-based and community-centred conservation approaches (as distinct from many integrated conservation and development projects or eco-development approaches focused on 'reconciling' human and biodiversity interests)
- Supporting inclusive decision-making and shared-power at all phases. (Of note here may be the approval of WCC 2016 [Res 22](#), "Recognising, understanding and enhancing the role of indigenous peoples and local communities in tackling the illegal wildlife trade crisis"⁵)
- As a critical and cross-cutting issue, **recognizing and securing (communal/customary) tenure rights.**

Making such changes will require, inter alia, shifts in donor and aid agency policies, many of which support conventional conservation approaches while tending to ignore or under-fund rights-based and community-led approaches. There are important exceptions to this, such as the GEF Small Grants Programme.

Expanding and strengthening supportive policy and guidance

The specific implications of existing human rights instruments and other international and regional law instruments for biodiversity conservation need to be better understood and operationalized. **Further, an international instrument on the rights of non-indigenous local traditional communities should be initiated.**

There is relevant policy and guidance directed to, and often coming from, conservation actors concerning human rights obligations, *the scope and content of which vary*. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Provisions of the [Durban Accord](#) (World Parks Congress, 2003), Promise of Sydney (WPC 2014), and various IUCN Resolutions and Recommendations⁶ calling for respect for the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities
- Policies of some international conservation organizations and funders, such as: IUCN Policy on [Human Rights and Conservation](#) (2012) and the Environmental and Social Management Framework ([ESMF Standard on Indigenous Peoples](#) (2016); WWF [Statement of Principles on Indigenous Peoples' Rights](#) (1996, updated in 2008); the Conservation Initiative on Human Rights (CIHR) [Framework](#); and GEF policies on [Indigenous Peoples](#) (2012), [Gender](#) (2011), and Public Engagement (under development)
- IIED and Natural Justice recently published [Conservation Standards](#) that aim to provide conservation actors (including indigenous peoples) guidance on, inter alia, in which ways conservation interventions can infringe on indigenous peoples' rights and what their responsibilities are in upholding these rights.

Such policies and guidance are an important step. They also **need to be further analysed, including to identify any gaps with respect to rights obligations**. Efforts to incorporate rights obligations (and take rights-based approaches) by conservation actors should be undertaken together with rights-holders, including indigenous peoples and local communities, and likewise should not lend themselves to ‘rights-washing’. Further, **the policies, guidance and actions of indigenous peoples, local communities, and other rights-holders to claim and uphold rights should be recognized and appropriately supported**.

2. Specific examples of good practices in the implementation of human rights obligations in biodiversity-related matters

Addressing violations of collective and individual human rights by biodiversity loss and environmental destruction

The destruction of nature, including via extractive industry and industrial agriculture, can also undermine collective and individual human rights, including communal land rights, cultural heritage, and rights to food, housing, water, health and a healthy environment. Often such destructive practices are carried out in indigenous peoples and local communities’ lands and territories, and other areas important to their rights and livelihoods. And, likewise, it is often movements of indigenous peoples, local communities and their allies at the front lines of fights against such destruction – from the Agua Zarca Dam (Honduras), to the gold and copper open-mining projects in the Cordillera del Condor (Ecuador), to the Dakota oil pipeline (US), to the currently shelved [Baram Dam](#) (Sarawak, Malaysia), and elsewhere around the world. Notably, this month IUCN Members adopted WCC 2016 [Resolution 6.026](#) on ‘Protected areas and other areas important for biodiversity in relation to environmentally damaging industrial activities and infrastructure development’ which, inter alia, “CALLS ON governments, decision makers, community and private landowners to give high priority to avoiding environmentally damaging industrial activities and infrastructure development that impact sacred natural sites and ...ICCAs... in line with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples”.

ICCAs are increasingly recognized as a way for caretaker indigenous peoples and local communities to secure collective rights and responsibility to their land, water and natural resources and foster respect for their traditional knowledge, practices and institutions. Forest and coastal areas, but also lakes, rivers and other key habitats that are traditionally managed by Indigenous and local communities, also have a key role in sustaining their livelihoods, water and food security, and preserve their cultural identity and pride. It is important to continue strengthening local engagement in direct governance of natural resources, drawing from customary knowledge, wisdom and institutions and engaging in fair negotiations among partners. ICCAs are an opportunity for conservation that is equitable and effective.

Mapping of Indigenous areas and territories is continuing and gaining more strength after the Constitutional ruling. The Agency for the registration of Indigenous Peoples Lands and Territories (BRWA), an autonomous body of the Alliance of Indigenous Peoples of the Archipelago (AMAN), has so far registered and verified 6.8 million hectares of customary lands in Indonesia.

*Since the first ICCA event held in Bogor in October 2011, the documentation of ICCAs is gaining strength all over the archipelago from Sumatra to Kalimantan, Lombok, Maluku Islands and Papua. The **Working Group on ICCAs in Indonesia** gathers ten among the most important actors in civil society that take a strong role in conservation, environmental rights and indigenous peoples’ rights in Indonesia and actively promotes the documentation and registration of ICCAs around Indonesia, and advocates for their recognition at all levels.*

Box 2: Good practices in the implementation of human rights obligations in biodiversity-related matters in Indonesia

Moving from policy to accountable action

There is urgent need to move from policy to action in the area of biodiversity and human rights. While existing policy and guidance demonstrate important progress, they ultimately mean little if not implemented. In practice, now 13 years since the Durban Accord, **implementation of many policies and commitments has been slow. Another key challenge remains the development and operationalization of effective measures for addressing grievances and for remedy and redress.**

Possible avenues for enhancing accountable action include:

- **Incorporating a focus on environment/biodiversity and human rights in the Universal Periodic Review process**
- **Implementing independent information and accountability systems, such as a World Commission on Environment/ Biodiversity**, along the lines of the World Commission on Dams
- Appropriately supporting related movements and networks of rights-holders, where/when they want support
- Exploring the application of human-rights impact assessments to conservation programmes and projects.
- Advancing efforts to secure (customary/communal) tenure
- Enhancing rights-holder and duty-bearer capacity, such as increasing legal literacy and training, expanding paralegal access, and linking conservation and human rights organizations

Ongoing initiatives to explore and build on include the [Whakatane Mechanism \(spearheaded by ICCA Consortium member Forest Peoples Programme\)](#), which has been piloted in three locations and is being further explored as an effective tool to help secure communities rights and a healthy environment, and the [Conservation Standards](#) (spearheaded by ICCA Consortium Natural Justice along with IIED), which provides a set of draft human rights standards for conservation.

3. Examples of challenges and obstacles to the integration and protection of human rights in biodiversity-related matters

Addressing violations of collective and individual human rights, and of local worldviews and practices, by conventional conservation practice

Despite increased awareness and action on human-rights and biodiversity conservation, 'conventional', exclusionary conservation practice remains a threat to the human rights of many indigenous peoples and local communities, including in the context of protected areas establishment and governance.⁷ One increasingly recognized but still largely unaddressed issue concerns **protected areas that overlap with areas and territories conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities (ICCAs)**. This widespread situation has resulted in conflicts, rights violations, and missed opportunities for conservation and social justice. A recently released report for the ICCA Consortium - [Recognising and Respecting ICCAs Overlapped by Protected Areas](#) (Stevens et al 2016⁸) – discusses overlaps, presents analysis and case studies, and offers best practices for recognizing and respecting overlapped ICCAs. Further, the IUCN Members' Assembly recently approved WCC 2016 [Resolution 6.029](#) on "Recognising and Respecting Territories and Areas Conserved by Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (ICCAs) Overlapped by Protected Areas", which, inter alia, calls for development of best practice guidance to be shared with the CBD and UN human rights mechanisms and used in the

development of standards for IUCN's Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas and IUCN reporting on protected areas being proposed for World Heritage status.

There is an urgency to **strongly challenge the 'compensation' and 'offsets' language and measures that many countries and donors are promoting, including market mechanisms** like compensation for biodiversity loss, plantations on community lands as offsets, etc., such as the large funding going to such a fund in India that is undermining the Forest Rights Act. This also relates to the importance of respecting indigenous peoples' (and all individuals') rights to self-determination and self-determined developed and their unique worldviews, which often conflict with the neoliberal market economy and mechanisms that entail financialisation or commodification of nature.

A cross-cutting challenge lies in ensuring that the conservation community does, in fact, recognize fundamental human rights obligations. There is currently a focus on 'equity' - e.g., in protected areas governance. This should not be decoupled from or prioritized over a rights and justice focus. It otherwise risks a backtracking from rights to 'benefit-sharing' or even eviction with 'compensation'. Likewise, conservation initiatives focused on broad landscapes should not obscure the rights of particular communities *within* those landscapes.

Despite undeniable progress, ICCAs and community conservation, more often than not, go unrecognized for the value of conservation effort that communities provide. Issues and concerns that have emerged regarding ICCAs in Indonesia, revolve around:

- *Securing the rights and traditional practices of indigenous people and local communities at local and national level;*
- *Addressing the development needs of forest communities in addition to their rights over resources;*
- *Offering appropriate recognition to the customary institutions capable of governing natural resources, and to their accompanying knowledge and management practices;*
- *Tackling conflicting visions and poor communication among indigenous peoples, NGOs and national park staff;*
- *Enhancing the level of participation and consultation of local stakeholders (including women);*
- *Providing higher transparency of information and ensuring prior informed consent of relevant indigenous peoples and local communities wherever the government and/or private sector companies affect their land and resources;*
- *Engaging in fair partnerships and negotiations.*

In the draft revision of the law on biodiversity and ecosystems currently under discussion, community conserved areas and related traditional knowledge are expected to be recognized and adopted as a new conservation governance type. And yet, the recognition of IPs rights and community conservation practices like ICCAs inside national parks is still lacking, and overlapping of NPs with Indigenous conserved areas and territories is not fully addressed in regulations about management of National Parks and other protected areas

Box 3: Challenges and obstacles in Indonesia

Clarifying and strengthening the rights of non-indigenous local and traditional communities

More broadly, greater attention needs to be paid to the **rights of non-indigenous local and traditional communities such as peasants, pastoralists and fisherfolk**, including (but not limited to) those who contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and nature through their customary laws, knowledge systems and ways of life. Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity have considered this to a degree in recent years⁹, as has the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues¹⁰, but there is not yet a clear definition or common

understanding of 'local communities' or what their rights entail in general, and specifically in the context of biodiversity and the environment. In the context of biodiversity, however, recognition of the rights of local communities (and, arguably, indigenous peoples) appears to be dependent on whether or not such communities are 'compatible with conservation or sustainable use requirements' (Article 10, Convention on Biological Diversity).¹¹ ICCA Consortium members Forest Peoples Programme¹² and Natural Justice¹³, among others, have issued commentaries on the rights of non-indigenous local communities. The process to develop a [UN declaration on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas](#) is also of close relevance.

4. Examples of how the rights of those who may be particularly vulnerable to the loss of biodiversity, including but not limited to indigenous peoples, are (or are not) provided with heightened protection

Despite important global policy advancements, **ICCAs continue to face serious threats**. In recent history many ICCAs have been destroyed or damaged, and many others are being coveted or attacked today due to, inter alia, expropriation of common/customary land and territories (nationalisation, privatisation, land and water grabbing), extractive industry and large-scale infrastructure and agriculture, land encroachment, and mass tourism. **There is urgent need to use international and other mechanisms to appropriately support and recognize ICCAs**, including as 'other effective conservation measures' under Aichi Target 11. The emphasis on 'appropriate' recognition is important, as support that is not invited and/or culturally/ contextually appropriate can undermine local or customary systems and contribute to rights violations. Borrini-Feyerabend et. al. 2013 ([Annex 1](#)) lay out 'do's' and 'don'ts' for appropriate support.¹⁴ The ongoing 'ICCA global support initiative' is working in at least 26 countries and at the global level to help link and support those caring for ICCAs, including through regional dialogues and capacity development workshops with indigenous peoples and local community representatives and other rights-holders and stakeholders associated with ICCAs.¹⁵

The loss of biodiversity directly affects indigenous peoples in many ways, including: the traditional knowledge and use of biodiversity like for traditional medicine, cultural and spiritual relations of the community with nature important for the identity of the community. For other people, the loss of biodiversity threatens to undermine the right to a good environment, and reduction of quality and quantity of drinking water.

Box 4: The rights of those particularly vulnerable to the loss of biodiversity in Indonesia

Better understanding and tailored approaches are also needed to meet human rights obligations in marine areas and with respect to natural resource and territories owned and used by nomadic/mobile peoples. Conventional protected area approaches are often severely problematic in such cases, not least because of the 'fluid' boundaries. Such approaches also often fail to account for the inextricable links between protection, conservation, and sustainable use. This is a pressing matter in part because of the current global (and in many cases national) push for new and expanded Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), including in the Pacific region, where many indigenous peoples still own their own customary land in sovereign nations. The IUCN Members Assembly recently approved WCC 2016 [Resolution 5.053](#), which, inter alia, "2. ENCOURAGES IUCN State and Government Agency Members to designate and implement at least 30% of each marine habitat in a network of highly protected MPAs and other effective area-based conservation measures, with the ultimate aim of creating a fully sustainable

ocean at least 30% of which has no extractive activities, *subject to the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities*” (emphasis added), including a note that “The potential impacts of the motion on the rights and interests of indigenous peoples... should be reviewed in a manner that allows participation consistent with both indigenous peoples' traditional decision-making process, and UNDRIP.”

Human rights issues need also to be better understood and addressed in the context of agricultural/domesticated biodiversity, including the farming, pastoral, and fisheries systems that sustain lives and livelihoods. Myriad rights issues may arise in the governance and management of such systems and their associated lands and waters - procedural rights such as participation and access to information; substantive rights including food, water, housing, and various cultural rights; and particular issues such as farmers’ rights to maintain crop, seed and genetic biodiversity on farms and in territories including or beyond ICCAs. The concepts of ‘conservation’ and ‘sustainable’ use are closely intertwined in landscapes/ seascapes being used by people, such as is illustrated in this [short video](#) about traditional fishing in Finland.¹⁶ **There is need to develop more guidance on the rights and recognition of non-indigenous local traditional communities, including via consultation with international groups representing such communities.**

There is also a need to respect and uphold constitutional protections, particularly where constitutions in turn align with international standards. For example, the Republic of Ecuador is allegedly violating its own Constitution when allowing copper and gold mines in Shuar Indigenous territories. Several Shuar communities are now threatened by psychological and physical violence, diseases, etc. The dominant market-based paradigm fails to acknowledge any issues beyond ‘economic development’, despite numerous international commitments to sustainable development. Indigenous peoples and local communities alike struggle to resist extractive industries in particular in their territories and areas, due to the extremely destructive and pervasive nature of such industries, and the misperception of state governments that such industries benefit communities and economies. Greater attention thus needs to be paid to economic justice as well, including human rights in the context of investment and trade agreements.

5. Examples of good practices in the protection of environmental human rights defenders working on biodiversity and conservation issues

More and urgent action is needed to appropriately support and protect defenders of environmental human rights, including the many indigenous peoples’ and local communities’ movements at the forefront. As an example of emerging and ongoing action, **the ICCA Consortium issues [Alerts and Actions](#) on certain pressing threats** to ICCAs and their defenders.

The government has engaged civil society in the working group to resolve tenurial conflicts and environmental crimes. One example is the “Team to End Tenurial Conflict in Forest Land”, which was established by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. The National Forestry Council is a multi-stakeholder platform established to encourage dialogue to resolve conflicts and improve governance in forestry issues. The government through the Ministry of Legal affairs and human rights makes available legal help to protect activists and communities in disputes linked to tenure rights and natural resources.

Box 5: Good practices in the protection of environmental human rights defenders and conflict resolution in Indonesia

Endnotes

¹ Kothari, Ashish with Corrigan, Colleen, Jonas, Harry, Neumann, Aurélie, and Shrumm, Holly. (eds). 2012. *Recognising and Supporting Territories and Areas Conserved By Indigenous Peoples And Local Communities: Global Overview and National Case Studies*. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, ICCA Consortium, Kalpavriksh, and Natural Justice, Montreal, Canada. Technical Series no. 64, 160 pp. Available at <https://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-64-en.pdf>

² A wealth of information about and examples of ICCAs can be found on the [ICCA Consortium website](#).

³ The World Parks Congress of Durban (2003), CBD PoWPA (2004), numerous IUCN Resolutions (2004, 2008, 2012, 2016), UNDRIP (2007), CBD agreements in Japan (2010), India (2012) and Korea (2014), the Aichi Targets (2010), the ICCA Registry at UNEP WCMC, and the World Parks Congress of Sydney 2014 all recognize and/or support ICCAs.

⁴ See ICCA [national legal reviews](#) and country case studies prepared by ICCA Consortium Secretariat, Members and partners, including [Kothari 2012](#).

⁵ WCC 2016 [Res 22](#), inter alia, “1. *URGES the Director General to work with State and Non-State Members, Commissions, Regional Offices and International Organisations to... recognise the critical role of indigenous peoples and local communities that live with wildlife as full partners in planning, making and implementing decisions and interventions to address IWT, including through means of their traditional knowledge and the rules and regulations they strive to have respected in their conserved territories and areas (ICCAs);*”

⁶ IUCN Resolution and Recommendations can be searched and accessed [here](#). Relevant ones include, inter alia:

- WCC 2016 (Approved but still to be published as official Resolutions and Recommendations) - [022](#) - Recognising, understanding and enhancing the role of indigenous peoples and local communities in tackling the illegal wildlife trade crisis; [026](#) - Protected areas and other areas important for biodiversity in relation to environmentally damaging industrial-scale activities and infrastructure development; [029](#) - Recognition and respect of indigenous peoples' and community conserved territories and areas (ICCAs) overlapped by protected areas; [030](#) - World Parks Congress 2014: The Promise of Sydney; [034](#) - Recognising cultural and spiritual significance of nature in protected and conserved areas; [080](#) - Enabling the Whakatane Mechanism to contribute to conservation through securing communities' rights
- WCC 2012 - [Res-099](#) - IUCN Policy on Conservation and Human Rights for Sustainable Development; [Res-047](#) - Implementation of the UNDRIP in the context of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention; [Res-097](#) - Implementation of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; [Res-094](#) - Respecting, recognizing and supporting IPTCCAs; [Res-181](#) - Citizen participation in legislative procedures regarding the environment; [Res-085](#) - Climate change justice and equity considerations
- WCC 2008 - [Res 049](#) (4.049) - Supporting ICTs and other indigenous peoples' and community conservation areas; [Res 048](#) (4.048) - Indigenous peoples, protected areas and implementation of the Durban Accord; [Res 052](#) (4.052) - Implementing the U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; [Res 053](#) (4.053) - Mobile indigenous peoples and biodiversity conservation; [Res 055](#) (4.055) - Mainstreaming gender equity and equality within the Union; [Res 056](#) (4.056) - Rights-based approaches to conservation; [Res 050](#) (4.050) - Recognition of indigenous conservation territories; [Res 081](#) (4.081) - Equitable access to energy

⁷ See, inter alia, Aili Pyhälä, Ana Osuna Orozco and Simon Counsell, “[Protected areas in the Congo Basin, failing both people and biodiversity?](#)”. Rainforest Foundation. United Kingdom. 2016

⁸ Stevens, S., N. Pathak Broome and T. Jaeger with J. Aylwin, G. Azhdari, D. Bibaka, G. Borrini-Feyerabend, M. Colchester, N. Dudley, C. Eghenter, F. Eleazar, M. T. Farvar, F. Frascaroli, H. Govan, S. Hugu, H. Jonas, A. Kothari, G. Reyes, A. Singh, and L. Vaziri. 2016. *Recognising and Respecting ICCAs Overlapped by Protected Areas*. Report for the ICCA Consortium, available online at www.iccaconsortium.org

⁹ For example: Expert Group Meeting of Local Community Representatives Within the Context of Article 8(j) and Related Provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity, 14-16 July 2011. UNEP/CBD/WG8J/7/8/Add.1.

¹⁰ UNEP/CBD/AHEG/LCR/INF/1, page 4. This document contains a background paper produced by the Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues on the concept of local communities for an expert workshop on the disaggregation of data.

¹¹ Morel, C. 2010. “Conservation and Indigenous Peoples’ Rights: Must One Necessarily Come at the Expense of the Other?” Pages 174-181 in *Policy Matters 17*. IUCN-CEESP.

¹² Forest Peoples Programme, 2013. *The Rights of Non-Indigenous ‘Forest Peoples’ with a focus on Land and Related Rights - Existing International Legal Mechanisms and Strategic Options*. Available at:

<http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/rights-land-natural-resources/publication/2013/rights-non-indigenous-forest-peoples-focus-land>.

¹³ See Section B (“Indigenous Peoples’ and Local Communities’ Rights”) from pages 22-27 in H. Jonas, J. E. Makagon and H. Shrumm, 2012. *The Living Convention: A compendium of internationally recognised rights that support the integrity and resilience of indigenous peoples’ and local communities’ territories and other social-ecological systems*. Available at: <http://naturaljustice.org/resources-and-research/the-living-convention/>.

¹⁴ Borrini-Feyerabend, G., N. Dudley, T. Jaeger, B. Lassen, N. Pathak Broome, A. Phillips and T. Sandwith (2013). *Governance of Protected Areas: From understanding to action*. Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 20, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. xvi + 124pp. Available at:

http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/governance_of_protected_areas_from_understanding_to_action.pdf.

¹⁵ For further information, see ICCA Consortium [webpage](#).

¹⁶ Video co-produced by the Snowchange Cooperative and Prettygoodproductions.