

- ICCAs in Indonesia
- Industrial Lifestock
- ABS
- Target 18

Collective action for recognition of ICCAs in Indonesia

Cristina Eghenter, WWF Indonesia and member of the Working Group ICCAs Indonesia

The conservation value that is integrated with the indigenous and local community's forest, water landscape and seascape management has not received full acknowledgement and substantial space in conservation regulations and policies.

Indonesia is a country with one of the highest biodiversity in the world. With 17,000 islands and total area of 1,904,569 ha land area, Indonesia also has a rich diversity in cultures and tradition with many ICCAS management systems from varying cultures and environmental conditions: lakes and rivers, peat land, mountains, and coastal areas. Although ICCAS is a relatively new and foreign-sounding term, indigenous communities in Indonesia have practiced ICCAs in natural resources and land conservation for a long time.

The ICCAs practices or 'kawasan lindung oleh masyarakat adat' provide examples of sustainable traditional natural resource management that at the same time ensures various aspects of the community's lives: livelihood, food and water security, biodiversity conservation and environmental sustainability. However, these practices and related values are not always recognized in conservation policies or adopted to enhance conservation results and values.

In Indonesia, the realization emerged that a broad alliance of organizations and individuals sharing a similar commitment to community rights in conservation could give additional vigour to the work of each organization, and provide stimulus and support to deeper analysis and advocacy for ICCAs through time. It was also clear that formally recognised ICCAs practices would provide a way to respond to both the need to protect critical ecosystems and the need to respect and secure the rights of local and indigenous communities.

It was in this way that WGII (Working Group on ICCAs in Indonesia) was actually born. Ten member organizations are united in WGII, comprising Indonesian NGOs active in advocacy and best practices for: good governance of natural resources and conservation, protection of the environment, community mapping, sustainable land use, securing tenure, community benefits and rights; and recognition of Indigenous Peoples. In the first phase of its work, WGII has decided to focus on documentation of ICCAs in Indonesia to help awareness and advocacy for their role on conservation and sustainable development. The documentation, recognition and registration of ICCAs continue to be fundamental to overcome the challenges and risks, internal and external, that ICCAs still face in Indonesia and elsewhere. This is particularly important now, when mapping of customary and indigenous territories has regained momentum and strength in many parts of the archipelago, and customary areas and territories start being recognized in local spatial plans.

Ultimately, the strength of ICCAs and traditional conservation initiatives depend on the existence of international and national instruments as much as on the strength of the customary law and traditional knowledge of the communities themselves ("how strong and committed we are"). In this sense, WGII understood that local and customary institutions need to be sustained and strengthened, and empowered through information, capacity building and skills sharing, to be participants and champions of improved governance of forests and natural resources.

What's at Steak?

Impacts of the industrial livestock and feedstock sector on forests, biodiversity, farmers and communities

Mary Louise Malig, Global Forest Coalition

A new report “What’s at Steak? The real cost of meat” - launched at COP13 - aims to expose the many ways in which industrial livestock farming is impacting our health, lives, forests, biodiversity and the environment, and to argue that - precisely because it does cause so many problems - transforming the industrial livestock sector should be a key objective not only of the UN FAO, but also of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

In particular, the CBD needs to assess its Aichi target 7 whose goal is that by 2020, areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.

The report shows global data and concrete examples of impacts on these different areas from the ground in five countries: Bolivia, Brazil, India, Paraguay, Russia.

Key points to highlight are that:

Industrial livestock farming is driving deforestation and contributing to biodiversity loss. In fact, the 2016 State of Worlds Forests report shows that from 1990 to 2005, 71% of deforestation in South America, was driven by demand for pasture.

The report argues that the industrial livestock production (‘factory farming’) model, including Concentrated Animal Feedlot Operations (CAFOs)[5], and large-scale cattle ranching for beef are unsustainable and a leading cause of deforestation.

As early as 2006, the FAO report on Livestock’s Long Shadow, exposed that “the livestock sector may well be the leading player in the reduction of biodiversity, since it is the major driver of deforestation, as well as one of the leading drivers of land degradation, pollution, climate change, overfishing, sedimentation of coastal areas and facilitation of invasions by alien species.”

Industrial livestock farming is responsible for 14.5% greenhouse gas emissions, contributing to climate change.

Beef and dairy farming are the worst contributors – with beef at 41% livestock emissions according to the FAO.

The growing corporate concentration in this sector has decimated the small-scale, sustainable farming practiced by small farmers and communities. The report argues that governments are currently supporting these with “perverse incentives.” Again, this is relevant to the CBD as perverse incentives in the form of policy support towards large-scale industrial programs in agriculture, forestry or fisheries that threaten biodiversity. The Strategic Plan of the CBD calls on countries to remove or redirect such perverse incentives before 2020.

The problem is growing. Urbanisation and growing demand in the developing world means that globally we are eating an unsustainable amount of meat.

This CBD meeting is about mainstreaming biodiversity, but this will be futile unless the industrial livestock sector is included in all relevant UN agreements. Global demand for dairy and meat is expected to rise by 70% by 2050. This means more severe impacts on forests, biodiversity and small farmers and communities.

Industrial livestock is a ‘forgotten sector’ when it comes to public awareness about its impact on climate change, but one can just as easily argue that the sector’s devastating impacts on forests and biodiversity, Indigenous Peoples, small-scale farmers, food security, animal welfare and public health are all equally neglected. The industrial livestock sector is getting away with murder, both literally and metaphorically.

The Report calls on governments to support and promote existing alternatives to the factory-farming model including agroecology, agroforestry, and extensive traditional pastoralist practices. Changing over-consumption and over-production models and diets of eating meat at an unsustainable rate is also crucial.

Download the report at www.globalforestcoalition.org

When Dollar Signs Grow on Bushes

Phil Bereano, Washington Biotechnology Action Council

For many decades, explorers from the Global North would return from their exploits with samples of the flora and fauna of the “exotic” lands they had explored. From even before Victorian times, these samples were shown in “cabinets of curiosities” and planted and stored in tropical gardens that were celebrated in London, Paris, and Amsterdam. Later, as notions of modern genetics developed, industry and university groups, conscious of the increasing monetary value of natural varieties of germplasm, mounted “biopiracy” trips to far-away lands.

Today, two international treaties (the CBD and the FAO Plant Treaty) declare, over continued vigorous opposition of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs), that germplasm is “owned” by the country in which it physically is located, not by the peoples who have developed and cared for it for millennia. And owned by the nation state whether located *ex situ* or *in situ* in its natural setting. Despite provisions in the treaties (and the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing) for the actual sharing to follow from any new access and exploitation of foreign germplasm, the reality is that there has been a lot more access than benefit sharing.

At a side event on Monday, “Contribution of the Nagoya Protocol to the Sustainable Development Goals”, this Access and Benefits Sharing trade-off was discussed by international organizations (such as GEF) and national governmental officials. With the exception of the German development agency GIZ, what was so striking in the session was the consistent use of business terminology to label our natural, biodiverse world. The framework clearly seemed to be one of profitability, not preservation of biodiversity. And the GEF, with 77 projects in the South, is funding what many see as biopiracy. Conversely, the presentation by the German development agency covered

bilateral agreements with countries of the South that appear to be far more sensitive to the rights and practices of IPLCs.

One official talked of “bioprospecting in Malaysia” as if it were a tourism activity and described it as a process “from traditional knowledge to innovation,” as if IPLCs haven’t innovated for centuries. After all, teosinte didn’t become maize without an awful lot of human help. Malaysian biodiversity was valued for its “ecosystem services” and would provide “wealth creation” for all parties involved, we were assured.

South Africa detailed the “value added products” it was able to realize by the “mass cultivation of species” that had been bioprospected. The field and forests and waters would no longer be subject to the “informal IPR trade” but become a profitable business, managed as a “sustainable, inclusive, commercially valuable sector”. One has visions of plantations of rare plants, resembling the long lines of oil palms one now encounters.

Yes, the Sustainable Development Goals would be folded in, yes, IPLCs would be “consulted”, and yes, jobs would be created for local people. But poor countries like Kenya appeared to be certainly eyeing “opportunities for development” as well as “ecosystem preservation.” As Panama put it, the “economic pressures to access genetic resources” would surely lead to political support for exploitation. In other words, the ideas of urban elites would trump the needs and cultural practices of IPLCs, yet again.

Will the historic theft of traditional knowledge continue in new guises? Or will the different treaties among nation states finally provide support for the cultures and dignity of indigenous peoples and local communities throughout the world?

Notes on Aichi Target 18 (next page)

1. CBD article 10 c, 2. Aichi Target 18, 3. A/71/266, UN Secretary General, paragraphs 41 and 63,
4. CoP XIII draft decision on Indicators, Annex on Generic and Specific Indicators, Aichi Target 18,
5. UNEP/CBD/WG8J/8/9, paragraph 9, 6. UNEP/CBD/COP/13/17, page 6, Annex I,
7. ILO Newsletter 2008 Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, pages 3 & 19,
8. <http://ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=20423&LangID=E>,
9. UNEP/CBD/WG8J/8/9, paragraphs 13 & 41 and ILO, CEACR, 73rd Session, 2002, observation, Peru, para 7, 10. E/2014/86, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, paragraph 78,
11. CESCR, E/C.12/GC/20, paragr. 25

The opinions, commentaries, and articles printed in ECO are the sole opinion of the individual authors or organisations, unless otherwise expressed.

Submissions are welcome from all civil society groups.

Email: lorch@ifrik.org

On customary sustainable use indicators, Aichi Target 18

Ville-Veikko Hirvelä

Diverse local customary forms of tenure and land use are adapted to local biodiversity regeneration for millenniums. States shall "protect and encourage customary use of biological resources in accordance with traditional cultural practices that are compatible with conservation or sustainable use"¹ and do this "with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities".²

Earth sustains the regeneration of its own biodiversity by itself under such customary tenures. But the capture of lands, forests and waters away from communities' customary use under the modern ownership-based commercial tenures and land use has led to wide, rapid loss of Earth's biodiversity.

Even though the modern management notes this current loss of world's biodiversity as catastrophic, still it does not restrict our modern industrial overconsumption and commodification which created this catastrophe but on the contrary rather further speeds up Earth's commodification. While many policies are assumed to address environmental destruction, they continue to manage the areas by such modern formal tenures, commercial ownership and management which have led to the catastrophic loss of Earth's diversity of life.

To save this diversity of Earth's life "the notion that a deed to property conveys with it the right to destroy an ecosystem needs to be changed".³ We cannot prevent the catastrophe by expanding use of the same commodified ways to measure and manage the Earth, which created it.

Still even the respect for communities' customary sustainable use of biodiversity in their traditional areas is now paradoxically proposed for the CEP 13 to become indicated by the modern formal ownership documents like commercial title deeds, which often take lands rather away from customary sustainable use.

As biodiversity has survived in indigenous territories without formal titles, its customary sustainable use is not duly indicated by "agricultural population with ownership" of such formal documents.⁴ Often in these "areas traditionally owned, used or occupied by indigenous and

local communities" on the contrary "changes in land use from indigenous forests to agriculture imply decreasing opportunity to practice traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use, including traditional occupations".⁵

Traditional occupations have been adapted by their land use to the regeneration of area's biodiversity, thus indicating its customary sustainable use by such ways of observing customary tenure which form a "'heritage' as opposed to 'property', thereby reflecting its custodianship and intergenerational character".⁶ They "originate from generations of experience of caring for and using their lands".⁷

Where people live by traditional occupations with customary tenure there biodiversity usually survives better than under commercial titles. Thus to operationalise the trends in traditional occupations, tenure and land use to indicate customary sustainable use of biodiversity, its specific indicators do not need to express formal ownership titles, but rather:

To what extent do people live by earth's biodiversity regeneration, without displacing it (traditional occupations) and to what extent they have got customary tenure secured for this (tenure/land use).

"Protection of biodiversity is a human rights issue as a healthy ecosystem is important for the full enjoyment of a wide range of human rights" whose realisation also "can provide useful tools for the effective protection of biodiversity".⁸

"Traditional occupations are fundamental to the livelihoods and culture of many indigenous and local communities" and confer also a right to customary tenure integral to their subsistence, having a human right status "closely linked to customary sustainable use of biodiversity".⁹ States are responsible for "ensuring security of tenure of all [...] regardless of the type of tenure"¹⁰ since as property status is "prohibited ground of discrimination", human rights "should not be made conditional on a person's land tenure status".¹¹

Notes: see previous page