



## Darwin Initiative Annual Report

### Important note:

To be completed with reference to the Reporting Guidance Notes for Project Leaders: it is expected that this report will be about 10 pages in length, excluding annexes



**Submission Deadline: 30 April 2011**

**Note: as this is an extensive project which is carried out in 6 countries, the length needed to provide all information that was required exceeds 10 pages**

### 1. Darwin Project Information

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Project Reference   | 18-003  |
| Project Title   | Supporting indigenous and local organisations to implement CBD article 10 (c)   |
| Host Country/ies  | Bangladesh, Cameroon, Guyana, Indonesia, Suriname, Thailand, Panama   |
| UK contract holder institution  | Forest Peoples Programme (FPP)  |
| Host country partner institutions   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Unnayan Onneshan, Bangladesh</li> <li>○ South Central People's Development Association (SCPDA), Guyana</li> <li>○ Institut Dayakology, Indonesia (West Kalimantan)</li> <li>○ Organisation of Kaliña and Lokono People in Marowijne (KLIM), Suriname (<u>Note</u>: formerly "Indigenous Land Rights Commission Lower Marowijine (CLIM)", the official name change was adopted in December 2009)</li> <li>○ Inter Mountain Peoples Education and Culture in Thailand Association (IMPECT), Thailand</li> <li>○ Fundación para la Promoción del Conocimiento Indígena (FPCI), Panama</li> </ul> <p><u>Note</u>: the project in the original host country in Cameroon has been completely self-funded with separate funds. Although we maintain good contacts with our partner OKANI and we are regularly updated, the project in Cameroon is separately coordinated and administrated. We are therefore not including Cameroon in this report.</p> |
| Other partner institutions  | N/A   |
| Darwin Grant Value  | <p>£90,000 per annum</p> <p>As we have indicated in question 22 of our original application, various other sources of funding have been secured and put towards the costs of this project. During the last project period, the co-funders of this project have been Swedbio, the EC (Guyana component), Oxfam-Novib, and the Christensen Fund. The budget for 2010 (January – December) was around €500,000.</p> <p>Achievements and results described in this annual report reflect progress made through the joint funding base.</p>  |
| Start/end dates of project  | 1 April 2010 – 31 March 2013  |
| Reporting period (eg Apr 2010 – Mar 2011) and number (eg Annual Report 1, 2, 3) | April 2010 – March 2011<br>Annual Report 1  |
| Project Leader name   | Dr. Maurizio Farhan Ferrari   |
| Project website   | <a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org">www.forestpeoples.org</a> (general FPP website, not project-specific)  |
| Report authors, main contributors and date                                      | <p>Maurizio Ferrari and Caroline de Jong, FPP, project coordinators, Sarah Roberts, FPP finance officer (financial report).</p> <p>In collaboration with the project teams from Unnayan Onneshan, IMPECT, KLIM, SCPDA, FPCI, and Institute Dayakologi.</p>  |

## 2. Project Background

### **Background & problem that the project seeks to address:**

In our application, we described that effective implementation of Article 10(c) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), which states that Parties shall protect and encourage indigenous and local communities' customary sustainable use of biological resources, is still a challenge. Some key issues are that:

- Many communities still broadly experience a lack of access to and control of lands and resources, and a lack of involvement in decision-making and management of natural resources, while secure rights to land, territories and resources represent a fundamental requirement for forest peoples to maintain and practise customary use and traditional knowledge.
- Despite the international acknowledgement of the importance of CSU, it is generally still disregarded and considered irrelevant at the national and sub-national levels. Top-down natural resource management and conservation approaches exclude customary practices, which can have severe negative consequences for the vitality of these systems. Often, biodiversity loss is even unjustly blamed on local communities' practices and therefore access to, and use of, resources are severely restricted. If customary sustainable management systems and customary laws and institutions, which are the backbone of customary sustainable use, are not respected and recognized by governments and national laws, such practices can become weakened.
- The establishment of protected areas without respect for indigenous peoples' rights and without adequate participation is posing challenges to communities in terms of both access and management of biological resources, and thus on the customary sustainable practices related to these areas.
- Customary sustainable use is also under threat from external pressures such as extractive industries (such as logging and mining) and top-down development interventions, which destroy customary territories, or restrict access. The application of free prior informed consent (FPIC) is important to protect customary use from such threats. However, FPIC is generally not institutionalised and not applied (and not fully understood).
- Many current education systems are aimed at assimilation and are enforcing non-indigenous languages, which cause loss of local knowledge and related practices. Education in the own language and on issues that relate to local environment and knowledge is vital to maintain customary sustainable use and traditional knowledge.

In this project, the host country partners (see below) – all organisations of indigenous peoples, local communities and local support organisations - with support from FPP, are aiming to implement article 10(c) more effectively, both by the communities themselves and in facilitating collaborative implementation with government and other relevant agencies .

The project a follow-up of work that has been done since 2004 to clarify the meaning and implications of customary sustainable use and advocacy work to implement this article of the CBD at the national and international levels.

### **Location**

The project is carried out in the following locations with the following indigenous peoples and local communities:

- Bangladesh – Sundarbans – traditional resource users
- Guyana - South and South Central District – Wapichan people
- Indonesia – West Kalimantan – Dayak people
- Panama – Guna Yala – Guna people
- Suriname – Marowijne district – Kaliña and Lokono people
- Thailand – northern highlands – Hmong and Karen people

## 3. Project Partnerships

### **Project partnerships:**

As we explained in our application, we have a long-term field relationship with all the host-country partners (the organisations of indigenous peoples and local communities), with whom we worked on similar projects for many years. In that respect, our relation has not changed since last year, although it does continue to be strengthened.

In terms of management structure:

The host country partners carry out the local and (sub)national level field and advocacy work activities, and represent and voice the local level concerns and issues in the international arena (CBD) and also

share the international outcomes with local level constituencies. They are responsible for their own administration, staff and office issues, and report regularly to FPP on project progress.

FPP takes care of the overall coordination and administration of the project. We manage the overall budget, raise additional funds, and put together the joint narrative and financial reports. We also facilitate regular exchanges and contact between the various partners and we support the production of joint publications or articles and play a role in media outreach. We usually coordinate the participation of the partners group in the CBD process at the international level, including international meetings and submissions of joint documents to the CBD Secretariat. FPP staff are also involved in the local project activities as technical advisors or resource persons for our partners.

The relations with the partners are managed in different ways. First of all FPP staff have a strong field presence in all partner countries; we visit the local offices at least once a year and we are very familiar with the project teams and activities on a personal level. From the UK we maintain regular contact through e-mail and skype. We meet with the entire project team to participate in CBD meetings, and we always use these opportunities to arrive 1-2 days in advance to spend time together to discuss project updates and possible problems. Every 2 years, we organise a partners' meeting (in one of the partner communities) where we reflect on progress and future steps together. We have just concluded such a meeting in Guna Yala (Panama), which was held 4-9 April – just outside the scope of this reporting period!

See also section 5 on monitoring and evaluation.

### **Other Collaboration**

The 10(c) team has strengthened the link with the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB), the indigenous peoples' caucus in the CBD. At CBD meetings, we operate within the IIFB and track and engage in issues related to customary sustainable use. Interventions and statements are made on behalf of the entire IIFB.

Prior to the official CBD meetings, there are IIFB preparatory meetings to discuss agenda issues and prepare positions. FPP and the 10(c) usually present 10(c) and related issues. Each morning between 9 and 10 a.m., the IIFB meets to reflect on the previous days and look ahead and strategize for the coming sessions. Statements or interventions are shared with the entire caucus and are agreed on before they are read in plenary.

FPP and the 10(c) are also directly and closely involved in the IIFB Working Group on Indicators, which is formally tasked to develop indicators related to indigenous well-being in relation to the CBD. On 7-9 May, prior to the SBSTTA-14 meeting in Nairobi, FPP co-organised a technical workshop with Tebtebba and the IIFB Working Group on Indicators on land use indicators. COP10 planned to adopt two new indicators on indigenous well-being under the multi-year programme of work on article 8(j). One of these focuses on changes in land use and land security, the other one on changes in traditional occupations. One of the methodologies for measuring these indicators is community mapping. The FPBP team shared their experiences with mapping and also exchanged information with other communities, and contributed to the discussions on these indicators.

FPP and the 10(c) team also strengthened the links with the CBD Alliance, a network of NGOs that are working on CBD issues.

FPP was also one of the 51 founding organizations that created the International Partnership of the Satoyama Initiative (IPSI) at COP10 in October 2010, and in January 2011 also became a member of the Steering Committee. The Satoyama Initiative is a high-level partnership launched by the Japanese government that includes a mixture of agencies, from international (UNEP, UNDP, FAO, CIFOR, CI) to community-based organisations, to promote socio-ecological systems relevant to sustainable use of biodiversity. As such this initiative is very relevant to 10(c) and FPP and partners have used this platform to highlight the linkages between Satoyama and 10(c) and to promote 10(c) – see section 4.1, activity 7 for more details.

### **Link with CBD focal point:**

The project partners maintain contact with the CBD focal points from their respective countries. In particular these contacts are strengthened 'in the corridors' of CBD meetings which we attend as observers and the focal points as Parties. Here there are good opportunities to exchange information and views. In particular the focal points from Bangladesh, Thailand and Suriname are open for collaboration and inputs from our partners and on several occasions they have discussed their positions with the partners. We provide them with the 10(c) team statements and interventions, and also invite them for our 10(c) side events (sometimes they attend), and give them copies of our 10(c) publications. In Suriname,

the KLIM has been invited to preparatory meetings to COP10 by the Ministry of Environment (the focal point) and they maintain regular email contact with the KLIM. In Thailand, the CBD focal point has met a few times with our partner, IMPECT, and they are now developing a collaborative project together.

## 4. Project Progress

**NB:** this project is carried out mostly at the local level in six countries and in many villages and communities. We do not require our partners to send us full minutes, notes, (training) materials, or reports from every single village or community meeting, workshop, training, etc that they have held. Most of these are held in indigenous, local or non-English national languages and some are considered confidential or private by the communities. We don't think these would be necessary for LTS/Defra either - but we do require our partners to send us summary reports of all the meetings, the outcomes and results, or any obstacles or questions arising from these meetings. However, if there is a particular item that LTS/Defra would like to see, we can discuss this with the concerning partners (and translate it into English as needed and appropriate). Please let us know when that is the case.

### 4.1 Progress in carrying out project activities

**NB:** the project activities in the project application (in the logframe / workplan) all correspond to various outputs because of the cross-cutting nature of the work. The outputs are provided below and we will report on each of the activities and indicate to which of the outputs this activity relates. They activities have been carried out as planned and on time.

**Output 1.** The acknowledgement and recognition of (the role of) CSU and traditional knowledge (TK), indigenous languages (IL), customary laws and institutions has increased

**Output 2.** Significant progress has been made towards securing land and resource rights of partner communities, including access and control

**Output 3.** Local involvement in biodiversity decision-making and management (including in protected areas) has increased and community-based management plans play a significant role in it

**Output 4.** Threats and pressures on CSU have decreased, among others through enhanced application of FPIC in matters affecting indigenous peoples' lands and territories

#### ***Activity 1: Capacity-building activities for local institutions in their capacity to interface with regional, national, and international agencies (governments, NGOs, private and other sectors) in asserting and maintaining their rights (including right to FPIC) ( outputs 2,3,4)***

This project element has focussed on facilitating meetings of traditional authorities, community organisations and networks to discuss communal concerns and develop collaborative strategies to respond to these. It also included raising awareness among the communities on issues that impact on the traditional territory and as such on the customary management of these areas, including building of capacity to respond to existing and emerging threats to the territories and the communities, such as actions by external actors (governments, companies, NGOs), or climate change impacts and top-down mitigation programmes. Good progress in this regard has been achieved in the following countries:

#### **Suriname:**

In Suriname, the village leaders and representatives of women and youth organizations in Marowijne are following a 4-year "Indigenous rights training and capacity building programme". This training programme is lead by Surinamese human rights expert Dr. Ellen-Rose Kambel and FPP project officer Caroline de Jong, and various guest trainers and experts. The training addresses the issues that are requested by the KLIM and as such responds to their needs for specific practical skills, expertise or information.

In the project period, three trainings were carried out within the framework of this programme. Each training session lasted for 3 or 4 full days and was attended by 15 – 25 persons. One of the issues covered during this session focused on successful leadership and illustrated successful initiatives of indigenous peoples in other countries. Another focus of this training session was on improving the communication skills of the KLIM leaders and members. A communication and leadership trainer from the Netherlands was hired by the KLIM to observe and analyse communicative strengths and weaknesses of the KLIM and to provide feedback, advice and suggestion for improvement, and to provide additional training on and support with internal and external communication strategies and organizational planning for the KLIM training.

Another part of the training focussed on large scale projects carried out in the Lower-Marowijne area and their possible impacts on the indigenous communities, for instance the various phases of large (mining) projects. The participants discussed and deliberated on how they should be consulted for each phase.

Output: capacity of community, in particular leaders, has increased and collaboration and collective action has been supported.

Means of verification: documents and materials produced by participants during the trainings (in Dutch); evaluations & quotes from participants and from trainers that skills and level of knowledge and capacity have improved; reports of KLIM meetings and board meetings (in Dutch).

### **Guyana**

Sixty-five Toshaos (traditional leaders), senior councillors, councillors, head teachers, health workers and resource people from south central Rupununi communities attended a climate change workshop. The government of Guyana is getting heavily involved in climate change mitigation financing projects, and these may have major impacts on the customary management of biodiversity in the areas used and occupied by the Wapichan peoples. Similar awareness sessions will be carried out by local trainers throughout the territory.

The project also enabled the South and South Central District Toshao Councils (DTCs) to continue to have regular meetings. Six separate meetings and one joint meeting of the South Central District Toshao Council (10 communities in south central Rupununi) and South District Toshao Councils (7 communities from south Rupununi) were convened, involving collective planning and decision-making on issues relating to land management, tenure rights and self-development. One particular point of discussion was the government's proposed Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS) and effective implementation of the 2006 Amerindian Act, including discussions on measures needed to respect the right to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC). An FPIC document has been developed during a joint meeting with all community leaders. Another output was a letter that the Toshaos sent to the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs about concerns of the Toshaos regarding Brazilian rustlers crossing into Guyana.

Outputs: capacity of community, in particular leaders, has increased and collaboration and collective action has been supported.

Means of verification: documents and materials produced by participants during the trainings (FPIC document, letter to the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs); reports (including agreements reached) of DTC meetings; feedback from project coordinators

### **Thailand**

The project supports bi-monthly meetings of the Maeya-Maepon watershed network, Mae Pae watershed network and Maetia-Maetae watershed network; quarterly meetings of the Chom Thong Highland Conservation Club committee; a meeting of the Hmong environmental network and various meetings of the Hmong women's network in 5 villages. These (watershed) networks play a crucial role in the collective interaction between highland and lowland communities and government agencies in terms of addressing and responding to issues that impact on lands, territories and resources customarily used by indigenous communities.

Forty-five community leaders of different target communities received a training on good leadership and public presentation skills. This strengthened the leaders to present and discuss their concerns with governments and other outside agencies. In another training, 45 village leaders learned how to read basic maps, and to use GPS to document locations in their communities and make a basic community map.

Outputs: capacity of 45 leaders has increased and collaboration and collective action of watershed networks have been supported.

Means of verification: network meeting notes (including agreements, points of action / steps to be taken); training reports (all in Thai); feedback and information provided by IMPECT staff.

### **Bangladesh**

In the project period, three cooperatives have been established in the project area. This is important because through self-organization, the Sundarbans traditional resource users can address issues concerning sustainable management of resources as well as pursue the recognition of their rights effectively. Moreover, it will improve their access to the resources in the Sundarbans, because the cooperative can acquire a communal boat with boat licence certificate (BLC), which is a legal prerequisite to obtain a license to use resources in the Sundarbans. This BLC – issued by Department of

Forestry - is the only valid document with which a person may enter into the forest and collect resources. The forest resource users, however, are very poor (most of them are day labourers) and they do not have their own boat. Accordingly, they cannot get the BLC. As a consequence, most traditional resource users have no other choice than to enter into agreements with money lenders to get access to the forest, to whom they must pay the lion's share of their collected resources, or they are compelled to sell their products at a very low price. Through the cooperatives they will stock their own capital (monthly subscription fee of members) and after one or two years they can buy their own boat and net.

In addition, these cooperatives will also serve as a platform to share experiences and understanding between honey collectors, *golpata* collectors, fishermen and other resource users, and to unite them in advocating their rights in resource management and participation in decision-making. This will help to establish a co-management regime that will – it is hoped - eventually ensure sustainability in the Sundarbans area. All three cooperatives are run exclusively by the forest resource users, who also carry out the administrative work.

Outputs: Sundarbans resource users are better organised and equipped for collective work and action through new cooperatives

Means of verification: three cooperatives registration papers and photos and film of official openings

### **Panama**

FPCI has developed educational/training materials on various topics: one on megaprojects, one on climate change, and one on biodiversity and traditional knowledge. All training materials are intended to strengthen the knowledge of indigenous peoples of Panama on these issues.

FPCI has contributed to two meetings of the general Kuna Congress, the highest Guna authority of the autonomous Guna Yala district where communities and authorities discuss and analyze issues of importance to the Guna people. The Guna General Congress asked FPCI for an explanation on climate change, REDD, adaptation and mitigation. FPCI has also held several separate meetings with the traditional authorities, to coordinate actions and exchange ideas and proposals. FPCI has shared outcomes of national and international meetings they attended with the authorities of the General Guna Congress.

A Guna Women Congress on Biodiversity and Climate change was also organised, intended to build women's capacity on this issue. It focussed on adaptation and mitigation and their potential impacts on women, children and traditional knowledge. Also several workshops and internal meetings have been held to enhance knowledge on climate change and biodiversity within the Guna 'Youth Group' consisting of 20 boys and girls.

Outputs: Guna people (leaders, youth, women) have increased knowledge and capacity, training materials have been produced

Means of verification: Evaluations by participants, information from FPCI project staff, meeting reports, educational materials

### **Indonesia**

In 2010 the Institut Dayakologi based in Pontianak, in collaboration with 'Tapankng Olupm Macatn Sangi' Sanjan Association (Tomas Association) started a project in West-Kalimantan, called "Empowerment and advocacy of indigenous peoples (Dayak Kodatn) in natural resource management at Kampong Sanjan, (Sanggau district, West Kalimantan province)". The Kampong Sanjan is the only kampong in Sanggau Kapuas Sub-district that has customary forest, which is considered rare because it is located 15 kilometres from the city centre yet it remains intact. The customary forest (*Tomawankng Ompu' Sanjan*) has been asserted and regulated by the community since 1950. Various clusters of large timber, rubber, tengkawang (illipe nut), and durian trees as well as a number of different kinds of orchids, are growing well in the 260-hectare customary forest.

However, the forest is vulnerable to land grabbing by large-scale oil palm plantations and industrial forest plantations simply because it does not get official recognition from the administration of Sanggau District yet. To support the Dayak Kodatn community, an empowerment and advocacy project has been initiated at Kampong Sanjan. During the project period, several workshops and trainings were held in the kampong to explain about customary rights and to prepare a collective lobby strategy for recognition of the customary ownership. It was decided to write a report that documents the customary forest use in *Tomawankng Ompu' Sanjan* and local researchers were trained for this purpose.

Outputs: community of Kampong Sanjan has started to build knowledge and capacity on the project issues

Means of verification: agreements on project planning, advocacy planning and strategy, and on the research team and planning for the documentation of the use of the customary forest (see below).

### **Activity 2: Documenting customary sustainable management systems (outputs 1, 3)**

This project element is not only about documenting customary sustainable use (such as community-based research, mapping or videoing); it is also about promoting and strengthening traditional knowledge and practises related to conservation and sustainable use. This includes the transfer of traditional knowledge and skills to balance the influences of mainstream education which often forces foreign language and cultures on indigenous children. Although under Article 10c of the CBD, governments are required to support CSU, many communities are already setting up their own initiatives in this respect – these are practical initiatives that are easy to support by others.

#### **Bangladesh**

In the Sundarbans trainings have been conducted among local resource (mostly young generations) users in different locations about sustainable natural resource management and traditional knowledge. The trainings were lead by experienced resource users from the communities and addressed various resource collection methods such as honey collection, *golpata* (*Nipah* palm) harvesting, fishing and wood collection, with a focus on the traditional knowledge about sustainability (including customary rules).

Also, an indigenous (Munda) cultural team was formed that will perform traditional songs, folklore, dance and drama through which traditional knowledge on resource management will be rejuvenated among the forest resource users. The team has been supported with musical instruments and traditional dresses. In this way, the cultural team will counter the influence of 'modern western culture' which threatens many of the traditional rules, norms and beliefs related to natural resource management.

Moreover, a local advocacy programme is carried out among Bawalis (small-scale woodcutters) to popularize so-called 'agro-silvo-aquaculture'. This is a new form of mangrove forestry on the mainland, in which mangrove species are growing along with fish, duck and vegetables. Such community-based mangrove forestry reduces pressure on the Sundarbans by providing forest resources as well as more secure livelihood incomes. It was first developed by a Bawali from of Naksha village, who received a 'Mangrove Award' for his outstanding innovation and contribution to forest conservation in 2008. It is a good example of a local-level adaptation strategy to changing circumstances and degrading resources.

Outputs: traditional knowledge and practices of traditional resource users in Sundarbans has been promoted and strengthened.

Means of verification: Unnayan Onneshan reports of trainings; establishment of cultural team; increasing number of resource users are starting to apply agro-silvo-aquaculture model.

#### **Thailand:**

Several traditional activities were carried out, that were partly aimed to engage younger people so that they would learn from them. For instance, Karen indigenous forest fire management activities were carried out, using rituals to ordain firebreaks, and also Karen aquatic animal conservation rituals, and indigenous headwater resource conservation rituals were carried out.

Cultural transmission activities were done in the cultural centers of Khunya, Khunpon and Maeyanoi village. Elders and experts taught young people on specific issues such as weaving skills, basketry, playing musical instrument and medicinal plants. A workshop on Karen herbal medicine was organized at San Din Daeng village. The main discussion was on how to conserve and promote medicinal knowledge of the Karen people. This included compilation and documentation of medicinal knowledge.

To increase plant biodiversity in Khunya and Khunpon village, additional trees were planted in the villages' food gathering forest. Also, signs (placards) were made and placed to indicate community natural resources and environmental management areas, such as 'conservation forest', 'community forest' and 'farming area'. These signs were placed in Khunya and Khunpon watershed area. In Mae Sa Nga village, community's signs that display community's rules were made and put up.

Villagers in San Din Daeng and Khun Ya village received training on making energy-saving stoves in August 2010. These trainings help villagers to gain knowledge on how to use soil from their community to make the stove and use in their households.

Outputs: traditional knowledge and practices of Karen and Hmong has been actively transmitted and applied.

Means of verification: IMPECT reporting on cultural transmission activities, visual outcomes such as signs, placards, newly planted trees.

### **Suriname**

The Kaliña people from Marowijne have taken the initiative to develop a bilingual (Dutch and Kalina) math method and to test this in a pilot project. This was done with the help of outside experts (among others a professional illustrator and an education expert) to oversee the complementarities of the book with the Surinamese national requirements for maths. The book is currently used in the school of Galibi. According to the teachers the children love the books and the educational results have also improved.

Outputs: a start has been made with education in indigenous language and culture.

Means of verification: Kaliña math book; feedback from the teachers about results and enthusiasm.

### **Guyana**

The Wapichan communities have commissioned four experts who will work together with local researchers to carry out studies on natural resource management and potential sustainable income generation options. Field work has started on the following issues:

- Ecological impacts of burning of savannah grasslands in the South Rupununi with recommendations for sustainable land management
- Use, management, ecology and health of natural fisheries in the South Rupununi with recommendations for sustainable management
- A feasibility study and options assessment for the development of Amerindian community-based farm enterprises in the South Rupununi
- A feasibility study and options assessment for the development of Amerindian livestock farming enterprises in the South Rupununi

Final reports are expected in May 2011 and a fifth study on Amerindian handicraft will also be set up.

Outputs: a start has been made with studies on natural resource management and potential sustainable income generation options.

Means of verification: updates from SCPDA; researchers have been contracted and field work has started.

### **Indonesia:**

The indigenous people of Kampong Sanjan in West-Kalimantan have started to carry out research to document the sustainable management of natural resources in their customary forest (Tomawangk Ompu' Sanjan). The Sanjan people plan to use this material in local, national and even international advocacy activities. Local researchers were trained do field surveys; focus group discussions with the community; and collecting field data by conducting interviews with informants, documenting customary natural resources management practices, and collecting secondary data. Field survey, discussion with the community and data collection of the first stage was conducted in January 2011 and data compilation and analysis has been conducted in February 2011 and a first draft of the research findings was produces in the same month.

In April 2011 a workshop (*boraump*) is planned in Kampong Sanjan to discuss the first research report draft, where the writing team should obtain inputs from the workshop participants to revise, correct and improve the first draft. The research findings are eventually planned to be published in the form of 100 books in Indonesian and English versions.

Outputs: first stage of research to document the sustainable management of natural resources in their customary forest has been completed.

Means of verification: first research draft is done; field surveys, discussions and data collection have been carried out (field notes and updates from Institut Dayakologi staff verify this).

### **Activity 3: Developing plans / proposals for community-based management and/or effective co-management (outputs 2,3)**

Secure access to and use of resources that indigenous peoples and local communities customarily use are vital to maintain and enhance customary sustainable practices and knowledge. The preferred way to



achieve this is to establish or recognise community management (which is community based and controlled), but a form of co-management (collaborative management by a variety of stakeholders, including community, government, NGOs) can also be a step forward. Under this project element, the partners develop their own resource management plans; map and indicate community boundaries, and try to achieve and prepare for such more equitable (co-)management approaches.

### **Guyana**

Seven inter-community workshops on the development of a land management plan (vision, objectives, principles, actions) have been conducted. Each workshop involved elders, women and elected village leaders and councillors from four to six neighbouring villages (participation numbers varied on different days from twenty to as many as sixty people). In all of these workshops, issues relating to land tenure, common land title boundaries and land title extension applications were discussed in great detail (using maps and sketch mapping methods).

At the same time, the workshops dealt in depth with inter-community actions and agreements on specific land uses, ecosystems and habitats according to the area of Wapichan territory under consideration. Some inter-community workshops focused on management of mountains, savannahs and bush islands, while other workshops focused on forest ecosystems and waters or cultural heritage sites. Agreements were reached on shared customary resource use.

A four-day initial write-shop was held which resulted in an initial outline draft management plan with objectives, management principles and agreed actions for different ecosystems and land uses. It is backed by twenty seven written inter-community agreements on sustainable resource use, shared land title boundaries between villages and a common vision for self-determined and community-driven development.

Outputs: progress made towards agreement on collective governance and management of Wapichan territory.

Means of verification: SCPDA updates and reports; written inter-community agreements on land use and shared boundaries, outline draft management plan with common vision.

### **Thailand**

Community mapping and land demarcation are main activities in Thailand. Land demarcation continues in communities bordering the Ob Luang National Park – this work has been ongoing in the past few years to address the overlaps between the National Park established by the government and the communities' ancestral lands, and the maps are used to renegotiate boundaries and use and access rights as well as to define land-use boundaries (especially agricultural land in relation to other various land-uses) in a collaborative way. The same is being done with regard to community boundaries in relation to the Doi Inthanon National Park.

Outputs: increasing extent of national park boundaries overlapping with indigenous lands are mapped and increasing number of agricultural lands are demarcated.

Means of verification: maps, reports and updates from IMPECT about use and effect of these maps and land-use definition and demarcation .

### **Suriname**

A land management plan team was formed, consisting of village leaders and other representatives from all villages in Marowijne (including women and youth), who will be leading the work on the land management plan in the coming years, and who will be working with the communities to gather the information, inputs and visions. An in-depth training was designed for this team to increase their level of understanding and capacity on this matter.

The team learned and discussed what a land management plan is, what land management plans (can) look like and what they (can) include (with examples from other communities), and why they are (can be) important and useful. It was also explained and discussed what the various steps/phases in the development of a management plan are. Exercises were done to formulate the ultimate goal (or vision) for the Lower-Marowijne and group exercises were done (per village) to make a SWOT analysis of their 'part' of the collective territory and identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. This is what the team will be facilitating in the village meetings as a first step to identify major issues and concerns. The team practiced how to explain the subject and to facilitate the SWOT- exercise. A brochure on the land management plan was developed and printed to disseminate among the villagers.

In December 2010 the coordinator of the KLIM also attended a seminar in Brazil by Amazônia Indígena to share experiences about demarcation and land management planning in the Amazon countries. This was a good occasion to set up a network with other countries that are working on similar issues.

Outputs: a good basis has been established to start work on developing a land management plan in the next project period.

Means of verification: management plan working group has been established and gained capacity (training reports, materials and evaluations available (in Dutch)); work plan for 2011 and strategy to involve all layers of communities agreed on.

### **Bangladesh**

A research project was set up and carried out to establish a participatory model for the identification and recognition of forest people in the Sundarbans Impact Zones (SIZ). Recently the Forest Department stated that they would issue passes and permits for forest resource collection in the Sundarbans to the traditional forest resource users. However, there is no list of who those traditional forest resource users are. This research project - ParMoRec-Sundarbans in short - has been developed to provide an authentic list of forest peoples to support the Forest Department and local government to ensure the recognition of rights for the real forest peoples.

The project is exclusively participatory in nature and included local traditional forest users, local elites, local government officials, forest department, and civil society in project planning, designing and execution. In the project period, many data were collected to feed into the study (for instance frequency of use, type of resource use, dependency on resources, level of knowledge, etc). These results are used to lobby with the forest departments to ensure that the real forest users get the permits, and also to address more secure access and user rights. Ultimately, it aims to advocate for co-management or even community management of resources in the Sundarbans.

Outputs: many data collected to develop a list of the real forest users

Means of verification: research data and notes, Unnayan Onneshan updates and reports

### **Activity 4: Community-based biodiversity monitoring (CBBM) training and activities (outputs 1, 3)**

Community-based biodiversity monitoring refers to activities of the communities that make use of traditional knowledge of the ecosystems to document status and trends in biodiversity and the related links with the livelihoods of community members.

### **Bangladesh**

Over the last few decades many species in the Sundarbans - one of the biodiversity hotspots of Bangladesh - have become extinct or are under threat. This is ultimately affecting the ecology of the Sundarbans and consequently the livelihood of the forest dependent people. Unnayan Onneshan has started a pilot project for community-based biodiversity monitoring of fish species.

With the assistance of the forest and fishery departments, the project team collected images of all fish species that occur in the Sundarbans. Experienced fishermen from the Sundarbans used the images of all the fish species to answer questions about the fish locations, qualities and quantities. Eventually the fish species were categorized as extinct (0-4), endangered (4-7), threatened (8-10), good (10+).

The communities around the Sundarbans have also carried out vulnerability mapping exercises. Forest degradation, recurring cyclones, salinity intrusion and other factors are contributing to increased vulnerability of the traditional resource users in the Sundarbans area. It is therefore very important to map the current and potential threats (such as flooding) and to identify the vulnerability of the traditional resource users. A vulnerability map of the local communities and regulatory bodies can indicate which areas need special conservation attention and which areas can be used for resource collection (and to what extent).

UO has supported the communities of the traditional resource users to prepare such vulnerability maps. Experienced resource collectors from different occupations (honey collectors, fishermen, *golpata* collectors) grouped together to divide their resource collection areas into three zones: a green zone where resources are abundant; a blue zone where resources are decreasing; and a red zone where resources have decreased considerably. They also identified factors relating to resource degradation. These resource maps of vulnerable areas in the Sundarbans are used for advocacy with the forest

departments, who often have a different view on the vulnerable areas and therefore don't direct appropriate action (they ban access to resources in the wrong places).

Outputs: status of fish species has been determined, and vulnerable zones identified and mapped by traditional resource users, which underlined the value of local TK and increased understanding among government departments.

Means of verification: report with fish monitoring outcome; vulnerability maps (photos and details of each mapping workshop available).

### **Suriname**

During the project period a start has been made with a community-based research on local climate change impacts and responses in the two villages that are located on the Atlantic Coast (on the estuary of the Marowijne River), where impacts from climate change are most visible.

Two local researchers (one man and one woman) from Galibi were hired to conduct interviews with fishermen and other villagers to gather data about the changes they are experiencing, what their thoughts about these changes are, how they affect biodiversity and resources and how they are coping and responding. The KLIM has decided that the research should be expanded to the other parts of the territory as well in the next project period, as climate change impacts are not confined to the coastal area.

Outputs: a start has been made with research on climate change impacts and responses.

Means of verification: notes from initial interviews with 25 persons.

### **Panama**

In Panama, fieldwork was carried out to analyze and diagnose problems related to communities and ecosystems which are vulnerable to climate change, combining methods of physical geography, ecology, sociology and traditional knowledge. Formal and informal interviews were carried out with community members, lobstermen, fishermen, researchers, farmers. A literature review was also carried out to produce an analysis which describes the effects of climate change on the ecosystems but also on the sociocultural and economical systems of the Guna peoples (and as such on their customary sustainable use of these ecosystems).

There was a focus on the ecosystems of sandy islands (reef islands formed by sand and the remains of coral reef systems). These islands in Guna Yala are managed by the Guna people – mostly for coconut production and tourism. These sandy islands face strong erosion of the beaches caused by a possible rise in sea level. The analysis demonstrated that in the area of Porvenir, Carti, Ustupu and Narganá, the vast majority of these sandy islands face a strong erosion of beaches; in some cases erosion removed the beach completely. This has negative impacts on the biodiversity and traditional management of Guna of the islands. A further rise in sea levels will greatly undermine the natural systems and the economy, food security and culture of the region.

Research was also carried out concerning mortality of coral reefs. Coral mortality is usually the result of environmental stress, and is generally attributed to the occurrence of a disease or the presence of pathogens and parasites. The current mortality is also attributed to human-induced impacts, such as global warming, bad fishing practices and gear such as the use of chlorine for the octopus fishery, waste, etc. Although the reefs in Guna Yala are still among the healthiest reefs in Panama, preliminary scientific data show a strong decline in living coral cover of 72% between 1983 and 1997. In this sense, it is vitally urgent and necessary to get better insight on the effects of each impact, including climate change.

Another focus was on the drying up of mangroves and other floral systems. The team investigated changes in the mangrove-swamps in the coastal flood plain and transit zones and looked at the impacts caused by the rising sea level and impacts from storms. Species such as *Conocarpus erectus*, *Rizophora* mangrove *Avicenia germinans* and *Laguncularia racemosa* were affected by increased salinity and erosion, causing leaf and physiological degradation of these species. Coconut palms (*Coco nucifera*) are located on islands and near-shore areas that are being affected by salinity and coastal erosion, and this led to the decline of this species in different coastal areas of the region. Erosion has not only undermined the beach systems, but also exposes the trees' roots, causing collapse of the species.

To complement the analysis of vulnerable ecosystems, a (first) biological inventory of flora and fauna in the vulnerable ecosystems was carried out. Some species have been already identified. FPCI expects to publish this work by mid-2011.

In addition, FPCI has carried out mapping exercises to get a better picture of the vulnerable ecosystems and their dynamics, accessibility, vulnerability, ecological stability and conservation status. For instance, the maps indicate the locations and abundance of the coral reefs in different time periods. This type of mapping was done in the communities of Yandub, Agguanusadup, Dad Nakue Dubbir and Usddub. The mapping is based on satellite images and field techniques. Several thematic maps were also produced, for instance to reflect the community growth from 1970, 1996 and 2010, and maps indicating floods in the communities of Usddub and Dad Naggue Dubbir.

Outputs: extensive data collected and maps produced on climate change impacts on Guna territory and people.

Means of verification: interview notes and other research data, maps of vulnerable ecosystems, inventory of flora and fauna in vulnerable ecosystems.

***Activity 5: Advocacy: promote policy, legal and institutional reforms for an effective implementation of Article 10(c) (meetings, presentations and workshops with/for governments and other involved parties) (outputs 1,2,3,4)***

**Thailand**

Good progress has been made to engage with the Municipal and District government offices to recognise customary use and community initiatives through local government decisions and budget allocation. This seems to be the most practical way to get communities' rights, needs and aspirations incorporated into land and development planning in the Thai political context. A newly elected Municipal Office is now in place in Baan Luang, an area bordering the Doi Inthanon National Park. IMPECT and FPP held a meeting with the elected officers in December 2010 to explain about IMPECT's work and deal with the National Park's reluctance to engage in the initiatives of the communities. The officers seem supportive of IMPECT's approach and will organise a workshop with IMPECT to discuss these matters in more details. After the meeting, the chair of the office asked IMPECT and FPP about REDD as their office has just received a proposal from a Bangkok-based company to lease large tracts of land for REDD reforestation. IMPECT has agreed to send them material and to engage in discussion with them about REDD.

On 15-16 December a Consultative Workshop to Develop a Strategy on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in Natural Resource Management and Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use was organised by IMPECT, IKAP and FPP. This workshop was convened with the participation of community leaders to discuss status and trends on the rights of indigenous peoples in relation to natural resource management and biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and to develop a strategy to engage with the CBD government focal point and with IUCN.

Presentations were made by IMPECT, NIPT (Network of indigenous Peoples in Thailand), and IKAP (Indigenous Knowledge and Peoples Network) on the situation in Thailand and two presentations were made by FPP on 'Indigenous peoples, protected areas and international law', and on 'What progress in implementing the new conservation paradigm?'. Two representatives from IUCN (Thailand) attended the workshop, so much of the discussion on the second day focused on potential collaboration between indigenous organisations and IUCN. The two IUCN representatives were not aware of the various IUCN resolutions and CBD provisions concerning indigenous peoples and were thankful to receive knowledge about them. The IUCN's work focuses on water resources, so potential areas for collaboration include watershed resources management and IUCN resolutions on indigenous peoples. As a result of the workshop, two follow-up meetings are planned in Bangkok during the next project period: with IUCN Thailand and Asia Regional Office and the other with the CBD focal point.

IMPECT also participated in a meeting with the Office of National Policy and Planning on Natural Resource and Environment (ONPPNRE) on the concept of payment for environmental service (PES), and in a meeting with the ONPPNRE and different government agencies on how to put COP10 outcomes into practice.

Also interesting to note is the passage of a Cabinet Resolution on 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2010 by the Ministry of Culture, which sets a policy framework for reviving Karen's traditional livelihoods and establishes a joint committee and sub-committee on the revival of Karen traditional livelihoods. The Karen Network for Culture and Environment (KNCE) was also part of this process. One sub-committee will monitor the implementation of the cabinet resolution and another sub-committee will carry out a study and promote rotational farming to be a world cultural heritage. Various government agencies have been invited to take part in the realization of this policy, such as Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Natural Resource and Environment, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Social Development and Human Security, Ministry of

Interior and Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperative. IMPECT feels that this cabinet resolution can be beneficial to the Karen people in Thailand. IMPECT already participated in a meeting with the sub-committee on revival of Karen traditional livelihoods, to discuss how to move the cabinet resolution forward for the benefit of the Karen people.

Outputs: relationship with officers at new municipal government offices has been strengthened and good initial discussions about customary use and the situation with the national park have been held. Indigenous peoples in Thailand have developed strategy for effective lobby with CBD focal point and IUCN and improved relationship with IUCN staff (including increased IUCN awareness of IP issues related to biodiversity); and with ONPPNRE about COP10 implementation. Progress in recognition of Karen traditional livelihoods through a cabinet resolution was also achieved.

Means of verification: agreement with municipal officers to have further collaboration and discussion (through a workshop) about the issue; notes, presentations and agreed actions of the consultative meeting; agreement on further workshop with IUCN; notes of meetings with ONPPNRE; cabinet resolution and notes of meeting of sub-commission

### **Bangladesh:**

In Bangladesh Unnayan Onneshan is involving relevant national and local government departments in many local activities regarding the Sundarbans, and tries to establish collaboration and joint work. This is aimed at creating better understanding of the importance of the community livelihood issues regarding the Sundarbans and to stimulate the government officials to take appropriate actions.

For instance, the community based fish species monitoring project was done in collaboration with the forest department, fishery department and other departments relating to Sundarbans management, who provided the project team with lists and images of the fish species of the Sundarbans. The outcomes of the resource mapping of vulnerable areas in the Sundarbans are also shared with the forest departments, to discuss more appropriate and effective actions. The three community cooperatives have been registered under the government's cooperative department.

Also the research project for the identification and recognition of forest people in the Sundarbans Impact Zones (the ParMoRec study) was done with the approval and encouragement of the government, in particular the forest department. The results are used to discuss a more fair and equitable system of permit issuance with this department. Other than applicability in forest management, the study has broader implications of influencing the national Occupation Classification System. In Bangladesh people with traditional occupations are not recognized in the National Classification. In 2008 ILO has revised its classification system and recognized traditional occupations under several occupational categories sub-units. Through the ParMoRec study it has been found that in the Sundarbans area forest dependent communities' activities fall under different sub-unit of ISCO-08 (International Standard Classification of Occupation by ILO). The ParMoRec study, therefore, will support the recognition of the activities of the people who depend on the Sundarbans and its resources as 'traditional occupations' in Bangladesh's National Occupation Classification.

Outputs: local governments approve of the project activities and are involved in them.

Means of verification: Unnayan Onneshan's reports and updates from staff.

### **Panama**

In Panama a protocol on access to genetic resources was developed. This protocol represents the first nationwide initiative that promotes protection of access to genetic resources of indigenous peoples. Also, an updated overview of Panama's laws on forests, protected areas, biodiversity and climate change, and protected areas was produced. Both publications have been completed and are expected to be published for the first months of 2011

Outputs: protocol on access to genetic resources developed

Means of verification: protocol is available.

### **Guyana**

In December 2010, a Wapichan representative team of Toshaos and councillors travelled to Georgetown to meet with the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Agriculture, Guyana Forestry Commission, Guyana Geology and Mines Commission, Office of Climate Change, Guyana Defence Force and Conservation International. The meetings were held to share general information on land and resource management and to raise issues impacting on sustainable land and resource use. Points raised included the need for speedy resolution of outstanding land rights matters and concerted

action to address threats to territorial integrity posed by illegal Brazilian grazing and rustling activities and mining pollution of the southern rivers of the territory. Other topics discussed included community plans for improved food security and presentation of an outline set of guidelines for free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) for Wapichan communities in relation to the LCDS process (developed in community workshops held under this project). Various development issues relating to health and education were also discussed.

Outputs: various ministries and government commissions and conservation organisations have been made familiar with information and concerns on land and resource management issues

Means of verification: meeting reports and updates from project staff.

### **Indonesia**

In West-Kalimantan the purpose of the advocacy and lobby activities with the administration of Sanggau District is to seek protection, recognition and ratification on the indigenous community's customary forest territory, and their management system. In addition, the community's customarily managed territory is expected to be listed in spatial development of the government, which is free from companies' management territory.

Although most lobby activities are planned for the next project period, some preparatory meetings were held already. An informal meeting between the team of Institut Dayakologi and the deputy head of Sanggau District was held at the official residence of the deputy head in Sanggau on 5 September 2010. This meeting introduced the empowerment and advocacy project in the kampong and also served to invite the deputy head to a workshop in the community about the recognition of the customary forest.

This workshop itself was held on 22 September 2010 at Kampong Sanjan. In local terms, the workshop is called *Boraump* (which means: a discussion to reach a consensus). It was attended by more than a hundred participants consisting of Sanggau District administration officials (deputy head of district, the heads of office, members of legislative, leaders of sub-district and village); NGO's (Institut Dayakologi, West Kalimantan Alliance of Indigenous Peoples of the Archipelago); and representatives of the community of Kampong Sanjan .

The *Boraump* was dynamic and the community had the opportunity to ask various questions to the government. The customary forest of *Tomawankng Ompu' Sanjan* was mapped by the Office of Forestry of Sanggau District in June 2010, but data validation had not been completed as of 22 September 2010. The community of Kampong Sanjan requested not only the government but also the facilitating NGOs to facilitate and finalise the map. The local government representatives welcomed the initiative of the Kampong Sanjan people and emphasised that they have been managing their customary forest well, and they promised to produce a decree on customary forest as soon as the data on the community forest are completed and submitted.

Outputs: Sanggau District administration officials have listened to concerns and questions from community in Kampong Sanjan and promised to produce a decree on customary forest as soon as the data on the community forest are completed and submitted.

Means of verification: reports of the meetings.

### **Activity 6: Raising public awareness, both nationally and internationally, of these efforts and outcomes (outputs 1,2,3,4)**

#### **Bangladesh**

Unnayan Onneshan has started to publish a quarterly national biodiversity newsletter (CBD Watch). The 'CBD Watch' is intended to serve as a knowledge bank for Bangladesh's rich but continuously decreasing biodiversity. UO published a report on the impact of natural disasters in the Sundarbans on the lives and livelihoods of the local traditional resource users (this is an assessment of the situation one year after cyclone Aila hit the Sundarbans). [http://www.unnayan.org/reports/climate/ailareport\\_final.pdf](http://www.unnayan.org/reports/climate/ailareport_final.pdf). Unnayan Onneshan co-organized a two day seminar on 6-7 June 2010 at Khulna on the occasion of World Environment Day, where Unnayan Onneshan made a presentation on '*Responses to the changes of the Sundarbans: natural to anthropogenic*'. A couple of articles have been written in a renowned newspaper on biodiversity issues, with a focus on the issues related to the Sundarbans. On the occasion of World Biodiversity Day an article on biodiversity issues was published in the most renowned English daily - The Daily Star - and the article received broad attention of conservationists, activists, researchers and general public. The article was rated 4 out of 5 stars and was one of the most cited articles of the

year 2010 in Bangladesh. See: Biodiversity for life and livelihood. *The Daily Star*, June 12, 2010. <http://www.thedailystar.net/newDesign/newsdetails.php?nid=142290>

In the project period a short film was produced as well (10 minutes): Dwindling Forests: Dwindling Futures? Mangroves and forest peoples under threat in the Sundarbans, Bangladesh. This video was produced together with Sundarbans forest communities and highlights how customary use of biodiversity by traditional resource users in the Sundarbans mangrove forest is vital to the conservation and sustainable use of this wetland. It demonstrates how traditional knowledge and customary use are being ignored by the Bangladesh Government, and forest peoples are being excluded from decision-making and management of the forest. The film calls for respect and recognition of traditional resource users' knowledge and practices and a participatory approach to the management of the Sundarbans as a contribution to the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), as well as respecting forest peoples' dignity and securing their livelihoods and future. The video has been widely disseminated (among others through an article with link to the video in the FPP Enews) and made available online, and has also been shown during several events at COP10, including the FPP side event on 10c on 18<sup>th</sup> October (see activity 7). It is available at: <http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/rights-land-natural-resources/news/2010/12/new-film-dwindling-forests-dwindling-futures-mangr>

In addition, a Sundarbans Resource Centre has been established at Unnayan Onneshan's Khulna office. The resource centre is publicly accessible and contains more than 250 books, journal articles, and research reports on the Sundarbans and mangrove issues. The centre is equipped with modern digital technology and broadband internet connection. Since the resource centre is situated in Khulna and the CBMS project area is located in Koyra, Unnayan Onneshan has started to construct three local resource centres in three project areas.

Outputs: wider awareness raised about 10(c) issues in Bangladesh

Means of verification: see publications/video and links above.

### **Thailand**

IMPECT produced several materials and media on traditional knowledge of natural resource management and on community mapping. These materials have been displayed and disseminated in different fora. For instance, posters were produced on indigenous people's natural resources management of seven indigenous groups, namely Karen, Lahu, Lisu, Mien, Hmong, Lua and Akha. Also, a brochure was produced for public relations purposes, which outlines the project goals and activities and the cabinet resolution on revitalization of Karen cultural livelihoods. An information brief on natural resource management of Karen and Hmong peoples was designed. Several video's were produced: one about a forest ordination ceremony in Lue Pa Kga; one on the performance of water animals conservation ceremony in Lue Thi performance; and one on community mapping for resolving farm land conflicts. IMPECT also participated in the Thai Environment Day, where various agencies and organizations were invited to present and display their work.

Outputs: wider awareness raised about 10(c) issues in Thailand.

Means of verification: posters, brochures, video's, info briefs (see above).

### **Panama**

The radio show "Paths of Biodiversity" has played a unique role in disseminating information not only among the indigenous population, but also among general national public. The radio medium is used to communicate and reinforce environmental awareness, social and cultural rights of indigenous and non-indigenous peoples. Every Sunday from 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m., the partners of the FPCI analyze and present diverse local, national and international topics. The show can be followed via the internet as well. During the project period, topics included:

- The rights of Indigenous Peoples
- Women and Biodiversity
- Climate Change
- Youth and the environment
- Results and analysis of CBD COP 10 (Nagoya) and UNFCCC COP 16 (Cancún)
- Impact of mega-projects (electric interconnection)
- Biodiversity and Sustainable Development (10c)
- REDD
- Tourism
- Inter-cultural bilingual education

Outputs: wider awareness raised about 10(c) issues in Panama.

Means of verification: radio show (see above).

### **Joint**

FPP has developed a new website (same address: <http://www.forestpeoples.org>), which will be much more effective and dynamic in outreach to the public (including space for videos and blogs).

Since 2009 we have started to send out Enewsletters every 3 months, which reach a large and diverse audience: almost 5000 policy-makers, NGOs, academics, indigenous organisations and other interested persons. This Enews regularly contains articles related to the 10(c) project: either they contain local-level items or news from one of our partners, or they look forward to, or back on, international events that we have participated in (such as SBSTTA-14 and COP 10 in 2010 – see activity 7 below). See <http://www.forestpeoples.org/eneewsletters>

A 10(c) synthesis report, summarising the country case studies on customary sustainable use and focussing on common aspects in all countries (including threats and proposed solutions, and community initiatives) was developed prior to the SBSTTA-14 meeting in May 2010. In preparation for COP10, FPP updated and finalised the 10c synthesis report. We prepared a special information pack on customary sustainable use: folder containing the 10c synthesis, a flyer about our side event on 10c, a glossy sheet with web links to all the country 10c case studies, and the FPP publications leaflets. It was disseminated at the conference centre in several locations (over 400 copies) which were (almost) all picked up. The 10c synthesis report was also attached to the Enewsletter, posted online. In 2011 we will make the report available in French and Spanish as well. Available here: <http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/convention-biological-diversity-cbd/publication/2010/customary-sustainable-use-biodiversity-i>

In preparation for the COP10 agenda item on sustainable use (Article 10), FPP prepared an internal briefing for FPBP partners and other interested members of the IIFB on sustainable use. This included background information on the previous CBD process on this issue, the most important parts of the draft decisions on 8(j) and sustainable use that were relevant for customary sustainable use and possible action or follow-up for COP10.

During COP10, FPP maintained an experimental blog. This was intended for FPP and partners to share daily impressions, news and feedback from the meeting with the public. We posted, for example, filmclips of partners reading statements in the plenary, and the presentation that we did in our side event on customary sustainable use. Available here: <http://www.forestpeoples.org/special-blogs/cbd-cop-10-nagoya>

FPP published some articles in the widely distributed ECO newsletter of the CBD Alliance both at SBSTTA-14 and at COP10.

ECO 31(1): <http://www.cbdalliance.org/sbstta-14/>

ECO 35 (8): <http://www.cbdalliance.org/cop-10/>

FPP and partners also contributed an overview article to the CBD Technical Series No.52, 'Sustainable use of biodiversity in socio-ecological production landscapes. Background to the Satoyama Initiative for the benefit of biodiversity and human well-being'. The article was called *Customary sustainable use of biodiversity by indigenous peoples. Case studies relevant to the Satoyama Initiative from Suriname, Guyana, Cameroon and Thailand*. Available here: <http://www.cbd.int/ts/>

Outputs: wider awareness raised about 10(c) issues in general and joint 10(c) project.

Means of verification: see articles, reports and other media mentioned above (including links).

### **Activity 7: Linking project activities and outputs to international processes on 10(c) (outputs 1,2,3,4)**

The most important CBD meeting during the project period was the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention – COP 10 – which took place in Nagoya, Japan 18-29 October 2010. At COP10 new decisions were passed, some of which contained important references to customary sustainable use (10c). FPP and the project partners have worked hard to prepare well for this meeting by submitting timely information and views on 10(c) issues, and also participated actively during the meeting sessions itself.



Customary sustainable use is an element of two cross-cutting issues of the CBD. It is part of the issue 'sustainable use of biodiversity' – which is the focus of Article 10 of the CBD. It is also an element of the issue 'traditional knowledge, innovations, and practices' – this is the focus of Article 8(j) and related provisions (article 10(c) is a related provision of Article 8(j)). Both issues were on the agenda of COP 10 as 'issues for in-depth consideration'. On the issue of sustainable use, the Parties discussed the in-depth review of implementation of the programme of work on Article 10 of the Convention. On the issue of 8(j), the multi-year programme of work on Article 8(j) and related provisions was assessed and revisions were planned.

Because the COP does not have the time to have lengthy discussions about all the agenda items, the various texts of the draft decisions were developed prior to COP10, during separate meeting sessions such as meetings of specific Working Groups or the Subsidiary Body on Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA), which are aimed at discussing a specific issue in-depth. The item on 8(j) and related provision was prepared by the 6<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j) and related provisions in 2009 (WG8(j)-6) – FPP and partners participated in this meeting and submitted extensive inputs in preparation for the meeting document for WG8(j)-6 (this was done in the period before this project's reporting period). The sustainable use item has been prepared by the 14<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA-14). During the project period, FPP and partners attended this meeting. The secretariat has also collected information and comments from Parties and organisations by email and through discussion forums. The draft decisions for COP10 were developed based on these inputs and discussions at these meetings. Hence the preparatory phase before the actual COP has been strategically very important.

The CBD meetings such as the SBSTTA-14 and COP 10 have been a very good international platform to share the local level observations and experiences regarding implementation of 10(c); to share the community initiatives and recommendations on this matter; and to link the local level experiences and work to the international-level policy making process.

This has happened formally, through submissions to the CBD secretariat and comments on online CBD forums, and in the plenary sessions. For instance through interventions on behalf of the IIFB (the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity – the indigenous caucus at the CBD, in which our team operates as the '10(c) expert team) when 10(c) paragraphs were discussed, opening and closing statements, and sometimes also by written interventions submitted to the chairperson which contain concrete text change suggestions on certain paragraphs). But also in the corridors there are plenty opportunities to exchange views with Parties. A video of 10(c) project team member Louis Biswane (Suriname) reading the IIFB statement on customary sustainable use in the plenary at COP 10 can be viewed here: <http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/convention-biological-diversity-cbd/video/2010/10/iifb-submission-article-10c-cbd-cop10-22> .

Moreover, during lunch breaks and evening breaks, there are opportunities to host side events. Both at the SBSTTA-14 meeting and at COP10 we have hosted a side-event on customary sustainable use and the implementation of 10(c). The speakers from our team explained what customary sustainable use is; what kind of threats their customary systems are facing; the problems that exist with implementation of Article 10(c) at the local levels; which initiatives communities are taking themselves to improve and accelerate implementation of 10(c); and what governments can or should do to implement 10(c) more effectively. The 10(c) information packs (see Activity 6) were also distributed here and all of them were picked up. Pictures of the side-event and the full PowerPoint presentation are available here: <http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/convention-biological-diversity-cbd/publication/2010/presentation-customary-sustainable-use-a>

A highlight in terms of substantial outcomes of the CBD process in the project period is the Parties' increasing recognition, appreciation, and prioritization of indigenous peoples' customary sustainable use of biological resources, although there still remain many challenging aspects of the Convention.

The new CBD Strategic Plan for the coming decade that was adopted at COP10 now includes a target for the respect of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge, and their customary use of biological resources. The Parties unanimously decided to accept target 18 on traditional knowledge and customary use that was drafted and proposed by the IIFB:

"By 2020, traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention, with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels by 2020".

Under the Multi-year programme of work on the implementation of Article 8(j), several important things were decided in relation to enhancing article 10(c):

- a new major component on Article 10 with a focus on Article 10(c) will be included in the revised programme of work on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions
- Parties, indigenous and local communities and non-governmental organizations are requested to submit information to the Executive Secretary regarding the implementation of Article 10 of the Convention, with a focus on Article 10(c),
- the Secretariat will convene, subject to the availability of funds, an international meeting on Article 10 with a focus on Article 10(c), with the participation of Parties, Governments and international organizations, and representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities,
- A strategy will be developed to integrate Article 10, with a focus on 10(c), as a cross-cutting issue into the Convention's various programmes of work and thematic areas, beginning with the programme of work on protected areas

This Decision implied that there will be plenty of opportunities for the 10(c) project team to provide input in the 10(c) process in the coming years. In the meantime, the CBD Secretariat has sent out a notification requesting views from Parties and other stakeholders on the above issues (see <http://www.cbd.int/doc/notifications/2010/ntf-2010-210-tk-en.pdf>) and the 10(c) team has submitted an extensive submission with views on implementation of 10(c) (this was done after this project period so we will report on it in detail in the next annual report).

The international expert meeting on 10(c) is going to take place in Montreal 30 May – 3 June 2011. This meeting will discuss how customary sustainable use can play a more prominent role in the Convention's work programmes. A nomination process was set up by the CBD secretariat and all the partner organisations from the 10(c) team secured a place for this meeting with CBD funding. We will report on the outcomes in the next project report.

In the context of the in-depth review of the implementation of Article 10 of the Convention (on sustainable use), the 10(c) project team's main objective was to point out that secure land and resource rights are vital in relation to customary sustainable use of biological resources.

While "addressing obstacles and devising solutions to protect and encourage customary sustainable use of biodiversity by indigenous and local communities" was the specific focus of one of the paragraphs in the SBSTTA-14 and COP10 meeting document on sustainable use, the Parties did not want to include a specific reference to land and resource rights or land tenure security. Although this was disappointing, it does indicate how much work is still needed to create a mind-shift among international and national policymakers in order to make full implementation of 10(c) a reality.

The final paragraph on customary sustainable use in the COP 10 decision (Decision X/32, paragraph 3e) reads:

"Address obstacles and devise solutions to protect and encourage customary sustainable use of biodiversity by indigenous and local communities, for example by incorporating customary sustainable use of biological diversity by indigenous and local communities into national biodiversity strategies, policies, and actions plans, with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities in decision making and management of biological resources"

As we described in section 3 (partnerships), FPP joined the International Partnership of the Satoyama Initiative (IPSI). FPP participated at the Global Workshop on the Satoyama Initiative that was held at the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 29 to 30 January. FPP and partners organizations contributed an article entitled '*Customary sustainable use of biodiversity by indigenous peoples - case studies relevant to the Satoyama Initiative from Suriname, Guyana, Cameroon and Thailand*' to the CBD Technical Series 52 (pp.22-35), which was published prior to SBSTTA-14 and WGRI-3 in May 2010. In October 2010, FPP joined the launching of the IPSI at CBD COP10 in Nagoya. In March 2011, FPP participated at the First Regular Meeting of the IPSI (10-12 March) in Aichi, Japan. At the IPSI Public Forum, FPP provided a presentation on '*Customary sustainable use of biodiversity by indigenous peoples and local communities: synergizing on-the-ground implementation of the Satoyama Initiative and CBD Article 10(c)*'.

FPP and partners recommended that the Satoyama Initiative should be developed and implemented complementarily with existing Articles of the Convention, especially with Article 10(c), as both aim to promote customary sustainable use that provides positive outcomes for biodiversity and human wellbeing. The COP-10 Decision on Sustainable Use (Decision X.32, paragraph 7) also pointed out these links:

“Recognizes and supports further discussion, analysis and understanding of the *Satoyama* Initiative to further disseminate knowledge, build capacity and promote projects and programmes for the sustainable use of biological resources, and promotes synergy of the *Satoyama* Initiative with other initiatives or activities including... to advance understanding and implementation of customary use in accordance with Article 10 (c) of the Convention on Biological Diversity”

Outputs: strong and (mostly) rewarding participation at CBD meetings; new decisions adopted at COP10 related to 10(c), some (most) of which are viewed as positive by indigenous peoples; good opportunities for future input on 10(c).

Means of verification: (internal) FPP notes and reports of CBD meetings; 10(c) team statements and submissions to the Secretariat and Chairpersons; COP10 Decisions, in particular Decision X/2 on the strategic plan; Decision X/32 on sustainable use, and X/43 on the multi-year programme of work on 8(j), (see <http://www.cbd.int/decisions/cop/?m=cop-10>).

## **4.2 Progress towards project outputs**

See below

**Note:**  
 We believe that through the combination of activities described in detail above, good progress has been made towards the four main project objectives (or outputs). We feel that at this point it is slightly difficult to use the original indicators to measure progress towards the outputs, as they are intended to measure the achievement at the end of the project (in 2013), while progress towards the goals and outputs is gradual and strongly vary per country. The important local-level and national-level work that our partners are engaged in – sometimes still in preparatory phases – do not necessarily pay off immediately in the sense of changes in policy and practice.

Nevertheless, we will try to indicate progress following the indicators, and address the means of verification as much as possible. In addition we refer to the previous section in which we have reported on the activities, and also indicated their success and effectiveness, and how this was measured. In this section we will try to summarize how these activities are contributing towards the gradual achievement of the outputs and ultimately the project purpose.

We propose that towards the end of the project we will organise a special workshop with all project partners to review and fill in the log frame per country for a full final assessment.

| Project summary   | Measurable Indicators   | Means of verification  | Important Assumptions  |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Output 1.</b> The acknowledgement and recognition of (the role of) CSU and traditional knowledge (TK), indigenous languages (IL), customary laws and institutions has increased</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of policies and laws, that recognise TK, CSU and IL</li> <li>- Number and quality of educational policies and programmes that promote indigenous languages and TK.</li> <li>- Number of educational initiatives by communities that are acknowledged and/or supported by government</li> <li>- Number of conservation or sustainable use initiatives that include / incorporate TK and CSU (see also output 3)</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Process (involvement of communities) and outcomes of development and revision of policies and laws</li> <li>- Education policies</li> <li>- Concrete commitments by government and other outside parties to communities' proposals and initiatives (materials, curricula, projects, other educational activities )</li> </ul> | <p>Community efforts manage to change perception of governments and others</p> |
| <p><b>Progress:</b></p>   | <p>Although at this stage it is very difficult to provide concrete “numbers” already, our local partners do observe gradual positive changes in perception and acknowledgement of TK and CSU.</p> <p>A good example is the new cabinet resolution of the Ministry of Culture in Thailand, which sets a policy framework for reviving Karen’s traditional livelihoods and establishes a joint committee and sub-committee on the revival of Karen traditional livelihoods (including recognition of rotational farming).</p> <p>Another example of progress is the approval and support of the Surinamese government (ministry of Education and national education commissions) for the Kaliña peoples’ initiatives for bi-lingual and multicultural education, which is leading to a formal collaboration with the ministry of education. The government has also adopted the celebration of the international day of mother language (which was originally an initiative of the indigenous organisations in Suriname).</p> |  |  |

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
|   | <p>The assumption in the last column still holds true. The efforts of the community are crucial to influence the perceptions of the government and others in a positive way – this does not happen automatically! The progress in the last project period is largely due to the communities’ own efforts to document information (in reports, video, or presentations, articles) and present and disseminate it at the local and national levels among government officials, conservation organisations, and the general public. Initiatives like community-based biodiversity monitoring, or researching climate change impacts and responses, in which TK plays a significant role (for instance in Bangladesh and Panama), also contribute to a more favourable perception of CSU and TK among policymakers.</p> <p>In the meantime, the community initiatives to maintain and revive traditional knowledge, indigenous languages and skills make sure that TK and CSU remain intact and continue to be applied.</p>  |  |  |
| <p><b>Output 2.</b> Significant progress has been made towards securing land and resource rights of partner communities, including access and control</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of project partners who have made progress towards land and resource rights; and extent of progress</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Official and unofficial government communication (oral and written); statements, commitments, discussions &amp; correspondence with communities, newspaper articles, reports</li> <li>- Outcomes, reports and minutes of meetings and workshops with governments</li> <li>- Changes in laws and policies</li> <li>- Land and resource arrangements or agreements</li> <li>- Project report and updates</li> </ul> | <p>Political will of governments</p> <p>Governments are open to input and ‘capacity building’ from communities</p> <p>Success / pace of dialogue and/or negotiations</p> |
| <p><b>Progress:</b></p>   | <p>This output is a very ambitious and quite long-term, so measuring progress after only one year is hard. Nevertheless, the activities and outcomes demonstrate that the communities are doing a lot of very important and useful preparatory work to achieve the output. Examples are the capacity building sessions to improve their level of knowledge and skills to advocate for their rights and the collection of the materials that are needed to support their claims.</p> <p>As we described in the activities section above, all partners have engaged in advocacy and lobby activities to address and discuss issues related to land and resource rights (access, use and control) with local, district, or national governments. Project reports and reports of these meetings indicate that in most cases, government officials are interested and open to receive the information about the communities’ initiatives and aspirations, and are willing to have more meetings to discuss the issues in more details (for instance this happened in Thailand with the staff of the new municipal office, who even request our partners to provide the with information on REDD).</p> <p>More secure land rights in Thailand have partly been achieved by a number of villages where the community maps have been used to demarcate agricultural land. Moreover, one of the project’s communities, Khun Tae village, has been selected for exploring the possibility to recognise collective land titles for indigenous and local communities by the Prime Minister’s Office.</p> |  |  |

|  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
|  | <p>In West-Kalimantan in Indonesia, the Sanggau District administration officials have attended several meetings with the community in Kampong Sanjan where concerns and questions related to the customary forest were addressed. They and promised to produce a decree on the customary forest as soon as the data on the community forest are completed and submitted.</p> <p>In Bangladesh, the research project for the identification and recognition of forest users in the Sundarbans Impact Zones (the ParMoRec study) has been done with the approval and encouragement of the government, in particular the forest department, which is open to use the outcome list to establish a more equitable system of permit issuance. The government also approves of the recent establishment of the community cooperatives. These steps are expected to lead to improved access and control for the traditional resource users.</p> <p>These are all small steps that can ultimately make a big difference. The assumptions still very much hold true: it always depends on the political will of governments and on their openness to bottom-up input and capacity building. This can vary within and between government departments as well. For instance in Thailand the superintendent of the Doi Inthanon National Park arrested a Karen community leader from Mae Ya Noi village in December 2010 and charged for encroaching and clearing forest in the National Park without permission. It concerned an ancestral area within the park's boundaries that the village committee had already surveyed and demarcated, but the farming boundary of this community had not yet clearly been resolved/agreed with the Park authorities. The case was later dismissed after a discussion with all involved parties such as district officer, police and park officials, but this proves the importance of the mapping work. Later in December, FPBP staff had a very positive meeting about the situation with Doi Inthanon National Park with the newly elected Municipal Office in Baan Luang, an area bordering the Doi Inthanon National Park, where the officials were very open to discussions with IMPECT.</p> <p>In Guyana, the activities have helped build key foundations for achieving this project output. Vital groundwork has been completed to help the communities secure common agreements on shared title boundaries which have been documented in formal written agreements. Securing these agreements has been a major achievement in the project period. Community plans to protect natural resources through application of customary laws and new agreements in Village Rules and intercommunity agreements on land management are advancing well under this project. Despite promising progress made in the first year, major external challenges and risks remain. Lack of official support for community land tenure security plans is a risk but it is hoped that documentation of land title boundary agreements will help communities meet government requirements for evidence of prior consultation with neighbouring villages in land title extension applications. Village Councils are now in a position to provide documentary evidence to the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs to show that the necessary and required consultations and agreements have been made among all affected applicant communities. It is likewise hoped that the outline management plan will bolster the community case for approval of their extension applications from the end of 2011</p> |   |   |
| <p><b>Output 3.</b> Local involvement in biodiversity decision-making and management (including in protected area) has increased and community-based management plans play a</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of community members that are involved in official natural resource policy/decision-making and management / governance activities</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Official records</li> <li>- qualitative feedback and reports from community representatives</li> <li>- Local management or co-management agreements</li> </ul> | <p>Political will<br/>Success / pace of dialogue and/or negotiations<br/><br/>Natural circumstances and</p> |

|                        |   |                              |   |
|------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|
| significant role in it | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- number of community-based management plans or proposals that are recognised and/or incorporated in biodiversity management and plans</li> <li>- number of indigenous and community conserved areas established by partners</li> </ul>  | - Project report and updates | circumstances in communities enable advanced development of community plans or proposals in 3 years time. |
| <b>Progress:</b>       | <p>Output 3 is closely related to output 2. Partners in several countries (Suriname, Guyana, Panama) are still in the initial process of developing land management plans (which include collecting and compiling information and data through mapping and surveying). We are not yet at the stage of finalisation and official recognition or formal incorporation in national programmes for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use , but preparations are going well. The development of these management plans are combined with capacity building and training for community members about the application and use of these plans and maps in advocacy activities and meetings with governments about increased community involvement and responsibilities</p> <p>The Guna people are already exercising a high degree of self-management in their autonomous territory and are in the process of strengthening their management approaches through a combination of traditional knowledge and rules and modern technologies. In Thailand the Karen people are involved in the joint management of the Ob Luang National Park, an outcome of earlier project phases and mapping and advocacy by IMPECT. The communities are now trying to achieve the same in relation to the Doi Inthanon NP.</p> <p>It is hoped that the progress in output 1 (enhanced acknowledgement of the value of CSU and TK) will also lead to enhanced involvement of the communities in decision-making and management of biodiversity. Therefore the community-based research and documentation initiatives, and the activities related to raising more (public) awareness, are very important. Initiatives that involve some formal collaboration with governments or conservation organisations, and/or which highlight the use and value of TK (such as biodiversity monitoring, surveys of flora and fauna, climate change impacts and responses in Bangladesh and Panama) could have this effect as well.</p> <p>All partners are planning to provide input for the new National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plans (NBSAPs) and to advocate for full and effective participation in the process when these are drafted.</p> <p>Also for this output, the assumptions still hold true. The issue of political will and success and pace of dialogues or negotiations are hard to predict. The time that is needed to make a community management plan is hard to predict too – it requires a lot of field work and data collection. National circumstances and circumstances in the communities indeed play a role as well. For instance, in Suriname no advocacy activities were done in the project period because it was election year – not only did this pre-occupy many community members, but also the partner organisation had to wait and see how the new government departments and ministries would be shaped and staffed and which Parties would be elected – in a country like</p> |                              |   |

|   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
|   | <p>Suriname this can have major impacts on the pace in which land issues are resolved.</p> <p>Seasons and climate change can also influence work schedules. For instance in Indonesia the field research on the customary natural resources management system of the community of Kampong Sanjan (field surveys; focus group discussions with the community; and collecting field data by conducting interviews with informants) were scheduled to commence in September 2010. However, this was delayed since the local researchers (who farm and tap rubber for their livelihoods) had to clear their farms, plant paddies and clear the weeds. Seasons were unpredictable this year: the land clearing is normally done in August, but in 2010 it had to be done in September and this in turn postponed planting and sowing seasons. Instead, field survey, discussion with the community and data collection of the first stage started in January 2011.</p>  |   |   |
| <p><b>Output 4.</b> Threats and pressures on CSU have decreased, among others through enhanced application of FPIC in matters affecting indigenous peoples' lands and territories</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number and nature of existing threats / pressures that were successfully addressed</li> <li>- Number and nature of new threats / pressures that were prevented</li> <li>- Number and nature of cases where FPIC was applied</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- documentation (reports and official and community feedback) of the threats, actions taken and outcomes</li> <li>- FPIC agreements</li> </ul> | <p>Success of communities' actions towards outside actors and government</p> <p>Project manages to convince / persuade outside parties to accept and apply FPIC</p> |
| <p><b>Progress:</b></p>   | <p>Several partners have addressed threats and/or pressures on their territories and as such on their CSU, but it is still too early to say if these have been successful or not. In this respect, the two assumptions are very valid.</p> <p>Several partners (Suriname, Guyana) are internally discussing and strategizing how to deal with and address outside threats on their territories caused by mining projects and REDD/climate change mitigation projects. The traditional authorities in these countries have taken steps to formulate FPIC guidelines. Until now these have not been formally adopted by the governments or applied/followed by companies, but the communities are still in the process of capacity building and empowerment in terms of enforcement and advocacy.</p> <p>In Guyana a significant risk remains that the government (GGMC and GFC) will continue to issue mining and logging concessions in Wapichan territory before land titles are secured. In October 2010, concerns emerged over reports of new timber and mineral concessions issued by government authorities on the untitled traditional lands of the Wapichan people in the Reewa and Kwitaro River basins. The District Toshiacos Councils are now trying to verify this information and have been mandated by their communities to raise the issue with government authorities. At the same time, there are (unconfirmed) indications that a government moratorium might be placed on further natural resource concessions in the South Rupununi within the context of official low carbon growth and climate protection policies for the interior. In order to tackle the major threat of further development of extractive industries, Amerindian communities are resolved to pressing government to protect their traditional forest lands and other fragile ecosystems. If these efforts are effective, it is hoped that a moratorium will be put in place so that a break can be put on further resource concessions on Wapichan lands.</p> <p>In Panama, Bangladesh and Suriname partners are working hard to demonstrate the uneven and adverse affects from</p> |   |   |



|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>climate change on the livelihoods of the indigenous peoples and local communities and propose solutions that are beneficial for these groups, drawing on traditional ecosystem knowledge. It is hoped that these are approved by the government and that the communities will play a role in initiatives to battle and deal with climate change.</p> <p>In Thailand the pressures on traditional lands caused by the establishment of the Doi Inthanon national park have been addressed during initial meetings with the new Municipal Office in Baan Luang, an area bordering the Doi Inthanon National Park. These were positive meetings and more meetings will follow.</p> <p>In Kampong Sanjan in Indonesia, the community forest is highly vulnerable to the expansion of oil palm plantations and industrial forest plantations because it does not get official recognition from the administration of Sanggau District yet. The Sanjan community has fined palm oil companies several times before for illegal activities on their territory, according to customary law. The advocacy and lobby activities with the administration of Sanggau District are hoped to lead to protection, recognition and ratification of the indigenous community's customary forest territory, and their management system. In addition, the community's customarily managed territory is expected to be listed in spatial development of the government, which is free from companies' management territory.</p> |
|--|---|

### 4.3 Standard Measures

**Table 1 Project Standard Output Measures**

| Code No.          | Description   | Year 1 Total          | Year 2 Total | Year 3 Total | Year 4 Total | Total to date | Number planned for reporting period | Total planned during the project |
|-------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Established codes |   |                       |              |              |              |               |                                     |                                  |
| 6A                | Number of people to receive other forms of education/training (which does not fall into categories 1-5 )  | 650                   |              |              |              |               |                                     | 800                              |
| 6B                | Number of training weeks to be provided   | 25                    |              |              |              |               |                                     | 75                               |
| 7                 | Number of (ie different types - not volume - of material produced) training materials to be produced for use by host country                                    | 15                    |              |              |              |               |                                     | 25                               |
| 8                 | Number of weeks to be spent by UK project staff on project work in the host country   | 15                    |              |              |              |               |                                     | 45                               |
| 9                 | Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) to be produced for Governments, public authorities, or other implementing agencies in host country | 4<br>(in preparation) |              |              |              |               |                                     | 4                                |
| 10                | Number of individual field guides/manuals to be produced to assist work related to species identification, classification and recording                         | 2                     |              |              |              |               |                                     | 6                                |
| 11A               | Number of papers to be published in peer reviewed journals  | 2                     |              |              |              |               |                                     | 10                               |
| 14A               | Number of conferences/ seminars/ workshops to be <b>organised</b> to present/disseminate findings   | 6                     |              |              |              |               |                                     | 20                               |
| 14B               | Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops <b>attended</b> at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated.                           | 15                    |              |              |              |               |                                     | 40                               |

| Code No.          | Description   | Year 1 Total  | Year 2 Total | Year 3 Total | Year 4 Total | Total to date | Number planned for reporting period | Total planned during the project |
|-------------------|---|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 16A<br>16B<br>16C | Number of newsletters to be produced<br><br>Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the host country(ies)<br><br>Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the UK | 4<br><br>5000 policy-makers, NGOs, academics, indigenous organisations and other interested persons |              |              |              |               |                                     | 12<br><br>5000+                  |
| 19A               | Number of national radio interviews/features in host county(ies)  | 40<br><br>(mostly path of biodiversity Panama)  |              |              |              |               |                                     | 100                              |
| 21                | Number of permanent educational/training/research facilities or organisations to be established and then continued after Darwin funding has ceased                      | 3   |              |              |              |               |                                     | 6                                |

**Table 2 Publications**

| Type (eg journals, manual, CDs)   | Detail (title, author, year)   | Publishers (name, city)   | Available from (eg contact address, website)  | Cost £ |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|--------|
| Report ('10(c) synthesis report') | Customary sustainable use of biodiversity by indigenous peoples and local communities: Examples, challenges, community initiatives and recommendations relating to CBD Article 10(c)<br><br>A synthesis paper based on case studies from Bangladesh, Cameroon, Guyana, Suriname, and Thailand.<br><br>11 October, 2010 | FPP<br>KLIM (Suriname),<br>SCPDA (Guyana),<br>IMPECT (Thailand),<br>OKANI, CED (Cameroon),<br>Unnayan Onneshan (Bangladesh) | <a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/convention-biological-diversity-cbd/publication/2010/customary-sustainable-use-biodiversity-i">http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/convention-biological-diversity-cbd/publication/2010/customary-sustainable-use-biodiversity-i</a> | N/A    |

| Type<br>(eg journals,<br>manual, CDs)          | Detail<br>(title, author, year)   | Publishers<br>(name, city)  | Available from<br>(eg contact address,<br>website)  | Cost £ |
|--|---|-----------------------------|---|--------|
| Enews article                                  | Indigenous '10(c) team'<br>prepare to promote<br>customary sustainable<br>use at SBSTTA-14,<br><br>FPP Enewsletter April<br>2010  | FPP and project<br>partners | <a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org/enewsletters/fpp-enewsletter-april-2010">http://www.forestpeoples.org/enewsletters/fpp-enewsletter-april-2010</a> | N/A    |
| Enews article                                  | Disappointment over<br>reluctance of SBSTTA-<br>14 to accept link<br>between land rights and<br>sustainable use and<br>over the treatment of<br>'bush meat' issues<br><br>FPP Enewsletter July<br>2010  | FPP and project<br>partners | <a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org/enewsletters/fpp-enewsletter-april-2010">http://www.forestpeoples.org/enewsletters/fpp-enewsletter-april-2010</a> | N/A    |
| Enews article                                  | Will the Parties to the<br>Convention on<br>Biological Diversity<br>finally accept proposed<br>solutions to halt<br>biodiversity loss that<br>also benefit forest<br>communities?<br><br>FPP Enewsletter<br>October 2010  | FPP and project<br>partners | <a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org/enewsletters/fpp-enewsletter-april-2010">http://www.forestpeoples.org/enewsletters/fpp-enewsletter-april-2010</a> | N/A    |
| Enews article                                  | Joy and disappointment<br>go hand in hand at the<br>10th meeting of the<br>Conference of the<br>Parties to the<br>Convention on<br>Biological Diversity<br><br>FPP Enewsletter<br>December 2010   | FPP and project<br>partners | <a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org/enewsletters/fpp-enewsletter-april-2010">http://www.forestpeoples.org/enewsletters/fpp-enewsletter-april-2010</a> | N/A    |
| Overview article in<br>CBD Technical<br>Series | Customary sustainable<br>use of biodiversity by<br>indigenous peoples.<br>Case studies relevant to<br>the Satoyama Initiative<br>from Suriname, Guyana,<br>Cameroon and<br>Thailand.<br><br>CBD technical series 52<br>(2010), p. 22-35.<br><br>CBD Technical Series<br>No.52: Sustainable use<br>of biodiversity in socio-<br>ecological production<br>landscapes. Background<br>to the Satoyama<br>Initiative for the benefit<br>of biodiversity and<br>human well-being. | FPP and project<br>partners | <a href="http://www.cbd.int/ts/">http://www.cbd.int/ts/</a>   | N/A    |

| Type (eg journals, manual, CDs)  | Detail (title, author, year)  | Publishers (name, city)  | Available from (eg contact address, website)  | Cost £ |
|--|---|--|---|--------|
| Article in ECO, journal of the CBD Alliance  | ECO Review of the implementation of Article 10(c): obstacles and ways forward<br><br>ECO 31(1): | FPP and project partners   | <a href="http://www.cbdalliance.org/sbstta-14/">http://www.cbdalliance.org/sbstta-14/</a>   | N/A    |
| Bangladesh quarterly national biodiversity newsletter (CBD Watch)  | A newsletter on biodiversity conservation and management  | Unnayan Onneshan   | <a href="http://www.unnayan.org/cbd/cbd-watch-i1v1.html">http://www.unnayan.org/cbd/cbd-watch-i1v1.html</a>   | N/A    |
| Report on the impact of natural disasters in the Sundarbans on the lives and livelihoods of the local traditional resource users | Cyclone Aila: one year on. Natural disaster to human sufferings.<br><br>2010.                   | Unnayan Onneshan   | <a href="http://www.unnayan.org/reports/climate/ailareport_final.pdf">http://www.unnayan.org/reports/climate/ailareport_final.pdf</a>   | N/A    |
| Article in English daily newspaper in Bangladesh   | Biodiversity for life and livelihood. <i>The Daily Star</i> , June 12, 2010.                    | Unnayan Onneshan   | <a href="http://www.thedailystar.net/newDesign/newsdetails.php?nid=142290">http://www.thedailystar.net/newDesign/newsdetails.php?nid=142290</a>   | N/A    |
| Video  | Dwindling Futures? Mangroves and forest peoples under threat in the Sundarbans, Bangladesh.     | Unnayan Onneshan, Humanity Watch, FPP, Nijera Kori, the Ecologist Film Unit. | <a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/rights-land-natural-resources/news/2010/12/new-film-dwindling-forests-dwindling-futures-mangr">http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/rights-land-natural-resources/news/2010/12/new-film-dwindling-forests-dwindling-futures-mangr</a> | N/A    |

The project also produced many publications intended for internal use (within the communities) or for local/national level use which are written in local languages and are not publicly available or for sale. Examples are

Panama: FPCI has developed educational/training materials on various topics: one on megaprojects, one on climate change, and one on biodiversity and traditional knowledge:

- Megaproyecto en Guna Yala. Interconexión Eléctrica entre Panamá y Colombia, sistematización de Experiencias.
- Manual de educación ambiental, diversidad biológica y conocimiento tradicional.
- El cambio climático y conocimiento tradicional, basado en la cosmovisión del pueblo Guna, comarca Guna Yala – Panama

The KLIM in Suriname has produced and printed (small scale) a math book in Kaliña and also a brochure on the land management plan process

IMPECT produced several materials and media on traditional knowledge of natural resource management and on community mapping, such as posters on indigenous people's natural resources management of seven indigenous groups. Also, a brochure was produced which outlines the project goals and activities and the cabinet resolution on revitalization of Karen cultural livelihoods. An information brief on natural resource management of Karen and Hmong peoples was designed. Several videos were produced: one about a forest ordination ceremony in Lue Pa Kga; one on the performance of water animals conservation ceremony in Lue Thi performance; and one on community mapping for resolving farm land conflicts.

Please let us know if you wish to receive a copy of any of these materials.

## 4.4 Progress towards the project purpose and outcomes

### Project purpose:

| Project summary  | Measurable Indicators            | Means of verification               | Important Assumptions   |
|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Purpose.</b><br>Advanced implementation of Article 10(c) in the 8 host countries by 2013. | Outputs below have been achieved | See below (verification of outputs) | The host countries also make significant efforts towards achieving other biodiversity goals related to the CBD.<br>- Host countries are committed to implement CBD timely and effectively |

In the original project application (copied above from the logframe) we have highlighted the link between the achievement of the outputs and the achievement of the eventual project purpose. Progress in meeting the outputs will lead to progress in implementation of article 10(c) in the host countries.

As we have described in section 4.2, progress is observed on all four outputs, and the indicators, means of verification and assumptions are still applicable. Although we feel it is better to make statements on the actual achievements at the end of the project, it is anticipated that if the projects continues in the manner of this project period, implementation of 10(c) will indeed be advanced by the end of 2013.

### Outcomes:

In the original application we listed eight intended outcomes. We will briefly comment on these below as most of the issues have already been addressed under the activities and/or outputs.

- Increased acknowledgement and recognition of (the role of) CSU and TK, customary laws and institutions (e.g. in policies and laws) in biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and benefit-sharing.

See our report on output 1 in section 4.2.

- Stronger, better organised indigenous and local institutions and/or networks working on implementing 10c and in achieving the objectives of the Convention.

Good progress, see our report on Activity 1 in section 4.1

- Significant progress towards securing land and resource rights and development of community-based sustainable management plans.

See our report on output 2 and 3 in section 4.2 and activity 3 in section 4.1

- Increased local involvement in natural resource decision-making and management (local control or co-management systems), including in protected areas.

See our report on output 3 in section 4.2.

- Increased application of FPIC in matters affecting indigenous peoples' lands and territories.

See our report on output 4 in section 4.2.

- Increased government awareness of international developments and agreements on 10(c) and associated responsibilities.

Progress has been made, see for example our report on activity 5 (advocacy) in section 4.1. However, it would be useful in the next project period to have some more specific meetings with governments to inform them about the meaning of 10(c) and how this should be implemented. These kinds of presentations have been done at international (CBD) meetings, but not all host country governments have attended these side events and it would be useful to use the presentations to have separate 10(c) sessions in each country. Activity 6 – to raise awareness – has also played an important role in raising awareness about 10(c) through publications (all partners and joint), videos (Bangladesh), radio shows (Panama), posters (Thailand).

- A start will have been made with educational policies and programmes that promote the use and revitalisation of indigenous languages and TK.

These have so far mostly been initiatives by the communities themselves to transfer traditional knowledge, language, and practices and skills to young generations, but what we observe is that these initiatives usually receive interest and approval from governments and can grow into collaboration and joint initiatives. See our report on output 1 in section 4.2 and activity 2 in section 4.1.

- International: new component on 10(c) in the revised MYPOW of the Working Group on Art. 8(j) and Related Provisions reflects recommendations from “10(c) team”.

This work is still ongoing and the new POW on 8(j) will be adopted by COP11 in 2012, but during the project period and lot of preparatory work has been done with good results; see our report on Activity 7 in section 4.1.

#### **4.5 Progress towards impact on biodiversity, sustainable use or equitable sharing of biodiversity benefits**

We believe that enhanced community-based governance and management of ecosystems will be beneficial for conservation and sustainable use of these ecosystems as well as for fairer benefit-sharing of communities.

When communities become more involved in governance and management (either through increased co-management, or through official community management by means of formal recognition of their territories and rights) and receive more responsibilities, these territories and ecosystems will be well taken care of. Places of special importance to biodiversity will be conserved, other areas and resources will be used sustainably, and damaging activities by outsiders will be banned. Naturally, the communities will profit more from the benefits of biodiversity when they are the primary users, managers and protectors.

Indigenous peoples and local communities have sustainably used and conserved their territories for centuries, and their new and ‘modern’ management plans demonstrate that the communities still aim to continue to practice these systems, which are based on cosmological visions and spiritual values, customary rules and laws about biodiversity, and the desire to conserve the territories for generations to come. The active practice and transfer of traditional knowledge and indigenous language and concepts to youth underline that these are not management systems from the past; and moreover communities are incorporating and applying modern technologies (such as GPS) to respond to modern threats and challenges. These plans also show that communities are not only willing, but are also able and ready, to govern and manage their territories.

When traditional institutions can play a more formal role and enforce the communities’ customary laws and rules, and FPIC is more structurally applied and enforced, they will be better able to keep outside threats and pressures out.

### **5. Monitoring, evaluation and lessons**

As we described under question 20 in the original application (monitoring and evaluation plan), we have many ways to monitor progress and these are closely related to the management – style of the project and the relationship with our partners.

The two FPP coordinators of the project are in regular contact with all of the partners. Every three months, the partners send us a short up-date. A more detailed mid-term narrative and financial report are submitted to us by the partners mid-way through the year, and at the end of each year, sometimes followed by additional information or clarifications on FPP’s request. This process gives us a good overview of how the project proceeds and represents a main monitoring tool (or indicator). Partner organisations hold their own evaluations (pertaining to the main process or a particular activity) with relevant groups, such as leaders or researchers. We meet with our partners at international meetings (such as CBD meetings) and always use this opportunity to discuss progress, share experiences and address challenges. Every year or two years (depending on financial availability) we organise a partners meeting entirely for evaluation, exchanging experiences, and planning next steps.

Each partner has at least one FPP staff member that spends field-time with each local organisation, e.g. as technical assistant or advisors to the partner, who is involved in workshops, trainings, advocacy work, and other activities. Because of this unique local involvement, we know the partners organisations very

well and all the staff personally. During fieldwork periods, automatically, the progress of the project is monitored in detail.

FPP’s financial department looks at all the financial reports submitted by the partners and tracks the overall financial status. At each FPP Annual General Meeting, we report about the progress of the FPBP project to the board and other staff, and discuss achievements and obstacles and receive advice and feedback from them.

Below is a table with the M&E indicators which we have used to check consistency:

| <b>Monitoring activities (from the log frame)</b>  |                        |
|--|------------------------|
| <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>Ticked if done:</b> |
| Indicator 1: 3-monthly updates from partners   | √                      |
| Indicator 2: 6 monthly narrative and financial reports – checking by FPP financial department  | √                      |
| Indicator 3: regular contact through email and skype   | √                      |
| Indicator 4: field visits – involvement in local implementation by FPP staff                   | √                      |
| Indicator 5: local evaluations carried out by local partner organisations with relevant groups | √                      |
| Indicator 6: evaluation-meetings with partners   | √                      |

For measuring output, purpose (outcome) and final goal (impact), we are using the logframe (annex 2) which includes the indicators and means of verification to measure and demonstrate progress and achievements or results.

The log frame is designed in such a way that if the activities are carried out as expected, they will contribute to achieving the outputs, which in turn lead to achieving the project purpose. The purpose is one aspect of the bigger goal of the Darwin Initiative.

**Lessons learned:**

The most important lesson learned related to the linking of local level initiatives, reflections, concerns, suggestions and recommendations to the international policy-making level (CBD in particular).

We drew a few conclusions from our COP10 participation that will (hopefully) help us to improve and shape our CBD engagement in the coming years:

- We need to focus even more on the preparatory process, when texts are being drafted and input can be made in writing and through online forums. At COPs there are still very few opportunities left to make text changes in draft decisions.
- We need to start lobbying delegations at a much earlier stage, i.e. when they are developing their positions – at a COP it is too last-minute. Most positions were already fixed upon arrival in Nagoya.

We did build up a good relationship with some delegations, including Guatemala, Sweden/EU, Switzerland, Norway, and Mexico, which we should build on in the coming years.

**6. Actions taken in response to previous reviews (if applicable)**

N/A

**7. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere**

One overall obstacle encountered this project year (and risk for near future) has been the shortage of funds. In the current financially difficult climate, it is very hard to raise funds for our activities. Some grants to the project have been stopped or reduced.



This means that both FPP and partners have had to choose and prioritize and cut back on activities, staff and office costs. It also means that we participate in international meetings with a smaller team than we would like, and that we cannot afford partners' meetings with a big group. If we could provide our partners with a bigger country budget, activities would be done quicker and more could be done (also with more staff).

We will make all efforts to identify and raise new funds this year.

## **8. Sustainability**

### **Sustainability / exit strategy:**

As we explained under question 15 of our application, this project does not comprise a stand-alone action with a concrete beginning and ending. Most of the activities in this project relate to long-standing objectives of the communities, which require sustained efforts and endurance. All communities have been working on these issues for quite some time. FPP has through the years provided different types of support or assistance, with different sources of funding. However, some of the activities are new and can be considered to be more 'discrete' – such as developing community-based land management plans.

At the community level, we know what we want to and can do in 3 years. However, concerning objectives that (partly) depend on other parties, such as governments, it would be risky to state that all can or will be reached within the project period. Therefore we have aimed to set realistic goals, such as 'make significant progress' in some fields.

Rather than speaking of an "exit strategy", if this project ends and not all goals are fully achieved, our strategy will be to seek new funds to continue the work for as long as needed. Together with our partners we will assess follow-up needs and actions, based on the situation at that time.

### **Profile of the project:**

See section 9 below (dissemination) and table 2 (publications) for details on efforts to promote the project, and also our report on Activity 6 (raising public awareness, both nationally and internationally, of efforts and outcomes) for information about how these were received.

## **9. Dissemination**

A publications officer and communication officer (both FPP) are involved in this project to support effective outreach and dissemination and produce attractive publications.

Target audiences are:

- members of indigenous and local communities in the host countries
- governments (national and local levels)
- international policy-makers
- professionals working in development, conservation, human rights (NGOs, academics)
- journalists
- the general public

We refer to our report on Activity 6 (raising public awareness, both nationally and internationally, of efforts and outcomes) and table 2 (publications) for details.

We anticipate that our collaboration with these partners will continue after the project period (see section 8 above), which includes support with dissemination activities and joint outreach.

## 10. Project Expenditure

**Table 3 project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2010 – 31 March 2011)**

| Item  | Budget (please indicate which document you refer to if other than your project application or annual grant offer letter) | Expenditure | Variance/ Comments |
|---|--|-------------|--------------------|
| <b>Staff costs specified by individual</b>              |  |             |                    |
| <b>Overhead costs</b>                                   |  |             |                    |
| <b>Travel and subsistence</b>                           |  |             |                    |
| <b>Operating costs</b>                                  |  |             |                    |
| <b>Capital items/equipment (specify)</b>                |  |             |                    |
| Video Camera and Recording Equipment                    |  |             |                    |
| Office Computer Equipment                               |  |             |                    |
| Technical Equipment for Mapping and Management Planning |  |             |                    |
| Others: Communications                                  |  |             |                    |
| Others: Publications and Translations                   |  |             |                    |
| Others: Media and Web                                   |  |             |                    |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  |  |             |                    |

## 11. OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements of your project during the reporting period (300-400 words maximum). This section may be used for publicity purposes

I agree for LTS and the Darwin Secretariat to publish the content of this section (please leave this line in to indicate your agreement to use any material you provide here)

## Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year 2010-2011

| Project summary   | Measurable Indicators  | Progress and Achievements April 2010 - March 2011  | Actions required/planned for next period  |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Goal:</b> To draw on expertise relevant to biodiversity from within the United Kingdom to work with local partners in countries rich in biodiversity but constrained in resources to achieve</p> <p>The conservation of biological diversity,<br/>The sustainable use of its components, and<br/>The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources</p> |  | <p><b>Contribution towards positive impact on biodiversity or positive changes in the conditions of human communities associated with biodiversity:</b></p> <p>Enhanced community-based governance and management of ecosystems based on customary laws and knowledge related to responsible use of biological resources, which this project is promoting and supporting, will be beneficial for conservation and sustainable use of these ecosystems as well as for fairer benefit-sharing of communities</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Original Purpose</b></p> <p>Advanced implementation of Article 10(c) in the 8 host countries by 2013.</p>   | <p><b>Original purpose level indicators</b></p> <p>Outputs below have been achieved</p>  | <p><b>Progress towards achieving the project purpose</b></p> <p>Progress is observed on all four outputs. It is anticipated that if the projects continues in the manner of this project period, implementation of 10(c) will indeed be advanced by the end of 2013</p>  | <p><b>Key actions planned for next period</b></p> <p>We plan to continue and build on the work that was done in this project period</p> |
| <p><b>Original outputs</b></p> <p><b>Output 1.</b> The acknowledgement and recognition of (the role of) CSU and traditional knowledge (TK), indigenous languages (IL), customary laws and institutions has increased</p>  | <p><b>Original output level indicators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of policies and laws, that recognise TK, CSU and IL</li> <li>- Number and quality of educational policies and programmes that promote indigenous languages and TK.</li> <li>- Number of educational initiatives by communities that are acknowledged and/or supported by government</li> <li>- Number of conservation or sustainable use initiatives that include / incorporate TK and CSU (see also output 3)</li> </ul> | <p><b>General progress and appropriateness of indicators:</b></p> <p>The indicators are still appropriate, although at this stage it is very difficult to provide concrete “numbers” already. However, our local partners do observe gradual positive changes in perception and acknowledgement of TK and CSU. In section 4.2 we have provided some examples of changes at the national level and also emphasised that the progress in the last project period is largely due to the communities’ own efforts to document information and present and disseminate it, and also that initiatives like community-based biodiversity monitoring, or researching climate change impacts and responses contribute to a more favourable perception of CSU and TK among policymakers as well.</p> |   |

| Project summary   | Measurable Indicators  | Progress and Achievements April 2010 - March 2011  | Actions required/planned for next period |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Output 2.</b> Significant progress has been made towards securing land and resource rights of partner communities, including access and control</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of project partners who have made progress towards land and resource rights; and extent of progress</li> </ul>   | <p>Also to this indicator applies that measuring progress after only one year is hard, but in this annual report we have demonstrated that the communities are doing a lot of very important and useful preparatory work to achieve the output. In section 4.2 we mentioned the capacity building sessions to improve their level of knowledge and skills to advocate for their rights and the collection of the materials that are needed to support their claims. We also described how all partners have engaged in advocacy and lobby activities to address and discuss issues related to land and resource rights (access, use and control) with local, district, or national governments, and that in many cases government officials are interested and open to receive the information about the communities' initiatives and aspirations.</p>   |  |
| <p><b>Output 3.</b> Local involvement in biodiversity decision-making and management (including in protected area) has increased and community-based management plans play a significant role in it</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of community members that are involved in official natural resource policy/decision-making and management / governance activities</li> <li>- number of community-based management plans or proposals that are recognised and/or incorporated in biodiversity management and plans</li> <li>- number of indigenous and community conserved areas established by partners</li> </ul> | <p>We described in sections 4.1 and 4.2 that partners in several countries are still in the initial process of developing land management plans, and that these activities are combined with capacity building and training for community members about the application and use of these plans and maps in advocacy activities and meetings with governments about increased community involvement and responsibilities.</p> <p>We mentioned that it is expected that the progress in output 1 (enhanced acknowledgement of the value of CSU and TK) will also lead to enhanced involvement of the communities in decision-making and management of biodiversity. Therefore the community-based research and documentation initiatives, and the activities related to raising more (public) awareness, are very important.</p>   |  |
| <p><b>Output 4.</b> Threats and pressures on CSU have decreased, among others through enhanced application of FPIC in matters affecting indigenous peoples' lands and territories</p>                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number and nature of existing threats / pressures that were successfully addressed</li> <li>- Number and nature of new threats / pressures that were prevented</li> <li>- Number and nature of cases where FPIC was applied</li> </ul>  | <p>In relation to this indicator and output, we mentioned in section 4.2 that several partners have addressed threats and/or pressures on their territories and as such on their CSU, but that is still too early to say how successful these actions have been.</p> <p>We mentioned that several partners are internally discussing and strategizing how to deal with and address outside threats on their territories caused by mining projects and REDD/climate change mitigation projects. The traditional authorities in these countries have taken steps to formulate FPIC guidelines. Until now these have not been formally adopted by the governments or applied/followed by companies, but the communities are still in the process of capacity building and empowerment in terms of enforcement and advocacy.</p> <p>In some of the countries partners are also working hard to demonstrate the uneven and adverse affects from climate change on the livelihoods of the indigenous peoples and local communities and propose solutions that are beneficial for these</p> |  |

| Project summary  | Measurable Indicators | Progress and Achievements April 2010 - March 2011   | Actions required/planned for next period |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|
|  |                       | groups, drawing on traditional ecosystem knowledge. Also pressures on traditional lands caused by the establishment of protected areas, oil palm plantations and industrial forest plantations are being addressed under the project. |  |
| <b>Original activities relevant to the outputs:</b>  |                       | <b>Progress on activities and what will be carried out in the next period:</b>  |  |
| Activity 1. Capacity-building activities for local institutions in their capacity to interface with regional, national, and international agencies (governments, NGOs, private and other sectors) in asserting and maintaining their rights (including right to FPIC) ( outputs 2,3,4) |                       | All activities are proceeding well (for details see section 4.1.) and in the next project period, partners will carry on with the work in the same way with the aim to achieve the outputs by the end of the project.                 |  |
| Activity 2. Documenting customary sustainable management systems (outputs 1,3)   |                       |   |  |
| Activity 3. Developing plans / proposals for community-based management and/or effective co-management (outputs 2,3)   |                       |   |  |
| Activity 4. Community-based biodiversity monitoring (CBBM) training and activities (outputs 1,3)   |                       |   |  |
| Activity 5. Advocacy: promote policy, legal and institutional reforms for an effective implementation of Article 10(c) (meetings, presentations and workshops with/for governments and other involved parties) (outputs 1,2,3,4)   |                       |   |  |
| Activity 6. Raising public awareness, both nationally and internationally, of these efforts and outcomes (outputs 1,2,3,4)   |                       |   |  |
| Activity 7. Linking project activities and outputs to international processes on 10(c) (outputs 1,2,3,4)   |                       |   |  |

## Annex 2 Project's full current logframe

This is the same as the original logframe

| Project summary   | Measurable Indicators   | Means of verification  | Important Assumptions   |
|---|---|--|---|
| <b>Goal:</b><br>Effective contribution in support of the implementation of the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention on Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species (CMS), as well as related targets set by countries rich in biodiversity but constrained in resources. |   |  |   |
| <b>Sub-Goal</b><br>Increased achievement of the three key objectives of the CBD in the 7 host countries through effective protection and encouragement of customary sustainable use (CSU).  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of national biodiversity targets achieved with reference to CSU</li> <li>- status and trends in decentralisation of biodiversity management leading to biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and fair and equitable benefit sharing</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Countries' national reports to the CBD</li> <li>- independent reports</li> <li>- evaluation of biodiversity projects</li> </ul>   |   |
| <b>Purpose.</b><br>Advanced implementation of Article 10(c) in the 8 host countries by 2013.  | Outputs below have been achieved  | See below.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The host countries also make significant efforts towards achieving other biodiversity goals related to the CBD.</li> <li>- Host countries are committed to implement CBD timely and effectively</li> </ul> |
| <b>Output 1.</b> The acknowledgement and recognition of (the role of) CSU and traditional knowledge (TK), indigenous languages (IL), customary laws and institutions has increased  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of policies and laws, that recognise TK, CSU and IL</li> <li>- Number and quality of educational policies and programmes that promote indigenous languages and TK.</li> <li>- Number of educational initiatives by communities that are acknowledged and/or supported by government</li> <li>- Number of conservation or sustainable use initiatives that include / incorporate TK and CSU (see also output 3)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Process (involvement of communities) and outcomes of development and revision of policies and laws</li> <li>- Education policies</li> <li>- Concrete commitments by government and other outside parties to communities' proposals and initiatives (materials, curricula, projects, other educational activities )</li> </ul> | Community efforts manage to change perception of governments and others   |

| <b>Project summary</b>   | <b>Measurable Indicators</b>   | <b>Means of verification</b>   | <b>Important Assumptions</b>   |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Output 2.</b> Significant progress has been made towards securing land and resource rights of partner communities, including access and control   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of project partners who have made progress towards land and resource rights; and extent of progress</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Official and unofficial government communication (oral and written); statements, commitments, discussions &amp; correspondence with communities, newspaper articles, reports</li> <li>- Outcomes, reports and minutes of meetings and workshops with governments</li> <li>- Changes in laws and policies</li> <li>- Land and resource arrangements or agreements</li> <li>- Project report and updates</li> </ul> | <p>Political will of governments</p> <p>Governments are open to input and 'capacity building' from communities</p> <p>Success / pace of dialogue and/or negotiations</p>   |
| <b>Output 3.</b> Local involvement in biodiversity decision-making and management (including in protected area) has increased and community-based management plans play a significant role in it | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of community members that are involved in official natural resource policy/decision-making and management / governance activities</li> <li>- number of community-based management plans or proposals that are recognised and/or incorporated in biodiversity management and plans</li> <li>- number of indigenous and community conserved areas established by partners</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Official records</li> <li>- qualitative feedback and reports from community representatives</li> <li>- Local management or co-management agreements</li> <li>- Project report and updates</li> </ul>  | <p>Political will</p> <p>Success / pace of dialogue and/or negotiations</p> <p>Natural circumstances and circumstances in communities enable advanced development of community plans or proposals in 3 years time.</p> |
| <b>Output 4.</b> Threats and pressures on CSU have decreased, among others through enhanced application of FPIC in matters affecting indigenous peoples' lands and territories                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number and nature of existing threats / pressures that were successfully addressed</li> <li>- Number and nature of new threats / pressures that were prevented</li> <li>- Number and nature of cases where FPIC was applied</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- documentation (reports and official and community feedback) of the threats, actions taken and outcomes</li> <li>- FPIC agreements</li> </ul>  | <p>Success of communities' actions towards outside actors and government</p> <p>Project manages to convince / persuade outside parties to accept and apply FPIC</p>  |

| Project summary  | Measurable Indicators | Means of verification | Important Assumptions |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <p><b>Activities</b> (details in workplan)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Capacity-building activities for local institutions in their capacity to interface with regional, national, and international agencies (governments, NGOs, private and other sectors) in asserting and maintaining their rights (including right to FPIC) ( outputs 2,3,4)</li> <li>2. Documenting customary sustainable management systems (outputs 1,3)</li> <li>3. Developing plans / proposals for community-based management and/or effective co-management (outputs 2,3)</li> <li>4. Community-based biodiversity monitoring (CBBM) training and activities (outputs 1,3)</li> <li>5. Advocacy: promote policy, legal and institutional reforms for an effective implementation of Article 10(c) (meetings, presentations and workshops with/for governments and other involved parties) (outputs 1,2,3,4)</li> <li>6. Raising public awareness, both nationally and internationally, of these efforts and outcomes (outputs 1,2,3,4)</li> <li>7. Linking project activities and outputs to international processes on 10(c) (outputs 1,2,3,4)</li> </ol> |                       |                       |                       |
| <p><b>Monitoring activities:</b></p> <p>Indicator 1: 3-monthly updates from partners</p> <p>Indicator 2: 6 monthly narrative and financial reports – checking by FPP financial department</p> <p>Indicator 3: regular contact through email and skype</p> <p>Indicator 4: field visits – involvement in local implementation by FPP staff</p> <p>Indicator 5: local evaluations carried out by local partner organisations with relevant groups</p> <p>Indicator 6: evaluation-meetings with partners</p>  |                       |                       |                       |



### **Annex 3 Onwards – supplementary material (optional but encouraged as evidence of project achievement)**

All the materials that we would like to share with LTS/Darwin Secretariat are available online and we have provided the url's (web links) in this annual report.

## Checklist for submission

|  | Check |
|--|-------|
| <b>Is the report less than 5MB?</b> If so, please email to <a href="mailto:Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk">Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk</a> putting the project number in the Subject line.  | YES   |
| <b>Is your report more than 5MB?</b> If so, please discuss with <a href="mailto:Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk">Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk</a> about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line. | NO    |
| <b>Have you included means of verification?</b> You need not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.  | YES   |
| <b>Do you have hard copies of material you want to submit with the report?</b> If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number.  | NO    |
| Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors   | YES   |
| Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?  | YES   |
| Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.   |       |