



Darwin Initiative – Final Report

(To be completed with reference to the Reporting Guidance Notes for Project Leaders (<http://darwin.defra.gov.uk/resources/>) it is expected that this report will be a **maximum** of 20 pages in length, excluding annexes)

Darwin project information

Project Reference	18-003
Project Title	Supporting indigenous and local organisations to implement CBD article 10(c)
Host country(ies)	Bangladesh, Indonesia, Thailand, Guyana, Suriname, Panama
Contract Holder Institution	Forest Peoples Programme
Partner Institution(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unnayan Onneshan, Bangladesh ○ Institut Dayakology, Indonesia (West Kalimantan) ○ Inter Mountain Peoples Education and Culture in Thailand Association (IMPECT), Thailand ○ South Central People's Development Association (SCPDA), Guyana ○ Organisation of Kaliña and Lokono People in Marowijne (KLIM), Suriname ○ Fundación para la Promoción del Conocimiento Indígena (FPCI), Panama
Darwin Grant Value	£XXX
Start/End dates of Project	1 April 2010 – 31 March 2013
Project Leader Name	Dr. Maurizio Farhan Ferrari
Project Website	www.forestpeoples.org (general FPP website, not project-specific)
Report Author(s) and date	<p>Maurizio Farhan 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>

1 Project Rationale

Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) have increasingly acknowledged the value and importance of customary sustainable use and traditional knowledge in conserving and upholding biodiversity, land- and seascapes, and also protected areas. Article 10(c) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) provides that Parties shall protect and encourage indigenous and local communities' customary sustainable use (CSU) of biological resources.

However, indigenous peoples and local communities in the host countries who have done extensive research at local and (sub)national levels to assess progress in implementation of Article 10(c) since 2004, concluded that the Article is not yet implemented effectively due to various reasons and obstacles preventing progress. For instance:

- Communities' 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, at the national and sub-national levels it is often still disregarded and considered irrelevant. Top-down natural resource management and conservation approaches exclude customary practices, which can have severe negative consequences for the vitality of these systems. Sometimes biodiversity loss is even 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 not generally 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.

Through this project, the host country partners have aimed to contribute to more effective implementation of Article 10(c) both in and by the communities themselves, as well as through facilitating collaborative implementation with government and other relevant agencies.

Parties also acknowledge that effective implementation of this Article is still a challenge and have at various occasions discussed how this situation could be improved. They agreed that there should be a greater focus on 10(c) in the implementation of the Convention. COP10 decided to include a new major component on Article 10, with a focus on 10c, in the revised Programme of Work on 8j and related provisions, which is now under development and to which project partners have provided in-depth input. Partners have thus not only tried to engage in relevant national policy processes but also in the broader international policy-level.

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

2 Project Achievements

2.1 Purpose/Outcome

The original purpose of the project was: Advanced implementation of Article 10(c) in the 6 host countries by 2013.

Our measurable indicator was that the four outputs have been achieved so please see section 2.3 for a detailed assessment of the final impacts under each of the 4 outputs.

While there have been variations between the countries and there are exceptions under nearly every output, the project has achieved all outputs.

We note the importance of formulation in this regard. Outputs were aimed at increasing or decreasing certain base-line situations (as they were determined in previous project phases), or to make significant progress in the base-line situations. These changes in existing situations were positively met. Altogether, this has led to advanced implementation of Article 10(c) in the 6 host countries by the end of the project. This does not mean that circumstances and implementation have become flawless and perfect. There are still challenges to be faced, and the new plan of action on CSU that will provide guidance to Parties for better understanding and implementation of 10c is still under development (it will be reviewed by WG8(j)-8 in October 2013 and will likely be adopted by COP12 in 2014).

2.2 Goal/ Impact: achievement of positive impact on biodiversity and poverty alleviation

The goal/impact in the original application was “Increased achievement of the three key objectives of the CBD in the 6 host countries through effective protection and encouragement of customary sustainable use (CSU)”.

The measurable indicators we put in the original log frame for this goal were “number of national biodiversity targets achieved with reference to CSU”, and “status and trends in decentralisation of biodiversity management leading to biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and fair and equitable benefit sharing”, which we intended to verify through countries’ national reports to the CBD, independent reports and evaluation of biodiversity projects.

Important assumptions under the project goal and purpose however were that the host countries also make significant efforts towards achieving other biodiversity goals related to the CBD, and that host countries are committed to implement CBD timely and effectively. It has been difficult getting information on recent national targets and results, as the host countries (except Suriname) have not submitted national reports or revised NBSAPs to the CBD recently, as the table below shows, so these could not be used to determine overall progress in the country.¹

Country	Bangladesh:	Guyana:	Panama:	Thailand:	Suriname:	Indonesia:
4 th national report	January 2010	December 2010	July 2010	2009	April 2011	2009
Most recent NBSAP	2006 (not on CBD website)	version 2 (for period 2007-2011), prepared in 2007.	2000	Version 3 is only available in Thai on the web.	(revised, v2): March 2013.	(revised, v.2): 2003

It has also been beyond the capacity of this project to assess exactly to what extent each country has advanced on all three objectives of the CBD and what the role of CSU has been in this regard. This would require an analysis of the 5th national reports (due in 2014 to review progress towards the new Strategic Plan) and also the 4th edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO4) which will be published in 2014 to provide a mid-term assessment of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, including progress on Target 18. It is too early to make firm statements about that at this stage.

However, as we have demonstrated under (primarily) output 3 in section 2.3, substantiated by our own project reports and partner updates, we have achieved progress in terms of increased decentralisation of biodiversity management. As it is our ground-based conviction that local, community-level management of biodiversity is generally in the long term more effective than

¹ Suriname's National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) (2012-2016) was finalized in February 2013 and submitted in March 2013. This is the only new government document that was actually used in this report to assess to what extent the government has incorporated issues brought forward by the project partners and/or in response to documentation submitted to them.

state-led, centralised management and conservation – which is confirmed by various recent studies on effective conservation of forests and protected areas worldwide² – we can safely state that our project has made a significant contribution to the higher goal, at least in the 6 host countries.

We would also like to point at the recognition in Decision XI/14 (preamble) that “the implementation of sustainable use, including customary sustainable use, is crucial in achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020”. In section 2.1 we have pointed out that implementation of Article 10(c) was advanced in the host countries (and in general at the policy level) through the life of the project, so as such a contribution has been made to conservation, sustainable use, and fair and equitable benefit-sharing.

2.3 Outputs

Below we provide information on the changes achieved under each of the 4 outputs. As the outputs are connected and inter-related, we have attempted to avoid repeating achievements in each country under each of the outputs but rather cross-reference achievements.

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

In **Guyana**, the development and public launch in February 2012 of the innovative Wapichan plan for community-based territorial management (see outputs 2, 3, and 4 as well) has greatly contributed to increased awareness, understanding and appreciation of Wapichan knowledge and practices among government officials, conservation actors and the general public in the country and elsewhere in the world. The plan describes in detail how the Wapichan care for their land and plan to do so in the future. The initiative, which stresses the importance of the Wapichan language, customary laws and authorities and initiatives to strengthen these, has won admiration of many and has become an important example of how indigenous peoples can take the lead themselves in revitalising and strengthening customary practices as a way of contributing to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use.

At the national level, the Wapichan have been publicly congratulated by the government, Guyanese indigenous peoples’ organisations and local civil society organisations. The international dissemination of the project achievements (e.g. at the Rio+20 summit in Brazil) has generated messages of praise and appreciation from indigenous peoples worldwide and from international organisations and the public. There is a general consensus that the Wapichan plan constitutes a model for participatory environmental planning for indigenous peoples. Since the launch of the plan, several international donor organisations have expressed interest in assisting the Wapichan to take their plans forward towards practical implementation. The Guyana Forestry Commission (GFC) affirmed that it is most interested in the methodologies used and under development by the Wapichan for community-based forest monitoring (based on traditional knowledge) and how these might feed into forest monitoring under Guyana’s low carbon development strategy.

The NBSAP of **Suriname** (March 2013) for the first time officially acknowledges the relation between CSU, traditional knowledge, indigenous languages and biodiversity. Under paragraph 2.2 on the importance of, threat to, and conservation of biodiversity, the NBSAP mentions the following: “In Suriname, we see a decline in the use of indigenous languages, knowledge and skills, which seems to be connected to the deterioration of biodiversity”. In section 3.2 on

² See for instance: “Peer-reviewed CIFOR and World Bank studies find that community-managed forests are better for conservation than strict protected areas”, <http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/environmental-governance/news/2011/10/peer-reviewed-cifor-and-world-bank-studies-find-communi>

sustainable use of biodiversity, the NBSAP affirms: "...the relationship with nature and wild plants and animals are particularly tight with people who lead a self-sufficient lifestyle, as e.g. traditionally the Indigenous people and Maroons in Suriname. The local environment does not only provide them food, but also for example construction materials and medicines. The culture and traditions of self-sufficient communities are very important to get an insight in the use of biodiversity and into the further development thereof".

Another indicator for this output is that since a few years, and with support of this project, a bi-lingual, intercultural math education method is used in a number of schools in the interior. This is a special pilot project in which – for the first time – indigenous children are taught in their mother tongue as well as in Dutch. This pilot project has the official support of the Surinamese government through the education department, as well as of the education organisations in Suriname.

In **Bangladesh**, U.O. has carried out and published a wide range of research to explain and demonstrate the value of the traditional knowledge and practices of traditional resource users in the Sundarbans, and presented these studies in various occasions, among others at important international meetings (including CBD meetings) that are attended by Bangladesh's key environmental policy- and decision-makers. One special focus of this work has been to highlight the role of traditional resource users and the value of their knowledge and initiatives in relation to climate change adaptation as a way to address climate change impacts in the Sundarbans, which is a serious problem in Bangladesh. For instance, a staff member of U.O. made a presentation on "Community Mangrove Aquaculture in the Sundarbans Impact Zone: examples of using traditional knowledge in adaptation to climate change" at the 2nd meeting of the International Partnership on the Satoyama Initiative, held on 13-14 March 2012 in Kenya. Another research was conducted on evaluating the sustainability of traditional practices in adaptation to climate change in the Sundarbans area (to become a chapter in a book on natural resource management of the Sundarbans). Community leaders from the Sundarbans attended COP 11 in Hyderabad and met with Bangladesh's Minister of Forest and Environment, with whom they discussed about recognition of their traditional practices. These efforts have had quite some positive impacts, although points of concern also remain. For example, the Government of Bangladesh has approved a new (draft) Biodiversity Conservation Act ("Bangladesh Biodiversity Act 2013") in which the importance of traditional knowledge in biodiversity conservation is duly acknowledged. According to the draft law, a National Committee will be formed involving concerned Ministries, Departments, research organizations and relevant stakeholders, including indigenous and local community representative. This committee will regulate all the issues dealing with conservation and biodiversity. One concern that has emerged is that through its enactment, the National Committee will be authorized to provide approval for access to and use of biodiversity related resources by individuals or organizations, which may restrict indigenous peoples and local communities' traditional rights over genetic resources, so UO is closely tracking the situation.

The Government of Bangladesh has also revised its Wildlife Protection Act of 1974 in 2012 and renamed it "Bangladesh Wildlife Protection and Welfare Act 2012". In the act, customary use is acknowledged and valued for conservation of biodiversity. Community Conserved Areas are recognized in the act but all kinds of hunting are prohibited under this law, which may restrict sustainable traditional bush meat practices, so UO is also looking critically into this.

In **Thailand**, an important step by the government has been a Cabinet Resolution in 2010 (proposed by the Ministry of Culture) on the recognition and revitalization of Karen livelihoods and culture. In 2011, meetings were held by IMPECT representatives with the sub-committee on the revival of Karen livelihoods to discuss how to implement the Cabinet Resolution on the ground. During 2012, IMPECT continued to contribute to the implementation of Thai Cabinet's Resolution in support of the Karen way of life through some specific activities in the village of Ma Wa Ki, including alternative education in schools managed by community members and surveys and data collection on natural resource management and land use in relation to Karen culture. In general, with the demarcation of community farmland done in collaboration with the Ob Luang National Park and the Forest Department during the last few years, local people are also now more confident to practice traditional rotational farming as their tenure over land has become more secure.

In **Panama**, during the project FPCI has shared its work with the National Environmental Authority (ANAM) at many occasions and on the issue of acknowledgement of traditional knowledge, FPCI has become a recognized benchmark organization in Panama. After many years of advocacy, FPCI has made some progress in terms the recognition of traditional knowledge by the authorities of ANAM, mainly in relation to the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing. Traditional knowledge is currently valued more among the government in Panama than a few years ago, which is illustrated for example by the fact that the national government through the directorate within the Ministry of Trade and Industry that is responsible for intellectual property has taken up the issue of collective intellectual property and is trying to implement Law 20 of June 26, 2006, which deals with the collective intellectual property of indigenous peoples of Panama.

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

In **Bangladesh**, to achieve this output, U.O. has done an extensive work developing a Participatory Model for Recognizing Forest Users (ParMoRec). This model is intended to support local forest officers to identify the real forest users who use resources for their own sustainable use, so that they can be issued a forest use permit. Problems in the past were related to a corrupt system of issuing forest use permits to outsiders with unsustainable intentions and practices, while many traditional forest-dependent communities did not receive permits and were deprived of income-generating opportunities. The findings of ParMoRec have been shared with local forest officers. UO also assisted various traditional forest resource user groups to form community cooperatives in which they can unite, work together and apply for permits together. Community members meet once in a month to discuss their communal problems and devise solutions, and training workshops have been organised every year to build capacity of the traditional forest users in addressing their rights when dealing with forest officials.

Good results of this work are visible towards the end of this project period: the cooperative members have received access permits from the Forest Department on time without any hassles, which represents a massive improvement compared with the past. One association (Harinagar Cooperative) has submitted a formal proposal to the District Administrative Officer for ensuring their access to common property resources in a village wetland (for fishing rights) and representatives of the the Munda Adivasi Cooperative have held meetings with the sub-district's (Thana) administrative officer who guaranteed their access to the Sundarbans and common-property wetlands. Local government officials now recognise traditional forest resource users and openly support their initiatives in securing their rights over resources.

In **Guyana**, the project enabled and facilitated intensive community and inter-community planning for securing land tenure. As we described in earlier reports, the Wapichan only have formal titles to small pieces of land close to their villages but not to the comprehensive collective Wapichan territory as a whole. A large number of meetings have resulted in 24 inter-community agreements on common boundaries between existing (recognised) land titles and proposed land title extension areas. The common boundary agreements facilitated under the project have already helped expedite the submission of formal applications for land title extensions and helped allay fears of potential overlap or conflicts with neighbours. The same outcomes have helped villages comply with the Amerindian Act that requires communities to consult with one another prior to submitting requests for land titles and extensions (Articles 45 and 59). Partial progress has been secured so far: at the close of the project, 12 (of 13) main villages had submitted formal applications for land title extensions, with at least 9 formally registered with the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs.

Early in 2012 the District Toshao Councils (DTC) and SCPDA delegation met with the Minister of Amerindian Affairs, who queried why their document had included plans for untitled lands. The delegation explained that untitled traditional lands are understood by villagers to belong to the communities under customary law, adding that the Wapichan had sought recognition of these same lands since times prior to independence from Britain. The delegation advised that it is these lands that are most insecure and vulnerable to expropriation and damage and this is why the project had included these untitled customary lands along with details of joint agreements on common boundaries for land title extensions to cover the full extent of Wapichan territory. The Minister responded that the government of Guyana takes Amerindian Village applications for title extension very seriously and applications would be dealt with in due course, and that applications for extensions from Wapichan Villages had been registered in accordance with the law. The Ministry affirmed that land titling and extensions are a core element in its five year plan and the South Rupununi Villages are included in that work programme. Ministry officials also advised that delays in titling are partly due to resource constraints. The result of the constructive meeting was an agreement among the two parties to follow-up the discussions and explore opportunities for future collaboration.

In **Indonesia**, the project helped to develop maps of customary areas of several *kampongs* (villages) in Kalimantan (see output 3). These have contributed to a more secure tenure situation for the indigenous peoples of the kampongs, which is illustrated by a testimony of Kadrianus/Karya, leader of the mapping team of Kampong Bangkan's ancestral territory, in September 2012: "We are very grateful because our rights over our ancestral territory/domain located on state-designated protected forest are now getting clearer, because we now have our own map of the ancestral territory, which is an exceptional honoured recognition."

While progress in **Suriname**, where indigenous people do not have any legal rights to their lands yet, has been slow during the project (note that in our 2012 annual report we wrote "the country where the government is severely hampering progress on this issue is Suriname, where a national land rights conference did not bear any fruit"), the country's recent NBSAP (March 2013) creates hope for good intentions and quick changes in the situation. In section 2.5 on land rights and FPIC, the NBSAP states the following (emphasis added):

"Based on the Constitution of the Republic of Suriname (1987) the entire Suriname territory, except for privately owned land, is 'domain' of the state. Neither this decree, nor the Constitution (1987; amended in 1992) provides for collective rights to property, while the Indigenous people and Maroons do claim these rights on the basis of international law. In 2007, Suriname cast its vote in the UN in favour of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The government of Suriname has committed itself to solve the so-called land rights issue. The core thereof is *recognition of collective property rights of Indigenous people and Maroons to among other things the land that they have lived on and cultivated traditionally*. Although these rights are formally not yet recognized in the national legislation of Suriname, internationally Suriname has already committed itself to recognize them. *A national 'translation' of this concept must still take place in Suriname. The solution of the land rights issue is a precondition to steer access to and the use of traditional knowledge with regard to*

biodiversity in the right direction which also contributes to the conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity.”

In **Thailand**, smaller but steady steps have been taken by continuing the demarcation of agricultural land in individual communities. On the policy side, one of the project's communities, Khun Tae village, was selected for exploring the possibility to recognise collective land titles for indigenous and local communities by the Prime Minister's Office in 2009 and two more villages from the area were proposed in 2012; this project is still ongoing but has been slowed down by a change of government.

In **Panama** there is less progress to report. While the Comarca Guna Yala is recognized by Law 16 of 1953, and as such the Guna have more rights than some other project partners under this project, a substantial part of the territory which the Guna people consider to be part of their ancestral territory are not recognized. To date the law remains in force, without being improved and modified and there has been no progress in this regard during the project.

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

In **Panama**, the Guna people are already exercising a high degree of self-management in their autonomous territory because of the 1953 Law recognizing Guna Yala. The creation of Guna Yala protected area, which is under the control of the traditional authorities, has caused some discomfort in the National Environmental Authority (ANAM), because it is the only protected area that is not under the control of ANAM nor co-management practice. The Guna Yala protected area receives little support from ANAM. Monitoring and protection is under the direct responsibility of Guna traditional authorities while FPCI has developed Guidelines for management of the eco-cultural environmental systems of Nusagandi (Guna name for that area). The next step is the development of a land use plan for the protected area and FPCI may also use the experiences from the Wapichan project partners in doing this.

In **Thailand**, the Karen and Hmong peoples have been 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 negotiating to achieve co-management also in the neighbouring Doi Inthanon National Park. IMPECT was appointed in 2012 by the two parks as an advisory body and joined Park Authority Committee meetings in both parks. The Ob Luang National Park superintendent was replaced in 2012; IMPECT and communities hope that the new superintendent will follow the same approach (of co-management) as the previous one.

Good progress has also been made in developing productive relationships with the Department of National Parks and IUCN concerning support for customary sustainable use in protected areas. In collaboration with them, a Whakatane pilot assessment (including field work and a public seminar) was carried out in 2012³ and a proposal to follow up on that work is currently being developed with IUCN Thailand.

In **Bangladesh** the government endorsed a co-management project (Integrated Protected Area Co-management- IPAC) and has invited the community co-operatives to take part in the Sundarbans co-management programme. Three informal schools have been set up under the project to prepare and educate traditional resource users to effectively take part in formal decision-making processes. Community members have already contributed to the new management plan of the Sundarbans which is under preparation by the Forest Department. Traditional knowledge holders have also been carrying out a pilot on monitoring of fish species,

³ See <http://whakatane-mechanism.org> and <http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/environmental-governance/international-processes/whakatane-mechanism>

as a pilot for wider community-based biodiversity monitoring, among others to demonstrate the potential of such local-level approaches.

The NBSAP revision is underway in Bangladesh and government has invited Unnayan Onneshan for consultation in the revision process. However, it is not clear what will be the form of consultation and how Unnayan's suggestions and input will be addressed. This will be found out later in 2013. Upon invitation from IUCN, Unnayan Onneshan has also attended consultation meetings for developing a strategic plan for the Sundarbans where they shared the traditional resource users' issues and concerns and shared research findings on customary sustainable use. These examples of participation are a good step forwards in comparison with a few years ago.

The project in **Indonesia** is aimed at empowerment and advocacy of indigenous peoples in local knowledge-based natural resources management in Sanggau. The project supported Kampong Sanjan, Kampong Bangkan and Segumon in terms of facilitation of direct empowerment and advocacy, policy advocacy and lobbying aimed at the government, documentation on village and customary rituals and publication of facilitation outcomes and research findings. During the project extensive mapping of the Bangkan ancestral territory has been carried out (which included among others a survey on delineation with other villages, the completion of data collection on delineation, a Participatory Rural Appraisal, cross-checking by Bangkan indigenous peoples, and final cross-checks and clarification). One of the most important moments in the programme for empowerment and advocacy of indigenous peoples in Sanggau district in Kampong Bangkan was the handover of the map and at the same time the signing by the Regional Administration of Sanggau District.

The ratification of this participatory map by the Head Deputy of Sanggau District is an important impact indicator. Despite the fact that this has not officially been incorporated in the Spatial Plan of Sanggau District (*Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah – RTRW*), this work is a concrete and significant step that is going to motivate other ancestral territories to work towards self-determined protection. For the government, a concrete benefit has been that indigenous peoples are now seen as being able to directly participate in self-empowerment and protecting their ancestral territories. Another benefit is the fact that the government is no longer deemed as the one to be blamed for challenges but as an entity that can support communities through the ratification of maps and support for effective development programme implementation. As a result of a more collaborative approach between communities and government, Institut Dayakologi is now part of the team for monitoring spatial plan and policy of West Kalimantan Province.

In **Guyana**, as described under outputs 1 and 2, the Wapichan people have been the first project partners to complete and publish a full community-based territorial management plan for the sustainable use of natural resources in their territory. The document contains a shared collective vision for Wapichan territory in 25 years hence; and several chapters on different kinds of lands, different land uses, important places in Wapichan territory, on development, and on local governance and implementation. Each chapter addresses goals and targets, land management principles, customary laws, general agreements and actions, existing and proposed Village Rules, and plans and agreed actions for specific places.

In addition to the boundary arrangements mentioned above, a further 25 intercommunity agreements have been made on shared resource use of farming grounds, grazing lands and gathering areas. More than 100 land and resource use agreements were also generated in relation to specific sites, including proposals to care for community conserved forests, community conserved sites for water sources, fish spawning grounds and wildlife habitats. Some villages have already started to implement elements of the management plan of their own accord in 2012 and 2013, including agreed action on the safe use of fire and actions to reduce the risk of harmful wildfires.

The issue of community-based management, derived from the management plan, was extensively discussed with the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment. Officials of the Ministry suggested that the Wapichan plan should be a model for other Amerindian Villages to replicate as a “blueprint” for community-based environmental planning and governance in the hinterland. The proposals on Community Conserved Wildlife Sites and Community Conserved Forests contained in the Wapichan territorial plan were of particular interest to Ministry officials. They noted, however, that full recognition and support for the Wapichan plans (see also output 2) would need consensus and backing from other Ministries and agencies, most notably the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs, Guyana Forestry Commission (GFC) and the mining commission GGMC. The dialogue with the Ministry is maintained and on-going.

The Wapichan delegation also had a fruitful meeting with the Deputy Commissioner of the Guyana Forestry Commission (GFC), who expressed much admiration and interest in the high quality of the Wapichan land management plan and related digital map of natural resource use and land occupation. Like the Environment Ministry, GFC informed the Toshaos that in principle the community proposals for community conserved forests are interesting and broadly in line with GFC objectives, but final recognition of these areas would need to meet national laws, including legislation on land titles and protected areas. Conservation organisations like CI and WWF have expressed much enthusiasm for the Wapichan chapter on wildlife conservation and this has already resulted in support for a follow up project for a preliminary wildlife survey in the South Central sub District (ongoing through the South Rupununi Conservation Society).

A challenge is to keep the momentum going after the launch of the plan. Momentum in the dialogues with the government has slowed somewhat since mid-2012, as many new Toshaos are still settling in to their roles after the Village Council elections in April 2012. It is anticipated that once new village leaders become familiar with their new roles and responsibilities, further follow-up with the government will be led by the District Toshaos Councils in 2013-2014.

Suriname

The KLIM is also in the first stages of developing a community-based management plan and have looked for help and inspiration to the Wapichan project partners. Though a secured grant for this special purpose a delegation of six members of (KLIM) traveled to the South Central and Deep South in Guyana in March 2013 to exchange experiences and approaches related to community resource mapping and territorial management planning. This was an extremely valuable, exciting and inspiring trip, which also laid the foundations for friendship and closer collaboration.

While the project partners have been doing their homework at the community-level, they have also actively participated in national biodiversity planning and decision-making, and it has been a good indicators that in recent years the Surinamese government has made it standard practice to invite indigenous organisations in their meetings. Project partner KLIM and their mother organisation VIDS have attended several preparation meetings in 2010 and 2011 for the NBSAP of Suriname, where they were asked to share their focal issues and points of view on the problems and actions in relation to biodiversity in the Interior and the Indigenous people and Maroons. Feedback from VIDS staff is that the NBSAP reflects well what they brought forward and that the Environment Department (finally) seems to listen to what they are saying.

The NBSAP contains some important entry points for increased local-level involvement in biodiversity management, including protected areas. On page 17, the NBSAP states that “the local communities are of great importance for biodiversity management, particularly the Indigenous people and Maroon communities and the NGOs and CBOs associated with them”. Objective 5.4 is on increasing the capacity of local organisations and communities to take part in biodiversity management and monitoring, and co-management plans. The management plan that KLIM is developing will thus become very relevant.

Section 3 of the NBSAP contains a detailed table with the actual objectives and guidance for implementation. In the section on conservation of biodiversity, the NBSAP mentions Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs): “currently in Suriname there are the government-designated nature reserves, nature parks and Multiple Use Management Areas (MUMAs). In Suriname, such as within the traditional territories of the Indigenous people, so-called “protected areas” have been designated by these people themselves. These, however, do not have the legal status of protected area in conformity with the national legislation”. One of the sub-objectives acknowledged the need for adjusted national laws and rules for the conservation of biodiversity inside and outside protected areas: “The national laws and regulations in relation to the conservation of biodiversity need to be further adjusted in accordance with international obligations. Adjustment is also necessary to make regulation more effective and better applicable, particularly by delegating tasks. The emphasis in this respect is on laws and rules that pertain to protected areas and vulnerable species that need in- situ protection. In formulating laws and regulations, the land rights issue must be taken into account. It must be examined whether the local communities can manage protected areas themselves in areas that they use for traditional purposes”.

The plan further mentions that in Suriname there is still insufficient information about the ecosystems, species and genetically different populations, and insufficient knowledge about methods for sustainable use of biodiversity. Section 4 on local cooperation and participation of communities announces plans for monitoring of biodiversity with the help and support of local communities, including monitoring of human impacts on biodiversity, i.e. unsustainable use, climate change, and for assessments of various ecosystems and their threats or. As KLIM is already working on this (they are doing their own research on climate change and vulnerable areas), their research could greatly contribute to this process.

Interestingly, the NBSAPs has incorporated the calls from indigenous organisations during preparation meetings about the fact that they are rights holders and should also be designated as such: “According to them, the term stakeholders is inappropriate. At NBSAP level this is relevant, at least within the specific context of access to genetic resources in traditional territories and in relation to traditional knowledge. This may be further examined within the framework of the national approach of the so-called land rights issue (see also output 2). The choice of words is a sensitive issue because it is related to judicial disputes between the state of Suriname on the one hand and on the other hand the Indigenous people and Maroons”. This content of the NBSAP is more progressive in terms of language on participation and rights holders than any other government document in the past which is a great step forwards as well as proof that project partners have been effective in addressing their concerns and issues.

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

In **Guyana** the project has generated a strengthened awareness on, and preliminary inter-community principles for, the respect of free, prior and informed consent relating to external proposals affecting Wapichan lands and resources. With the territorial plan, community leaders, Village Councils and ordinary community members and youths have a common practical and consensus-based reference document to assist internal land use and community development planning; and to inform dialogues with external agencies.

In 2010 and 2012, meetings were held with the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Agriculture, Guyana Forestry Commission (GFC), Guyana Geology and Mines Commission (GGMC), Office of Climate Change, Guyana Defence Force and Conservation International to address threats to territorial integrity posed by illegal Brazilian grazing and rustling activities and mining pollution of the southern rivers of the territory. During these meetings the SCPDA team also presented an outline set of guidelines for free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) for Wapichan communities in relation to the Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS) process (developed in community workshops held under this project). Various development issues relating to health and education were also discussed.

The meeting with the Deputy Commissioner of GGMC was effective in sharing information, concerns and proposals on mining activities as put forward in the territorial plan. Leaders again communicated to GGMC their deep concerns over the very destructive impacts of small-scale mining that is increasingly using wheeled and tracked mechanised excavators to rapidly clear forest and open huge open cast mining pits. GGMC explained that effective GGMC monitoring and regulation of mining in hinterland areas is limited by a lack of staff and resources. GGMC recognises that the system for issuing permits and concessions is flawed due to a lack of information regarding the ecological and social characteristics and importance of specific areas requested as mineral properties by mining interests.

The Deputy Commissioner further explained that the only information available to GGMC is the presence or absence of Amerindian land titles in the areas in question, which is a major short-coming that needs to be rectified with improved information systems. The Wapichan delegation advised that their own document now indicates lands under application for title extensions and all these areas are of cultural and livelihood importance to Amerindian Villages. GGMC acknowledged the importance of this community-based information and also praised the quality of the document and land use map. The result of this meeting with GGMC was an agreement to continue dialogue on ways to ensure a timely flow of information from communities to GGMC on the cultural, biological and livelihood value of specific areas (e.g. creek heads, spawning grounds and community conserved sites etc). In the same way, GGMC agreed to work to improve prior consultation and notification processes on proposals for new permits and concessions affecting Amerindian lands in the South Rupununi.

The GFC acknowledged that the management plan compiled by the Wapichan is most useful in notifying GFC of the existing land title extension proposals of Wapichan Villages and that this information will be taken into account in considering applications for forestry concessions from third parties. In March 2013, however, the GGMC apparently issuing mining permits near one of the Wapichan villages (Aishalton) and the Toshias had to send an urgent letter to GGMC pointing out the areas being proposed for mining are part of their extension claims. So, vigilance on these matters by the local partners has to continue in the future.

In Guna Yala in **Panama**, the main problems are solid waste pollution and climate change. Solid waste is a threat to coastal and marine biodiversity and is worsened by an increased flow of tourists in the area and it is a threat to traditional practices and knowledge. It is necessary to have a management plan for tourism that allows the Guna people to have a sustainable development approach that does not threaten their knowledge and customary practices. Because of the sea level rise, the islands where the largest Guna population lives are under increasing threat of being flooded, causing a great threat to the Guna people's culture and future. Climate change adaptation has thus been a key topic for FPCI under this project.

Currently there is much interest by many companies to implement some initiatives in the Guna Yala region, which have been required to comply with FPIC to be considered for approval at the General Congress Guna. This is required by internal Guna norms, and no initiative that does not follow this process will be permitted. To strengthen the application of FPIC in Guna Yala, FPCI has developed the Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Traditional Knowledge with the participation of women, youth, authorities and Guna leaders. FPCI has also become an advisory organisation for the Guna traditional authorities on negotiations with the USA-based company Cocoa Well on using images of Guna people/villages.

In **Bangladesh** the project has mainly focused on the threats to CSU coming from climate change impacts, as well as a decline in knowledge among traditional resource users themselves and community-level pressures on the resources due to various circumstances and challenges. Training workshops have been arranged by experienced resource collectors to young members of the community to transmit traditional knowledge, to demonstrate and explain more sustainable resource collection techniques and climate change adaptation practices. Community based fish monitoring exercises were also carried out with traditional resource users to make them more aware of the causes and effect of biodiversity loss. Three community resource centres have been established in the Sundarbans to store data on and protect customary sustainable use of biodiversity.

One impact has been that young people are increasingly collecting resources from the Sundarbans following traditional practices again. Local fishers are more aware about fish diversity and stopped using very small meshed net to avoid unwanted fish fry loss. Another result has been the preparation of a map of vulnerable areas, which resource users are using when they are collecting resource, hence decreasing pressure on such areas. The mangrove agro-silvo-aquaculture cultivation model, developed and promoted under the project as alternative to shrimp farming and suitable for saline-affected lands (see previous reports) has provided an increasing number of resource users with a sustainable source of income, despite climate impacts, and has also decreased pressure on Sundarbans resources.

In **Suriname**, the recently revised NBSAP (see output 2) reflects the discussions the government has had with indigenous organisations (including project partners) and shows that their inputs have been incorporated, including in section 2.5 on land rights and FPIC.. The NBSAP includes the following: “Something that is closely related to this is the involvement of local communities (particularly of Indigenous people and Maroons) in development plans and policy formulation that influences their rights, culture, way of living and/or territory, in accordance with the principle of Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). According to this principle, the local population must get a specific formal role and power of decision in various development processes. Representatives and representing organizations of Indigenous people and Maroons urge to apply the FPIC in the drafting of policy, the development and implementation of projects, as well as with regard to several actions mentioned in the current NBSAP”. While this certainly does not mean that FPIC is already a standard practice in Suriname, the inclusion of this paragraph in the NBSAP does demonstrate progress in the consideration and acceptance of FPIC in Surinamese society.

FPIC is further considered in relation to access to genetic materials and associated traditional knowledge, and fair and equitable benefit-sharing (ABS). The NBSAP affirms that special consideration must be given to research in the traditional territories of Indigenous people and Maroons knowledge, “given the traditions and the position of the Indigenous and Maroons”. The NBSAP also wants to make a clear distinction between research into biodiversity in itself and research into traditional knowledge (TK) about biodiversity. In the case of research into the traditional knowledge about biodiversity, such knowledge must be protected and the use thereof must be regulated. There is also a need for laws that regulate the access to and the sharing of benefits that derive from its direct use and innovation. Desired actions are included in the NBSAP are, among others, evaluation of existing agreements, laws and rules with regard to access and indigenous peoples rights, consultation of traditional communities on laws and regulations to be developed, and develop procedures with respect to sharing benefits from the use of genetic material. Adequate laws and regulations will have to be developed to protect traditional knowledge, especially in case of transfer of such knowledge to third parties and the further use thereof. The benefits that ensue from use of traditional knowledge by third parties should be shared in a fair and just manner, particularly among the collective owners of such knowledge. The NBSAP acknowledges that classical indigenous peoples rights legislation (in Suriname) offers insufficient protection to collective rights.

3 Project support to the Conventions (CBD, CMS and/or CITES)

This project has targeted enhanced implementation of the CBD, focussing on elements of the CBD that deal with indigenous peoples, their knowledge and practices, and issues of participation and benefit-sharing, such as:

- The programme of work on Article 8(j), in particular the action plan on customary sustainable use (article 10c) that has been under discussion and development since the start of this project;
- Aichi target 18 and its indicators;
- Other relevant programmes such as the programme of work on protected areas, most notably programme element 2 on participation, equity and benefit-sharing.

One of the findings of previous research on the implementation of these aspects of the CBD was that in many government departments, while some slow progress may be due to lack of political will, in many cases there is predominantly a lack of (human and financial) resources and capacity within national and local governments to fully track and understand the CBD developments and issues and to implement them effectively. The project partners have made big efforts to support the governments in their respective countries to better understand and implement the CBD elements listed above.

The partners have invested a lot of energy in building up relationships with CBD focal points in their respective countries in order to share information and views, in particular related to explaining what CSU is and what is required to sustain it. Partners have attended and organised workshops and dialogue sessions in their own countries as well as invited their delegations for side events and presentations at CBD meetings. Case studies and other materials have been shared and partners also requested and had personal meetings with their delegations within the realms of CBD venues (see further down for a brief overview per country).

Partners have also started to become actively involved in national-level follow up with their governments in relation to the formulation of national targets and plans towards the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan. Aichi targets 18 has been the key target to focus on as it calls for: “By 2020, traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary sustainable use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the Convention, with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels.”

In order to assess the implementation of this target, the CBD has developed a number of indicators. It has one operational indicator, on linguistic diversity and numbers of speakers of indigenous languages, and three additional operational indicators categorised as indicators for further development: trends in land use change and land tenure; trends in the practice of traditional occupations; and trends in the degree to which traditional knowledge and practices are respected through full integration, participation and safeguards in national implementation of the strategic plan.

In line with the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan, many countries are now developing or revising and updating their NBSAPs and national targets, so this has been and still is a very important time for indigenous and local community organisations to get involved in biodiversity processes at the national level. Evidence-based reporting on progress on Target 18, based on indicators, reports from Parties and other sources, will need to be developed. During this project the partners have used the opportunity to contribute their local-level experiences and information towards this process, and will continue to do so in the coming period.

One example of such contribution has been the work of International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) Working Group on Indicators, which the project partners are active members of. This working group has spearheaded the process of identification of indicators relevant to indigenous peoples and discussed priority indicators and existing methodologies. The adopted indicators were based on the recommendations from this group. These indicators have given Parties guidance in achieving the Target and measuring progress.

At the same time, the IIFB Working Group on Indicators has been contributing to the development of methodologies related to traditional knowledge indicators under the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and Aichi Biodiversity Targets and offering solutions and examples, for instance related to community-mapping and monitoring (see outputs section and see also section 5 for a discussion about the technical contributions, transfer of knowledge and capacity-building of this project).

Increasingly, there has been a shift of focus towards community-based initiatives that support CSU – this is now also one of the priority tasks in the action plan on CSU – which means that

rather than waiting for others to do the work, communities are setting up initiatives themselves and are asking governments and others to support these. Examples are the community-based management plans and education activities on traditional knowledge and CSU. Another priority task in the CBD plan of action on CSU is to incorporate CSU in the NBSAPs. Partners are also prioritising getting involved in this process.

FPP and partners participated in the negotiations at COP11 (and preparatory meetings) that lead to the COP Decision related to CSU, which reads as follows:

“Decision XI/14, section F,

10. *Decides* that the initial tasks for the first phase of the major component of work on Article 10 with a focus on 10(c) shall be:

(a) To incorporate customary sustainable use practices or policy, as appropriate, with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, into national biodiversity strategies and action plans, as a strategic way to maintain biocultural values and achieve human well-being, and to report on this in national reports;

(b) To promote and strengthen community-based initiatives that support and contribute to the implementation of Article 10(c) and enhance customary sustainable use; and to collaborate with indigenous and local communities in joint activities to achieve enhanced implementation of Article 10(c);⁴

(c) To identify best practices (e.g. case studies, mechanisms, legislation and other appropriate initiatives) to:

- (i) Promote, in accordance with national legislation and applicable international obligations, the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, and also their prior and informed consent to or approval of, and involvement in, the establishment, expansion, governance and management of protected areas, including marine protected areas, that may affect indigenous and local communities;
- (ii) Encourage the application of traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use in protected areas, including marine protected areas, as appropriate;
- (iii) Promote the use of community protocols in assisting indigenous and local communities to affirm and promote customary sustainable use in protected areas, including marine protected areas, in accordance with traditional cultural practices.”

Interaction with CBD focal points and involvement in national CBD/NBSAP processes so far:

Joint: we organized several side events at CBD meetings such as WG8(j)-7, COP10, and COP11 where we made joint presentation and partners made individual presentation on Article 10(c) and related issues. Host country delegations were always invited and copies of relevant reports and briefings were disseminated. See annex 5 for some of the most relevant presentations, which are available on request.

Suriname: VIDS/KLIM representatives have actively attended preparation meetings for the revised NBSAP and a lot of their input has been incorporated (see section 2). KLIM representatives have also met informally with their country delegates from the Ministry of Environment at COP meetings and have shared with them copies of their 10c case studies and recommendations, and invited them to attend side events.

In **Panama** the participation of indigenous peoples in the national CBD planning and reporting has been low. FPCI and other indigenous organisations were not directly involved in the

⁴ Former task 6 of the list of indicative tasks.

preparation of the 4th national report (July 2010) and in the preparation of the latest NBSAP (2000) there was little participation of indigenous peoples as well. However, FPCI has recently been meeting with officials of the National Environmental Authority of Panama (ANAM) and one of the topics of discussion is the participation in the 5th national report of Panama. Building up relations with the CBD focal point in Panama is more complex as the Panama government has assigned the focal point to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, so the focal point does not have direct knowledge and relation to environmental work. One of the FPCI's successes however is that ANAM authorities have openly recognized FPCI as the reference indigenous organization in the field of traditional knowledge, biodiversity, and climate change and Article 10(c).

In **Bangladesh**, Unnayan Onneshan has facilitated the participation of the leaders of four community cooperatives from the Sundarbans to attend COP11 in India and arranged for a meeting between them and the Bangladesh focal point. The NBSAP revision is underway in Bangladesh and government has invited U.O. for consultation in the revision process.

In **Thailand**, good progress has been made in developing productive relationships with the CBD focal point. In January 2013 IMPECT and FPP had a meeting with the new CBD Focal Point and two of his staff. The meeting started off with an introduction of the participants, followed by an explanation of IMPECT's work in Chom Thong and the development of a national network of IPs, and a brief presentation by the CBD Focal Point on the NBSAP revision process in Thailand. FPP and IMPECT gave a presentation on key issues related to IPs in the CBD and the Thai context, including 8j and 10c (including the 10c project), the Programme of Work on Protected Areas, and key decisions from COP10 and COP11 (strategic plan, participatory NBSAPs, Satoyama Initiative, Indicators, new action plan on 10c). The director said he learned a lot about IPs/LCs in the CBD and about the requirement of participation in the NBSAPs and implementation of the convention at the national level.

Other things discussed were:

- NBSAP: The director's assistant explained the NBSAP revisions process (NBSAP-4, started in June 2011 and just about to finish with proposed submission to the Cabinet in February 2013 and provided a copy of the draft. After hearing that COP10 and COP11 had invited Parties to revise the NBSAPs in a participatory manner, the director admitted that there had actually been less participation in this NBSAP process compared to the past. He promised that he will ensure that IMPECT and other relevant civil society organisations will be involved in implementation and monitoring of the NBSAP.
- While the NBSAP revision and updating was not carried out in a participatory manner, the national strategy on climate change (for the next 40 years) had been quite participatory (soon to be finalized) so we can learn from that process. The Ministry is addressing climate and biodiversity in an integrated manner as they are deeply connected.
- Participation in future steps: the Focal Point suggested that indigenous peoples and local communities could select their representatives and officially submit their names for participation in NBSAP next steps. They could also become members of the Committee on Biodiversity.

IMPECT's reflection on this meeting was that the new Focal Point seems to be much more open to their input and to participatory approaches. It was also positive that he acknowledged that conservation must go hand in hand with sustainable use, and that focussing just on conservation is not effective. IMPECT decided to make maximum use of this initial positive meeting by providing comments on the NBSAP despite the very limited time available and then to keep in regular contact with the Focal Point.

4 Project Partnerships

As we explained in our application and previous reports, 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 with them and their internal bond as a team continues to be strengthened.

The partnerships with these organisations were started based on a specific demand or request from them to FPP for help with issues dealing with biodiversity, rights, and traditional knowledge. Since the 6 project partners all carried out case studies on customary sustainable use (Article 10c) since 2004/2005 with FPP support, and got involved in the CBD, they started to form a project team that since then has become very close.

We arrange meetings with the entire project as often as possible, mostly on the margins of international meetings like CBD meetings, to spend time together to discuss project updates, problems encountered and possible solutions. Every 2 years, we organise a partners' meeting (in one of the partner communities) where we reflect on progress and future steps together. The workplans are always developed by the partners, with FPP's feedback, and there is room for divergence between partners: each partner focuses on its own strengths and priorities, although there is an obvious overlap.

The strength in this partnership approach is the strong inter-community solidarity and support and the opportunity to exchange knowledge, methodologies and experiences. In March 2013 our partners from Suriname and Guyana secured a grant to organise an exchange visit to have in-depth discussions and communal learning on management planning and shared challenges. This international friendship in the team is quite unique. While we suggested that we may have to break up the project into smaller one-country programmes, the partners protested as they emphasised the huge added value of the partnership

This is a challenge at the same time (see also Q6 on lessons learned) because as the project is getting more diverse and divergent it is becoming more challenging to coordinate and fundraise for. We try to deal with this by supporting partners to raise more individual additional funds and to raise funds for certain aspects of the project work (such as community-based biodiversity monitoring), and to use more skype and e-mail to stay in regular touch with partners.

5 Contribution to Darwin Initiative Programme Output

5.1 Technical and Scientific achievements and co-operation

5.2 Transfer of knowledge

5.3 Capacity building

We will respond to sections 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 together as in this project the aspect of community-based research (incorporating TK and innovative local-level methodologies and approaches); the sharing and collaboration with other practitioners and policymakers (to apply it in practical conservation challenges), as well as their capacity building are very much interrelated.

We would like to highlight one of these approaches, namely:

Sharing and promoting approaches for local-level ecosystem data collection and monitoring

As we mentioned in section 3, COP10 adopted two indicators for Aichi Target 18 to complement the adopted indicator on "status and trends of linguistic diversity and numbers of speakers of indigenous languages" (which had been adopted at COP7):

- Status and trends in land-use change in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities.
- Status and trends in the practice of traditional occupations.

COP11 then requested the Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions, in collaboration with SBSTTA, the IIFB Working Group on Indicators and interested parties (..), to pursue the on-going refinement and use of the three adopted indicators for traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use of biodiversity (..), and also requested Parties to consider, pilot-testing the two new indicators for traditional knowledge and customary use adopted at COP10.

In section 3 we already mentioned that the project partners played an active role in the IIFB WG on Indicators that focused on developing a plan and strategy to operationalize the proposed indicators. Part of that strategy is to shift the focus of data gathering for indicators to the country and local level. In this respect, community mapping is seen as a core methodology for collecting and presenting data from the ground up on land-use change (mapping methods and technology should be shared and exchanged) and the importance of work on community-level monitoring and information systems on traditional knowledge, biodiversity, climate change and well-being of indigenous peoples is now coming to the fore.

The project partners are pioneers in land use mapping and community-based biodiversity monitoring, as previous reports to Darwin have demonstrated, for example:

- All partners have developed extensive expertise on community mapping.
- In the Sundarbans, Bangladesh, experienced traditional resource users (fishers and forest resource users) have recently developed a set of locally developed indicators to continually monitor the status of biodiversity and keep records of the changes in the status of biodiversity. Unnayan Onneshan also spearheaded work on vulnerability mapping related to disasters and associated livelihood insecurities, and carried out extensive research on communities' adaptation approaches.
- FPCI (Panama) recently published a biological inventory of the flora and fauna of the coastal marine systems in Guna Yala, which includes information on customary use of these species. FPCI have also done extensive work to document the impacts of climate change on river and forest areas and cultivated areas in Guna Yala that are vulnerable to climate change. The research has included information on traditional knowledge and customary practices in relation to resilience to climate change.
- In Thailand, community surveyors have started to collect data on status and trends of biodiversity (flora and fauna) and IMPECT intends to provide further training on this.

As mentioned in section 3, many efforts have been made to share these initiatives and their benefits with policy makers and conservation actors in the host countries as well as more widely at CBD meetings, to generate more understanding and recognition of communities' initiatives and their innovative technologies and very valuable outputs. All host countries are aware of the work our partners have done and have said they support it and welcome it very much.

In line with the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan, many countries are now developing or revising and updating their NBSAPs and national targets, Furthermore, the 4th edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO4) will be published in 2014 to provide a mid term assessment of progress towards the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Evidence-based reporting on progress on Target 18, based on indicators, reports from Parties and other sources, will need to be developed and written up by early 2014, for inclusion in GBO4. This provides opportunities to indigenous and local communities to contribute local level experiences and information towards this processes.

5.4 Sustainability and Legacy

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.

Concerning objectives that (partly) depend on other parties, such as governments, it is risky to state that all higher or final goals can or will be reached within the project period. Therefore we have aimed to set realistic goals, such as 'make significant progress', or increasing certain base-line situations. This is also what we explained in question 2.1. of this report. As described in sections 2 and 3, we think that local level partners are now stronger than when the project started and so we expect that their achievements will continue in the future. At the same time, impacts have been created on policy in the host countries as partners have developed relationships with their respective Focal Points and have started to engage in the revision of NBSAPs, in some places with very good outcomes (see Suriname NBSAP).

Along the same lines, we don't speak of an "exit strategy". With each project partner, we are assessing progress, new circumstances and needs, and design new plans for the coming 1-2 years that respond to the current priorities, gains and opportunities, and we are raising new funds for this work. As we mentioned in various other places in this report, we are planning to start focussing more on community-based monitoring and information systems, which means getting more involved in collecting and sharing information on indicators to assess progress in national and local level implementation of CBD provisions, and in stepped-up national involvement in biodiversity assessments and evaluations, which also feed into the 5th national reports and GBO4. We have developed some innovative technologies and methods to provide this kind of input and the intention is that project staff will remain employed in the next stages of the project (assuming successful fund-raising)

6 Lessons learned

We feel that this project has been very positive but may have been somewhat too ambitious in its set-up for the Darwin programme. It has been challenging to coordinate this project in multiple countries and working on multiple levels for various reasons, especially:

- It has been difficult to frame it as a 'stand-alone project and to treat the Darwin grant as a separate project or at least know which elements the other sources of funding should cover. Obviously all work in all these countries could not be funded out of the Darwin grant. This has been a challenge for our finance officer.
- Considering the four outputs we have been working towards, and considering that the situations, activities and progress in the six countries diverge quite significantly, it has been difficult to monitor progress on all project elements in all countries and to report on them to Darwin. Several times our reports exceeded the maximum report size because there is just too much variety and so much information to be shared.
- It has been difficult to distil one 'snapshot' of the overall progress and to make common statements, again due to the fact that there is so much variety in progress in the various countries on various issues.

We concluded that for a potential next time, we should probably either select one common key/focus activity or approach/methodology for a group of partners (the same partners under this project, or working with a wider indigenous network) or alternatively, to develop more discreet but detailed proposals for one country. We submitted a proposal to Darwin Round 19 for the implementation and follow-up on of the Wapichan management plan, which would be easier to coordinate and monitor. Unfortunately the proposal was turned down, but it was a useful exercise in breaking down the project into smaller one-country parts.

6.1 Monitoring and evaluation

There have been no major changes in the project design or to the log frame.

The M&E system for this project is a standard and tested way of working in all FPP projects and has also been useful for this project.

The two FPP coordinators of the project have been in regular contact with all of the partners. Every three months, the partners sent us short up-dates. More detailed mid-term narrative and financial report were submitted to us every six months, sometimes followed by additional information or clarifications on FPP's request. This process gave us a good overview of how the project proceeded and represented a main monitoring tool (or indicator). Partner organisations held their own evaluations (pertaining to the main process or a particular activity) with relevant groups, such as leaders or researchers. We met with our partners at international meetings (such as CBD meetings) and always used this opportunity to discuss progress, share experiences and address challenges. We organised one partners meeting in April 2011 in Guna Yala, Panama, entirely for evaluation, exchanging experiences, and planning next steps. While we would have liked to hold more of these, the budget did not allow for that to happen. The most important finding or conclusion of that meeting was that sustained effort is required at the national level in order to have a well-working 2-ways system between the local and international level. All partners felt that good progress had been made at the local level and in the international arena (although negotiations techniques can still be further improved) but progress in legal and policy-making at the national level has been slower and dependent on the political will and capacities of the governments and other agencies. It was decided that more emphasis should be placed on achieving better progress at the national level. This was one of the reasons that the team started to become more involved in the NBSAP processes and to pay more attention to national-level piloting of indicators on Aichi target 18.

Each partner organisation has at least one FPP staff member that spends field-time with each local organisation. During fieldwork periods the progress of the project is monitored in detail. FPP's financial department has processed all the financial reports and tracked the overall financial status. All partners have signed an MoU with FPP to clarify roles and responsibilities and to make agreements on reporting dates and requirements. During the time of this project, there have been no cases of partners not or not correctly reporting to us.

6.2 Actions taken in response to annual report reviews

No outstanding issues.

7 Darwin identity

As we explained in section 6, the Darwin initiative support formed part of a larger programme (a continuation of previous and on-going work) in various countries and at various levels so it was not a distinct project. This made it more challenging to clearly identify or promote the Darwin identity on every occasion, presentation or publication.

However, Darwin is mentioned and thanked in FPP's public annual reports for their support to this work and among project partners and our larger network of IPOs and CBOs we have familiarised people with the Darwin Initiative (they all know they fund this project and know what Darwin does). We also shared funding opportunities – SCPDA decided to apply for Round 19 in a joint project with FPP. At CBD meetings where our work was presented several times, the Darwin Initiative was mentioned as one of the main donors.

FPP has contributed to several articles in the Darwin newsletter, which we have distributed within our network.

8 Finance and administration

8.1 Project expenditure

Project spend since last annual report	2012/13 Grant (£)	2012/13 Total actual Darwin Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs (see below)	XXX	XXX	(10,364)	Office Staff for partner countries was a necessity for the work and there was no other funding for them in this year.
Consultancy costs	XXX	XXX		
Overhead Costs	XXX	XXX	(2,724)	Partner overheads higher than expected as no core funding to cover this area in 2012/2013
Travel and subsistence	XXX	XXX	1,454	
Operating Costs	XXX	XXX	6,808	FPP did not incur operating costs, all monies sent to partners and spent by them on project activities, or staff and office costs
Capital items (see below)	XXX	XXX	3,990	No capital items required at this stage in project
Others (see below)	XXX	XXX	846	
TOTAL	XXX	XXX		

Staff employed (FPP Only) (Name and position)	Cost (£)
Maurizio Ferrari, Project Coordinator	XXX
Caroline de Jong, Project Assistant	XXX
Sarah Roberts, Finance Officer	XXX
Annabelle Galt, Communications Officer	XXX
TOTAL	XXX

Capital items – description	Capital items – cost (£)
TOTAL	

Other items – description	Other items – cost (£)
Communications	XXX
Publications and Translations	
Media and Web	
Exchange	
TOTAL	XXX

8.2 Additional funds or in-kind contributions secured

Source of funding for project lifetime	Total (£)
Swedbio/ Swedish Resilience Council	XXX
Oxfam Novib	XXX
Christensen Fund	XXX
Ecosystem Alliance	XXX
Norad and Other Contributions	XXX
TOTAL	XXX

Source of funding for additional work after project lifetime	Total (£)
Swedbio/Swedish Resilience Council	XXX
Ecosystem Alliance	XXX
	XXX
	XXX
TOTAL	XXX

8.3 Value for Money

The project was cost-efficient because FPP allocated the majority of the grant to the local partners in the host countries directly, who directly spent it on the activities towards the output. The partners determine each year what their priorities or most viable activities are, and what the best and most effective ways are to carry out the work (including organising travel, buying equipment, hiring local staff, developing materials). For FPP it is important that most of the money goes to the local level and people and to be a bit flexible with this; only then we know the money is put towards the most important or useful things at that time. We could also state that it was good value for money given the large number of activities carried out in 6 countries as well as at the international level, with some positive outcomes at all levels (local, national, international).

Annex 1 Report of progress and achievements against final project logframe for the life of the project

Note: For projects that commenced after 2012 the terminology used for the logframe was changed to reflect DFID's terminology.

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements in the last Financial Year (2012-2013)	Actions required/planned for next period
<p>Goal/Impact:</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of national biodiversity targets achieved with reference to CSU - status and trends in decentralisation of biodiversity management leading to biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and fair and equitable benefit sharing 		<p>The implementation of Article 10(c) has been advanced in the host countries as well as at the CBD level (plan of action on customary sustainable use (CSU) being developed now and is scheduled to be adopted by COP12). As the implementation of sustainable use, including CSU, is considered crucial in achieving the Aichi Targets and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, the project has therefore contributed to the increased achievement of the three objectives of the CBD.</p> <p>Indicator 1: this is difficult to verify as only Suriname has submitted a revised NBSAP to the CBD; this does include good references to CSU, but details on implementation and from other countries are not available. It will be necessary to check the revised NBSAPs and the 5th national reports from each country in order to use this indicator effectively.</p> <p>Indicator 2: increased decentralization of biodiversity management leading to biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and fair and equitable benefit sharing has been achieved to different degrees in all 6 countries (see output 3 in section 2.3 and section 2.2).</p>	<p>Do not fill not applicable</p>

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements in the last Financial Year (2012-2013)	Actions required/planned for next period
<p>Purpose/Outcome</p> <p>Advanced implementation of Article 10(c) in the 6 host countries by 2013</p>	<p>Outputs below have been achieved</p>	<p>While there have been variations between the countries and there are exceptions under nearly every output, the project has achieved all outputs.</p>	<p>Do not fill not applicable</p>
<p>Output 1</p> <p>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"> - Number of policies and laws that recognise TK, CSU and IL - Number and quality of educational policies and programmes that promote indigenous languages and TK. - Number of educational initiatives by communities that are acknowledged and/or supported by government - Number of conservation or sustainable use initiatives that include / incorporate TK and CSU (see also output 3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 4: Bangladesh Conservation Act and Wildlife protection Act; Suriname NBSAP, Thai Cabinet resolution on Karen way of life. - All partners (6) are using education materials and initiatives to promote TK and IL, which have high value as they are developed by communities themselves. These are employed both within informal and formal education. - Suriname government supports bilingual and intercultural education pilot. Local government in Northern Thailand also acknowledges IMPECT's efforts at bilingual education. - Three government recognised processes: Co-management project IPAC Bangladesh; Joint management Ob Luang National Park Thailand; customary use in forest management, Indonesia. 	
<p>Output 2</p> <p>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"> - Number of project partners who have made progress towards land and resource rights; and extent of progress 	<p>At least 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - see Suriname NBSAP text on land rights (although these are only words so far, no practice yet); - Wapichan extension claims in line with requirement of Amerindian Act, Guyana; - permits and easier access for traditional resource users in the Sundarbans through cooperatives, guaranteed access to wetlands by regional administrative office; - Indonesia: acceptance of community delineation map by local government; - Thailand: pilot project to recognise collective land titles, including in one community in our project area (this, however, has now been slowed down by new government) <p>Note: Guna (in Panama): high degree of autonomy already but no progress in recognition of other ancestral areas outside title.</p>	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements in the last Financial Year (2012-2013)	Actions required/planned for next period
<p>Output 3</p> <p>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"> - Number of community members that are involved in official natural resource policy/decision-making and management / governance activities - number of community-based management plans or proposals that are recognised and/or incorporated in biodiversity management and plans - number of indigenous and community conserved areas established by partners 	<p>Note on appropriateness of indicator number one: number of community members is difficult to say, better speak of partners or number of partner communities.</p> <p>At least 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traditional resource users getting involved in IPAC Bangladesh and in management plan for Sundarbans; - Thai communities involved in Ob Luang and IMPECT was appointed in 2012 by Ob Luang and Doi Inthanon parks as advisory body (joined Park Authority Committee meetings in both parks); - Guna manage Guna Yala PA largely themselves; - Wapichan proposed conserved forest areas: not recognised yet, but Wapichan plan is widely supported and acknowledged 	
<p>Output 4</p> <p>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"> - Number and nature of existing threats / pressures that were successfully addressed - Number and nature of new threats / pressures that were prevented - Number and nature of cases where FPIC was applied 	<p>Note on appropriateness of indicators: may be too optimistic/ambitious, given the timeframe of the project and the varying degrees of threats. It may be more instructive to address the number of partners who have developed successful tools to address threats.</p> <p>Two community tools based on FPIC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guna protocol on ABS; - Wapichan FPIC guidelines; 	
<p>Activity 1</p> <p>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)</p>		<p>Done in all partner countries. Capacity building is an integral part of the project.</p>	
<p>Activity 2</p> <p>Documenting customary sustainable management systems (outputs 1,3)</p>		<p>Done in all partner countries.</p>	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements in the last Financial Year (2012-2013)	Actions required/planned for next period
Activity 3 Developing plans / proposals for community-based management and/or effective co-management (outputs 2,3)		Wapichan have finalised their plan and are now moving towards implementation; Guna and Kalin'a and Lokono are in the process.	
Activity 4. etc Community-based biodiversity monitoring (CBBM) training and activities (outputs 1,3)		Done in all countries	
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)		Done in all countries	
Activity 6. Raising public awareness, both nationally and internationally, of these efforts and outcomes (outputs 1,2,3,4)		Done in all countries	
Activity 7. Linking project activities and outputs to international processes on 10(c) (outputs 1,2,3,4)		Successfully done: team made significant inputs in the development of the new major component on article 10c in the revised CBD programme of work on 8(j).	

Annex 2 Project's full logframe, including indicators, means of verification and assumptions

Note: Insert your full logframe. If your logframe was changed since your Stage 2 application and was approved by a Change Request the newest approved version should be inserted here, otherwise insert the Stage 2 logframe.

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
Goal:			
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.			
Sub-Goal 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"> - Number of national biodiversity targets achieved with reference to CSU - status and trends in decentralisation of biodiversity management leading to biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and fair and equitable benefit sharing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Countries' national reports to the CBD - independent reports - evaluation of biodiversity projects 	
Purpose. 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"> - The host countries also make significant efforts towards achieving other biodiversity goals related to the CBD. - Host countries are committed to implement CBD timely and effectively
Output 1. 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"> - Number of policies and laws, that recognise TK, CSU and IL - Number and quality of educational policies and programmes that promote indigenous languages and TK. - Number of educational initiatives by communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Process (involvement of communities) and outcomes of development and revision of policies and laws - Education policies - Concrete commitments by government and other outside parties to communities' proposals and initiatives (materials, curricula, projects, other educational activities) 	Community efforts manage to change perception of governments and others

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
	<p>that are acknowledged and/or supported by government</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of conservation or sustainable use initiatives that include / incorporate TK and CSU (see also output 3) 		
<p>Output 2. 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"> - Number of project partners who have made progress towards land and resource rights; and extent of progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Official and unofficial government communication (oral and written); statements, commitments, discussions & correspondence with communities, newspaper articles, reports - Outcomes, reports and minutes of meetings and workshops with governments - Changes in laws and policies - Land and resource arrangements or agreements - Project report and updates 	<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>Output 3. 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"> - Number of community members that are involved in official natural resource policy/decision-making and management / governance activities - number of community-based management plans or proposals that are recognised and/or incorporated in biodiversity management and plans - number of indigenous and community conserved areas established by partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Official records - qualitative feedback and reports from community representatives - Local management or co-management agreements - Project report and updates 	<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>

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Output 4. 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"> - Number and nature of existing threats / pressures that were successfully addressed - Number and nature of new threats / pressures that were prevented - Number and nature of cases where FPIC was applied 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - documentation (reports and official and community feedback) of the threats, actions taken and outcomes - FPIC agreements 	<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>Activities (details in workplan)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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) 2. Documenting customary sustainable management systems (outputs 1,3) 3. Developing plans / proposals for community-based management and/or effective co-management (outputs 2,3) 4. Community-based biodiversity monitoring (CBBM) training and activities (outputs 1,3) 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) 6. Raising public awareness, both nationally and internationally, of these efforts and outcomes (outputs 1,2,3,4) 7. Linking project activities and outputs to international processes on 10(c) (outputs 1,2,3,4) 			
<p>Monitoring activities:</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 Project contribution to Articles under the CBD

Project Contribution to Articles under the Convention on Biological Diversity

Article No./Title	Project %	Article Description
6. General Measures for Conservation & Sustainable Use		Develop national strategies that integrate conservation and sustainable use.
7. Identification and Monitoring		Identify and monitor components of biological diversity, particularly those requiring urgent conservation; identify processes and activities that have adverse effects; maintain and organise relevant data.
8. In-situ Conservation	45%	Establish systems of protected areas with guidelines for selection and management; regulate biological resources, promote protection of habitats; manage areas adjacent to protected areas; restore degraded ecosystems and recovery of threatened species; control risks associated with organisms modified by biotechnology; control spread of alien species; ensure compatibility between sustainable use of resources and their conservation; protect traditional lifestyles and knowledge on biological resources.
9. Ex-situ Conservation		Adopt ex-situ measures to conserve and research components of biological diversity, preferably in country of origin; facilitate recovery of threatened species; regulate and manage collection of biological resources.
10. Sustainable Use of Components of Biological Diversity	45%	Integrate conservation and sustainable use in national decisions; protect sustainable customary uses ; support local populations to implement remedial actions; encourage co-operation between governments and the private sector.
11. Incentive Measures		Establish economically and socially sound incentives to conserve and promote sustainable use of biological diversity.
12. Research and Training		Establish programmes for scientific and technical education in identification, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity components; promote research contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, particularly in developing countries (in accordance with SBSTTA recommendations).
13. Public Education and Awareness		Promote understanding of the importance of measures to conserve biological diversity and propagate these measures through the media; cooperate with other states and organisations in developing awareness programmes.
14. Impact Assessment and Minimizing Adverse Impacts		Introduce EIAs of appropriate projects and allow public participation; take into account environmental consequences of policies; exchange information on impacts beyond State boundaries and work to reduce hazards; promote emergency responses to hazards; examine mechanisms for re-dress of international damage.
15. Access to Genetic Resources	10%	Whilst governments control access to their genetic resources they should also facilitate access of environmentally sound uses on mutually agreed terms ; scientific research based on a country's genetic resources should ensure sharing in a fair and equitable way of results and benefits.

Article No./Title	Project %	Article Description
16. Access to and Transfer of Technology		Countries shall ensure access to technologies relevant to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity under fair and most favourable terms to the source countries (subject to patents and intellectual property rights) and ensure the private sector facilitates such assess and joint development of technologies.
17. Exchange of Information		Countries shall facilitate information exchange and repatriation including technical scientific and socio-economic research, information on training and surveying programmes and local knowledge
19. Bio-safety Protocol		Countries shall take legislative, administrative or policy measures to provide for the effective participation in biotechnological research activities and to ensure all practicable measures to promote and advance priority access on a fair and equitable basis, especially where they provide the genetic resources for such research.
Other Contribution		Smaller contributions (e.g. of 5%) or less should be summed and included here.
Total %	100%	Check % = total 100

Annex 4 Standard Measures

Code	Description	Totals (plus additional detail as required)
Training Measures		
1a	Number of people to submit PhD thesis	
1b	Number of PhD qualifications obtained	
2	Number of Masters qualifications obtained	
3	Number of other qualifications obtained	
4a	Number of undergraduate students receiving training	
4b	Number of training weeks provided to undergraduate students	
4c	Number of postgraduate students receiving training (not 1-3 above)	
4d	Number of training weeks for postgraduate students	
5	Number of people receiving other forms of long-term (>1yr) training not leading to formal qualification(i.e. not categories 1-4 above)	
6a	Number of people receiving other forms of short-term education/training (i.e. not categories 1-5 above)	800
6b	Number of training weeks not leading to formal qualification	75
7	Number of types of training materials produced for use by host country(s)	36
Research Measures		
8	Number of weeks spent by UK project staff on project work in host country(s)	48
9	Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) produced for Governments, public authorities or other implementing agencies in the host country (s)	1 finalised, 3 others in preparation
10	Number of formal documents produced to assist work related to species identification, classification and recording.	6
11a	Number of papers published or accepted for publication in peer reviewed journals	0 (due to lack of time)
11b	Number of papers published or accepted for publication elsewhere	41 (see annex 5)
12a	Number of computer-based databases established (containing species/generic information) and handed over to host country	6
12b	Number of computer-based databases enhanced (containing species/genetic	

Code	Description	Totals (plus additional detail as required)
	information) and handed over to host country	
13a	Number of species reference collections established and handed over to host country(s)	
13b	Number of species reference collections enhanced and handed over to host country(s)	
Dissemination Measures		
14a	Number of conferences/seminars/workshops organised to present/disseminate findings from Darwin project work	20
14b	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops attended at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated.	40
15a	Number of national press releases or publicity articles in host country(s)	15
15b	Number of local press releases or publicity articles in host country(s)	
15c	Number of national press releases or publicity articles in UK	
15d	Number of local press releases or publicity articles in UK	
16a + b + c	Number of issues of newsletters produced in the host country(s) Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the host country(s) Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the UK	12 7500+
17a	Number of dissemination networks established	1
17b	Number of dissemination networks enhanced or extended	
18a	Number of national TV programmes/features in host country(s)	
18b	Number of national TV programme/features in the UK	
18c	Number of local TV programme/features in host country	
18d	Number of local TV programme features in the UK	
19a	Number of national radio interviews/features in host country(s)	80 (mostly 'path of biodiversity') in Panama
19b	Number of national radio interviews/features in the UK	
19c	Number of local radio interviews/features in	

Code	Description	Totals (plus additional detail as required)
	host country (s)	
19d	Number of local radio interviews/features in the UK	
Physical Measures		
20	Estimated value (£s) of physical assets handed over to host country(s)	£ XXX
21	Number of permanent educational/training/research facilities or organisation established	5
22	Number of permanent field plots established	
23	Value of additional resources raised for project (<i>See Section 8.2 above</i>)	£ XXX
Other Measures used by the project and not currently including in DI standard measures		

Annex 5 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’)	<p>Customary sustainable use of biodiversity by indigenous peoples and local communities: Examples, challenges, community initiatives and recommendations relating to CBD Article 10(c)</p> <p>A synthesis paper based on case studies from Bangladesh, Cameroon, Guyana, Suriname, and Thailand.</p> <p>Latest revised version, 25 October, 2011.</p>	FPP KLIM (Suriname), SCPDA (Guyana), IMPECT (Thailand), OKANI, CED (Cameroon), Unnayan Onneshan (Bangladesh)	http://www.forestpeoples.org/customary-sustainable-use-studies	N/A
Submission to CBD Secretariat	<p>Joint submission to the CBD Secretariat in response to a notification on the Programme of Work on Article 8(j) and related provisions with a request for contributions from Parties and stakeholders regarding possible elements of a new major component of work on Article 10, with a focus on Article 10(c).</p> <p>August 1st, 2012.</p> <p>(used as INF doc at COP11).</p>	FPP and 26 indigenous and local community organisations and supportive NGOs working on issues related to customary sustainable use of biodiversity in various countries	see http://www.forestpeoples.org/sites/fpp/files/news/2012/10/Joint%20submission%20on%2010c%20-%2001%2008%2012.pdf	
Submission to CBD Secretariat	<p>SUBMISSION In relation to the notification on the Programme of Work on Article 8(j) and related provisions</p> <p>March/April 2013</p>	FPP, Natural Justice, and endorsed and signed by over 70 community-based organisations, networks, and NGOs working on issues related to traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use	available in Spanish, French and English: http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/convention-biological-diversity-cbd/publication/2013/submission-convention-biological-diversi	

		of biodiversity in various countries		
Briefing for IPO and NGO participants at COP11 (part of set of CBD briefings by the CBD Alliance)	Article 8(j) and Related Provisions: focus on Article 10(c) on customary sustainable use October 2012	FPP and Natural Justice	http://www.forestpeoples.org/sites/fpp/files/news/2012/10/Article%208j%20and%20Related_cbda%20brief%20for%20COP11.pdf	
Guide	Indigenous Peoples in Decisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity (Working Draft) Compilation of main COP10 decisions that contain references to indigenous peoples and local communities 8 October, 2012 (being updated and extended in 2013)	Forest Peoples Programme and International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB)	http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/convention-biological-diversity-cbd/publication/2012/new-publication-indigenous-peoples-decis	
Enews articles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wapichan people in Guyana present territorial map and community proposals to save ancestral forests Karen People forcibly expelled from the Kaeng Krachan National Park in Thailand Pilot Whakatane Assessment in Ob Luang National Park, Thailand, finds exemplary joint management by indigenous peoples, local communities, National Park authorities and NGOs <p>FPP Enewsletter February 2012</p>	FPP and project partners	http://www.forestpeoples.org/enewsletters/fpp-e-newsletter-february-2012	
Enews article	Views of FPP partners on Rio+20 summit FPP Enewsletter July 2012	FPP and project partners	http://www.forestpeoples.org/enewsletters/fpp-e-newsletter-july-2012	
Enews articles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indigenous 	FPP and project	http://www.forestpeoples	

	<p>advocates at Convention on Biological Diversity COP11 meeting in India</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest Peoples Programme, Thai and Kenyan partners report back on 5th IUCN World Conservation Congress <p>FPP Enewsletter October 2012</p>	partners	.org/enewsletters/fpp-e-newsletter-october-2012-0	
Enews article	<p>Parties to the Biodiversity Convention not ready to accept 'indigenous peoples'</p> <p>FPP Enewsletter October 2012 December 2012</p>	FPP and project partners	http://www.forestpeoples.org/enewsletters/fpp-e-newsletter-december-2012	
Enews article	<p>Indigenous peoples' rights violated and traditional lands in Guyana threatened by mining</p> <p>FPP Enewsletter February 2013</p>	FPP and project partners	http://www.forestpeoples.org/enewsletters/fpp-e-newsletter-february-2013	
Enews article	<p>Gender dimensions in indigenous peoples' customary use of biodiversity</p> <p>FPP Enewsletter June 2011</p>	FPP and project partners	http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/customary-sustainable-use/news/2011/06/gender-dimensions-indigenous-peoples-customary-use-bio	N/A
Enews article	<p>Upcoming Convention on Biological Diversity meetings with issues of relevance to Indigenous Peoples</p> <p>FPP Enewsletter October 2011</p>	FPP and project partners	http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/convention-biological-diversity-cbd/news/2011/10/upcoming-convention-biological-diversity-mee	N/A
Enews article	<p>President of Suriname shuts down land rights conference following clear demands from indigenous and tribal peoples</p> <p>FPP Enewsletter December 2011</p>	KLIM/VIDS	http://www.forestpeoples.org/region/suriname/news/2011/12/president-suriname-shuts-down-land-rights-conference-following-clear-de	N/A
Enews article	<p>CBD Working Group agrees on development of new Plan of Action on</p>	FPP and project partners	http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/environmental-governance/news/2011/	N/A

	Customary Sustainable Use of biological resources FPP Enewsletter December 2011		12/cbd-working-group-agrees-development-new-plan-action-cu	
Square Brackets Newsletter	New focus on customary sustainable use in the CBD By FPP and partners Issue 5 (June 2011)	CBD Secretariat and CBD Alliance, Montreal, Canada	http://www.cbd.int/ngo/square-brackets/square-brackets-2011-06-en.pdf	N/A
Article in ECO, journal of the CBD Alliance	Local experiences and lessons learned on customary use and article 10c ECO 38(1), November 2011	CBD Alliance	http://www.cbdalliance.org/wg7-8j/	N/A
Article in ECO	A briefing on indigenous peoples and local communities in the CBD, related to the discussions on updating the terminology - ECO 44(6), 15 October 2012	CBD Alliance	http://www.cbdalliance.org/storage/cop11/eco/eco-44-6.pdf	
Article in ECO	"COP12 and Customary Sustainable Use": ECO (45) 30 November, 2013	CBD Alliance	http://www.cbdalliance.org/post-cop11-eco-issue/2012/11/30/post-cop11-eco-issue.html	
Darwin newsletter	'Wapichan people in Guyana develop community plan to save tropical forests on their traditional lands' July 2012	Darwin Initiative	http://darwin.defra.gov.uk/newsletter/Darwin%20News%202012-07.pdf	
Darwin newsletter	COP11 developments related to customary sustainable use December 2012	Darwin Initiative	http://darwin.defra.gov.uk/newsletter/Darwin%20News%202012-12.pdf	
Blog in Eco-agriculture web site	Indigenous resource management systems: A holistic approach to nature and livelihoods Maurizio Farhan Ferrari 14 March 2012		http://blog.ecoagriculture.org/2012/03/14/forest_peoples_programme/	
Press release	Wapichan people in Guyana showcase community proposal to save tropical forests on their traditional lands	FPP (UK) and SCPDA (Guyana)	http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/environmental-governance/news/2012/02/press-release-wapichan-people-guyana-showcase-community	N/A

Publication	Natural resources management and local people's wisdom	Institut Dayakology, TOMAS, Indonesia		
Publication	<i>Kaimanamana'o, wa zaamatapan, wa di'itapan na'apamnii wa sha'apatan Wapichan wiizi</i> Guyana'ao raza.us Thinking Together for those Coming Behind Us - An outline plan for the care of Wapichan territory in Guyana.	SCPDA, Guyana	http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/customary-sustainable-use/publication/2012/wapichan-people-guyana-make-community-based-agreem	
Publication	A handbook on spiritual rituals of indigenous people and sacred areas of 5 indigenous groups in Northern Thailand	IMPECT, Thailand		
Publication	A handbook on traditional health care and herb in Ban Mae Pon, Northern Thailand	IMPECT, Thailand		
Report	<i>Directrices de Gestion para un Plan de Ordinacion de los Sistemas Ambientales Eco-cultural de Nusagandi y Areas Cercanas al Camino Llano-Gardi</i> (management guidelines of ecological-cultural environmental systems of Nusagandi and areas near the Camino Llano-Gardi)	FPCI	Available upon request to FPCI	
	Guiá de flora y fauna de sistemas costeros de Kuna Yala 2011			
Report	<i>Manejo y Uso de Bosque y Conocimiento Indígena</i> (management and use of the forest and traditional knowledge).	FPCI	Available upon request to FPCI	
Report	Climate Change and Traditional Knowledge	FPCI		
Report	"Protocolo Indígena de Acceso a Recursos Genéticos y	FPCI		

	Participación Equitativa de Beneficios. Indigenous Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Traditional Knowledge. 2011			
Book	Melindungi Tiong Kandan Sebagai Sumbat Dunia'	Institut Dayakologi		
Newspaper articles in Bangladesh English newspapers	Articles authored or co-authored by Mohd. Abdul Baten, Unnayan Onneshan Forest Biodiversity: our common future, (January 2) Save forest biodiversity, save the world (May 23) Evaluating the services of the Sundarbans (July 2) Aila impact: people suffering endlessly (part I) (July 22) Aila impact: people suffering endlessly (part II) (July 23) Aila impact still lingers on people and environments (August 13). One article on the occasion of World Environment Day Evaluating services of Sundarbans (in the occasion of World Biodiversity Day), 2 July	<i>New Age</i> <i>Daily Sun</i> <i>The Daily Star</i> <i>Daily Sun</i> <i>Daily Sun</i> <i>The Daily Star</i> <i>New Age</i> <i>The Daily Star</i>	http://newagebd.com/newspaper1/op-ed/20605.html http://www.thedailystar.net/newDesign/news-details.php?nid=192409	
Video	Climate change in Guna Yala	FPCI, Panama	http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MgKceWMhmes	
Video	Nabire Guede Gudi (Guna worldview and way of interacting with Mother Nature)	FPCI, Panama		
Video	A documentary film on the Sundarbans, focussing on the traditional resource	Unnayan Onneshan, Bangladesh		

	users who depend on the Sundarbans for their livelihoods, and on their collective action for sustainable development in the Sundarbans.			
Video	Management of natural resources and land use in Chomthong district.	IMPECT, Thailand		
Radio show	'Path of biodiversity', weekly broadcast on biodiversity and climate change issues and traditional knowledge	FPCI		
Presentation	Article 10(c) - customary sustainable use: Examples, Challenges, Community Initiatives and Recommendations COP10 side event 18th October 2010	FPP and project partners	Available on request	
Presentation	Implementing 10(c): initiatives and experiences from indigenous peoples and local communities International meeting on Article 10 with focus on 10(c) Montreal, 31 st May 2011	FPP and project partners	Available on request	
Presentation	Content and implementation of the new major component of work on customary sustainable use in the programme of work on Article 8(j) and related provisions WG8(j)-7 Montreal, 31 st October 2011	FPP and project partners	Available on request	
Presentation	<i>"Community Mangrove Aqua Silviculture in Sundarbans Impact Zone: Example of using traditional knowledge in adaptation to climate change"</i> was presented at the Second Global Conference on International Partnership on Satoyama Initiative.	Unnayan Onneshan, Bangladesh	Available on request	

	Kenya on 13-14 March 2012. And WG8(j)-7, November Montreal 2011			
Presentation	"" Dynamics of knowledge systems under multilateral environmental negotiations: example from Bangladesh" Side event COP11, 15 October 2011	Unnayan Onneshan	Available on request	
Presentation	Management approaches in marine and coastal ecosystems: experience from Guna Yala Side event COP11	FPCI	Available on request	
Poster	The management of natural resources by community and security to their land and food.			
Calendar	Yearly calendar to promote the management of natural resources by community and security to their land and food.			
<p>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 (in particular in Thailand) and are not publicly available or for sale.</p> <p>Please let us know if you wish to receive a copy of any of these materials.</p>				

Annex 6 Darwin Contacts

Ref No	18-003
--------	--------

Project Title	Supporting indigenous and local organisations to implement CBD article 10(c)
Project Leader Details	
Name	Dr. Maurizio Farhan Ferrari
Role within Darwin Project	Project Coordinator
Address	1c Fosseyway Business Park, Stratford Road, Moreton-in-Marsh, GL56 9NQ
Phone	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 1	
Name	Mr Mohammed Abdul Baten
Organisation	Unnayan Onneshan
Role within Darwin Project	Bangladesh country coordinator
Address	16/2 Indira Road, Farmgate, Dhaka-1215, Bangladesh
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 2	
Name	Mr Onel Masardule Arias
Organisation	Fundación para la Promoción del Conocimiento Indígena
Role within Darwin Project	Panama country coordinator
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 3	
	Mr Nicholas Fredericks South Central People Development Association Guyana country coordinator Shurinab village, Rupununi
Partner 4	
	Mr George Awankaroe Organisation of Kalin'a and Lokono in Marowijne (KLIM) Suriname country coordinator
Partner 5	
	Mr John Bamba Institut Dayakology Indonesia country coordinator

Partner 6	
	Mr Udom Charoennyomphrai Inter Mountain Peoples Education and Culture in Thailand Association Thailand country coordinator