Integration of Article 8(j) and provisions related to indigenous peoples and local communities in the work of the Convention and its Protocols

Possible institutional arrangements, including lessons learned and pros and cons of current arrangements

Marina von Weissenberg

Luonnon monimuotoisuus
ELÄMÄN EHTO

Marina von Weissenberg, Senior Ministerial Adviser at the Ministry of the Environment

19 February 2019, FINLAND

Sámi Parliament of Finland with 21+4 members
Chair: Tiina Sanila-Aikio

https://www.samediggi.fi/task/?lang=en

Finnish Lapland

1. Based on your experience on traditional knowledge (TK) and indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs), share some views regarding the future work on TK within the CBD and its Protocols

The Future Work

The new Programme of work on Article 8(j) and related provisions part of the post 2020 biodiversity framework and target(s) formulated and integrated in the new target setting – 'Beijing targets'.

- Art 8(j) prominent part of the exsisting SBI (incl. CBD and its protocols) and a separate possible Working Group considering:
  - Regional broad-based consultations

- A new permanent body, open-ended, such as a Subsidiary Advisory Body on Article 8(j) to the CBD.

2. Based on your experience on TK and IPLCs, share some views regarding the future work on TK within the CBD and its Protocols

Institutional arrangement. Why?

i) Continuity both related to the Programme of work on Article Art8 (j) and existing institutional arrangements;
ii) Participation: Full and effective participation of IPLCs; *Increase focus on implementation* to achieve 2030 targets and the 2050 vision, as well as the objectives of the CBD and its protocols;
iii) Efficiency – compare current arrangements -> Art8 (j) OEWG or part of the SBI. Note! Right to make recommendations and draft decisions to the COP – Voice of the IPLCs.
iv) Advisory role to the COP and its protocols, adressing gaps and providing draft decisions by IPLCs on perspectives concerning them. Disclosure & appreciation. Fullfillment of UNDRIP.

3. Explain how this possible institutional arrangement would work in the post 2020 related to IPLCs in the work of the Convention and its Protocols.

- **Pros**

i) Continuation of work

ii) Strong mandate, disclosure

iii) Link to SDGs <-> CBD

iv) Review and update of TK indicators for the post 2020 biodiversity framework

v) Tools for cooperation and improving synergies, mandate, integration and implementation.

- **Cons**

i) Technical back-up, IPLCs involvement, financial means;

ii) List of elements for the PoW (23 elements) – 12 submissions

iii) Cost implications – way forward?

iv) Involvement of IPLCs – who is speaking and deciding?

v) IPLCs and TK resources.

4. Explain what the outcomes would be if Parties implement this institutional arrangement in connection with the vision "Living in Harmony with Nature" by 2050.

- IPLCs and TK considerations more prominent part of the solutions for instance in relation to SDGs, future NBSAPs – > channel their perspectives on the work of the Convention and its protocols;
- The consultations and involvement would be better foreseen (not on voluntary base, ad hoc) and structure in place;
- The Convention would have stronger impact on considerations related to Art8 (j) and benchmarking best practices and implementation i.e. making use of new IT tools, mechanisms (cost efficiency);
- Outcome: Exsisting guidelines, measuirng the rate of implementation, visibility and knowledege sharing, appreciation.

5. Question for the audience in relation to this institutional arrangement.

In the post 2020 biodiversity framework and considering the institutional arrangements relating to Art 8(j):

Is communication and languages an issue?

How to manage consultations on the future governance modalities?

Any advice or considerations.

2019 | INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF
Indigenous Languages

Thank you!