INTEGRATING TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE INTO NATIONAL POLICY AND PRACTICE IN GUYANA
ORIGINS


• Promoted a bottom up approach of identifying and documenting community owned solutions

• Using community owned solutions to influence policy and channel REDD+ funding

• Peer to peer sharing of community owned solutions

• What could be done to add to this work?
AICHI TARGET 18

• 'By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels'.
  • Increase recognition and respect of IP and TK
  • Increase integration of TK in policy and practice
  • Increase participation of knowledge holders
PROBLEM AND OBJECTIVES

- Little progress on the CBD achieving this target
  - Lack of information
  - Lack of capacity
  - Lack of resources

- Objectives
  - Evaluate the opportunities and barriers to TK integration focused on protected areas management
  - Create an evidence based approach for TK integration
  - Develop a national action plan
Methodology

- Initial community visits
  - Informing and gaining consent.
  - Choosing selected villages for in-depth engagement.

- Community workshop and training
  - TK indicators, disaggregated by men, women, youth
  - Community researchers trained in PV
  - Training PV videos

- Community follow-up
  - PV on PA challenges and concerns
  - PV on PA community owned solutions

- Screenings to decision makers
  - Mutual understanding
  - Feedback and request for further details/evidence
  - Action on issues

Facilitated by NRDDB researchers, with support from MoIPA, EPA, RHUL and CC.

Free, prior and informed consent is an ongoing process

- Input from Indigenous associations and forums
- Input from wider PA communities

Analysis and collation of PV by NRDDB researchers/MoIPA/EPA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Starting out</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What challenges are the community facing in relation to TK?</td>
<td>Vision - what do you want to achieve in relation to the protected area and TK?</td>
<td>What is needed to achieve your vision?</td>
<td>Activities - How will you go about achieving the vision?</td>
<td>What difference will your actions make to your community? How are you going to know whether your vision has been achieved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What challenges are the community facing in relation to the protected area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of data identified
- Which solutions could be implemented
- Which solutions required direct intervention from outside
- Which could be implemented with some level of partnership
Identified the most important indicators for management
Which were considered community owned solutions
Integration level was assessed using a three level approach (adapted from Kettunen 2014, 2017):

1) **conceptual integration**; where documents underpinning sectoral policies (e.g. Strategies) explicitly or implicitly take TK/IP rights into account.

2) **operational integration**; where specific measures or instruments are identified and committed to address tk/ip rights related objectives within policy sectors.

3) **implementation integration**; where concrete measures achieve integration on the ground in actual policy- and decision-making situations.
### METHODOLOGY OF POLICY REVIEW

### TRAFFIC LIGHT EVALUATION SYSTEM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explicit and comprehensive recognition of Traditional Knowledge (TK)</th>
<th>Explicit and comprehensive recognition of the rights of indigenous people</th>
<th>Some explicit integration but not comprehensive (e.g., some mentioning of TK)</th>
<th>Some explicit integration (e.g., some mentioning of indigenous people’s rights)</th>
<th>Implicit and indirect integration, generally focus on preventing negative impacts of a policy sector on TK</th>
<th>Implicit and indirect integration, generally focus on preventing negative impacts on the rights of indigenous people.</th>
<th>No recognition (direct / indirect) of TK</th>
<th>No recognition (direct / indirect) of the rights of indigenous people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### DIVIDED INTO TWO ELEMENTS:

1) **TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE (TK)**

2) **INDIGENOUS PEOPLE’S RIGHTS (IP)**
**FINDINGS OF POLICY REVIEW** (PRELIMINARY)

**• INDIGENOUS PEOPLE’S RIGHTS INTEGRATION RESULT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Integration</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Climate change</th>
<th>Conservation Protected area</th>
<th>Conservation Biodiversity</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Development Land use</th>
<th>Extractive</th>
<th>Forestry</th>
<th>Human Rights Indigenous people</th>
<th>Land rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Explicit & comprehensive recognition of indigenous people's (IP) rights**
- **Some explicit integration but not comprehensive (e.g. some mentioning of IP rights)**
- **Implicit and indirect integration, generally focus on preventing negative impacts of a policy sector on IP**
- **No recognition (direct / indirect) of IP rights**
- **Data missing**
FINDINGS OF POLICY REVIEW (PRELIMINARY)

Key Findings for level of TK integration

• 3 sectors showed a good level of integration (Dark to light green)
  • Conservation
    • Protected Area
    • Biodiversity
  • Culture
  • Human rights
• Sub-sector of Protected area (particularly the Management plans) and the Culture sector showed high level (dark green) of both Conceptual and Operational integration

• Worst 3 sectors of (red) no recognition of TK was Agriculture, Extractive (mining and petroleum) and Land rights
TK LITERATURE REVIEW METHODS

• Systematic search
  • 7 search terms based on 5 key ‘elements’
  • Traditional knowledge, best practice, decision making and policy, participation, management
  • Literature containing key terms in abstract included in literature review
  • 768 pieces of academic and grey literature refined down to 150 ‘primary’ articles

• Literature review
  • ‘Primary’ articles read in entirety
  • 48 case studies found reflecting good practice from around the world
  • Case studies assessed against 21 criteria based on Aichi target 18 and Articles 8j and 10c, and the nagoya protocol
  • Case study types encompass impact assessments, protected areas, resource management, and sustainable development, and indigenous and community-conserved areas (iccas)

• Analysis
  • Summary statistics and cluster analysis indicating key gaps and patterns
  • By level of economic development, region, case study type, and overall
  • Key lessons drawn from qualitative analysis (preliminary)
BARRIERS TO TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE INTEGRATION

• Communicative
  • Arise from different languages and styles of expression used by tk-holders

• Conceptual
  • Stem from an organization’s difficulties in comprehending the values, practices, and context underlying TK

• Political
  • Result from unwillingness to acknowledge TK messages that may conflict with the agendas of government or industry
• Objective 1: Raise awareness nationally of the critical role of Indigenous peoples and their TK
  • Long-term Outcome: Guyanese respect and value the contributions of Indigenous Peoples in local conservation efforts

• Objective 2: Strengthen local laws, governance and mechanisms for preservation and integration of TK
  • Traditional knowledge in Guyana is preserved and protected through improved laws and increased inclusiveness of Indigenous peoples in decision-making.

• Objective 3: Empower Indigenous communities to document and address matters pertaining to the preservation and integration of TK
  • Indigenous communities are networking effectively to address common issues and concerns, and sharing best practices
  • Language, culture and practices of Indigenous peoples remain an important component of their way of life
NEXT STEPS

• Continued engagement with the other protected areas

• Continuing the FPIC process with communities and other stakeholders

• Full consultations with stakeholders for the development of the action plan

• Develop a training program for the full process of TK integration

• Peer to peer exchanges with other countries in the Guiana Shield
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