

IIFB WG DSI First Intervention

We echo the concern of Brazil on the selection of GEF as the vehicle for managing the fund. All 7 sociocultural regions of Indigenous Peoples and local communities must be served by these funds, in both developing and developed countries. Many funds are likely to be obtained from DSI derived from GRs, TK associated with GRs, and TK from IPs and LCs from non-parties and from developed countries. Support needs to be provided to IPs and LCs, women and youth in all countries to continue their stewardship, protection and conservation of genetic biodiversity.

We request that discussion on the management of the funding consider multiple sources of funding, including those that can accommodate direct funding to IPs and LCs, women and youth, with building capacity over time.

For similar reasons, while we believe there can be geographic criteria, these cannot be the only ones. All areas have appropriate biodiversity deserving of conservation, and risk, vulnerability and threats are also important. Arctic biodiversity may be low, but is at high risk under climate change. Multiple criteria for benefit sharing should be developed, involving representatives of IPs and LCs and stakeholders.

The hybrid mechanism is also part of Decision 15/9, and conflicts may be due to different understandings of what is meant by the hybrid approach. All DSI is derived from GRs that come from somewhere, and therefore regulated by the Convention, the NP, national laws. For IPs, the UNDRIP Article 31 is also relevant. MAT is only relevant to bilateral approaches to GRs, FPIC, PIC or approval and involvement is necessary for access to TK, and the deposit of DSI of derived from the genetic resources of States, IPs and LCs into databases covered by existing rights and interests.

Once deposited, then DSI should be regulated by universal principles of open and responsible data governance, ethical guidelines and safeguards for societal rights in and interests in open access and use. This applies to the rights and interests of IPs and LCs. Many States have already developed these, as IIFB referenced in our opening statement. DSI should only be deposited into databases that provide for benefit sharing.

Non-monetary benefits should go beyond technology capacity building. Multiple forms of capacity building, including capacity to improve land rights and land tenure security are also critical. The stewardship of biodiversity by IPs and LCs that are necessary for the maintenance of GRs from which DSI is derived must be maintained against environmental pressures and the erosions of TK and other values that underpin these. Even support for the languages and values of Indigenous Peoples and those of local to local communities that contribute to biodiversity conservation can also have significant benefits to conservation and sustainable use.

