



New report uncovers human rights impacts of exclusionary natural protected areas on the Kichwa People of San Martin in the Peruvian Amazon

Ethnic Council of the Kichwa Peoples of the Amazon (CEPKA), the Federation of Indigenous Kichwa Peoples of the Lower Huallaga San Martin (FEPIKBHSAM), the Federation of Indigenous Kichwa Peoples of Chazuta, Amazonia (FEPIKECHA), and the Coordinator for the Development and Defense of Indigenous Peoples of the San Martin Region (CODEPISAM) and Forest Peoples Programme

A new report (1) published last November shows how the creation and implementation of two State protected areas in Peru threaten the continuity of the Kichwa people's territorial occupation in the San Martin region, as well as their traditional forms of control and usufruct. It also outlines how these human rights violations have been further compounded by large-scale carbon trading - which falsely claims to deliver nature-based climate solutions - without consent or accountability towards the affected Kichwa communities.

The report "Conservation Without Indigenous Peoples. The Case of Kichwa Territories in Cordillera Escalera and Cordillera Azul in San Martin, Peru" was published by several prominent Indigenous organisations within Peru, and Forest Peoples Programme.

The two conservation areas which are the focus of the report, the Cordillera Azul National Park and the Cordillera Escalera Regional Conservation Area are natural protected areas created in the San Martin region

of Peru in 2001 and 2005 respectively. The Kichwa people have been calling on the IUCN since 2021 to remove Cordillera Azul from its Green List of exemplary protected areas for denying their territorial rights.

The report ends with a series of recommendations, including that the Peruvian State must take immediate measures to fulfil its responsibility to recognise and protect the Kichwa people's Indigenous territories through the collective titling that they have been demanding for years, as well as implement mechanisms within the management of both protected areas that respect the Kichwa's territorialities, collective rights and effective participation.

(1)<https://www.forestpeoples.org/en/2022/new-report-exclusionary-natural-protected-areas-kichwa-san-martin>

We need gender in the biodiversity policy agenda NOW!

Zuhura Ahmad, CBD Women Programme Lead at Tanzania Biodiversity Organization

This is the moment to see adoption of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. And our hope relies on an intergenerational gender lens in the policy framework that will respond to the needs for transformative change. However, since women have always been at the forefront in biodiversity conservation but their contributions not recognised and documented, it is of the utmost

importance to have a GBF with a mechanism to develop gender disaggregated data.

Only gender responsive policy, human behavior, finance, science and transformative approaches can conserve biodiversity in the long term and push the biodiversity agenda forward, thus fulfilling the 2050 Vision of living in harmony with nature.

The opinions, commentaries and articles printed in ECO are the sole opinion of the individual authors or organizations.

Time to support Target 22 on gender equality towards COP15

UNCBD Women's Caucus

The UNCBD Women's Caucus acknowledges and thanks all the "Gender Champions" who have supported and built the momentum of hope - hope for justice, hope for inclusion and hope in pursuit of rights and acknowledging the role and contributions that half of the world population make to living in harmony with nature - the women.

A gender equality stand-alone target has gained momentum and secured large Parties' support. Human rights, including the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, are core to ensuring and delivering the ambitions of an effective, just and inclusive Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF), with a whole of society approach. The many valuable references to human rights and gender equality and women empowerment have to be retained in relevant goals and targets.

The GBF has to create a scenario that promotes effective, equitable and full participation, and gender equality at all levels of governance and decision making, and also ensure accountable implementation, review, monitoring and reporting. The monitoring framework has to include an overarching principle on data disaggregation, including sex disaggregation and including gender-sensitive indicators to ensure the gender-responsive implementation of the post-2020 GBF.

On a final important note, financing and investing in the implementation of the post-2020 period will be critical for the achievement of the goals and targets of the post-2020 GBF. However, biodiversity policy should not be dictated by those who have money only. It is absolutely crucial that such financing does not come from sources harmful for women and biodiversity such as carbon offsetting.

Ecuador's Galápagos Islands are not a laboratory for testing risky gene drive organisms

Adam Breasley, Stop Gene Drives

Language in Target 6 on invasive species referencing "new tools" and "innovation" is an implicit reference to gene drives. Island Conservation, the lead NGO advocating gene drives, promotes using them in the Galápagos Islands despite Ecuador having a constitutional prohibition on Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO). The iconic Galápagos with its associations with biodiversity and evolution highlights the stakes - do we want a future where biodiversity is conserved or a future where ecosystems are genetically engineered? Island Conservation's own slogan is "preventing extinctions" yet they lobby for a genetic technology to engineer extinctions. Engineering extinction has no place in the GBF nor the CBD. Actor Leonardo DiCaprio gave \$43 million to Island Conservation in 2021 to "Rewild" the Galápagos. One wonders if DiCaprio knows his money is being used to promote risky extinction technology. Researchers from the University of Adelaide in Australia recently announced gene drives can be used to spread infertility in the

common house mouse (*Mus musculus*). Mice are a widely dispersed species having great capacity to establish themselves. What happens if a gene drive escapes and crashes global mice populations? Mice are the preferred species for biomedical research. We have no guarantee that a gene drive system would not escape species barriers. Gene drive researchers promote islands for testing gene drive organisms, but islands are not contained environments, evidenced by the fact that an invasive species arrived there. Gene drives are an invasive species.

Island states participating in OEWG5 and COP15 should be wary of being manipulated as places to test risky experimental technologies under the guise of conservation; their legitimate wishes to preserve their endemic biodiversity and save threatened species should not be exploited by those wishing to test technologies posing serious risks to global ecosystems.

The responsible approach to Target 17

Jack Green, graduate student in Environmental Policy

The coming OEWG5 meeting will be integral in establishing the standards and norms on the future development of new biotechnologies. Though the Informal Group provided a streamlined Target 17 text for negotiators to consider, a substantive decision on the removal of brackets around horizon scanning, tech assessment, and monitoring has yet to be encouraged.

This language encourages the use of a necessary and complete toolkit in discerning between technologies that will have a positive socio-environmental impact and those that will undermine the work of the Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF), biodiversity and human rights. This text provides clear and actionable direction to reviewing these new technologies while reaffirming the precautionary principle, the Cartagena Protocol and the Kunming Declaration's support of biotechnologies only "as appropriate".

Horizon scanning, technology assessment, and monitoring refers to basic mechanisms by which decision makers are informed of risks in technology transfer and new biotechnology development. Practices that review and identify new technological developments, processes that evaluate these developments and regular reviewing of policy decisions about technology are all established in this language, and Parties to SBSTTA have already drafted a decision outlining a structured process governing this review in the field of synthetic biology.

A Target 17 text that does not include these key conditions for technology transfer would not only be inconsistent with the previous decisions of the CBD, but also undermine the basic values and intentions of the Post-2020 GBF. Parties must integrate this language in the final Target 17 text during the OEWG5 negotiations.

Human rights and accountability in the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

Cristina Eghenter, WWF International

The Post-2020 GBF needs to put rights and equity at the center. This is a core enabling condition for halting and reversing biodiversity loss in ways that are inclusive, just and sustainable. The framework needs to be about effectively and equitably tackling the root causes of biodiversity loss and recognizing the rights and contributions of the main custodians of biodiversity like Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs), women, and youth. However, we need to be able to monitor and measure rights and equity for accountability. It is part of our responsibility to nature and future generations. If human rights are only principles in a preambular section and are not translated into clear elements and actions leading to impact, and cannot be tracked and accounted for, the risk is for a human rights-based approach (HRBA) to remain a good "statement of intention" rather than a strong commitment and effective action to halt and reverse

biodiversity loss, and to support the vision of living in harmony with nature.

The first step is to have elements of human rights principles embedded in actionable targets as relevant. The second step is to develop appropriate indicators in the monitoring framework. For example, if the principle is "respecting and upholding human rights", one action in the relevant target would be to ensure that environmental human rights defenders are protected. This can be achieved, it can be monitored and reported. Another action in the relevant target would be to ensure that areas conserved by IPLCs are recognized, respected and appropriately supported. This can be achieved, it can be monitored and reported.

A HRBA in the GBF needs to be implemented and accounted for, for people and nature.