

Call for Input 2023

Meaningful engagement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in Article 6.4 mechanism

Date Submitted	2 November 2023
Prepared For	Article 6.4 Supervisory Body

This document includes consolidated inputs from eco securities and its local partners actively engaged with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs). The following representatives have contributed to this submission:

ecosecurities

Audrey Palomar
audrey.palomar@ecosecurities.com

GreenPact Trading and Consultancy Inc.

Glen De Castro
glen.decastro@greenpact.eco

Center for Conservation Innovations PH Inc.

Adryon Javier
a.javier@conservation-innovations.org

**Nagkakaisang Tribu ng Palawan (NATRIPAL)
or the United Tribes of Palawan**

Mercedes Limsa
limsamercedes@yahoo.com

Reynante Luna
r.luna@conservation-innovations.org

1. What are the current or anticipated challenges Indigenous Peoples and local communities face in engaging with the Article 6.4 mechanism?

Company / Organization	Response
Ecosecurities	<p>Current Challenges</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Absence of Formal Representation of IPLCs in A6.4. The participation of IPLC representatives endorsed or nominated by duly organized and legitimate IPLCs/ICCs should be enabled to incorporate perspectives and insights of IPLCs in A6.4 discussions.2. Absence of Sufficient A6.4 Capacity Building Support and Resources for IPLCs Technical and financial support for IPLCs is necessary to enable their participation in discussions, most especially on matters affecting the governance of their land and resource rights.3. Lack of Access to Up-to-Date and Contextualized Information for Decision-Making on A6.4 Matters Given this emerging mechanism's highly technical and complex nature, most IPLCs/ ICCs are unaware of the A6.4 discussion. Locally appropriate information materials should be made available and communicated to IPLCs. This will allow them to be well-informed of critical concepts to formulate opinions and decide on matters affecting their communities and rights.

	<p>Anticipated Challenges:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establishing culturally appropriate grievance mechanisms 2. Integrating locally appropriate systems to A6.4. 3. Intergenerational knowledge transfers and continuity of work
Center for Conservation Innovations PH Inc.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complex Legal Framework: The legal intricacies surrounding Article 6.4 can be challenging to navigate and understand. Both the IPs and the mandated government agency/ies usually encounter difficulty in grasping the concept of trading emission reduction and removal credits generated through specific activities making it difficult for them to assert their rights effectively. 2. International Level Approval: Rules at the international level on the eligibility (or not) of specific technologies or processes may run counter to what is culturally appropriate. 3. Inclusivity: Ensuring the involvement of all voices within Indigenous and local communities (rather than relying solely on a select few leaders) in decision-making processes is challenging but vital for fair and equitable engagement. 4. Cultural and Environmental Impacts: Evaluating and mitigating the potential cultural and environmental impacts of Article 6.4 projects demands specialized knowledge and resources. This necessitates a broader contribution from stakeholders rather than relying solely on by-the-book research.
NATRIPAL/ GreenPact	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How to measure attribution or performance when it is tied to the land? Are claims enough to make IPs owners of the carbon rights or titles (CADT) are required? 2. Capacity. On their own, IP groups will find it challenging to implement, measure, and report their performance. 3. Can traditional IP structure be allowed to transact and negotiate for credits? Or more formal structures, with all its attendant requirements like legal registrations, bank accounts, governance mechanisms, be required? 4. What if there are no government policies that would allow IP participation in emission reduction activities?

2. What mode of communication could facilitate better dialogue between the Supervisory Body and Indigenous communities?

Company / Organization	Response
Ecosecurities	<p>Facilitated Community-Level Dialogues Managed by Trusted Indigenous Peoples' Partners</p> <p>Organizing regional dialogues catered to IPLCs will allow a more open and direct conversation focusing on their concerns.</p>

<p>Center for Conservation Innovations PH Inc.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bilingual or Multilingual Communication: <u>Recognize that many Indigenous communities may have their own languages or dialects.</u> Providing communication in these languages, along with a common language like English or the official language of the country, can facilitate better understanding. 2. Traditional Communication Methods: <u>Respect and utilize traditional communication methods,</u> such as oral storytelling, to convey information and foster engagement. 3. Education and Training: <u>Offer educational opportunities and training to both Indigenous community members and the government regulatory body that supports Indigenous Peoples</u> on topics pertaining to the work of the Supervisory Body. This empowers them to engage more effectively. 4. Conflict Resolution Mechanisms: Implement clear and <u>culturally relevant conflict resolution mechanisms</u> to address disputes or disagreements that may arise during the dialogue process between all parties.
<p>NATRIPAL/ GreenPact</p>	<p>There should be a way to directly communicate with the Supervisory Body considering that government designated authorities are hampered by bureaucracies and capacities. There is no integrating mechanism yet within the government that would consolidate and bring up the issues of IP groups all over the country to the discussion.</p>

3. How would you envision meaningful long-term engagement and active participation from Indigenous Peoples and local communities on the work of the Supervisory Body and the mechanism?

Company / Organization	Response
<p>Ecosecurities</p>	<p>To have meaningful, long-term engagement, and active participation from IPLCs, their fundamental rights to their lands and resources must be recognized and secured under the A6.4 mechanism.</p>

<p>Center for Conservation Innovations PH Inc.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cultural Sensitivity: Recognize and respect the cultural values, customs, and traditional knowledge of Indigenous Peoples. <u>Ensure that engagement methods are culturally sensitive, appropriate and in accordance with the law.</u> 2. Technology and Digital Access: Where possible, ensure that Indigenous communities have <u>access to digital platforms</u> and technology to facilitate communication, information sharing, and participation. 3. Independent Monitoring: Support independent monitoring mechanisms, possibly established in partnership with Indigenous communities, to assess the mechanism's environmental and social impacts. 4. Feedback and Adaptation: Continuously seek feedback from Indigenous communities and <u>adapt the engagement process based on their input and changing needs.</u>
<p>NATRIPAL/ GreenPact</p>	<p>Meaningful, long-term, and active participation of IP communities in the work of the Supervisory Body and the mechanism is inextricably hinged on their ownership of their ancestral lands and waters. IP groups find it difficult to think of long-term investment in their lands without security and sense of ownership. If the Supervisory Body is really serious in institutionalizing IP participation in reduction emission, their basic right to land should be supported as well. This is the foundation of a more meaningful and long-term participation of IP groups in this endeavour.</p>