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The CBC transforms knowledge - from diverse sources and perspectives, and spanning areas of scientific research as well as traditional and local knowledge - into conservation action.
A biocultural approach to indicator development

Begins with an understanding of locally grounded questions and institutions

Uses participatory methods to ensure indicators are relevant for local decisions

Explicitly encompasses environmental and cultural elements in a system

Gavin et al. 2015; Sterling et al. 2017 a, b; McCarter et al. 2018
What are the benefits of using a biocultural approach?
Project Area

- Hawaii
- Marshall Islands
- Solomon Islands
- Fiji
- French Polynesia
Drawing from community-visioning workshops across the Pacific and working with an interdisciplinary research team, we developed an iterative list of 93 elements, within 8 dimensions.
Exploring Pacific Island Well-being

Drawing from community-visioning workshops across the Pacific and working with an interdisciplinary research team, we developed an iterative list of 93 elements, within 8 dimensions:

- Environmental State
- Access to Natural and Cultural Resources
- Sustainability Management
- Connectedness to People and Place
- Indigenous and Local Knowledge, Skills, Practice, Values, and Worldviews
- Education
- Human Health
- Access to Infrastructure, Civic Services, and Financial Resources

Local to Global Exploration: Coding Global Indicators of Sustainable Development

Publication forthcoming: Sterling et al. Submitted
**Target:** Ecosystems that provide *essential services*, including services related to water, and contribute to *health, livelihoods and well-being*, are restored and safeguarded taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable

**Indicator:** Extent to which indicators resonate with aspects of well-being (via Well-being Elements)

Contributions to the Aichi Biodiversity Target
**Contributions to the Aichi Biodiversity Target**

**Target:** Ecosystems that provide **essential services**, including services related to water, and contribute to **health, livelihoods and well-being**, are restored and safeguarded taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable

**Indicator:** Extent to which indicators resonate with aspects of well-being (via Well-being Elements)

### BEFORE (2011-2020)

**Focusing on some of the indicators for this target…**

- Red List Index (pollinating species)
- Red List Index (species used for food and medicine)
- Coverage by protected areas of important sites for mountain biodiversity
- Ocean Health Index

**We find connections to these Well-being Dimensions:**

- **Environmental State**

  *And, to a lesser extent,*

  - Access to Natural and Cultural Resources
  - Sustainability Management
**Contributions to the Aichi Biodiversity Target**

**Target:** Ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable

**Indicator:** Extent to which indicators resonate with aspects of well-being (via Well-being Elements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE (2011-2020)</th>
<th>AFTER (post-2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focusing on some of the indicators for this target...</td>
<td>Considering other key dimensions of well-being and using a biocultural approach to indicator development...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Red List Index (pollinating species)</td>
<td>• Connectedness to People and Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Red List Index (species used for food and medicine)</td>
<td>• Indigenous and Local Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coverage by protected areas of important sites for mountain biodiversity</td>
<td>• Human Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ocean Health Index</td>
<td>• Access to infrastructure and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education</td>
<td>• Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We find connections to these Well-being Dimensions:

• Environmental State

*And, to a lesser extent,*

• Access to Natural and Cultural Resources
• Sustainability Management

We reveal additional metrics to monitor progress towards Target 14 including trends in:

• Appropriate access to cultural resources, supported and recognized by local and/or national rules
• Representation of local and traditional values in stakeholder decisions
• Knowledge of socio-ecological connections, interdependence, and feedbacks
• Access to sustained funding or resources for sustainability management
Message to the CBD for post-2020
Suggestions to IPSI for post-2020
Consider the role of indicators highlighting connections between people and place
Examples from related resources:
Examples from related resources:

Households and communities are able to move around between different production activities and locations as necessary

(Indicator on "Socio-ecological Mobility" as described in UNU-IAS, Bioversity International, IGES and UNDP 2014)
Examples from related resources:

Households and communities are able to move around between different production activities and locations as necessary

(Indicator on “Socio-ecological Mobility” as described in UNU-IAS, Bioversity International, IGES and UNDP 2014)

Strong families and kinship networks, built over generations, have others they can rely on in times of need and neighbors they can trust

(Vanuatu Alternative Indicators of Wellbeing indicator on “Community Vitality” as described in Sterling et al. 2017)
Examples from related resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong families and kinship networks, built over generations, have others they can rely on in times of need and neighbors they can trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households and communities are able to move around between different production activities and locations as necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Indicator on “Socio-ecological Mobility” as described in UNU-IAS, Bioversity International, IGES and UNDP)

Provisioning of opportunities by nature for people to develop a sense of place, belonging, rootedness or connectedness, associated with different entities of the living world

(e.g., cultural, sacred and heritage landscapes, sounds, scents and sights associated with childhood experiences, iconic animals, trees or flowers)

(IPBES NCP Reporting Categories indicator on “Supporting Identity” as described in Diaz et al. 2018)
The Action Group on Knowledge Systems and Indicators of Wellbeing
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Nature-Culture Indicators and Knowledge Systems Resource Directory

http://resources.cbc.amnh.org/indicators
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