



BENELEX Working Paper N. 15

(November 2017)

Spaces for local voices? A discourse analysis of the decisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity

Louisa Parks, School of International Studies & Department of Sociology and Social Research, University of Trento (louisa.parks@unitn.it)

This paper is part of the project “BENELEX: Benefit-sharing for an equitable transition to the green economy - the role of law,” which is funded by the European Research Council Starting Grant (November 2013-October 2018):
<http://www.strath.ac.uk/research/strathclydecentreenvironmentallawgovernance/ourwork/research/benelexproject/>.

Introduction

This paper discusses the existence and shape of a discursive space for local voices in the arena of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Political ecology and other critical literature on global environmental governance argues that dominant or hegemonic discourses shape decision-making in such arenas, and delimit the boundaries of possible policy choices. Discourses that shape global environmental governance are seen as rooted in a dominant worldview stemming notably from a capitalist view of value. This, it is argued, precludes discursive spaces for other types of worldviews based on different conceptions of value (for example commons approaches) held in those local communities considered crucial in protecting the environment and natural resources. The paper aims to contribute to this area of study by looking in detail at the CBD, argued by some as a more open arena for local voices (e.g. Reimerson 2013, Bavikatte 2014). The contribution relies on a discourse analysis applied to the CBD's decisions since its creation and up to its most recent meetings held in late 2016. Essentially, the aim of the analysis is to apply the arguments of political ecology and other critical literature to the decisions of the CBD in order to investigate how far they conform to this critical view. The results presented here are the first to emerge from the initial discourse analysis, and further work is being carried out. Nevertheless, they suggest points of interest for further debate and research.

The CBD entered into force in late 1993. With 196 parties it is one of the most widely subscribed global environmental governance instruments covering every country in the world with the exception of the United States. Its aims are 'the conservation of biodiversity, the sustainable use of its components, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources' (Convention on Biological Diversity, art 1). The aim of fair and equitable benefit sharing in particular has led the CBD to pay specific attention to indigenous peoples and local communities that may hold biodiversity-related knowledge and resources. Decisions taken by the CBD Conference of the Parties to implement conservation, sustainable use, and benefit-sharing have led some scholars to argue that this global arena hosts spaces that allow for the recognition and valorization of different ways of organizing the use and care of natural resources. In particular Bavikatte (2014) has written about the recognition of community protocols¹ in the Nagoya protocol on access and benefit-sharing of the CBD (the Nagoya Protocol), and argues that this recognition in the area of traditional knowledge and bioprospecting has opened a space for local voices and the expression of other worldviews that will increase over time. Nevertheless, if community protocols, or other types of expressions of local voices, are to address power structures outside local spaces, there is a need to investigate the discursive

¹ Community protocols are documents (written or otherwise recorded) developed by communities (as they wish to define themselves) to record what information they feel should be known by any external actor wishing to engage with them. They may outline the ways in which communities engage with natural resources and the environment including commons arrangements, customary law and institutions, worldviews and ideas of what constitutes 'development', lay down instructions on how the community be consulted, detail what the community seeks as benefit in any agreement that might be reached, or any other information considered important by the community in question.

spaces available to them. While there may be more work on national governance levels, detailed work on international arenas is not widespread, hence the choice to investigate the discursive landscape of the CBD. The choice of this arena is also guided by the debate over whether this is a typical arena of global governance, or one that is more open than others to the voices of non-state actors (Affolder 2017) or local communities (Reimerson 2013, Bavikatte 2014).

The more hopeful existing analyses of the CBD are based either on the specific recognition of community protocols in the Nagoya protocol (Bavikatte 2014), the text of the Treaty (Reimerson 2013), or observations on the unfolding of Conferences of the Parties (COPs) (Affolder 2017). Among scholars that oppose this more optimistic view of the CBD, the focus is again on particular decisions (e.g. Mulligan 1999) or specific Conferences of the Parties (COP) (Marion Suiseeya 2014). The analysis here seeks to draw a picture of the development of the CBD in discursive terms over time rooted in the details of its decisions. Legal scholars have shown that, in line with a constructivist view of the law, COP decisions have been used to extend the scope of the original CBD treaty and move forward with innovative interpretations (Morgera and Tsoumani 2011). Therefore, an analysis of the evolution of the discursive shape of the CBD can supplement existing knowledge by showing how the arena changes over time as well as details of different components of discourse. It is important to note that the current analysis is designed to supplement detailed case study work rather than as a stand-alone source of knowledge. It may also be used by other scholars to corroborate or challenge other analyses of the CBD.

The paper proceeds as follows. The next section presents a brief and non-exhaustive review of the broad field of work on local communities and global environmental governance, including work from socio-legal studies, environmental politics and sociology which may be united under the broad title of political ecology. This yields a fairly clear view of the powerful discourses that are argued to shape global environmental governance. The methodology employed for the discourse analysis is then described, including a discussion of the strengths and limits of the approach. In particular, this discussion underlines that the worth of the current analysis is as a supplement to other work that takes a more contextualized and case study based approach to these issues. The results of the analysis are then presented and discussed. The paper concludes with a summary of findings, first thoughts about how the analysis confirms and challenges existing literature, and suggested paths for future research.

Literature review

Political ecology refers to a broad and multi-disciplinary body of work that seeks to understand the ways in which people and societies interact with natural resources (Robbins 2004). Natural resources, like other social relations, are understood as embedded within fundamentally political, power-laden discourses. The discourses surrounding processes of nature conservation thus exclude some ideas and explanations as a result of promoting others. These dominant discourses can often be read in political economy explanations of practices of the social

relations of production with an emphasis on access and control over resources (Svarstad 2004, Ribot and Peluso 2003). The focus of political ecology literature in the field of biodiversity is therefore on the production and power of dominant discourses, and the asymmetrical relations between dominant and minor discourses.

The dominant discourses identified as forming the basis of constraints on environmental governance in much work on political ecology are colonialism and capitalism. In an early consideration of the CBD's obligations regarding bioprospecting, for example, Mulligan (1999) describes rules as firmly rooted in a colonial discourse where raw materials from the global South are acquired for processing into expensive products in the global North. Adger et al (2001) also touch on the continued importance of colonial views in their analysis of the CBD's work on bioprospecting as a 'win-win' discourse, partnered by a dominant opposition discourse around 'biopiracy'. Their work, brings together local level case studies to illustrate issues in the discursive underpinning of the Rio treaties, also evidences the close link between colonialist discourses and capitalist discourses, often used interchangeably since colonial expansion was driven by the will to further enrich metropolises. Bioprospecting is traced to colonial searches for useful plants and a contemporary rise of European botanic and zoological gardens, with the export of plant material underpinning colonial and economic expansion and continuing in the North-South exchange described above. The similarities between colonial and capitalist discourses are also discussed in work on the 'valorisation of nature', that is the idea fundamental to the green economy of placing a monetary value on environmental resources. Wilkinson (2014) explores payments for ecosystem services through an eco-feminist framework, and finds that the underlying problem of attaching economic worth to 'nature' is that resulting schemes are underpinned by a discourse that threatens the way of life or system that produced the 'good' (such as sustainable forest use or the production of useful traditional knowledge) sought in the first place². Work on bioprospecting also provides evidence about the increased worth attached to western science, where traditional knowledge underpinning products developed by western scientists goes unacknowledged.

Literature on global policies also underlines problems related with external imposition, specifically the difficulties of addressing local specificities. The issue of externally imposed solutions is also addressed in work focusing on the local level. Vermeulen (2007), for example, looks at issues arising following the conclusion of a benefit-sharing agreement on Hoodia and dispersed San communities (2007). The creation of institutions that did not reflect the breadth of a community spread across different countries caused various problems, not least the ineffective communication of information about the agreement throughout the group. Literature focusing on experiences of community-based natural resource management echoes these more specific findings across a range of national cases. The link to colonial discourses is made through the equation of external imposition and models of 'fortress' natural resource management (where

² Another example would be intellectual property law, which raises similar questions around the destabilization of systems based on different legal concepts of ownership (e.g. Posey 2004, Tsoumani et al 2016).

nature protection is argued to be best achieved by the removal of all people and the fencing of protected areas). This model of nature conservation is argued to be derived in part from accounts justifying forced removals by colonialists, since these views equate indigenous peoples with 'wild' nature and thus remove their agency in shaping landscapes and protecting natural resources in order to justify their removal (e.g. Jones 2006). Poor policy decisions are tied to this external imposition: though fortress conservation models have increasingly given way to participatory approaches, their origins in this discourse can translate into, for example, corruption and a lack of real power transfer (ibid). Bixler et al (2015) also provide recent comparative examples of difficulties in local level benefit-sharing and conservation schemes linked to power and capacity asymmetries silencing minority voices, while Martin et al also note that schemes intending to provide just outcomes often fall short of their goals (2015). The findings from work at the local level thus underline the various problems that arise when solutions are imposed by external actors with colonial/capitalist understandings of the world that do not take sufficient account of local specificities.

Continuing the theme of colonial understandings of nature, a number of authors refer to the 'nature/culture divide' (e.g. Uggle 2009). This refers back to colonial invasions and the establishment of reserves following the expulsion of residents. The discourse that defended such moves saw residents not as agents who had shaped lands and waters, but as threats to 'untouched' nature, and feeds into the aforementioned fortress conservation model. Some authors see this discourse to be somewhat limited in the CBD however. Reimerson (2013) considers the echoes of colonial discourse in the CBD, and argues that the text of the CBD perpetuates some colonial discourses that limit the scope of local and indigenous groups to draw on the treaty in order to protect themselves from threats, particularly to their lands. She notes a particular element of colonial discourse linked to the 'othering' or removal of agency from local communities and indigenous peoples is present in the CBD, which she argues perpetuates a clear distinction made between nature and the role of humans in environmental management. However, she deems this discourse to be 'less apparent' in the CBD as a consequence of the recognition given to indigenous peoples and local communities' roles in conserving biodiversity (Reimerson 2013, p. 1005). Similarly, Uggle (2009) argues that the CBD is unique in its recognition of the intrinsic value of biodiversity and the various meanings of nature³, and thus allows holistic approaches that avoid the 'nature/culture divide' and combine environmental protection with human rights.

The idea that the CBD allows spaces for other worldviews that are not characterized by a 'nature/culture divide' to be expressed is also echoed by other scholars (including Escobar 1998 with reference to Article 8(j) and Reimerson 2013). Jonas et al (2010) and Bavikatte (2014) discuss this in detail, and link this possibility to community protocols. Local and indigenous communities must contend with bodies of law that reify hegemonic, capitalist discourses, and produce and place Lockean conceptions of private property at the centre of legal

³ The first paragraph of the preamble to the CBD states that Parties are conscious 'of the intrinsic value of biological diversity and the ecological, genetic, social, economic, scientific, educational, cultural, recreational and aesthetic values of biological diversity and its components.'

regimes. Nevertheless, progress against this dominant discourse has been made, with the most prominent examples lying in the achievements of the representatives of local communities and indigenous peoples in the negotiation of Nagoya. The latter, Bavikatte argues, creates a space for a wider interpretation of property, and is thus a concrete challenge to the practices arising from hegemonic discourses (2014). This is achieved through the recognition of community protocols as a means of allowing the recognition of different property regimes based, in turn, on different understandings of the world lying outside the nature/culture dichotomy. Community protocols are seen as an opportunity that 'empowers communities to challenge the fragmentary nature of state law, and instead to engage with it from a more nuanced and integrated perspective' (ibid 2014: 234). Yet other scholars dispute this more positive view of the CBD as an arena: Marion Suiseeya's (2014) work, based on a collective ethnography at the negotiations of the Nagoya Protocol, suggests that they were dominated by debates over instruments, which severely limited space for negotiating fundamental meanings of nature and culture. Brand and Vadrot (2013) argue that 'epistemic selectivities' in the CBD impose limitations about which arguments are admissible, excluding, for example, traditional knowledge outside the requirements of the Nagoya Protocol.

This brief overview of the literature can be condensed into a number of clear themes. The acknowledgement of the power of discourse is a common trait, where dominant discourses are seen to exercise power by shaping worldviews and thus the limits of what may be considered rational solutions to environmental problems. The dominant discourses identified are rooted in capitalism and colonialism. According to this reading, colonial powers in the global North exploited the raw materials of the global South for capitalist gain, exalting the role of western science and denying the part played by traditional knowledge. These relations are perpetuated in the present in solutions proposed for global environmental problems, which are top down, favour western actors and seek to assign economic value to environmental goods. The latter demonstrates another consequence of capitalist discourse, an understanding that 'nature' or 'the environment' and 'society' or 'culture' are dichotomous. This dichotomous perspective is not present in the worldviews of many of the indigenous peoples and local communities who have, in addition to their traditional knowledge, been recognised as key to environmental protection and conservation (Vermeulen 2017). Very generally, the worldviews of these groups are argued to share a general perspective that considers 'Nature so integrally intertwined with community life that it represented an entire way of being and knowing' (Bavikatte 2014, p. 6). Because of this mismatch, current policies are argued to threaten the societal systems that produce the goods they aim to protect. Some scholars see the CBD as hosting discursive spaces for less dominant discourses, and community protocols as allowing a direct challenge from the local level (e.g. Bavikatte 2014). Others challenge this view, seeing little effective space in the global arena of the CBD albeit without referring to local levels (e.g. Marion Suiseeya 2014).

Overall, the existing literature has done much to reflect on the discursive structure of the CBD and spaces for local voices, with some examples departing from local

case studies, some reflecting on the international level, and others more conceptually on the text of the Treaty. The contribution of a fine-grained discursive map based on the decisions made under the CBD is, first, to assess and build on the conclusions of this literature by providing a detailed account of the discursive evolution of the CBD over time. Second, the exercise will provide data that may allow us to begin to understand if and where the CBD seeks to create spaces for local voices. This will be the goal of future research building on the current exercise in particular. Spaces for local voices in global arenas are not extensively discussed in existing work. This sits uneasily with the recognition of the vital role that local communities play in environmental protection. A deeper understanding of how the global arena of the CBD works to create spaces for local voices at different levels can open the way for assessments of which of these is most effective in terms of allowing local shaping of global policies and learning from local communities.

Methodology – analyzing the discourses of CBD decisions

The methodology for the discourse analysis that forms the central focus of this paper flows from the literature outlined above. Discourse is considered as central to the way global institutions exercise power over the formation of policy: it shapes both in more obvious and direct ways, as well as delimiting the thresholds of what is deemed sensible and possible (Lukes 2004). The decisions of the Conferences of the Parties (COP decisions) are selected as the most thorough resource for uncovering the discursive structure of the CBD. While work analyzing the discursive meaning of the text of the CBD treaty exists (e.g. Reimerson 2013), COP decisions form the fine detail and move the CBD beyond its treaty text towards dynamic implemented and development. COP decisions are adopted by consensus by all 196 parties to the CBD, and represent the product of prolonged intergovernmental negotiations – an unusual feature since the CBD is the treaty that comes the closest to universal coverage. In addition, the CBD is argued to be one of the most inclusive in terms of stakeholders, seen to have some influence and speaking rights in some working groups including the ad hoc working group on Article 8(j) (Affolder 2017). While the comparative openness of the CBD is seen to be positive by various commentators, there is no specific evidence about the effects of the inclusion of such stakeholders on the discursive construction of decisions. Drawing on insights from the literature on global civil society, direct and deliberative democracy, stakeholders that are often professional staff members of NGOs may not be representative of local voices in the sense that inclusively drafted community protocols may be. While the present work cannot draw real conclusions about these issues, it can form a more detailed basis of how the CBD's discursive landscape has evolved over time that could inform future work in this direction. The analysis covers all 13 COPs held since the beginning of the implementation of the CBD (dates available in table 1).

As the literature is characterized by clear consensus about the general qualities of discourses underlying global environmental governance – notwithstanding some disagreement about how far spaces for different discourses are hosted by the CBD – the discourse analysis proceeds by coding the COP decisions deductively on the

basis of pre-defined categories. Opposite categories for the discourses suggested by the existing literature are constructed to test whether there is indeed any discursive space for non-dominant discourses within the CBD. The categories suggested by the literature, and the opposites generated (also with reference to literature with a more optimistic view of the CBD arena) are as follows:

1. **Exclusion** of indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs) and **Participation** of (IPLCs).⁴ These categories flow from work that highlights problems flowing from the denial of agency and the exclusion of certain groups in a colonial view. As the coding progressed, it became clear that further fine-grained inductive coding was needed to better understand participation. Specifically, participation was reclassified into smaller codes denoting whether the participation opportunity was at the global, national or more local level as well as further details on the nature of the participation (contributing information including best practices, contributing experts, or other types of participation).
2. Also related to exclusion/participation discourses, more proactive discourses around **Internal (or own) Initiatives** and **External Imposition** are coded. These codes flow from the work on community protocols in particular, where the growth of recognition for methods developed and undertaken by IPLCs is noted. This is distinct from participation either in discussions or the implementation of policies decided outside communities. The external imposition code reflects the latter – where communities are seen as passive of policies or programmes. External imposition can be combined with participation to denote particularly circumscribed instances of participation.

There is some overlap between codes for participation and internal initiative – clearly the latter involved IPLC involved in securing the goals of the Convention. Participation here is coded where the text makes some statement calling for IPLCs to participate in CBD processes. Internal initiative is coded where a clear statement is made that internal initiatives – actions taken on the initiative and organized and devised by IPLCs – are appreciated and should be supported. Internal initiatives can include, for example, community protocols and indigenous community conservation areas. Both codes will appear only if two such statements appear in the text.

3. A central role for Modern/Western science vs. the recognition of the importance and role of **traditional knowledge**, customary sustainable use, and other comparable local community practices in support of biodiversity. These coding categories flow from the work around

⁴ The reason for this terminology is that it is used by the CBD – although this body took some time to be persuaded to use the term ‘indigenous peoples’. For ease of reference in the analysis, this language is therefore reproduced here.

colonialism and bioprospecting, particularly relevant to the CBD as this falls within its remit.

4. **Capitalist/Market reasoning vs. Valorization of other worldviews.** These codes attempt to capture both the fundamental claim in much of the literature that capitalism, understood in conjunction with colonialism, underpins global environmental governance by placing price tags on nature and favouring private property regimes as exclusive access. This also has the effect of splitting nature and culture. The opposite category attempts to capture any evidence of discourse acknowledging worldviews that are not based on such a dichotomy, for example expressions of the intrinsic worth of nature, commons approaches, and other expressions giving value to or recognition of the validity of other worldviews).

Given the amount of text the analysis deals with, keyword searches were conducted to narrow down the text to be coded to only those parts of COP decisions that are relevant to IPLCs. The keywords were chosen in consultation with international legal experts well versed in the history and terminology adopted by the CBD, and added to throughout the discourse analysis process where certain terms were seen to be linked to the area of interest. The resulting keywords were: local; indigenous; traditional; customary; community protocol; dependent; biocultural; community based; non-market; and mother earth. All repetitions gathered as a result of overlapping from the keyword searches were removed. The paragraph or sub-paragraph (depending on length) containing the keyword was then recorded. Any irrelevant pieces of text were removed as coding progressed. The keyword search yielded a total (after removal of repetitions and irrelevant lines) of 2150 pieces of text for analysis. The distribution of the pieces of text is recorded in Table 1 in the next section.

To facilitate the analysis, Excel was used to record the pieces of text along with the number of the COP, the year it was held, the presence of keywords, the title of the section the text was found in and the cross-cutting theme the text related to. The latter is particularly interesting in terms of tracing the shape of the discursive field, since most of relevant decisions emanate from a single cross-cutting theme: Traditional Knowledge, Innovations and Practices - Article 8(j). Recording correlations with cross-cutting themes allows an analysis of how discourses in the CBD have spread from this theme to other areas of the Convention in addition to recording the shape and quality of the discursive arena more generally.

To code the pieces of text, a coding guide was first developed to ensure consistency. The coding guide provided detailed explanations of when to code the different discourses, which may of course occur in various combinations in one piece of text. Inter-reliability tests were then performed on randomly generated text lines from a variety of COPs by the two coders carrying out the analysis until a satisfactory level of consistency was achieved. Nevertheless, the inter-reliability tests showed that the two coders tended to diverge on particular codes. It was therefore decided that whenever a coder felt it possible that one of these codes should be recorded that the two coders should discuss. In addition, whenever a coder felt at all unsure about how to code a piece of text, this was discussed and a

mutual decision reached. As the coding progressed, the coders held regular meetings that allowed further guidance on coding to be developed and mutual coding decisions to be reached. These procedures address the inherent weakness of discourse analysis: researcher subjectivity. Although such subjectivity cannot be entirely avoided, the development of clear rules for coding, the involvement of more than one coder, and the mutual decision-making for more challenging codes goes some way to address the problem.

The strength of this type of discourse analysis is in the breadth of the exercise compared to existing discursive work on the CBD: it covers all pieces of text of relevance to the question of spaces for local community approaches to environmental governance, across the entire lifespan of the CBD to date. In addition, different combinations of discourse codes can quickly and simply illustrate complex positions taking form within the CBD arena. For example, where modern/western science and the recognition of traditional knowledge are coded, this can be taken as evidence for the development of some dialogue or mutual recognition between two discourses. By drawing discourse codes from the wide literature around global environmental governance and local communities, the analysis also provides a very different picture to accounts rooted in legal and socio-legal literature, concentrating on the underlying politics that shapes decisions in this arena. However, some limitations are clear. These are related to researcher subjectivity as discussed above, but also to the deductive approach. By drawing pre-defined codes from the literature, the analysis is necessarily limited to testing these, and may be argued to miss underlying discourses that have not yet been suggested by the literature (or are discussed in literature not covered here). This limitation is undeniable, yet given the large amount of work converging around arguments on these codes, the worth of the exercise is still clear.

In this vein, in ongoing work further fine-grained inductive coding will be carried out for all texts coded with participation, the code that was by far the most common in the analysis. Given the number of times participation is mentioned, more information is needed to uncover the varied meanings attached to this discourse. The texts coded for participation will be broken down into sub-codes indicating the level where participation was being called for (local, national, global) in order to fill a particular gap in the literature, as well as more content on the type of participation (simple calls, funded, obligatory etc.). In the interests of completeness, further coding work was carried out for mentions of ecosystem services and the ecosystem approach. In the first instance both of these were taken to indicate a more capitalist or market discourse. After consulting with legal experts on the BENELEX project,⁵ these mentions were re-coded to reflect differing connotations. Ecosystems services is linked to ideas of market-based valuation approaches, while ecosystems approaches are coded according to an interpretation of which foresees conservation married with a recognition of non-western values and participatory approaches.⁶ These first approaches towards fine-tuning have and will go some little way to addressing the limitations of the

⁵ My thanks to Elsa Tsioumani and Daniela Diz for pointing to this and providing valuable expertise for the re-coding.

⁶ See the CBD's principles on the ecosystem approach, available at: <https://www.cbd.int/ecosystem/principles.shtml>

discourse analysis method employed (and it should be recalled that this analysis is intended to supplement case study research), and also demonstrate the flexibility (and the importance of reflexivity) in the approach.

Results & discussion

This section will present the findings uncovered by the discourse analysis of CBD COP decisions, and discuss their potential meaning for local community voices in this international arena. Before illustrating and discussing the meaning of the results of the discourse analysis, however, it is important to note the distribution of pieces of text across the COPs analyzed (Table 1) since these explain in turn the distribution of discourse codes to some extent. The distribution of the texts of relevance to the analysis starts slowly, with a significant peak in COP 7, followed by a return to levels similar to COPs 5 and 6 thereafter. COP 7, held in 2004, most likely forms a peak in terms of texts of relevance to indigenous peoples and local communities because of the adoption of the Akwé: Kon Guidelines for cultural, environmental and social impact assessments and the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for sustainable use. This COP has been argued to stand out as the pinnacle of work around Article 8(j) and rights-based language in the CBD. However, in terms of the content of each individual COP, COP 5 has been described as another important moment in the evolution of the language used to refer to local communities due to the adoption of the work programme on Article 8(j).⁷ While frequencies alone may suggest that this language is cemented in COP 7, it can thus be argued that the precedent was set in COP 5. While the analysis trains some focus on the frequency of discourse codes as a guide to the evolution of the arena, a parallel focus necessarily remains on the content and evolution of discourse in order to give a slightly more complete picture.

Table 1: Distribution of texts across COPs (text sections coded)

COP Year	1 '94	2 '95	3 '96	4 '98	5 '00	6 '02	7 '04	8 '06	9 '08	10 '10	11 '12	12 '14	13 '16
Text lines	5	17	36	53	144	257	499	238	157	216	179	147	202

Moving to the content of the discourse analysis, Figure 1 summarizes the distribution and frequency of each of the discourse codes over time.

⁷ Article 8(j) states that 'Each contracting Party shall, as far as possible and as appropriate: Subject to national legislation, respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and promote their wider application with the approval and involvement of the holders of such knowledge, innovations and practices and encourage the equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge innovations and practices' (CBD).




Figure 1 shows that when COP decisions use language that refers to local communities and indigenous peoples, the overwhelming discourses underpinning that language are around the recognition of the role of traditional knowledge and/or customary sustainable use and participation by these groups or their representatives in the Convention's processes. The prevalence of the recognition discourse code is in line with findings about the increasing acknowledgement at the international level of the role of local communities and indigenous peoples in environmental stewardship, demonstrated by statements to this effect in a number of agreements and treaties, not least the recent Paris Agreement on climate change.⁸ Over time, recognition rises and stays at a fairly stable level across COP decisions, indicating that this is by now a generally accepted position. This is indicated by the fact that many of the statements coded for this discourse are linked to the cross-cutting theme of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices (discussed further below), and formulaic statements of recognition based on treaty language are common. While statements recognizing the fundamental contributions of traditional knowledge and customary sustainable use to environmental protection are positive for local voices and local methods of using and maintaining natural resources, they could be argued to be easier statements to include when compared to discourse codes that more clearly carry

⁸ Savaresi notes that 'The Paris Agreement recognises the role of 'traditional knowledge, knowledge of indigenous peoples and local knowledge systems' as a means to adapt to climate change (Paris Agreement, article 7.5)'. BeneLex blog 'benefit-sharing and traditional knowledge: recent developments and new frontiers in the climate regime. Available at: <http://www.benelexblog.law.ed.ac.uk/2017/11/08/benefit-sharing-and-traditional-knowledge-recent-developments-and-new-frontiers-in-the-climate-regime/>

policy commitments. Thus, while the entrenchment of this language is clearly positive and important, a further step towards spaces for local voices could be linked to discourse codes indicating support for internal initiatives and the valorization of other worldviews. These may be seen as commitments to support such initiatives and respect approaches based in other worldviews, and thus to move beyond mere statements of recognition. Indeed, as discussed below, these two codes are much less prevalent.

Participation, the second most frequently recorded discourse code, shows a clear peak in COP 7, coinciding with the adoption of the Akwé: Kon Guidelines for cultural, environmental and social impact assessments and the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for sustainable use. This peak at COP 7 is nevertheless preceded in COP 6 and followed up by high numbers of codes comparable to those for recognition (as discussed below, these are often combined). The information provided by a participation code proves rather weak given the strength of showing: what exactly do the statements around participation mean? Are they calls for more participation, steps towards allowing participation to take place such as through funding, or other more restrictive calls for input? As detailed in the methodology section, inductive coding will be conducted to generate a fine-grained list of detailed codes for participation generated from the actual texts to investigate this.




Figure 2 shows the counts by COP for the remaining positive codes for the sake of clarity. As already mentioned, the counts for these two codes are significantly lower compared to recognition and participation, which may be due to their costliness as discussed. It is however interesting to note that there is a general upward trend in 'internal initiative' codes from COP 10 onwards, with only a slight decrease in COP 13 compared to COP 12. Internal initiative is coded where a statement supports or encourages community-based programmes including community protocols and indigenous peoples' and community conserved territories and areas. This, as suggested above, may be argued to mean that statements in support of these initiatives would entail policy changes moving away from top down approaches – thus making them costly statements. The

general increase after an initial drop following COP 7 indicates that this position of support for community-led initiatives that may include approaches based on commons may be becoming discursively entrenched and generally accepted in the CBD arena. This provides a more concrete discursive opportunity for local communities where they may be able to frame their approaches in similar language to gain recognition and galvanize support for their efforts.


The picture for the code 'valorization of other worldview' is less easy to read. The numbers remain generally low throughout all COPs, and although the highest numbers appear to be stabilizing by the three most recent COPs these are still only around 10-12 mark. As already discussed, while other positive statements may be politically less costly, similar statements recognizing the validity of worldviews may well challenge those that underpin the CBD, and thus be more difficult to adopt. It may be that comprehending even the existence of such other worldviews is a challenge for many delegates, particularly given their international role where local realities may seem far away. Given the low numbers in the codes, however, it is possible to conduct a more qualitative overview of their content. The first coding in COP 3 is a statement encouraging the 'adequate incorporation of the market and non-market values of biological diversity into plans, policies and programmes'. Moving to COP 7, this trend of a discursively weak acknowledgement of other worldviews or systems of value that are not based in economic gain continues (weak in the sense of defining such other worldviews only with reference to the market rather than in any different terminology), with codes focusing once again on 'non-monetary' measures for the worth of biodiversity, albeit mentioning traditional knowledge this time (and moving the discourse away from terminology based only on the market).

By COP 8, however, there are clearer statements demonstrating some understanding of the link between the 'good' sought (the protection of biodiversity) and the worldviews that underpin the social systems that produced it. 'In terms of cultural diversity, a number of islands, including arctic islands, are also the home to unique cultures that have developed traditional resource-management methods that have, in many cases, enabled people to develop and live in harmony with biodiversity.' This idea is developed further by COP 10 with the adoption of the Tkarihwaíé:ri Code of Ethical Conduct to Ensure Respect for the Cultural and Intellectual Heritage of Indigenous and Local Communities Relevant to the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity. This Code states, for example, that "Traditional guardianship/custodianship recognizes the holistic interconnectedness of humanity with ecosystems and obligations and responsibilities of indigenous and local communities, to preserve and maintain their traditional role as traditional guardians and custodians of these ecosystems through the maintenance of their cultures, spiritual beliefs and customary practices.'

The Nagoya Protocol, also adopted at COP 10, equally includes language underlining 'the interrelationship between genetic resources and traditional knowledge, their inseparable nature for indigenous and local communities, the importance of the traditional knowledge for the conservation of biological diversity and the sustainable use of its components, and for the sustainable


livelihoods of these communities'. In COP 13 we find references calling for respect for other cosmologies, as well as references to a dialogue held at the CBD ad hoc open-ended working group on Article 8(j) on 'challenges and opportunities for international and regional cooperation in the protection of shared traditional knowledge across borders for the strengthening of traditional knowledge and the fulfilment of three objectives of the Convention, in harmony with Nature/Mother Earth' that saw many contributions made by representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities (for an account see ENB 2015). While the trend in terms of the quantity of statements that might be understood as valuing and recognizing other worldviews is not clearly increasing and numbers remain low, then, there is some evidence of positive qualitative change in the content of such statements becoming more meaningful over time.

Moving to discuss the remaining codes generated from the brief literature review which might be described as more pessimistic or negative about the discursive opportunities offered to local voices at the global level of environmental governance. Figure 1 shows the general discursive trends that underlie statements about indigenous peoples and local communities. The key feature to note is the vertical axis, which shows how low the overall frequency of these more negative codes in comparison to their positive counterparts. This indicates that when statements about indigenous peoples and local communities are made in COP decisions they are overwhelmingly framed in positive ways, thus challenging the more pessimistic pictures painted in some of the literature. This finding, however, should be tempered by the observations about the prevalence of statements that do not necessarily carry policy consequences as discussed above. In addition, while the analysis attempts to code clear instances of the exclusion of local voices (which is coded where a statement names a number of actors but fails to mention local communities or indigenous peoples) there is certainly a bias towards a description of what is said over what is *not* said. The exclusion of local voices is by definition most harmful where these groups are not considered at all. For this reason, the further work will be undertaken to attempt to account for this and is discussed in the conclusions. As for the trends in these more negative codes, for the sake of clarity, figure 3 shows only the negative codes drawn from the literature to show their various trajectories in more detail.



The clear trend amongst these code counts, which are overall similar in terms of their lower frequency in comparison with discourses of recognition and participation in particular, is that they peak around COP 7 and then register a general fall moving towards the most recent COP 13. There are some increases, but the general trend is downward. This appears to confirm the rosier picture suggested by the discussion of the positive codes above, both in terms of generally low frequency and a tendency to be lower. There is some evidence from further coding work to corroborate the view of expert commentators about an earlier commitment to the ecosystems approach within the CBD conference of parties, shifting at a later point to the ecosystems services paradigm.

Nevertheless, this view of single codes only tells part of the story. Where codes for capitalist or market reasoning, or for modern or western science are found in conjunction with codes for recognition or for the valorization of other worldviews in particular there may be grounds for clear dialogue between groups advocating different approaches to environmental protection and conservation. With this in mind, figure 4 shows the most frequent combinations of codes found in the analysis.



Beginning with code combinations that can be seen in a more positive light in terms of discursive spaces for local communities, the most common combination by far is recognition and participation. This combination occurs over 200 times in comparison with the next most frequent combination (recognition and internal initiative), which occurs just over 40 times. This frequency is unsurprising given the discursive domination of these two codes, which may be attributed to their ‘cheap’ nature as discussed above. The combination of recognition and internal initiative is more meaningful, and its occurrence among the most common combinations of codes seems a positive sign that the generalized recognition of the importance of traditional knowledge for achieving the aims of the CBD is in many instances backed up with more weighty policy commitments. Similar observations also apply to the combination of recognition of traditional knowledge, internal initiative and participation. The recognition of traditional knowledge alongside codes for modern or western science as well as participation also register, albeit in lower numbers, among the most common combinations. These are particularly interesting in terms of combining so-called ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ codes to provide evidence that traditional knowledge is being placed on a similar level to modern or western science, thus acknowledging traditional knowledge as an equally important source for achieving the aims of the Convention or, in discursive terms, creating a space for co-existence between discourses. The recognition of traditional knowledge as comparable to modern or western science in discursive terms is key to achieving fair and equitable benefit-sharing and ending the unfair use and exploitation of such knowledge, and can be considered as part of the discussion on the right to science (Morgera 2015). Combinations of participation and modern or western science could, depending on the specific type of participation referred to, be interpreted in similar sorts of terms. The remaining positive combination – recognition of traditional knowledge with valorization of other worldviews – is perhaps the strongest indicator of discursive spaces for local voices, though occurring only 11 times.

Other code combinations registering amongst the most frequent paint a more negative picture. This is the case for participation coded alongside external imposition. Texts coded in this way speak of participation, but this is clearly curtailed with IPLCs expected to participate only in the implementation of decisions already taken, or to provide information on highly circumscribed issues. Other combinations that may be damaging to the chances of local community voices pair the recognition of traditional knowledge with apparently contradictory discourse codes (capitalism, exclusion, and external imposition in various combinations, sometimes alongside participation) that may be interpreted as rendering recognition rather redundant. It should be noted, however, that an alternative reading could be argued for the combination participation and capitalism, as the text coded in this way may be specifically asking IPLCs to provide information about money generated from biodiversity conservation, or about the role of biodiversity in livelihoods. In addition, the numbers of negative combinations are altogether lower than combinations allowing a generally positive reading.

The discussion so far has focused on the discourse codes and different combinations. Of still more interesting perhaps is the analysis of how these different codes and combinations map to the different cross-cutting themes of the CBD. These correlations will tell us whether discourses that create discursive spaces for indigenous peoples and local communities are spreading from their original source in the cross-cutting theme of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices. Figure 5 gives an overview of the single discourse codes and their correspondence with the CBD's cross-cutting themes.





Figure 5 shows that the short answer to this question is no. Mapping the different discourse codes to cross-cutting themes clearly shows that the vast majority of discourses concerning indigenous peoples and local communities – both positive and negative – remain within there has not been not much movement out of a single cross-cutting theme of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices. This is a clear indication that any discursive space available to these groups remains mainly confined to this single area. There is a more encouraging side however, if we consider the fact that traditional knowledge, innovations and practices is a cross-cutting theme within the CBD is in itself encouraging. There is also some evidence that the CBD executive recognizes that there is some degree of ghettoization occurring around this theme, as evidenced by the decision to couple meetings of Ad Hoc Working Group on Article 8(j) and the Ad Hoc Working Group on Access and Benefit-Sharing prior to the adoption of the Nagoya Protocol in 2010, and thereafter in the decision to pair meetings of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Article 8(j) with the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice. The logic behind these decisions is, presumably, to give added access to those representatives of indigenous peoples and local

communities attending the Article 8(j) Working Group to other treaty bodies.⁹ To check for greater spread to other cross-cutting themes in more recent COPs, the same correlation was applied to COPs 10-13 only. This showed a picture broadly similar to that shown in figure 5, though spread was slightly stronger to the themes of Identification, Monitoring, Indicators and Assessments and New and Emerging Issues, spread to other areas was actually lower.

A closer look at the cross-cutting theme of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices is provided in figure 6, which gives an overview of how the discourse codes falling within this theme have evolved over time, including code combinations occurring more than 10 times.



The trends displayed in figure 6 show some notable differences when compared with the overview of all codes presented in figure 1. Within this cross-cutting theme, the discourse codes show two separate peaks: for modern or western

⁹ My thanks to Elsa Tsioumani and Elisa Morgera for drawing my attention to this argument.

science and for recognition of the importance of traditional knowledge in COPs 7 and 10. These peaks thus correspond with the adoptions of the the Akwé: Kon Guidelines and the Addis Ababa Principles at COP 7 and with the adoption of the Nagoya Protocol at COP 10. While these two discourses are not often mentioned in the same pieces of texts (since this would result in a combined code line showing on the chart), this does suggest that within this cross-cutting theme the recognition of traditional knowledge as being on the same playing field as modern/western science is present to some extent, and beginning to become more commonplace from around COP 5. Another peak displayed in figure 6 is for the discourse code internal initiative, falling at COP 7 and this corresponding once again with the Akwé: Kon Guidelines. Participation, which registers very strongly in the overall view of the discourse analysis provided in figure 1, is much less present in the cross-cutting theme of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices. This points to the idea that rather than appearing alone, participation is instead appearing alongside other codes in combinations that are not among the most frequent and therefore not shown in figure 6. This spreading out of participation codes suggests that the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities is not simply added on as a separate statement within this cross-cutting theme. Instead, it suggests that participation is integral to a large number of statements made about these groups. This underlines once again the need for further coding within the participation discourse to reveal more meaning within calls for participation by IPLCs, including the possibility that traditional knowledge is regarded as useful in terms of contributions to other CBD thematic areas and can be gleaned from the participation of indigenous representatives.

Although it is undeniable that there has not been any significant discursive spread to other areas covered by the CBD, it is worth looking more closely at those cross-cutting themes that show some evidence of a small-scale adoption of similar discourses, namely: protected areas; sustainable use; ecosystem restoration; identification, monitoring, indicators and assessment; new and emerging issues (such as synthetic biology); tourism; implementation of the Convention; and economics, trade and incentive measures. The figures discussed below show the evolution of discourse codes within these cross-cutting themes, grouped by similarity in general trends. Figures 7 to 11 show the distributions of discourse codes and combinations over time for the themes sustainable use, tourism, implementation, protected areas, and ecosystem restoration, which display some overall similarities.

Figure 7: Total discourse code counts for cross cutting theme Sustainable Use of Biodiversity (single codes and code combinations with frequency of 10 or more)




Figure 8: Total discourse code counts for cross cutting theme Tourism and Biodiversity (single codes and code combinations with frequency of 3 or more)




Figure 9: Total discourse code counts for cross cutting theme
Implementation of the Convention
(single codes and code combinations with frequency of 4 or above)








Figure 10: Total discourse code counts for cross cutting theme
Protected Areas (single codes and code combinations with frequency
of 3 or more)





The discursive structures of these cross-cutting themes all reproduce the pattern seen in the general overview of codes provided in figure 1 in terms of overall trajectories which show peaks around COPs 6 to 8. The numbers of codes are low however, and numbers decrease in more recent COPs. Given the generally low numbers of codes in all of the cross-cutting themes with the exception of traditional knowledge, the suggestion that there is some generalized acceptance of discourse recognizing the value of traditional knowledge and the participation of IPLCs is not confirmed. As a result, there may be more significance to attach to the fact that these codes decrease in more recent COPs. Indeed, these findings challenge claims about the logical spread of discourses to other areas of the Convention (Bavikatte 2014), including protected areas (Jonas 2017). In that cross-cutting theme, the more discouraging pattern noted for participation also holds for the internal initiative discourse. This is surprising given the progressively more prominent discussions about approaches covered by the internal initiative code, notably indigenous community conserved areas. A closer look at the discourse analysis shows that the internal initiative code actually occurs 13 times within the Protected Areas cross-cutting theme, across a number of different code combinations with frequencies too low to appear in figure 10. Internal initiative is thus discussed with reference to protected areas in conjunction with other matters. It is also worth noting the presence of the combination of participation and external imposition recorded for the cross-cutting theme implementation of the Convention – here this combination is unsurprising since calls for participation linked to implementation of the Convention are usually tied to asking indigenous peoples and local communities to participate in implementing decisions about the Convention that have already been made. A similar point applies to this combination within the ecosystem restoration cross-cutting theme, though here this is offset by a more significant presence of discourses around internal initiatives as well as some indications of an upward trend in codes for participation, recognition and internal initiative at the most recent COP.


The picture for the cross-cutting themes of identification, monitoring, indicators and assessment and new and emerging areas is different, albeit for different reasons. Figures 12 and 13 below show the distribution of single codes and combinations of codes with counts higher than 5.



Once again, the numbers of coded discourses in these areas are low, but interesting in that both show rather low to non-existent discourses around

participation and recognition until the most recent COPs. In the case of new and emerging issues, this is because this cross-cutting theme did not exist at the earlier stages of the CBD. Nevertheless, these small trends in both of the themes illustrated may still be considered to indicate some initial take up of these discourses that may, over time, lead to a similar adoption of internal initiative discourses. This would be particularly pertinent for identification, monitoring and assessment, since traditional knowledge and skills are important in reading changes in the environment and local communities may have systems in place that regulate their customary sustainable use levels. A future take up of internal initiative discourses may be predicted if the general indication of a slow spread from the theme of traditional knowledge is accepted. Only further similar analyses of future COPs will allow any confirmation or otherwise of this.

The final cross-cutting theme that suggests some level of discursive spread from the traditional knowledge theme, albeit only to a low extent, is that of economics, trade and incentive measures, illustrated in figure 14 below.



Again, the numbers here are very low, but given the focus on economics and trade, the fact that the most frequent codes are internal initiative and the valorization of other worldviews is rather surprising. As discussed earlier, these discourses may be considered to be stronger than those of participation and recognition since they may entail more concrete policy consequences. In addition, this cross-cutting theme carries a logical expectation of more capitalist or market discourses. These do register to some extent, but notably only in conjunction with the valorization of other worldview codes, often expressed as a nod to the equal value of 'non-market' values. This suggests that to at least a small extent care is being paid at times to underline the existence and validity of approaches that do not value economic gain as the most important aim within this theme. However, these stronger positive codes do disappear in later COPs, and recognition and participation codes only

remain more or less stable in the most recent meeting. Generally, this is small evidence for positive discourse, but nonetheless noteworthy.

Summary and preliminary conclusions

This paper sought to investigate whether or not there might be any discursive space for commons and other local community driven approaches to the conservation of natural resources at the global level of environmental governance. The question was investigated through a discourse analysis of decisions taken by the conference of the parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Since local and commons approaches are found in the literature to be based in rather different understandings of the world and the aims of conservation and environmental protection than those argued to underpin instruments of global environmental governance, the discourse analysis looked for evidence of these discourses and their constructed opposites in CBD decisions over time. Although there are clear limitations to this methodology, linked for the most part to issues of research subjectivity, there are also clear advantages since this method allows a comprehensive overview of CBD decisions over time that does not yet exist in the literature.

The discourses searched for in the analysis consisted in the exclusion of indigenous peoples and local communities or calls for their inclusion; discourse relating the imposition of certain policies or approaches by external actors or instead statements supporting initiatives internal to and driven by local communities; statements giving primacy to modern or western science as opposed to statements recognizing the role and worth of traditional knowledge; and finally texts betraying capitalist or market reasoning behind policy decisions as opposed to statements revealing some valorization and recognition of the existence and worth of differing worldviews or cosmologies.

The overall picture revealed by the discourse analysis can be summarized as follows. First, when CBD decisions make statements that are relevant to local communities, these statements are clearly characterized by positive discourses much more than they are characterized by negative discourses. The detail of the picture is more nuanced however. The most common discourses, the analysis revealed, are around participation and recognition of the worth of traditional knowledge. Undoubtedly these fall into the category of positive discourses. However, it could be argued that when compared to the other codes around internal initiative and the valorization of other worldviews that these codes are not as strong. The latter two discourses were found in the analysis, but at lower levels comparable to the frequencies uncovered for the negative codes – though a small upward trend was noted for internal initiative codes over time. What this finding means is that overall the analysis challenges claims made in some literature about the complete lack of space for local voices and approaches in global arenas. However, the nature of that space is debatable. What is of real weight when thinking about the invisible power of discourse is how discursive possibilities are *perceived*. In that sense, discourse asking for input through participation and statements recognizing the value of traditional knowledge may

not be seen as concrete as discourses on internal initiatives and other worldviews which might be seen as opening up more ground for different approaches to the conservation of biodiversity based in different cosmologies. Whereas calls to participate and the general recognition of traditional knowledge may be good ways to get into the CBD arena, the other codes may be perceived as establishing a real discursive space once access is achieved. In that sense, the prevalence of participation and recognition could be interpreted as showing that the door to IPLCs is very much open, but that it may take longer to be really heard. Nevertheless, further research is needed both to understand the levels of participation outlined in the COP decisions, and to understand the actual perceptions of the CBD arena amongst IPLCs or their representatives.

There is also more nuanced meaning to be considered where codes combine: while negative codes alone may spell discursive closure for local communities, where negative and positive codes co-occur this may be a basis for increased dialogue between differing approaches. The analysis showed that the most common code combination was recognition and participation. However, some positive/negative combinations did register amongst the most common combinations, albeit at levels much lower than those for recognition and participation. In particular, the combination of modern/western science and the recognition of traditional knowledge is a significant combination that may point to the beginnings of these two types of knowledge being given more equal weight relative to their use for achieving biodiversity conservation. Given that the overall analysis of discourse in the CBD decisions also revealed a spike in positive statements at COP 7, seen as the peak of rights-based approaches in the CBD followed by a rise in market-based approaches (cite ENB?), such combinations of discourses as evidence of spaces for dialogue may be the best way forward for local voices. The analysis did not reveal such combinations to be very frequent, nor was any clear upward trend in such combinations revealed however.

The paper also looked at how the discursive terrain of the CBD has changed over time within the separate cross-cutting themes that apply to the body's work. Specifically, some literature has posited the likelihood that discursive spaces for local voices will expand over time both within the CBD and to other arenas of global environmental governance (e.g. Bavikatte 2014). The analysis showed that the vast majority of all discourse codes fall within the cross-cutting theme of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices. As this is a cross-cutting theme this is not necessarily either surprising or limiting, as the very nature of cross-cutting themes is that they should be considered in all decisions. Nevertheless, the spread of discourses around internal initiative and the valorization of other worldviews to other themes would be more encouraging when evaluating the discursive spaces available to local voices. There was some rather limited evidence of spread to the themes on sustainable use, tourism, implementation, protected areas, ecosystem restoration, identification monitoring and assessment, new and emerging issues, and finally economic and trade incentives. Generally, the evidence is that this spread is limited to the weaker positive codes around participation and the recognition of the importance of traditional knowledge, but that this disappears or becomes much lower in more recent CBD decisions.

The analysis overall challenges the existing literature to some extent. The aim of the discourse analysis was to provide a more detailed discursive map on this global arena, given that much of the existing literature discusses this on the basis of the Convention's text alone, on the basis of local level case studies, or in terms of theorization. Thus, the existing literature provides some contradictory findings, arguing about the potential or actual discursive spaces within the CBD as very promising (e.g. Bavikatte 2014, Reimerson 2013), or as very circumscribed in the context of actual negotiations (Marion Suiseeya 2014), or as oblivious to the local specificities its policies will face (Adler et al 2001). The worth of the discourse analysis presented here is thus the nuanced picture it provides in terms of the spaces for local voices at the global level. Further work on some codes, particularly participation, will provide more information about where local voices might make claims to be heard. The general picture that emerged from the analysis appeared to bolster more positive views of the CBD. When the CBD speaks about indigenous peoples and local communities, it tends to be in a positive way. Nevertheless, the prevalence of discourses around participation and the recognitions of traditional knowledge might be interpreted as opening the door to local voices rather than providing a ready-made discursive basis for allowing them to be fully heeded, which might instead be argued were more discourses around internal initiative and the valorization of other worldviews found. This more nuanced view, which might be said to temper the most positive evaluations of the CBD, is bolstered by the relative confinement of discourses about indigenous peoples and local communities to their own cross-cutting theme – a more encouraging picture would see general positive discourses taken up within other cross-cutting themes across the CBD. While there is some basis to think that discursive spaces are opening up within the CBD for local voices and approaches, then, there is also much evidence to show that these spaces are clearly delimited.

More research is needed to place this evidence in a wider context, however. The view of the CBD as more open to civil society, indigenous peoples and local communities is often implicitly based in the assumption that other arenas of global environmental governance are less open, both institutionally and discursively. Moving beyond arenas of global environmental governance, international trade negotiations and human rights negotiations are equally important for local voices. The production of similar discourse analyses of more arenas will provide a more complete discursive 'map' of global environmental governance arenas and show which of these provide spaces for local voices and where. More qualitative research is also needed to establish the perceptions of global arenas held by local actors. Finally, there is little research on how far those purported to speak for local communities reflect their diverse views and perceptions in arenas of global environmental governance. Discursive maps of the voices of organised civil society groups present at the global level may go some way to investigating this question.

There is also further work that could strengthen the current analysis of CBD COP decisions. Inductive coding with a view to developing the different meanings of participation has already been mentioned. On the basis of the original discourse analysis as well as the further work on participation, further work will also be carried out to determine the syntactical relationships that exist between the

keywords used to locate statements about indigenous peoples and local communities and the presence of different discourses. Once these relationships are discovered, the entire text of the COP decisions can be analysed to check whether the discourse constructed around indigenous peoples and local communities is a unique one, or is echoed for other actors addressed by the CBD. This type of analysis may go some way to addressing the problem of describing the areas where the CBD harms local voices by ignoring them. If very different discourses surround other actors, this will give a different view of the discourse surrounding local voices. Using legal informatics, schemata of how arguments about various actors are built within COP decisions broadly, or indeed within particular cross-cutting themes or specific discourses such as recognition, can be produced. These will provide important points of comparison to develop the present analysis.

References

Adger, Neil W., Benjaminsen, Tor A., Brown, Katrina and Svarstad, Hanne (2001) Advancing a Political Ecology of Global Environmental Discourses Development and Change 32, 681-715.

Affolder, N. (forthcoming 2017) Non-State Actors, in Morgera, E. and Razzaque, J. (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Environmental Law: Biodiversity and Nature Protection Law* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Bavikatte, S. K. (2014) *Stewarding the earth: rethinking property and the emergence of biocultural rights* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bixler, R. P., Dell'Angelo, J., Mfunne, O., and Roba, H. (2015) The political ecology of participatory conservation: institutions and discourse *Journal of Political Ecology* 22, 165-182.

Brand, U. and Vadrot, A. B. M. (2013) Epistemic selectivities and the valorisation of nature: the cases of the Nagoya protocol and the intergovernmental science-policy platform of the biodiversity and ecosystem services (IPBES) *Law, Environment and Development Journal* 9(2), 202-220.

Convention on Biological Diversity (1992), available at <http://www.un-documents.net/cbd.htm>

Earth Negotiations Bulletin (2015) *Summary of the Nineteenth Meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and Ninth Meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j) of the Convention on Biological Diversity*. Available at <http://enb.iisd.org/vol09/enb09663e.html>

Escobar, A. (1998) Whose Knowledge, Whose Nature? Biodiversity, Conservation and the Political Ecology of Social Movements. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 5, 53-82.

- Jonas, H. Bavikatte K. and Shrumm H. (2010). Community Protocols and Access and Benefit Sharing *Asian Biotechnology and Development Review* 12:3, 49-77.
- Jones, S. (2006) A political ecology of wildlife conservation in Africa *Review of African Political Economy* 109, 483-495.
- Keck, M. and Sikkink, K. (1998) *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Lukes, S. (2004) *Power: a Radical View* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marion Suseeya, K. R. (2014) Negotiating the Nagoya protocol: indigenous demands for justice *Global Environmental Politics* 14(3), 102-124.
- Morgera, E. (2015) Fair and equitable benefit-sharing at the cross-roads of the human right to science and international biodiversity law. *Laws* 4, 803-831.
- Morgera, E. and Tsoumani, E. (2011) Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow: Looking Afresh at the Convention on Biological Diversity *Yearbook of International Environmental Law* 21(1), 3-40.
- Martin, A., Akol, A. and Gross-Camp, N. (2015) Towards and explicit justice framing of the social impacts of conservation *Conservation & Society* 13(2), 166-178.
- Mulligan, S. P. (1999) For Whose Benefit? Limits to Sharing in the Bioprospecting 'Regime', *Environmental Politics* 8(4), 35-65.
- Parks, L. (2016) Challenging power asymmetries from the bottom up? Community protocols and the Convention on Biological Diversity at the global/local crossroads. *Benelex Working Paper no. 11*, available at <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2884965>.
- Posey, D. A. (2004) *Indigenous Knowledge and Ethics: A Darrell Posey Reader* (ed. K. Plenderleith). Oxon: Routledge.
- Reimerson, E. (2013) Between nature and culture: exploring space for indigenous agency in the Convention on Biological Diversity, *Environmental Politics* 22(6) 992-1009.
- Ribot, J. C. and Peluso, N L (2003), A Theory of Access, *Rural Sociology* 68(2), 153-181.
- Robbins, P. (2004) *Political Ecology: a Critical Introduction* Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sibuye, R., Uys, M.-T., Cocchiato, G., & Lorenzen, J. (2012). The Bushbuckridge BCP: Traditional healers organise for ABS in South Africa in Participatory learning and action, biodiversity and culture: exploring community protocols, rights and consent. International Institute for Environment and Development, 101-108. Available at <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/G03403.pdf>.

Svarstad, H. (2004) A Global Political Ecology of Bioprospecting, in Paulson, S. and Gezon, L. L. (eds.) *Political Ecology across spaces, scales and social groups*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 239-256.

Tsioumani, E., Muzurakis, M., Ieropoulos, Y. and Tsioumanis, A. (2016) Following the Open Source Trail Outside the Digital World: Open Source Applications in Agricultural Research and Development *tripleC* 14, 145-162.

Vermeulen, S. (2007) Contextualizing 'Fair' and 'Equitable': The San's Reflections on the Hoodia Benefit-Sharing Agreement. *Local Environment* 12(4), 423-436.

Vermeulen, S. (2017) Materiality and the ontological turn in the anthropocene: establishing a dialogue between law, anthropology and eco-philosophy. In Kotzé, L. (ed.) *Law and Governance for the Anthropocene*. Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Uggla, Y. (2009) What is this thing called 'natural'? The nature-culture divide in climate change and biodiversity policy *Journal of Political Ecology* 17, 79-91.

Wilkinson, K. (2014) Payment for 'ecosystem services' and the 'green economy': green-washing or something new? *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment* 5(2) 168-191.