



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General

21 March 2007

Original: English

8,494 words

Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues

Sixth session

New York, 14-25 May 2007

Item 4 of the provisional agenda*

Implementation of recommendations on the six mandated areas and on MDGs

Report on Indigenous Traditional Knowledge**

Prepared by Michael Dodson¹

Summary

At its fifth session in May 2006, the Permanent Forum, taking into account the recommendations of the International Technical Workshop on Indigenous Traditional Knowledge (E/C.19/2006/2, para. 41) regarding a study on customary laws pertaining to indigenous traditional knowledge, decided to appoint Michael Dodson as Special Rapporteur charged with preparing, within existing resources, a concept paper on the scope of the study that

* E/C.19/2007/1.

** The present report was submitted late in order to ensure the inclusion of the most recent information.

¹ The valuable assistance of Olivia Barr is acknowledged in the preparation of this paper. It would not have been possible without her help.

Advance Unedited Version

would investigate to what extent such customary laws should be reflected in international and national standards addressing traditional knowledge, and requests the Special Rapporteur to report to the Permanent Forum at its sixth session on this matter. The study would include an analysis of indigenous customary law as a potential sui generis system for protecting indigenous traditional knowledge. Relevant organizations of the system should collaborate to promote respect for and recognition of the customary legal systems of indigenous populations pertaining to indigenous knowledge in national legislation and policies as well as with regard to their application.

Advance Unedited Version

Content

I. Introduction

II. Overview of Current Situation

III. Objectives, Scope and Strategy of the Study

IV. Issues to be considered by the Study

V. Concluding Comments

Advance Unedited Version

I. Introduction

1. For many years, indigenous people have expressed concern about the inadequate protection of their traditional knowledge. Although this concern has not gone unheeded, the issue remains unresolved. The challenge that confronts the international community is determining how the overall lack of protection of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge should be remedied.²

2. "Indigenous traditional knowledge" is used in this paper in general terms to mean the traditional practices, culture, knowledge of plants and animals and knowledge of their methods of propagation; it includes expressions of cultural values, beliefs, rituals and community laws and it includes knowledge regarding land and ecosystem management. It is more often unwritten and handed down orally from generation to generation and it is transmitted and preserved in this way. Some of this knowledge is of a highly sacred and secret nature and therefore extremely sensitive and culturally significant and not readily publicly available, even to members within the particular group. This is the understanding upon which this paper proceeds. It is not meant to be an all encompassing, comprehensive definition of the subject matter.

3. Since its establishment in 2000, the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues has made a number of recommendations calling for traditional knowledge to be addressed as a matter of urgency.³ Recognising that numerous United Nations and intergovernmental bodies were already actively engaged in ways to remedy the inadequate protection of indigenous traditional knowledge, an International Technical Workshop was convened in Panama City, in

² This report has been edited to fit the criteria of UN documentation. A copy of the full report can be found at: http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/session_sixth.html#docs

³ UN Document PFII/2005/WS.TK, annex I at 8-14, <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/workshop_TK_background_note.pdf>.

Advance Unedited Version

September 2005, to bring together indigenous experts and United Nations agencies.⁴ The International Technical Workshop (“the Workshop”) discussed issues surrounding the protection of indigenous traditional knowledge, including approaches taken by different agencies, and made numerous recommendations. Recognising the relationship between indigenous traditional knowledge and customary laws, the Workshop recommended that the Permanent Forum commission a study on “customary laws pertaining to indigenous traditional knowledge in order to investigate to what extent such customary laws should be reflected in international and national standards addressing indigenous traditional knowledge”.⁵

II. Overview of the Current Situation

4. There are a variety of documents, systems and activities that currently seek to address the lack of protection of indigenous traditional knowledge at national, regional and international levels. Providing an exhaustive list of the existing methods of protection is not necessary for the purpose of this paper, however, an understanding of the more significant documents, systems and activities is crucial to understanding the nature of the issue and the environment in which a study commissioned by the Permanent Forum would be located. An increased awareness of the current environment will also assist in determining exactly what is needed from such a study.

5. The right of indigenous peoples to protect and enjoy their traditional knowledge is recognized in a number of international instruments, including:

- (a) Article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;
- (b) Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

⁴ E/C.19/2005/9 at para 140.

⁵ E/C.19/2006/2 para 41.

Advance Unedited Version

- (c) Article 15(1)(c) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Civil Rights;
- (d) Article 8(j) of the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- (e) International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture;
- (f) Articles 13, 15 and 23 of the International Labour Organization Convention No. 169;
- (g) Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works;
- (h) Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights;
- (i) Article 3 of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, Particularly in Africa;
- (j) Paragraph 12(d) of the Authoritative Statement of Principles for a Global Consensus on the Management, Conservation and Sustainable Development of all Types of Forests (1992);
- (k) Paragraph 26.1 of Chapter 26 of Agenda 21;
- (l) World Health Organization's Traditional Medicine Strategy 2002-2005;
- (m) Principle 22 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development; and
- (n) Articles 11 and 31 of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

6. In addition to these international documents, there are numerous regional systems of protection, including the Organisation of American States Draft Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the Bangui Agreement of the Organisation Africaine de la Propriete Intellectuelle, the Tunis Model Laws and the Model Provisions. There are also a number of declarations, including the Mataatua Declaration and the Kari-Oca Declaration.

Advance Unedited Version

7. At a national level, there is a plethora of legislative and policy initiatives aimed at addressing the issue of indigenous traditional knowledge. The following examples from several different States, which address environmental, health, medicinal and intellectual property aspects of traditional knowledge, illustrate the diversity of these approaches. A comprehensive list of legislative text directed at the protection of traditional cultural expression can be found on the WIPO website.⁶

8. In Australia, environmental protection regulations recognise the “...special knowledge held by Indigenous persons about biological resources.”⁷ The Australian government guidelines for natural resource management recognises that indigenous peoples “...have links to the land and sea that are historically, spiritually and culturally strong and unique.”⁸ In the Northern Territory of Australia, traditional medicinal knowledge is partially recognised through the utilisation of Aboriginal Health Workers, who act as a bridge between traditional healers, indigenous communities and conventional medical practitioners.⁹

9. In Canada, health practices are regulated through legislative means at the federal and provincial levels and some provincial laws specifically recognise aboriginal healing practices.¹⁰ The Canadian *Environmental Assessment Act 1992* provides for the consideration of; “...aboriginal traditional knowledge ... in conducting an environmental assessment.”¹¹ Canada also utilises aboriginal skills under its National Forestry Strategy 2002-2008 and the Certification System for National Forest Management.¹²

⁶ <<http://www.wipo.int/tk/en/laws/folklore.html>>.

⁷ *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (Amendment) Regulations (No. 2) 2005*, Part 8A.01(c).

⁸ <http://www.nrm.gov.au/indigenous/index.html>.

⁹ *Health Practitioners and Allied Professionals Registration Act 1985*.

¹⁰ <<http://www.gov.yk.ca/legislation/acts/health.pdf>>.

¹¹ Section 16(1).

¹² <<http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/tasb/MANUALS/Policy/resmngmt/rm15-1.htm>>.

Advance Unedited Version

10. In South Africa, the *Traditional Health Practitioners Act 2004* recognises and regulates the practice of traditional medicine in that country. The South African *National Environmental Management Act 1998* directs decision makers on environmental matters to take into account all forms of knowledge, including traditional knowledge. Another example is Bolivia, where a national system of protected areas has been established under the Supreme Decree No. 24, 122 of 1995, wherein traditional knowledge is acknowledged and used in management practice.

11. Ecuador, recognises the practice of traditional medicine in its national constitution. In the Philippines, traditional medicinal practices are recognised by law. Section 4(b) of the *Traditional and Alternative Medicine Act 1997* defines traditional medicine as “...the sum total of knowledge, skills, and practice on health care, not necessarily explicable in the context of modern, scientific philosophical framework, but recognized by the people to help maintain and improve their health towards the wholeness of their being, the community and society, and their interrelations based on culture, history, heritage, and consciousness.”¹³ In India, the World Health Organization Worldwide Review indicates that 70% of the rural population depend on the Ayurveda System of traditional medicine practices. The Indian government regulates traditional medicinal knowledge through the *Indian Medicine Central Council Act*.

12. Protection via intellectual property law in Nigeria is the *Copyright Act 1990* which seeks to protect traditional folk law. Article 28(5) defines folklore as “a group-oriented and tradition-based creation of groups or individuals reflecting the expectation of the community as an inadequate expression of its cultural and social identity, its standards and values as transmitted

¹³ <http://www.stuartxchange.org/TAMA.html>.

Advance Unedited Version

orally, by imitation or by other means”.¹⁴ The Central African Republic copyright law defines folklore as, “all literary and artistic productions created by the national communities, passed on from generation to generation and constituting one of the basic elements of the traditional cultural heritage.”¹⁵ In Ghana, the copyright law seeks to protect traditional folklore under the *Copy Right Act 2005*, although its introduction was met with some controversy.

13. In many instances, domestic laws recognise indigenous customary law as the foundation of the relevant indigenous peoples rights to land and heritage. A comprehensive coverage of these issues will be a matter of central concern to the scope of any study the Permanent Forum may choose to pursue.

14. In relation to provisions in international documents, various levels of protection are offered that are principally either protection as an aspect of human rights law or protection that specifically addresses indigenous traditional knowledge. Examples of human rights based protection are article 27(2) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and article 15(1)(c) of International Covenant on Economic, Social and Civil Rights, which both recognise the right to the “protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.”¹⁶ In relation to indigenous traditional knowledge, however, the protection provided by such a provision is limited. This can be illustrated by considering the problematic notion of “author”, which evokes an understanding of an individual and does not easily encompass communal creation and ownership.

¹⁴ <http://www.nigeria-law.org/CopyrightAct.htm>.

¹⁵ Ordinance No. 85-002 on Copyright (Central African Republic) art. 9. <http://www.wipo.int/tk/en/folklore/>.

¹⁶ Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 10 December 1948, GAOR, III, Resolutions, (UN Doc. A/810), 71 and International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights U.N.T.S No. 14668, vol. 999 (1976), 171.

Advance Unedited Version

15. An example of a more specific indigenous traditional knowledge provision is article 8(j) of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Article 8(j) calls upon parties to respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities that embody traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. Although article 8(j) directly considers indigenous traditional knowledge, it is limited to situations where traditional knowledge is relevant to biological diversity and is simply not designed to provide holistic protection for indigenous traditional knowledge.

16. Arguably the most explicit provision for the protection of indigenous traditional knowledge is contained in the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (“Draft Declaration”), which currently languishes before the General Assembly. Despite its current status, the Draft Declaration provides a strong and persuasive statement in support of the protection of indigenous traditional knowledge. Article 31(1) of the Draft Declaration states:

Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures, including human and genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs, sports and traditional games and visual and performing arts. They also have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their intellectual property over such cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions.

Advance Unedited Version

17. Importantly, paragraph 2 of article 31 urges States to “take effective measures to recognize and protect the exercise of these rights”. In addition to article 31 of the Draft Declaration, article 11 emphasises the right to practice and revitalize cultural traditions and customs and urges States to provide redress through effective mechanisms, with regard to indigenous, “cultural, intellectual, religious and spiritual property taken without their free, prior and informed consent or in violation of their laws, traditions and customs”.¹⁷ The preamble of the Draft Declaration also adds support to the protection of indigenous traditional knowledge by recognising “that respect for indigenous knowledge, cultures and traditional practices contributes to sustainable and equitable development and proper management of the environment.”¹⁸

18. Although international, regional and national documents do provide some protection for indigenous traditional knowledge, they fail to provide comprehensive protection. There are a number of United Nations agencies and intergovernmental organizations that are currently engaged in activities aimed at addressing this inadequate protection; including the World Intellectual Property Organization, the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Working Group on Indigenous Populations and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

¹⁷ *Ibid* at Article 11(2). and 24(1).

¹⁸ *Ibid*.

Advance Unedited Version

19. There are a number of significant activities that ought to be recognised, however, a consideration of the World Intellectual Property Organization's ("WIPO") latest activities aptly represents the most recent developments. In 2000, WIPO established an Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore ("IGC") to provide a forum to consider the interplay between intellectual property law and indigenous traditional knowledge. Two recent activities of WIPO are of particular significance. First, the IGC have developed two comprehensive draft provisions addressing the protection of indigenous traditional knowledge. These two documents set out a potential system of protection and aim to comprehensively address the practical issues that arise in the implementation of a *sui generis* system of protection. Second, the IGC have approved a study of customary law in recognition of the role of customary law and its relationship with indigenous traditional knowledge.¹⁹ The study is, however, still in its early stages.

20. WIPO, through the IGC, have played a leading role in the push for the recognition and protection of indigenous traditional knowledge from misuse and misappropriation. However, the pre-eminent role of WIPO has meant this international debate has occurred primarily within the parameters of intellectual property law. International intellectual property law provides protection for creators of certain works, whether it is literature, music, dance or art and are, at times suffice. However, for the most part intellectual property law fails to protect indigenous rights and interests because western constructs of intellectual property focus on individual knowledge and creativity, rather than communal trans-generational knowledge. Attempting to alter intellectual property law so that it accommodates traditional knowledge, knowledge that is completely different in essence, is reminiscent of the proverb, "You can't fit a round peg in a

¹⁹ <http://www.wipo.int/tk/en/consultations/customary_law/index.html>.

Advance Unedited Version

square hole”. No matter how one tries, it just does not fit. It is for this reason that a completely new and customised approach is needed.

21. The call for *sui generis* protection has not necessarily been a call for an exchange of the current intellectual property system for a new system but is a call for a *sui generis* system that complements the current system by providing protection to those areas of traditional knowledge that receive only very limited protection from international intellectual property law. However, even where it has been recognised that *sui generis* protection is necessary, it has predominantly been located within the confines of a *sui generis* system of intellectual property law. Hence, the limited nature of such *sui generis* protection fails to properly account for the unique experiences of indigenous peoples, the unique nature of indigenous traditional knowledge and the role of customary law. Indigenous traditional knowledge is not simply a different type of intellectual property; it is a completely different entity. While this appreciation remains unrecognised, questions will persist about the appropriateness of existing intellectual property regimes to protect indigenous interests.

III. Objectives, Scope and Strategy of the Study

22. It is recognized that international, regional and national documents provide some protection for indigenous traditional knowledge however, they do not adequately address the concerns of indigenous peoples. The efforts by governmental bodies to prevent misappropriation and misuse of indigenous traditional knowledge, though admirable, are disparate and insufficient. Despite being an issue of international attention for many years and despite the creation of numerous documents, initiatives and activities, indigenous traditional knowledge is still vulnerable to

Advance Unedited Version

misappropriation. Significantly, the fundamental question still remains; how can indigenous traditional knowledge be properly protected?

23. Acknowledging that the intellectual property regime is inadequate and recognising the nature of indigenous traditional knowledge, the question becomes; should a *sui generis* system of protection be established that is unimpeded by western conceptions of intellectual property law but is instead guided by indigenous customary legal systems? If such a system is to be established, how can and should it operate? A *sui generis* system grounded in customary laws could set standards and provide guidance to States as to the appropriate protection of indigenous traditional knowledge. In addition to providing international recognition of the right of indigenous peoples to protect and enjoy their traditional knowledge from misappropriation and misuse and subsequently providing guidance to States, a framework that recognises the relationship between indigenous traditional knowledge and customary law and provides space for the operation of indigenous legal systems will provide additional benefits to indigenous peoples that flow from the recognition of ownership.

24. The Permanent Forum should commission a study, under its mandate to prepare and disseminate information, in order to determine whether there ought to be a shift in the focus on the protection of indigenous traditional knowledge away from intellectual property law to protection via customary law, and if so, how this should occur. The study should consider how indigenous traditional knowledge could be protected at an international level by utilising customary law, including the extent to which it should be

Advance Unedited Version

reflected, thereby providing guidance to States and subsequently protection at national and regional levels.

IV. Issues to be considered by the Study

25. Should the Permanent Forum recommend a study be commissioned, there are a number of issues that need to be addressed, both in the creation of the study and the study itself.

Identifying the Question

26. Embodied in the call for a study on customary laws pertaining to indigenous traditional knowledge are a number of questions and assumptions. In order to craft an effective study, careful consideration needs to be given to the nature of the question so that it will assist in determining both the nature and the parameters of the study, which will in turn provide a foundation upon which an effective study can be built. There are three preliminary issues that must be considered: terminology, the nature of a *sui generis* system and the intended beneficiaries.

27. First, it must be recognised that there are some initial challenges posed by the variety of terminology used in this area. Terms such as “indigenous knowledge”, “traditional knowledge”, “indigenous knowledge, cultures and traditional practice”, “folklore”, “indigenous heritage” and “indigenous cultural and intellectual property” are often bandied around and are invariably used in different contexts and attributed different meanings. Regardless of the terminology the Permanent Forum ultimately uses, the term should be clearly defined to indicate the parameters of the study. However, providing a comprehensive definition of traditional knowledge is a

Advance Unedited Version

difficult task and one that has questionable benefits. If traditional knowledge is to be recognised and protected by providing a framework within customary laws, it may be in the best interests of indigenous peoples to leave the term undefined. The benefit of using a term that is clearly delineated from other terms but is not explicitly defined is that the content of the term is not fixed it will therefore be able to adjust and adapt to dynamic customary legal systems and novel aspects of traditional knowledge. The downside of such an approach is, that without a strict definition it may be difficult to ascertain what is actually included within such a term. This may lead to unacceptable levels of uncertainty, which may ultimately make any such instrument unworkable. Article 31 of the Draft Declaration may provide considerable guidance to the Permanent Forum in this regard.

28. Second, there needs to be a clear understanding of what exactly is being asked for when there is a call for a *sui generis* system of protection. The term *sui generis* is a Latin term literally translated as “of its own kind” or colloquially translated to mean “unique”. *Sui generis* is a term that has gained increased usage in indigenous rights jurisprudence, particularly as a vehicle to describe the unique interaction between indigenous peoples and dominant legal systems. Traditional knowledge is often labelled as *sui generis* to indicate the failure of dominant legal systems, particularly the intellectual property system, to properly account for it. The term is also used to positively affirm the unique nature and status of indigenous peoples and the right to protect their knowledge, customs and practices. However, it is important to ensure that *sui generis* does not ultimately result in “lesser” protection. Although recognising this may be interpreted as unnecessarily cynical, indigenous peoples have experienced the lesser nature of

Advance Unedited Version

specialised protection in other situations.²⁰ This may be due to the difficulties in ensuring dominant legal systems are sufficiently malleable to accommodate indigenous perspectives, experiences, rights and customary laws. In any event, it is crucial that whatever form of protection is ultimately used, protection has a positive impact on indigenous peoples and does not further alienate or misappropriate traditional knowledge and indigenous customary laws.

29. The call for *sui generis* protection may encompass a number of intentions. First, it may be used to indicate that the intellectual property regime is inadequate and to declare that there is a need for that system to adapt itself in unique ways in order to properly address the misappropriation and misuse of indigenous traditional knowledge. Second, the call for a *sui generis* system may also be used to indicate that the current systems of protection are inadequate and that as a result of the unique nature of indigenous peoples, their culture, knowledge and law, there is a need for a unique system of protection that is not bound by current systems and structures of national or international law. Finally, it may also be used to indicate that indigenous legal systems are of their own kind and as customary systems, bear little resemblance to western legal systems of common law, civil law and international law. As a result of this lack of resemblance, a unique way of protecting indigenous traditional knowledge is needed that is grounded in indigenous legal systems. This final view resonates most soundly with the question asked by the Permanent Forum. Whatever the intention is behind the call for a *sui generis* system, it seems that in the case of traditional knowledge, the current systems and activities are insufficient and something radically different needs to occur. **The Permanent Forum should consider assessing in what manner a *sui generis* system is required and thereby clarify what the study intends to address.**

²⁰ UN Document UNEP/CBD/WG8J/4/7.

Advance Unedited Version

30. The final preliminary issue that needs to be considered is the intended benefits of the study and the intended beneficiaries. It is important to recognise that much of the focus on this issue has been on protecting indigenous peoples from the misappropriation and misuse of traditional knowledge without the free, prior and informed consent of the traditional knowledge owners. Any system of protection that is developed needs to ensure that traditional knowledge is not inappropriately taken without the free, prior and informed consent of the relevant peoples. However, the desire to protect traditional knowledge also includes the desire to recognise ownership and control, which creates an opportunity for indigenous peoples and communities to utilise a valuable resource. Without in any way justifying misappropriation, the fact that indigenous traditional knowledge has been misappropriated for so long and in so many circumstances is indicative *inter alia* of the commercial value of traditional knowledge. Proper protection will enable indigenous peoples to own and control traditional knowledge. This ownership and control will include the ability to protect secret and sacred aspects of traditional knowledge. It will also enable indigenous peoples to engage in local national and international economies in a commercially viable manner, if that is what communities' desire. Indigenous peoples constitute some of the poorest communities in the world and disproportionately live in situations of poverty. The opportunity to engage in trade and economically utilise a commercially viable resource should not be underestimated.

31. It is important that the Permanent Forum properly conceive of the nature of the question and the objectives of the study, including definitional challenges, assessing a *sui generis* system and being aware that the protection of traditional knowledge can act as both a sword and a shield. It

Advance Unedited Version

may be that these questions will be initially difficult to define and answer, however, by keeping these issues at the forefront of the study, the Permanent Forum will be able to determine the parameters of the study and ensure that the study does not divert from its intended course.

Determining the Relationship between International, Regional, National and Communal Forums

32. The role of customary law in providing guidance and protection to indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge and the nature of the owners of traditional knowledge necessarily posits the indigenous community as a central component in this issue. It is generally the indigenous community collectively, as distinct from the individual, who own the rights to traditional knowledge. It may be a section of the community or in certain instances, a particular person sanctioned by the community that is able to speak for or make decisions in relation to a particular instance of traditional knowledge. Hence, the role of the community is central in this regard. In addition, the operation of customary law occurs at a community level. The operation of customary law within an indigenous community is significant in shifting the focus of protection away from dominant legal systems, such as intellectual property, to a system based in or upon indigenous legal systems.

33. There are indigenous peoples living in approximately 70 countries throughout the world and constituting approximately 350 million people, including 5000 distinct peoples and over 4000 languages and cultures. Amongst this vast population, there are many indigenous legal systems. On a global scale, it is not unreasonable to assume that there are at least as many legal systems associated with a fair proportion of indigenous peoples throughout the world. While the centrality of the community is self-evident, the challenges however, lie in deciphering the

Advance Unedited Version

relationship between indigenous communities and international, regional and national forums. The central question in deciphering these relationships is; how should the intersection between international, regional, national and communal systems be resolved?

34. Indigenous peoples have looked to the international arena as a place to seek protection of their rights and their way of life and as a place for indigenous voices to be heard. Despite the early denials of access,²¹ the international arena is now heavily engaged in protecting indigenous rights and raising awareness of indigenous issues. The international arena can provide a focal point in a discussion, such as this one, that is very broad reaching. It cannot be denied that the lack of protection afforded to traditional knowledge is an issue of international significance. Not only does the international arena operate as a focal point for such an important discussion, international law also provides certain vehicles that are available to remedy the lack of the protection, such as the development of an international instrument. Also, the symbolic importance of this discussion occurring and being resolved in the international arena cannot be underestimated.

35. Domestic laws provide another level of intersection with traditional knowledge. In some States, national laws have been implemented to address this issue, however, it can be generally stated that these are ad hoc and on the whole, do not provide adequate protection. There are a host of issues that arise when considering the role of national laws in this instance, but the predominant question is simply; can national laws be used effectively? If the answer to this question is yes, then why has this not occurred and why is it an issue that remains central on the international stage? Perhaps the issue is not so much as to whether national laws could be

²¹ UN Chronicle Online: <http://www.un.org/Pubs/chronicle/2004/issue2/0204p18.asp>.

Advance Unedited Version

effective, but rather whether they could be effective without the guidance provided by some activity occurring at an international level. It seems clear that this is not an issue that can remain simply within the domestic domain. If that were to occur, the chances of this issue being resolved for all indigenous peoples is negligible. The implementation of national legislation or policy will be a tool in the process of developing mechanisms of protection for indigenous traditional knowledge. It should not, however, be an issue left solely for the domestic realm. There clearly needs to be an international standard to guide domestic implementation.

36. The regional dimensions of traditional knowledge must also be recognised. Existing regimes that operate, particularly in South America, Africa and Asia, are cognisant of the regional dimension of this issue. Simply put, indigenous communities are not necessarily located within national borders, indigenous customary legal systems may cross-borders and interactions between indigenous communities, such as through trade, may occur across national borders. For these and other similar reasons, the regional aspect of traditional knowledge must be taken into account by any proposed model of protection.

37. The principal challenge is determining how the intersections between communities, States, regions and the international forum should be resolved. Providing the backdrop to this challenge is the issue of uniformity. No matter what mechanisms of protection are considered, the question of uniformity will need to be addressed. Obviously the benefits of uniformity are many, including clarity and consistency of law. However, in this instance, a tension exists between uniformity and the recognition of the variety and diversity of customary laws and indigenous traditional knowledge. If uniformity is given primacy over and above the protection of diversity,

Advance Unedited Version

then any protection afforded to traditional knowledge may be at the expense of recognising customary laws or of recognising the dynamic nature of customary laws. It seems that such an outcome would be a hollow victory. On the other hand, if the diversity of customary legal systems is given primacy over uniformity, it is likely that a complex legal web will be woven, which may ultimately result in varying levels of protection for indigenous peoples. The tension between uniformity and diversity is not a new issue in international law or a new issue for the Permanent Forum, but is one that has particular significance in these circumstances.

38. If international law were to take a back seat in this discussion, it would be difficult to envisage a solution that was not ad hoc. Further, without utilising international mechanisms, it seems likely that any hope of uniformity would be lost. International law must be at the forefront of any discussion of traditional knowledge. Through international processes and the role of international law, guidance can then be given to both national and regional forums.

Determining the Relationship Between the Study and Existing Structures, Activities and Resources

39. As indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge covers a wide range of areas, the protection of indigenous traditional knowledge may intersect with various areas of law or international issues, such as intellectual property law, environmental law, heritage and sustainable development. As a result, activities have tended to focus on either a particular aspect of indigenous traditional knowledge or a particular interaction between indigenous traditional knowledge and a specific area of law. For example, some activities focus on traditional medicinal knowledge, whereas other activities take a more general approach to protection. In recognition of these diverse

Advance Unedited Version

approaches, there has been increased consultation and coordination between agencies working in this area.²²

40. It will be necessary to identify existing systems, activities and resources and also identify all works in progress across the board. Identifying these existing systems and activities is crucial to ensuring the work of the Permanent Forum coordinates and integrates with the work of other United Nations and intergovernmental agencies. By being conscious of other agencies' activities, the Permanent Forum will be able to ensure that any work undertaken is structured in such a way as to avoid any unnecessary duplication. This will enable the Permanent Forum to undertake a study with the proper and efficient use of limited United Nations and Permanent Forum resources.

41. The process of determining existing systems and activities may occur in several ways. It may be efficient to initially commence a comprehensive literature review. Alternatively, it may be useful to initiate a follow-up Workshop. In addition to ensuring the Permanent Forum is updated as to the current status quo, a further Workshop would allow experts and agencies to discuss the best way forward. Depending on the approach taken by the Permanent Forum, a literature review may suffice and a Workshop, if needed, may be more beneficial if it were to occur at a later stage in the study or perhaps even regularly throughout the duration of the study.

²² For example, UNESCO and WIPO have a history of collaboration, including the development of the Tunis Model Law on Copyright for Developing Countries (1976) and the formulation of the Model Provisions for National Laws on the Protection of Expressions of Folklore Against Illicit Exploitation and other Prejudicial Actions (1982). For an extensive list of collaboration between Conference of the Parties to the Convention of Biological Diversity and WIPO, see UN Document UNEP/CBD/COP/8/INF/41.

Advance Unedited Version

42. It is important that the Permanent Forum does not simply ascertain what systems, activities and resources already exist and then commission a study based on these arrangements. Once it has been determined what structures and resources either exist or are soon to exist, it will be necessary to assess their relevance and value as resources for this study. If such an assessment is not undertaken, the study may be misguided and the results of any study may be limited by assumptions embodied in prior work. For example, assessments should consider whether there are any assumptions underlying the work and whether the question and potential solutions being considered are located solely within a framework of intellectual property law and whether the work has been developed in consultation with indigenous peoples. The question of how these mechanisms should be assessed will need to be addressed by the Permanent Forum. A list of objectives or criteria of relevance should be established to guide any such assessment. In any event, the assessment of existing mechanisms and resources will be fundamental in ensuring that there is optimal utilisation of United Nations resources available to the Forum. Importantly, a proper assessment will identify areas that need to be addressed by the study and will also assist the Permanent Forum in determining the next step forward.

43. Once a proper assessment has occurred, the Permanent Forum will need to consider how any further developments that may result from the study can relate to existing mechanisms and resources. The Permanent Forum will also need to consider how any developments from the study will relate to any other developments that may occur, such as the creation of an international document by WIPO. It would be wise to ensure that any future developments by other United Nations or intergovernmental agencies complemented, rather than inhibited, the outcomes of this study and *vice versa*.

Advance Unedited Version

Potential Structures and Outcomes

44. The Permanent Forum seeks to enquire whether customary laws could be reflected in international and national standards. As mentioned previously, it seems clear that an international framework of some sort is necessary in order to provide guidance to States in this area. At the UNCTAD meeting of experts in 2000, this was aptly stated as follows:

National sui generis systems by themselves will not be sufficient to protect [traditional knowledge] adequately. There is therefore a need to explore an international mechanism that might explore minimum standards of an international sui generis system for [traditional knowledge] protection.²³

45. On this basis, the following discussion is limited to potential mechanisms of protection located within the international arena. The presumption is that any mechanism developed internationally will in due course filter down to States and will be implemented nationally.

46. Although there are various options internationally, it seems that the principle options tend to involve the development of an international instrument. It has been suggested, by both the Workshop and the Permanent Forum, that customary laws should be reflected in international standards. This could occur through the creation of a treaty, a framework agreement, a memorandum of understanding or a number of other structures. It should be noted that the

²³ 'Outcome of the Expert Meeting' TD/B/COM.1EM.13/L.1, 9 November 2000, p.7 UNCTAD, "Expert Meeting on Systems and National Experiences for Protecting Traditional Knowledge, Innovations and Practices" Geneva, Switzerland, 30 October - 1 November 2000.

Advance Unedited Version

mechanisms considered in this concept paper are not intended to limit, in any way, the potential structures that may be considered in the study.

47. A treaty is one way in which customary laws could be reflected in an international document and provide a strong basis upon which traditional knowledge could be protected. If a treaty were developed for the sole purpose of ensuring protection of indigenous traditional knowledge, rather than in unison with other issues, the level of specificity would need to be carefully considered. If articles within a treaty were quite specific and provided detailed requirements as to what may constitute traditional knowledge or what circumstances may be afforded protection, then this could potentially raise concerns of inflexibility. However, inflexibility is also an issue to the operation of a treaty as a whole. For example, if customary law were to be completely reflected in an international treaty, this could inhibit the development of customary law and could be perceived as unnecessarily inflexible. A treaty that quite specifically details the subject matter will be uniform in nature, but indigenous peoples, customary laws and traditional knowledge are not uniform in nature. The concern with a treaty such as this is that it may not provide the space or allow enough room for the operation of what are diverse customary legal systems of diverse indigenous peoples throughout the world.

48. Similarly, in addition to potentially being inflexible as to its subject matter, a specific treaty that seeks to codify customary law may struggle to aptly protect the rights of indigenous peoples to their traditional knowledge. The reason for this is that any attempt to codify customary law at international level will be artificial. For example, the vast number of indigenous legal systems in the world are not uniform. Although there may be certain commonalities, such as a tendency for

Advance Unedited Version

communal rather than individual ownership, this may not always be the case. As a result, any attempt to reflect customary law in international law by articulating customary law principles as they pertain to traditional knowledge may in fact limit the operation of customary law and accordingly, fail to protect traditional knowledge. Such an outcome could have disastrous effects on indigenous people. Likewise, if customary laws were not codified internationally but a treaty encouraged codification nationally, the same concerns apply.

49. A further issue to consider is the question of what mechanism would be put in place to handle disputes over the interpretation of indigenous traditional knowledge. The issue of interpretation becomes particularly important in situations of secret or sacred knowledge. If customary law is subject to some form of codification, the question of who interprets the law is pertinent. In the case of an international treaty, disputes may be resolved by way of diplomacy, through an entity created by that treaty for that particular purpose, such as a tribunal or a committee, or in some circumstances through the International Court of Justice (“ICJ”). In this situation, it is important to recognise that it is States that have standing in the ICJ. Private persons, collectivities and international organizations are not entitled to access the Court, however, public international organizations, including specialised agencies like WIPO and United Nations organs do have access in various circumstances.²⁴ In order for the ICJ to deal with disputes under a treaty to protect indigenous traditional knowledge it would be necessary for such a treaty to include a jurisdictional provision enabling this to occur.²⁵ It may be that the study finds that dispute resolution and legal interpretation via the ICJ is not the preferred option. In any event, the process of treaty making necessarily requires some mechanism or some forum

²⁴ <http://www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/ibasicdocuments/ibasictext/ibasicorgansandspecialized.html>

²⁵ *Statute of the International Court of Justice*, article 36, para 2.: <http://www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/icjhome.htm>.

Advance Unedited Version

in which disputes, including disputes as to the interpretation of provisions, can be resolved. By codifying customary law and reflecting customary law in an international instrument, the danger for indigenous peoples is that the power of interpretation of the treaty, including the power to interpret customary laws, will be posited in a non-indigenous body. It may be that a central body would be useful to settle such disputes, however, such a decision should be made with caution whilst being cognisant of the potential of such a body usurping the power of interpretation and subsequently law-making power from indigenous peoples.

50. The study should also consider the development of a treaty that does not specifically articulate principles of customary law but still provides general protection to traditional knowledge. Such a treaty may provide fairly general protection, although in more detail than article 8(j) of the Convention on Biological Diversity or the Draft Declaration, but also provide the actual mechanics of such protection, including provisions for arbitration and enforcement. Such a treaty would reflect customary law but not articulate customary law. Although situated nationally, an example of general protection is section 35(1) of the Canadian *Constitution Act 1982*, which states, “[t]he existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed”. A provision that recognises and affirms indigenous peoples rights to their traditional knowledge may be a conduit for international recognition whilst avoiding the dangers of detailed articulation of customary laws. A provision that recognises and affirms traditional knowledge would provide legal space for the operation of customary laws. It may be that subsequently, a more complex legal relationship would need to be developed between indigenous customary law and domestic law, however, this relationship

Advance Unedited Version

would be guided by the international recognition and affirmation of indigenous peoples rights to their traditional knowledge.

51. Two different approaches to the creation of a traditional knowledge treaty have been suggested; a specific treaty that codifies customary law to some extent and a more general treaty that creates legal space for the continuing operation of indigenous legal systems without impinging upon their operation. In considering whether either of these proposals are viable options, the study by the Permanent Forum should consider the relative benefits and relative detriments. As mentioned, issues of uniformity, flexibility, dispute resolution and interpretation ought to be part of the process of assessing the relative merits of these models. In addition, the study must carefully consider the issue of registration. The study should also closely examine the appropriateness of codification; it may not be the ideal method for indigenous peoples to retain control of their customary law.

52. In addition to advocating the creation of a treaty, the Permanent Forum should promote other structures, such as a framework agreement or a memorandum of understanding.

53. Regardless of which models are contemplated, the Permanent Forum will need to consider whether there should be a document, structure or forum that addresses all aspects of indigenous traditional knowledge or whether there should be a separation of issues across various documents, structure or forums. If there is to be a separation, then how could customary law be recognised across diverse areas? Could this occur with uniformity? On the other hand, if a central document or structure were to be created, how would this interact with existing

Advance Unedited Version

instruments, such as article 8(j) of the Convention on Biological Diversity? These questions will need to be considered irrespective of which mechanisms of protection are examined. Further, the question of arbitration should be carefully considered. The study should consider whether a body should be established that is constituted by indigenous peoples or whether alternatively, an established forum, such as the Human Rights Committee, could be utilised. Finally, no matter which vehicle is used, the question of enforcement and mechanisms for compliance will need to be addressed.

54. In addition to legal mechanisms for protection, it is important that non-legal approaches are considered. Although a legal response is most likely necessary, it may be beneficial to consider what structures could exist outside of the international forum. For instance, the Permanent Forum may be able to advocate initiatives, such as the creation of an indigenous label similar to the Fairtrade mark, in order to identify indigenous ownership.²⁶ Such a campaign may have far-reaching effects and assist in raising awareness of this issue globally. This may be undertaken as an initiative either separately or in addition to the creation of a formal instrument.

55. In summary, there are a number of potential mechanisms of protection located within the international arena that could reflect customary law to varying degrees and that could be developed in order to properly protect indigenous traditional knowledge both at an international and a national level. Careful consideration of the relative benefits of each instrument will assist in developing a mechanism of protection that assists indigenous peoples in their fight to protect

²⁶ Report of UNCTAD-Commonwealth Secretariat Workshop on Elements of National *Sui Generis* Systems for the Preservation, Protection and Promotion of Traditional Knowledge, Innovations and Practices and Options for an International Framework, Geneva, Switzerland, 4-6 February 2004.
<http://www.unctad.org/trade_env/test1/meetings/tk2/TKworkshop.report.final.2August2004.pdf>.

Advance Unedited Version

their traditional knowledge. Although the process of developing an instrument or structure will not be easy and there are a host of difficult issues that will need to be addressed, the process itself is important. By engaging in a consideration of potential structures with an awareness of the issues outlined above, the Permanent Forum will be able to navigate its way through this complex area.

V. Concluding Comments

56. The Permanent Forum may consider it appropriate to recommend to the Economic and Social Council that it commission a study under its mandate as one way of resolving this issue. Furthermore, the Permanent Forum may consider providing advice to the Economic and Social Council about the conduct of the study, including what role the Permanent Forum might be given in the examination of this question. Alternatively, the Permanent Forum may decide to examine the issue under its own mandate.

57. The Permanent Forum could create a subsidiary forum, such as an intersessional meeting, appoint a Special Rapporteur or leave the matter with organizations currently engaged in this issue. The Forum could decide the best approach is to support these existing processes. As another option, the Permanent Forum may consider dedicating part of one of its sessions into a working session, say for 3 days, to consider the matter. The Forum could also as, another approach, appoint say 5 of its members to hold specialized meetings on indigenous traditional knowledge during sessions of the Forum. If an intersessional meeting were decided upon, it could consist of members of the Permanent Forum and delegates from United Nations, intergovernmental agencies and indigenous

Advance Unedited Version

experts involved in this issue, which may be a suitable forum to oversee the study. The potential role of the inter-agency support group should also be taken into account. The Permanent Forum should also consider whether a Special Rapporteur dedicated to this task should be appointed or whether the study should be left in the charge of other entities. Regardless of how the study is initiated, the question of an appropriate budget will need to be considered, bearing in mind that the question of resources available to the Permanent Forum remains unresolved.

58. There are several other practical matters that may need to be addressed initially, such as whether there should be “exploratory missions” and whether pilot projects should be established in particular countries, and if so, at what stage of the project. As these decisions will have budgetary ramifications, it would be beneficial if they were contemplated at the outset.

59. In constructing a study that aims to address the continued failure to protect traditional knowledge, the Permanent Forum should be cognisant of the process. Developing an appropriate process as to how this issue should be addressed will assist in working towards a successful outcome. The study should call upon the experience gained surrounding the elaboration of the Draft Declaration through the United Nations system. The capacity of such a process to educate and generate cross-cultural awareness should not be underestimated. **The Permanent Forum may wish to consider how, and to what extent, indigenous peoples can be involved in setting up the study. This may be by consulting indigenous peoples as to what process should be used or developing a code of conduct.**²⁷ **Although this will take some time, if there is to be a**

²⁷ UNEP/CBD/WG8J/4/8.

Advance Unedited Version

shift to a truly *sui generis* system of protection, creating a *sui generis* system of enquiry may be a crucial first step.

60. **In addition to considering what role the Permanent Forum wishes to have and how to develop an appropriate process, the Permanent Forum should also consider the intended outcomes of the study.** These considerations include articulating the expected accomplishments of the study and developing indicators of achievement or evaluation criteria in order to determine the quality and effect of the study. Although these criteria could be amended as the study evolves, it will be an important process of clarifying the intended objectives of a study. The study must be mindful not to raise the expectations of indigenous peoples unnecessarily and unrealistically.

61. Despite being an issue of international attention for many years, indigenous traditional knowledge is still vulnerable to misappropriation. It is time to recognise that indigenous traditional knowledge is not simply an intellectual property issue. Likewise, it is not simply a human rights issue, a trade issue nor an amalgamation of these issues. The proper protection of indigenous traditional knowledge is an indigenous issue and indigenous peoples should be central to this process.