
RESPECTING OUR KNOWLEDGE

NATIONAL RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS AND THEIR OBLIGATIONS TO INDIGENOUS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES UNDER ARTICLE 8 (J) AND RELATED PROVISIONS OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY¹

For Indigenous peoples and local communities, the Convention on Biological Diversity is rapidly assuming the status of the most important legally-binding international instrument to protect our traditional biological resources, our cultural heritage and lifestyles. It is also becoming increasingly recognized worldwide that the maintenance of biological diversity is dependent upon maintaining cultural diversity: that in fact the two share a mutually dependent relationship. Not only does the Convention and the Conference of the Parties recognize that the knowledge that we as Indigenous peoples hold is important to the maintenance, conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, they also acknowledge that we also have an active role to play in the management of that biodiversity.

The Convention on Biological Diversity contains a number of requirements which involve the interests of Indigenous peoples and local communities. These are specifically spelled out in Articles 8(j), 10(c), 17.2 and 18.4. Article 8(j) requires that, as far as possible and as appropriate, and subject to national legislation, the

contracting parties respect, preserve and maintain the knowledge, innovations and practices of Indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles; promote their wider application with the approval and involvement of the holders of such knowledge, utilize innovations and practices, encourage the equitable sharing of benefits which arise from such utilization.

The wording of this Article has been widely criticized by Indigenous and local community organizations—particularly the qualification that its provisions should be subject to national legislation, thereby raising the issue that Article 8(j) stands or falls on the degree to which legislation reflects the intent of the Article.² It is to be hoped, however, that within the next two or three years the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity will adopt guidelines for national legislation relevant to the implementation of Article 8(j). This will make it easier for the Conference of the Parties, Indigenous communities, international agencies like the World Conservation Union (IUCN), UNESCO, the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations and the

Commission on Human Rights, and non-government organizations to monitor Parties' compliance with the guidelines. Nevertheless, there is still sufficient substance and moral authority to the Article for it to provide significant protection to the interests of Indigenous and local communities with regard to the maintenance of cultural traditions, the protection of intellectual property rights regarding traditional knowledge, and adequate rewards to the holders of traditional knowledge when it has been applied elsewhere, with respect to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

Article 10(c) lays down a powerful obligation on Parties regarding cultural maintenance through the continued use of biological resources. It provides that contracting parties shall, as far as possible and as appropriate, protect and encourage customary use of biological resources in accordance with traditional cultural practices that are compatible with conservation and sustainable use requirements. However, Article 10(c) can only be implemented within the context of the whole of Article 8 regarding *in situ* conservation of biological resources. Article 8, amongst other things, deals with protected areas, restoration of degraded ecosystems, aspects of biosafety with regard to the release of living modified organisms resulting from biotechnology into the environment, and recovery of threatened species—areas in which Indigenous and local community

involvement is critical if Article 10(c) is to have any relevance or to be successfully implemented. Thus, pursuant to Article 8(j) and 10(c), contracting parties are therefore obliged to not only respect, preserve and maintain traditional knowledge, innovations and practices, but also protect and *encourage* customary use of traditional biological resources in a manner consistent with the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Article 17.2 concerns the exchange of information, which shall include exchange of results of technical, scientific and socio-economic research, as well as information of on training and surveying programmes, specialized knowledge, *Indigenous and traditional knowledge as such* and in combination with technologies relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, or which make use of genetic resources, and which do not cause significant damage to the environment. Article 18.4 concerns technical and scientific cooperation, such that contracting parties "shall, in accordance with national legislation and policies, encourage and develop methods of cooperation for the development and use of technologies, *including indigenous and traditional technologies*, in pursuance of the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity. For this purpose, the contracting parties shall also promote cooperation in the training of personnel and exchange of experts."

Many of the other Articles also contain

provisions which directly involve the interests of Indigenous peoples and local communities. For example, Articles 7 (identification and monitoring), 11 (incentive measures), 15 (access to genetic resources) and 16 (access to and transfer of technology) cannot be read without reference to the various obligations contained, particularly in Article 8(j). Thus the Convention on Biological Diversity contains a web of interlocking provisions which involve Indigenous people and local communities in the work of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The implications of these provisions are being unravelled, explored and elaborated by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and various decisions of the Conference of the Parties. For example, at the third Conference of the Parties meeting, a number of decisions were taken which reflect current thinking and interpretation of various Articles of Convention on Biological Diversity in order to give effect to their implementation. Under Decision III/14, regarding the implementation of Article 8(j), the Conference of the Parties recognized that traditional knowledge should be given the same respect as any other form of knowledge in the implementation of the Convention.³ In decisions III/10, the Conference of the Parties endorsed Recommendation II/2 of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice concerning capacity-building for taxonomy. Paragraph 8 of that

recommendation states, in part, that it "should also be recognized that traditional taxonomic systems offer a valuable perspective on biological diversity and should be considered part of the total taxonomic knowledge base at national, regional and subregional levels."⁴ In Recommendation II/1, the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice noted that improvement of taxonomic knowledge was fundamental to the development of indicators for biodiversity monitoring, and that traditional knowledge "could play a valuable role in the development of indicators, as well as in monitoring and assessment."⁵

The Convention of the Parties is also greatly concerned about the protection and exercise of intellectual property rights under the Convention and their potential relationships with other aspects of the Convention's implementation, including, for example, implementation of Articles 8(j), 15 and 16. It wants Parties to consider the role and the potential of existing intellectual property rights systems in achieving the objectives of the Convention, including, *inter alia*, in facilitating technology transfer and in arrangements by which interested parties, including Indigenous and local communities and countries, may determine access to and share equitably the benefits of genetic resources or [traditional] knowledge, innovations and practices."⁶

On June 18, 1993, Australia ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity, thereby binding the Commonwealth and the states and territories to the obligations specified in the Articles of the Convention. The Commonwealth's key measures for implementing the nation's obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity are contained in the *National Strategy for the Conservation of Australia's Biological Diversity*, signed by all states and territories. The *National Strategy* is,

The purpose of my ...
analysis is to indicate the
scope for the kind of
comprehensive research
agenda required to address
Australia's obligations to its
Indigenous communities

itself, a cornerstone of the *National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development*, and together with other national policies and strategies for our coasts, forests, fisheries, rangelands, wetlands, and so on, forms a comprehensive plan for the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources as required by Article 6 of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The respective Commonwealth and state responsibilities for, amongst other things, implementing the strategy are outlined in the *Agreement on the Environment* concluded by the Council of Australian Governments in November 1997, with Commonwealth

financial support coming primarily through the Natural Heritage Trust. Commonwealth and state and territory departments with environmental responsibilities, particular agencies, like the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority; and institutions, such as the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Australian Institute of Marine Science universities and cooperative research centres, are also bound to reflect the policies for the implementation of the nation's responsibilities under the Convention on Biological Diversity as laid out in the *National Strategy for the Conservation of Australia's Biological Diversity*, the various sectoral policies and strategies, and the Council of Australian Governments' *Agreement on the Environment*. Failure to do so is tantamount to dishonouring, or limiting the capacity of the Commonwealth to deliver on these responsibilities.

With respect to the *National Strategy for the Conservation of Australia's Biological Diversity*, there are a number of references to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. Of the principles which have been adopted as a basis for the Strategy's objectives and actions, and which should be used as a guide for implementation, the final principle states:

The close, traditional association of Australia's indigenous peoples with components of biological diversity should be recognised, as should the desirability of sharing equitably benefits arising from the

innovative use of traditional knowledge of biological diversity.⁷

The goal of Objective 1.8 is to: "Recognise and ensure the continuity of the contribution of the ethnobiological knowledge of Australia's indigenous peoples to the conservation of Australia's biological diversity." One of the actions designed to implement this objective concerns access to information through

[The provision of] resources for the conservation of traditional biological knowledge through cooperative ethnobiological programs; and

The provision of] access to accurate information about biological diversity for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, and involve them in research programs relevant to the biological diversity and management of lands and waters in which they have an interest.⁸

A second reference concerns the need to improve our knowledge and understanding of Australia's biological diversity essential for its effective conservation and management. With regard to the ethnobiological knowledge of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, it is necessary to:

Recognise the value of the knowledge and practices of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and incorporate this knowledge and those practices in biological diversity research and conservation programs by:

a) encouraging the recording (with the approval and involvement of the indigenous peoples concerned) of

indigenous peoples' knowledge and practices;

b) assessing the potential of this knowledge and these practices for nutritional and medical uses, wildlife and protected areas management and other purposes;

c) applying the knowledge and practices in ways that ensure equitable sharing of the benefits arising from their use.⁹

The final reference, concerning implementation of the *Strategy*, sets an objective that, by the year 2000, Australia will have, *inter alia*,

implemented cooperative ethnobiological programs, where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples see them to be appropriate, to record and ensure the continuity of ethnobiological knowledge and to ensure that the use of such knowledge within Australia's jurisdiction results in social and economic benefits to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.¹⁰

These references, in their various wordings, reflect the requirements of the Convention on Biological Diversity with respect to Articles 8(j), 10(c), 17.2 and 18.4, but also reflect the need to involve the nation's Indigenous peoples in the work of other provisions, such as Article 7 (identification and monitoring) and the whole of Article 8 (*in situ* conservation).

The purpose of my somewhat detailed analysis is to indicate the scope for the kind of comprehensive research agenda

required to address Australia's obligations to its Indigenous communities under various Articles of the Convention and as reflected in the *National Strategy*. It might be expected that national research institutions would reflect these obligations in their own research agenda and make sure that at least some projects carried out under their auspices address them. However, this appears not to be the case.

I now want to indicate the extent to which Indigenous research interests and involvement in research processes—including the selection of research projects—are marginalized by examining the structure and research output of the Cooperative Research Centre for Ecologically Sustainable Development of the Great Barrier Reef. This analysis is based on its 1996-97 *Annual Report*.

The Cooperative Research Centre for Ecologically Sustainable Development of the Great Barrier Reef is an unincorporated joint venture established in 1993 by an agreement between the Centre Parties, namely, the Association of Marine Park Tourism Operators, the Australian Institute of Marine Science, Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, James Cook University of North Queensland and the State of Queensland through its Department of Primary Industries.¹¹ Membership therefore reflects a heavy weighting in favour of those with commercial interests in the Great Barrier Reef. Indigenous

communities, as major stakeholders who have traditional marine estates and cultural, spiritual and economic interests in the Great Barrier Reef—and as expressed in many native title claims—were therefore excluded at the outset from consideration as a possible Centre Party.¹² This is despite the fact that the activities of some of the Parties, such as the Association of Marine Park Tourism Operators and the Queensland Department of Primary Industries (as the principal agency responsible for monitoring and setting quotas for commercial and recreational fishing in the Great Barrier Reef) impact greatly on the interests of Indigenous reef communities and that the best place to start to address such conflicts of interest over sustainable development of the Great Barrier Reef would have been through Indigenous membership as a Centre Party, thus entitling Indigenous communities to representation on the Centre Board.

The management structure of the Cooperative Research Centre Reef primarily consists of the Board (and the Director), which is advised by three Advisory Groups: the Users Advisory Group, the Technical Advisory Group, and the Public Relations/Media Group. As might be expected, given the composition of the Centre Parties, there is no provision for Indigenous membership of the eleven-member Board. According to the 1996-97 *Annual Report*, the Association of Marine Park Tourism Operators had four members, while the Australian Institute of Marine Science, James Cook University,

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, Queensland Department of Primary Industries, the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation and SUNFISH had one each, with the Director making up the eleventh member.¹³ Similarly, Indigenous membership on each of the three Advisory Groups is absent.¹⁴ The seven-member Technical Advisory Group, comprising the Cooperative Research Centre Reef Chair, five Programme Leaders and James Cook University student representative, has no Indigenous representative. This is despite the fact that the Centre for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Participation in Research and Development exists at James Cook University and could provide leadership to a Program in its own right, or could ensure that Indigenous research needs are met within the existing framework of the Cooperative Research Centre (through integration of our research needs within the other programs and through the conduct of research specific to Indigenous reef communities).

The Users Advisory Group, consisting of some eight members, considers issues and knowledge required by major user groups, review research outputs and assists in implementation towards "effective use". The role and structure of the Group is being reviewed to broaden involvement in the process of selection of tasks and the assessment of opportunity for research products. During the year 1996-97, the Users Advisory Group drew membership from the Association of Marine Park

Tourism Operators, the Department of the Environment, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, and Queensland Department of Primary Industries. At face value, such representation seems hardly representative of the diverse user groups of the Great Barrier Reef. One would think that Indigenous reef communities would constitute an important user group (and not just in economic terms) and should have representation on this advisory committee.

The Public Relations/Media Group provides a focal point for communications with the wider community, drawing on the public relations and media skills within the four institutional Parties (ie. James Cook University, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, and the Australian Institute of Marine Science and Queensland Department of Primary Industries). The Group addresses broad extension activities for stakeholders and the wider community. This ten-member committee comprises representatives of the Cooperative Research Centre Reef, the Australian Institute of Marine Science, Queensland Department of Primary Industries, Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority and James Cook University.¹⁵ One of the principal publications of the media section is the Cooperative Research Centre Reef's bi-monthly newsletter, *CRC Reef Research News*. Given the lack of representation on the Public Relations/Media Group, despite the fact that the Townsville campus of James Cook University has an excellent Aboriginal and

*Lin Onus,
Barmah Forest, 1994,
Acrylic on linen,
183cm x 244cm*

*Photo courtesy of
the Australian
Heritage Commission*



Torres Strait Islander media training facility as part of the Centre for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Participation in Research and Development, with a number of students from Indigenous reef communities, it comes as no surprise that matters concerning Indigenous reef communities receive scant attention. For example, the four issues of *CRC Reef Research News* (Vol. 4, Issues 3-6), which had been sent to me in Montreal, do not refer to Indigenous reef communities at all.

It should also be noted that, in 1996-97, the Cooperative Research Centre Reef was associated nationally with more than 115 organizations which included fourteen universities and TAFE colleges; sixteen Cooperative Research Centres, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation and marine research agencies; fifteen state government departments and corporations; sixteen Commonwealth departments and corporations; sixteen local government and consultative organizations; and forty-two private companies and industry groups.¹⁶ Despite the existence of Federal and State Indigenous agencies, like the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission regional councils, the Aboriginal Coordinating Council and the Islander Coordinating Council; Aboriginal land councils; and a number of Aboriginal local government authorities, such as the Palm Island, Yarrabah, Wujai Wujai, Hope Vale, Lockhardt River and Injinoo community

councils, all representing Indigenous communities with interests in the Great Barrier Reef, not one of these is listed among those 115 organizations.

Given the lack of Indigenous representation on the Board and its three principal advisory committees, and the lack of association with Indigenous representative bodies, it also comes as no surprise that Indigenous reef concerns do not feature in the Cooperative Research Centre Reef's research output as evidenced by the titles of research publications, technical reports, student thesis topics, and conference and seminar presentations. For example, of the seventy-eight PhD, Masters and Honours theses,¹⁷ only one thesis would appear to have a direct connection to Indigenous interests, namely, "Management of the archaeological record in the Great Barrier Reef Province".¹⁸ With regard to research publications, technical reports and so on, there are over 320 titles listed in the *Annual Report*.¹⁹ *Not one of these titles refers specifically to Indigenous reef concerns or interests.* In other words, *of the some 400 research topics, only one would appear to deal with an Indigenous reef concern or issue.* Of course, many of the issues addressed in some of the research papers are of concern to us, but our interests have been excluded from the parameters of such research.

On the evidence presented, one can justifiably conclude that Indigenous reef interests and concerns have been entirely

written out of the research agenda of the Cooperative Research Centre Reef and that the Centre has comprehensively failed to meet its obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity and the *National Strategy for the Conservation of Australia's Biological Diversity*.

Unfortunately, while the Cooperative Research Centre Reef presents an extreme case of the marginalization of Indigenous research needs and interests, the situation is nearly as bad in other cooperative research centres. For example, the Cooperative Research Centre - Conservation and Management of Marsupials, a relatively new cooperative research centre, has no Indigenous representation on its nine-member Advisory Group, its six-member Board, or its ten-member Research and Management Executive,²⁰—a situation of which the Director, Professor J. Rodger, is aware.²¹ However, the role of Aboriginal people in managing marsupial populations has at least been identified as “a particularly important issue.”²²

My 1995 analysis of the management structure and research output of the Cooperative Research Centre - Tropical Rainforest Ecology and Management also revealed an extremely negative picture with regard to Aboriginal involvement and research interests.²³ However, the situation has improved with Aboriginal participation now occurring within its administrative structure, leading me to the conclusion that, once such a situation is

exposed with regard to cooperative research centres, it will generally lead to better outcomes for Aboriginal people.

At least four messages come out of this analysis of the Cooperative Research Centre Reef.

First, the cooperative research centres need to be aware of their national obligations imposed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and the *National Strategy*—and this includes any such obligations which might be relevant to their institutions under Articles 8(j), 10(c), 17.2 and 18.4, and provide for these in their strategic planning and research agenda.

Second, in order to do this, however, there must be Indigenous representation on the governing boards and advisory committees so that the institutions as a whole can address these obligations in a strategic manner which is both meaningful and acceptable to the Indigenous communities concerned.

Third, they need to remain informed about the decisions and the debate regarding the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, including decisions of the Conference of the Parties and any notes prepared by the Secretariat to assist the Parties and the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice. This information is readily available through the national focal point for the Convention on Biological Diversity, which is the

Biodiversity Group in Environment Australia, Canberra, or direct from the Secretariat office in Montreal via the Internet. These obligations are not just confined to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Other Conventions such as CITES,²⁴ the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands,²⁵ and the Convention to Combat Desertification²⁶ also have implications for the involvement of Indigenous peoples in their work. Also wide-ranging moral obligations are entailed in such non-binding instruments as the statement of principles contained in the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development,²⁷ Agenda 21,²⁸ and the Statement of Forest Principles.²⁹

Finally, universities associated with cooperative research centres concerned with natural resource use and management would do well to incorporate units within their courses which inform and sensitize students to Australia's international obligations to Indigenous peoples under such treaties. They should also include within their courses, units on the role that traditional knowledge can and should play in the management and sustainable use of Australia's biodiversity.

Indigenous communities for their part, can scrutinize the activities of research institutions—reading and analyzing their annual reports is a good starting point—and prepare case studies in response to the various invitations extended by the Conference of the Parties, for example, as contained in para. 4 of Decision III/14

(concerning the implementation of Article 8(j)) and para. 1 of Decision III/17 (concerning intellectual property rights).

Such case studies can expose the shortcomings of national research institutions to address the needs of Indigenous peoples and local communities in the international fora of the convention—the Conference of the Parties, Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, regional meetings and so on. Such case studies are usually circulated in information documents prior to any meetings, incorporated in syntheses, stored in Secretariat databases and are made available through the Clearing House Mechanism. The Convention on Biological Diversity is also one of the world's most popular international treaties, with over 170 Country Parties as signatories. Indigenous community groups can also extensively lobby international Indigenous networks and non-government organizations, thereby putting pressure on national institutions "to do the right thing".

I think that, if these measures can be carried out, Australia's Indigenous peoples will get a better deal from those of the sixty-eight cooperative research centres nationally whose research domains have relevance to us. Co-operative research centres in their turn will come to have greater respect for our knowledge and its application, particularly in partnership projects, to conservation issues which

affect all of us. In doing so they will not only fulfill their obligations under the *National Strategy for the Conservation of Australia's Biological Diversity*, and effect reconciliation between our traditional knowledge systems and Western science, but also assist the nation as a whole to fulfill its obligations to its Indigenous peoples under the Convention on Biological Diversity.~

HENRIETTA FOURMILE

Henrietta Fourmile has taught at James Cook University, and until early 2000 was Associate Professor and Senior Research Fellow with the Centre for Indigenous History and the Arts, University of Western Australia. She is currently Social Affairs Officer responsible for Indigenous Knowledge with the UN Secretariat for Biological Diversity, and has undertaken extensive research work and published in the areas of intellectual property regimes; cultural heritage and property; traditional biodiversity-related knowledge; and international law and Indigenous peoples' rights

NOTES

- 1 The views expressed in this paper are mine alone and do not imply the expression of any opinion on content or policy whatsoever on the part of the Convention on Biological Diversity Secretariat or of the Australian Federal Government. I speak as a representative of the Yidindji people, traditional owners of land and sea

country in the Cairns region, and who therefore have an interest in the management of the Great Barrier Reef and in any research conducted to do with the use and management of its waters and resources.

- 2 The issue of national legislation to which Article 8(j) is subject is complex as environmental matters are generally addressed by a raft of legislation existing, in federal systems like those in Australia, and have long been frustrated by the different standards for their involvement in natural resource management, notably in protected areas, existing between the Commonwealth and the states. How our Indigenous communities will fare with respect to the implementation of Article 8(j) and related provisions now, of course, depends on the outcomes of the new environmental legislation regime which the Federal Government is proposing. Our concern should particularly focus on its proposal for a new Biodiversity Conservation Act intended to result in an integrated framework for the conservation and sustainable use of Australia's biodiversity. Amongst the legislation which this Act is intended to replace is the *National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act 1975* (C'th), which of course, contains the key provisions which enable the traditional owners of the Uluru-Kata Tjuta and Kakadu national parks to be in the majority on their respective boards of management. It was the joint-management regimes set up under this Act that were considered to be the "blue print" for Indigenous involvement in the management of protected areas elsewhere in Australia and in some countries overseas. It is important that, whatever standards acceptable to Indigenous peoples were set in the previous legislation, these standards are to be

- maintained, and if possible, advanced in its replacement.
- 3 United Nations 1997. *The Biodiversity Agenda: Decisions from the Third Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Buenos Aires, Argentina, 4-5 November 1996*. New York and Geneva, p. 48.
 - 4 *The Biodiversity Agenda*, pp. 27 and 103.
 - 5 *The Biodiversity Agenda*, pp. 27 and 95.
 - 6 *The Biodiversity Agenda*, Decision III/17, para. 1(b) and (d), p. 56.
 - 7 Commonwealth of Australia, 1996. *National Strategy for the Conservation of Australia's Biological Diversity*, Canberra, p. 6.
 - 8 *The Biodiversity Agenda*, p. 14.
 - 9 *The Biodiversity Agenda*, p. 35.
 - 10 *The Biodiversity Agenda*, p. 41.
 - 11 Cooperative Research Centre for Ecologically Sustainable Development of the Great Barrier Reef, *Annual Report 1996-97*. Townsville, p. 5.
 - 12 This raises the issues concerning the need for Indigenous reef communities to have some form of body to represent their interests in the Great Barrier Reef.
 - 13 Cooperative Research Centre for Ecologically Sustainable Development of the Great Barrier Reef, *Annual Report 1996-97*. Townsville., p. 6.
 - 14 *The Biodiversity Agenda*, pp. 6-7.
 - 15 *The Biodiversity Agenda*, p. 7.
 - 16 *The Biodiversity Agenda*, pp. 9-10.
 - 17 *The Biodiversity Agenda*, pp. 29-33.
 - 18 K. Mortimer, Honours thesis; 'The Biodiversity Agenda', p. 32.
 - 19 *The Biodiversity Agenda*, pp. 44-62.
 - 20 CRC – Conservation and Management of Marsupials, *Annual Report 1996-1997*, pp. 6, 12-13 and 50-51.
 - 21 Personal communication.
 - 22 CRC – Conservation and Management of Marsupials, *Annual Report 1996-1997*, p. 33.
 - 23 Fourmile, H.L., 1995. "Problems and Potentialities for Future Rainforest Aboriginal Cultural Survival in the Wet Tropics." In Fourmile, H.L., Schnierer, S. and Smith, A. (eds), *An Identification of Problems and Potentialities for Future Rainforest Aboriginal Cultural Survival and Self-Determination in the Wet Tropics*. Report to the Wet Tropics Management Authority, Cairns.
 - 24 Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species.
 - 25 Convention of Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat.
 - 26 Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa.
 - 27 UN Declaration on Environment and Development. See, in particular, Principle 22.
 - 28 The program of implementation for the Rio Declaration. See, in particular, Ch. 26.
 - 29 The UNCED Authoritative Declaration with Non-legally Binding Force of Principles for a Global Consensus on Management, Conservation and Sustainable Development of All Types of Forests. See, in particular, preambular paragraph (c), and Principles 2, 5 and 8.



