A tool to assess the resilience and security of a territory of life

Guidance on using this tool

This tool helps you to assess the resilience and security of a territory of life by checking the 'health' of its five essential 'building blocks':

- the **strength of the custodian community**
- the **connection between the community and its territory**
- the **functioning of the governance institution**
- the **territory's conservation status**
- the **livelihoods and well-being of the community**

This Resilience and Security Tool is to be used in grassroots discussions, ideally with the support of the Facilitator Team and possibly with a focus on small groups of shared gender, age, relationship to the territory, etc.

For each 'building block', the Team stimulates group reflections by offering a few relevant questions and keeping the discussion focused. After 10 to 20 minutes of sharing of views, evidence and experiences, the Team will pose an overarching 'key question' about the building block, which will be answered collectively according to a qualitative scale (e.g., from 'does not exist' to 'very strong or healthy'). If desired, the qualitative scale can be translated into a numerical score (e.g. a 0 - 5 scale), as shown immediately below.

0 Does not exist	1 Very weak or degraded	2 Somewhat weak degraded	3 Moderate or mixed	4 Somewhat strong or healthy	5 Very strong or healthy

Scores are not at all important. What is important is to **understand how healthy each 'building block' is, and why.** If it is 'weak', what are the main weaknesses and what contributes to them? If it is 'strong', what are those strengths, and what contributes to them? Are there current or anticipated threats or opportunities that weaken or strengthen this factor? And so on…

The Team should take detailed notes about the issues raised during the discussion, the diverse opinions that may be expressed and any recommendations that may be offered.

At the end of using the tool, a 'total score' can be assigned by adding up all of the scores of the five building blocks, as shown below. The **summary score** will be between 0 and 25, and it will offer a very approximate indication of the overall resilience and security of the territory of life. This indication will be **community-specific** and may be used to check after one or more years to see whether matters appear to improve. Scores *cannot* be compared across different territories of life, as they are fully dependent on contexts and the processes.

0 – 5 Not secure or resilient	5 - 10 Insecure, low resilience	10 – 15 Somewhat insecure, low resilience	15-20 Reasonably secure and resilient	20-25 Highly secure and resilient

Building Block 1: The integrity and strength of the custodian community

Discussion Questions:

- Does our community have a sense of **common identity and shared values**, including with respect to our territory of life?
- Are there specific **events, ceremonies, activities or mechanisms that appear to keep alive and strengthen our common identity and internal solidarity**?
- Does this differ across groups within our community —e.g., men and women, elders and young people, ethnic minorities, livelihood type, wealth or language groups?
- Is our community **able to develop an internal consensus** about important issues affecting our life and territory?
- Does our community see any worrying or positive **trends in terms of our overall integrity, sense of mutual connection, and responsibility for our territory**?

Discussion notes (What key issues were identified?):

Key Question 1: To what extent do people in our community feel connected with and responsible for one another?	Group Answer:(description)	Summary score: (0 to 5 according to the scale below)

0	1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Just a little	Somewhat but this is degrading	Moderately, but dependably	Quite a lot, and increasing	Very much!

Building Block 2: The connection between the community and its territory

Discussion questions:

- Does our community have a **long-standing and/or very solid relationship** with our territory (or, at least, with part of it)?
- Are community members **aware** of our territory and its features, and of the important connections that bond us together with it?
- Do our community members think the territory is **important**? Are we, as a community, **ready to protect it and defend it**, if needed?
- Does our community see any worrying or positive **trends** in terms of our overall **connection to and sense of responsibility for our territory**?
- Does this sense of connection differ across groups within our community —e.g., men and women, elders and young people, ethnic minorities, livelihood type, religion, wealth or language groups?
- Are the **knowledge, skills and relationships** related to our territory of life being **passed on from our elders to the younger generations**? Are those being deepened and enriched with time?

Discussion notes (What key issues were identified?):

Key Question 2: How strong is our community's bond or sense of connection with our territory of life?	Group Answer: (description)	Summary Score: (0 to 5 according to the scale below)

0	1	2	3	4	5
Inexistent	Quite weak	It is there but is degrading	It exists and is stable	It is strong and increasing	It is very powerful

Building Block 3: The functioning of the governance institution

Discussion questions:

- **Is there an institution** that makes decisions regarding our territory of life (e.g. rules of access and use)?
- Are the decision-making institutions **legitimate** in the eyes of our community? Are our community members in **solidarity** with our territory of life governance institution? Do they **respect its decisions and defend them, if need be**?
- Is our territory of life governance institution **capable of securing the implementation of its own decisions and rules**?
- Related to the preceding question, does our territory of life have **boundary demarcation?** Is our territory of life **mapped**? Is it **formally recognised in state law or reflected in any policy documents or national reports**?
- Does our community see any worrying or positive **trends** in terms of overall **respect for** and **community engagement with territory of life governance**?
- Does this engagement differ across groups within our community —e.g., men and women, elders and young people, ethnic minorities, livelihood type, wealth or language groups?

Discussion notes (What key issues were identified?):

Key Question 3: How well is our territory of life governance institution functioning?	Group Answer:(description)	Score: (0 to 5 according to the scale below)

0	1	2	3	4	5
It is not functioning	It is very weak	It is functioning, but degrading	It is functioning moderately well and is stable	It is functioning well and becoming stronger	It is a very powerful institution

Building Block 4: The ecological health and integrity of the territory

Discussion questions:

- How 'healthy' are the **land, air, water and natural resources** of value to the community (e.g., air and soil quality; freshwater quality and quantity; abundance and health of endemic species; wildlife, fisheries, etc.)?
- How healthy are the **ecosystems** (e.g. the forests, rangelands, wetlands watersheds, coastal areas, etc.) within our territory of life or in its vicinity?
- Does our community see any worrying or positive **trends** in terms of overall **ecological integrity and health** of the territory of life ecosystem(s)?
- What is the status and trend of the **key endemic species** (flora and fauna) in our territory of life? Are there any endemic species that appear to be thriving or declining in significant ways?
- Are the landscapes and/or seascapes in our territory of life aesthetically harmonious? If applicable, do they maintain their character and cultural, social, spiritual or religious values for our peoples and community?

Discussion notes (What key issues were identified?):

Key Question 4: How healthy is nature in our territory of life?	Group Answer:(description)	Score: (0 to 5 according to the scale below)

0	1	2	3	4	5
It is extremely degraded	It is degraded	It is still OK, but the trend is not good	It is OK and stable	It is in a good state and improving	It is thriving

Building Block 5: Community livelihoods and wellbeing

Discussion questions:
- How secure are the material values associated with our territory of life, such as **food, water, housing and resources used for livelihoods or to generate income**?
- Is there any evidence of **increasing or decreasing poverty and inequality in our community**? Is there any relation between these trends and our territory of life?
- How is the overall **health of our community**? Is there any relation between the health of our community and the presence and maintenance of our territory of life?
- How secure are the non-material values associated with our territory of life, such as **spiritual and cultural values, sense of satisfaction and well-being**?
- Are we facing **cultural change, emergence of new conflicts, crimes, disrespect of customary values**, migration phenomena, vandalism or self-destructive behaviour? Are these trends in any way related to the situation of our territory of life?
- Does this differ across groups within our community —e.g., men and women, elders and young people, ethnic minorities, livelihood type, wealth or language groups?

Discussion notes (What key issues were identified?):

Key Question 5: What is the general level of wellbeing in our community, especially for those whose livelihoods are directly connected to the territory of life?	Group Answer:(description)	Summary score: (0 to 5 according to the scale below)

0	1	2	3	4	5
It is extremely poor	It is rather poor	It is still OK, but the trend is not good	It is OK and stable	It is in a good state and improving	It is thriving