

AMISTAD SAGRADA
PISAQ · SACRED VALLEY · PERU

ALLIN KAWSAY & AGENDA 2030

THE MISSING LINKS

*Self-determination, living knowledge, and the roots
beneath the Sustainable Development Goals*

A companion to the Allin Kawsay Vision Document

Offered in support of Agenda 2030 — and in service of
its own first promise: to leave no one behind.

PREFACE

A Word Before We Begin

This document is written in support of Agenda 2030 — not in opposition to it.

The seventeen Sustainable Development Goals represent something rare in human history: a nearly universal agreement among nations that hunger, illiteracy, preventable illness, and ecological collapse are not inevitable, and that the world can be organised to end them. That agreement is worth defending. Its first and most demanding promise — to leave no one behind — is one we recognise immediately, because it is the same promise Amistad Sagrada made in a much smaller voice, in a much smaller place, seventeen years ago, to the Quechua communities in the mountains above Písaq.

A promise of that magnitude deserves people willing to test it honestly. Not to weaken it. To root it.

What follows examines one gap between the Agenda's aspiration and its present practice — the gap as it appears from where we actually stand. We did not discover this gap. It was named carefully, and from within the sustainable development field itself, by two scholars whose essay occasioned this document and whom we credit with gratitude throughout. Our contribution is not the diagnosis. Our contribution is that we live inside it, and have for a long time.

And having lived inside it, we believe we have something to offer: not a critique, but a working model. Not a challenge to the Agenda, but a contribution toward its completion.

The Goals tell us where the world has agreed to go. They do not always tell us how a mountain community walks there without losing itself along the way.

That is the question this document takes up.

How to read this document. It is a companion to the Allin Kawsay Vision Document and assumes it throughout, referring to its Movements and Chapters rather than repeating them. Where the Vision Document describes what we are building, this document describes the ground it stands on: who decides, who owns what is learned, and how a community's authority over its own future is made to outlast the people who happened to begin the work — ourselves included.

The Silence in the Agenda

The promise, and the practice

Agenda 2030 opens with a commitment of unusual moral clarity: that no one is to be left behind, and that those furthest behind are to be reached first. It obliges its signatories not merely to improve averages, but to seek out precisely those whom averages hide.

In July 2026, two scholars of indigenous rights — **Juan Daniel Oliva Martínez**, dean, researcher and professor at the Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, and **Elías Ángeles-Hernández**, doctor of law, researcher at UC3M and professor at the UNAM — published an essay in *Ojarasca* asking a question that gives this document its starting point: sustainable development without indigenous peoples? They wrote following the Ninth Meeting of the Forum of the Countries of Latin America and the Caribbean on Sustainable Development, convened by ECLAC in Santiago de Chile from the 13th to the 16th of April.

Their observation is measured, and it is uncomfortable. Governments were present. Academia was present. The private sector and organised civil society were present. But the region's indigenous peoples — the peoples whose territories hold much of what the Goals exist to protect — were marginal or absent from the principal panels, and so had no opportunity to be seen or heard. In the closing text, the authors note, they appear chiefly as vulnerable groups to be protected by States: a framing the authors call clearly paternalistic.

The Forum's own text, they observe, affirms the importance of integrating indigenous and traditional knowledge, and declares it crucial to reach the furthest behind first and to empower those in situations of vulnerability. And yet those same peoples had no place in the programme, and no seat at the tables where decisions affecting their territories were drawn. The authors name this a *rhetorical paradox*. We would put it more simply, and more sadly: it is the difference between being spoken about and being spoken with.

The scale of what is at stake

The figures the authors cite from UNESCO make the omission difficult to file away as a matter of protocol. Fifty-eight million people. More than eight hundred distinct indigenous peoples. Ten percent of the region's population — and the guardians of the greatest biological and linguistic diversity on the continent. In Bolivia and Guatemala they are the majority. In Mexico they number thirty million. Yet demographic weight, the authors observe, has not translated into political weight. Their survival, in the authors' striking phrase, remains a heroic anomaly against structures that, for all the normative progress, seem designed for their erosion.

This is not, in the end, only a question of justice. It is a question of competence. A sustainability policy that excludes the people who have sustained these landscapes longest is a policy reasoning without its best evidence.

The deeper silence

The authors then point to something quieter, and more consequential than any single conference agenda.

Across all seventeen Goals, the right of indigenous peoples to self-determination — la libre determinación — is nowhere named. The authors call this a revealing silence.

This right is not one entitlement among many. It is, in their words, the foundation on which the rest of their rights rest. Without it, a right to land is a request. A right to culture is a courtesy. A right to be consulted is a formality that concludes whenever the consulting party decides it has heard enough. And the omission has a practical consequence they name precisely: where self-determination is unnamed, free, prior and informed consent has no secure foundation — and decisions about indigenous territories are made in indigenous absence. Exclusion at this level, they warn, is the prelude to legal unprotection and territorial dispossession.

They note the resulting contradiction with Goal 17, which calls for a genuine global alliance among governments, the private sector, academia and civil society. An alliance is defined by its partners. One that omits the guardians of the region's biodiversity is not yet complete — not as a matter of ideology, but as a matter of arithmetic.

How we receive this

We do not receive it as an indictment. We receive it as an unfinished sentence.

It is worth noting that the authors' own conclusion is constructive rather than rejectionist. They do not argue that Agenda 2030 should be abandoned. They argue that traditional knowledge should not be integrated as though it were a collection of museum pieces, that indigenous peoples must be recognised as full political subjects, and that to ignore their governance and their right to prior consent is not only an ethical error — it condemns sustainability policy to failure for want of solid roots.

We agree. And because we happen to live in one of the places where this could be demonstrated rather than argued, we have spent seventeen years quietly attempting it.

The Peruvian Ground

Peru has done more than most. That is precisely why the remaining gap matters.

A country that legislated first

Peru ratified ILO Convention 169 — the binding international instrument on the rights of indigenous and tribal peoples — and brought it into force in 1995. In 2011 it became the first country in the region to enact a general law on prior consultation: **Law No. 29785**, the Law of the Right to Prior Consultation of Indigenous or Native Peoples. In a hemisphere where such commitments are often left to jurisprudence, this was a real and creditable step, and Peru deserves recognition for taking it.

The distinction that follows is not a criticism of Peru. It is the distinction the international standard itself draws — and understanding it is what allows an organisation like ours to know where its own responsibility begins.

Consultation and consent are not the same word

Under Law 29785, the State must consult. It must convene, inform, and dialogue in good faith, within a defined procedural window. But if that dialogue closes without agreement, the final decision returns to the State. The community holds a well-protected right to be heard. It does not hold a right to decide.

Free, prior and informed consent — as articulated in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples — asks for something further: that the answer may be *no*, and that *no* is an answer, not a delay.

Consultation asks a community to speak. Consent allows a community to decide.

A remarkable five weeks

In early 2024 this question moved through the Peruvian courts twice, in opposite directions, within the span of five weeks.

On **26 January 2024**, the Constitutional Bench of the High Court in Lima ruled that the Constitution requires Congress to implement free, prior and informed consent for legislative measures affecting the rights of indigenous peoples — a significant advance beyond the standard of consultation established in 2011.

On **2 March 2024**, the Constitutional Tribunal, ruling in a case brought by the peasant communities of Chila Chambilla and Chila Pucará in Puno, held that free, prior and informed consent is not a fundamental right protected by the Constitution. The decision drew expressions of concern from more than forty indigenous and civil society organisations, from the national Ombudsman, and from the Ministry of Culture itself.

We record both rulings because they are matters of public record, and because any honest account of the legal ground beneath this work must include them. We draw no political conclusion from them. Peru's courts will settle their own jurisprudence in their own time, through their own institutions. That is their work, and we take no side in it.

The one conclusion we do draw

It is a practical one, and it is the hinge of everything that follows.

A community's authority over its own future should not have to wait on the outcome of a legal debate it did not choose to enter.

Whatever the law ultimately settles, Allin Kawsay holds to the higher standard by its own choice — not because it is compelled to, but because it is right, and because a relationship built on anything less does not survive a generation. We are not asking the Peruvian State for permission to honour these communities. We are simply honouring them, and then building the structures that make that honouring durable, transparent, and binding on whoever comes after us.

This is the spirit in which every commitment in Part Five is offered: voluntarily, in full compliance with Peruvian law, in open partnership with Peruvian institutions — and exceeding what either currently requires. It is the same spirit the Vision Document names in Chapter Ten, where government partnership is sought wherever it strengthens the work, and never at the cost of the community's own sovereignty over what is built.

PART THREE

The Nine Pillars and the Seventeen Goals

We speak the language of the Goals fluently, and gladly. We simply do not let it do our seeing for us.

The Sustainable Development Goals are a common tongue. They allow a mountain community above Písaq to be understood in Lima, in Geneva, in a foundation office in another hemisphere. That is a real gift, and we use it without reservation: every pillar of Allin Kawsay maps to the Goals, and we intend to report against them honestly.

But a language is not a source. Ours is **Allin Kawsay** — the good life, lived well together: life in right relationship with the land, the community, the ancestors, and the generations still to come. The Goals measure outcomes. Allin Kawsay asks whether a life is whole. Both are needed. Only one of them is ours.

What follows sets each of the nine pillars — in the canonical order of the Vision Document — beside the Goals it serves, and beside the thing the indicator cannot quite see.

I · EDUCATION — Yachay Wasicha

Aligned Goals: SDG 4 (Quality Education), esp. 4.1, 4.5, 4.7

What the indicator measures. The Goal counts enrolment, literacy, completion.

What Allin Kawsay sees. Allin Kawsay asks whether a child can count, argue, pray and dream in Quechua — and then step into the wider world without being asked to leave any of it at the door. Target 4.7 asks for education *about* cultural diversity. Yachay Wasicha is education *from within* a culture: a school where, as the Vision Document puts it, Andean culture is not a subject but the living context in which all learning takes place. The deepest education empowers without uprooting.

II · NATURAL HEALING — Sumaq Kawsay

Aligned Goals: SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-being), esp. 3.4, 3.8

What the indicator measures. The Goal counts coverage, access, mortality.

What Allin Kawsay sees. Allin Kawsay asks about health sovereignty: whether a family's first recourse in illness is a tradition they trust, understand and own. At the Sumaq Kawsay Center — *beautiful life* — traditional healers and modern natural medicine practitioners work alongside one another, not in hierarchy, and a Healers' Council of elders and traditional practitioners holds authority over the healing philosophy itself. That last fact is the whole of Link One, expressed in one institution.

III · FOOD AND WATER

Aligned Goals: SDG 2 (Zero Hunger, esp. 2.4 and 2.5) · SDG 6 (Clean Water, esp. 6.6) · SDG 13 (Climate Action)

What the indicator measures. The Goal counts yield, undernourishment, water access.

What Allin Kawsay sees. Allin Kawsay asks who holds the seed. Target 2.5 calls for maintaining the genetic diversity of seeds and cultivated plants; here that diversity lives in the hands of the families who bred it over centuries, and the community seed library exists to keep it there. The *anden*es restored on the hillsides and the *amunas* recharging the aquifers are not heritage. They are working infrastructure, pre-Inka in origin and precisely suited to glacial retreat.

IV · CULTURAL REGENERATION

Aligned Goals: SDG 11.4 (safeguarding cultural heritage) · SDG 4.7

What the indicator measures. The Goal counts expenditure on heritage protection.

What Allin Kawsay sees. Allin Kawsay asks whether the language is spoken at dinner — not whether it is performed at a festival. The Vision Document is exact about this: a culture that is truly alive does not need to be preserved; it needs to be lived. The work is to create the conditions in which the living culture of this valley chooses itself, generation after generation.

V · YOUTH EMPOWERMENT

Aligned Goals: SDG 8 (Decent Work, esp. 8.6) · SDG 4.4 (relevant skills)

What the indicator measures. The Goal counts youth employment, training, skills.

What Allin Kawsay sees. Allin Kawsay asks a harder question: can a nineteen-year-old build a whole life here — and does she *want* to? The Skills Training Academy exists so that staying is the most compelling choice a young person can make, rather than a failure to leave.

VI · ELDER CARE

Aligned Goals: SDG 3 · SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities, esp. 10.2)

What the indicator measures. The Goal counts social inclusion and old-age support.

What Allin Kawsay sees. Allin Kawsay asks whether the elders are *needed*. An elder receiving a meal has been included. An elder teaching in the school, sitting in council, holding the seed and the story, has not been included — she has been restored to her place. Elders here are living libraries, and the care that flows to them is met by the knowledge that flows back: *Ayni* in its most literal form.

VII · COMMUNITY ECONOMY

Aligned Goals: SDG 1 (No Poverty) · SDG 8 · SDG 9.3 (financial inclusion for small-scale enterprises) · SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption)

What the indicator measures. The Goal counts income, poverty lines, productivity.

What Allin Kawsay sees. Allin Kawsay asks where the value settles. *Ayni* and *Minka* are not folklore; they are functioning instruments of reciprocity and collective labour, and a cooperative economy built on them keeps value circulating inside the *ayllu* rather than draining out of the valley within a season. Target 9.3 asks specifically about access to financial services and market integration for small-scale enterprises — and this is where infrastructure, rightly built, serves rather than replaces what already works. A weaver's cooperative reaching a fair market without a middleman who keeps the margin; a natural-medicine product certified and sellable without surrendering the formula to whoever certifies it — these are not innovations imported from outside. They are old work, given the tools to reach further than a single village.

VIII · THE MOUNTAIN COMMUNITIES

Aligned Goals: SDG 15 (Life on Land, esp. 15.4 — mountain ecosystems) · SDG 6.6 · SDG 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy, esp. 7.1, 7.2) · SDG 11

What the indicator measures. The Goal counts ecosystem conservation and land degradation.

What Allin Kawsay sees. Target 15.4 speaks explicitly of conserving mountain ecosystems and the benefits they provide. We would only add that these ecosystems already have stewards — twelve of them, each with its own name, its own *Apu*, its own priorities and its own answer. The Vision Document commits to engaging each one individually, listening before proposing, and building what is needed and wanted on that community's own terms. None will be averaged into a statistic. Each may decline. The same holds for power. Grid electricity reaches these communities unevenly, and where it doesn't, the answer is not a single technology handed down from outside but a question asked locally: micro-hydro drawing on the same watersheds the *amunas* already recharge, in some places; solar, where the terrain makes a grid line uneconomical for a generation to come, in others. Energy sovereignty, like water sovereignty, means the choice of source stays with the community that will live with it.

IX · THE EXPANSION

Aligned Goals: SDG 17 (Partnerships, esp. 17.16 and 17.17)

What the indicator measures. The Goal counts partnerships and resources mobilised.

What Allin Kawsay sees. Allin Kawsay answers Goal 17 in the most direct way available: by becoming a partner worth having. What is learned here — the governance, the curricula, the water systems, the failures — becomes an open-source framework released to any community or institution that wants it, carried outward by young people from these mountains who were trained here and chose to go.

Two Goals that run through all nine

SDG 5 — Gender Equality. Not a pillar, because it is not a compartment. It is a condition of every pillar, and it is addressed directly in Part Four.

SDG 16 — Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions. Target 16.7 asks for responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at every level. We would observe, gently, that such institutions already exist in these mountains, and have for a very long time. They are called the community assembly and the council of elders. Our task is not to build them. Our task is to submit to them.

A Goal We Do Not Claim

Seventeen Goals in total. Fourteen now appear by name across the nine pillars above; two more — gender equality and strong institutions — run through all nine, as just described. That leaves one: SDG 14, Life Below Water. The Sacred Valley sits at altitude, far from any coast, and nothing built here touches a marine or coastal ecosystem. We name the absence rather than manufacture a link that would not hold. A Goal not claimed honestly is worth more than one claimed for completeness.

The Missing Links

Five places where the Goals, as written, do not quite reach the ground — and what we can contribute there.

These are offered as contributions to a shared body of practice, not as corrections. Each is drawn from what seventeen years in these communities has actually taught us — including, and especially, the parts we got wrong first.

Link One · Self-determination: the foundation beneath the Goals

If self-determination is unnamed in the Agenda, then any project working in indigenous territory must supply it deliberately, or it will simply reproduce the silence. Allin Kawsay supplies it through free, prior and informed consent held as a living practice rather than a signature.

- **Free.** Consent is sought without pressure, inducement, or the quiet coercion of a community's need. Every community retains the right to say *no* — to a component, to a phase, or to the whole — without penalty, without the withdrawal of existing services, and without the loss of our friendship. A *no* that costs something is not free.
- **Prior.** Engagement begins at conception, not at approval. This is the Vision Document's own first rule for the mountain communities: listening before proposing, always. Timelines follow the community's rhythms of deliberation — the assembly's calendar, the agricultural year, the time an elder needs to think — not the funding cycle of a donor in another hemisphere.
- **Informed.** Technical plans, budgets, risks and trade-offs are presented in Quechua, orally and visually, through participatory mapping and open questions, until the community understands them as well as we do. The standard is comprehension. A signature on a document nobody could read is not consent; it is paperwork.
- **Continuing.** Consent is re-affirmed at every major milestone — design, construction, operation, expansion — and may be withdrawn. Consent that cannot be withdrawn was never consent. It was capture.

Link Two · Living knowledge, not museum pieces

The authors of the essay are precise here: it is not enough to integrate indigenous knowledge as though it were a collection of museum pieces. In a valley shaped by tourism, this is not an abstract risk. It is the specific and unglamorous danger we manage every year — that ancestral knowledge is honoured in language while being quietly converted into someone else's asset: a photograph, a dataset, a paragraph in a sustainability report, a technique published without its source. Knowledge honoured that way is knowledge embalmed.

Allin Kawsay treats Quechua knowledge as what it is: an evolving science, currently in use, presently adapting.

The *amunas* are the plainest proof. These are pre-Inka channels that sow rainwater into the earth in the wet season, directing it toward fractured rock so that it percolates slowly through the geology and emerges months later in the springs that feed the dry season. Water sown in February is harvested in August. This is not a memory of good engineering. It *is* good engineering — and in a watershed losing its glaciers it is among the most relevant climate adaptation technologies available to us. It will be restored here not as heritage but as infrastructure, by the descendants of the people who designed it, alongside hydrologists with the humility to learn something.

The test is simple: does the knowledge remain in the hands that hold it, free to change? A tradition permitted only to repeat itself has been mounted and framed. A tradition free to innovate is alive.

Link Three · Leave no one behind, applied inward

The Agenda's first principle is usually pointed outward — at nations, at institutions, at the powerful. It also has to be pointed at ourselves, and at the structures we convene.

Quechua women hold much of what this entire vision depends on: the seed knowledge, the water knowledge, the nutrition of the household, the daily transmission of language to children. The Vision Document already names them as the historic guardians of seed diversity and traditional food knowledge, and centres them in the demonstration farm and in household nutrition. They are also, very often, furthest from the formal table where decisions are recorded.

We say what follows with care, because we do not arrive from anywhere to instruct any community in its own governance. That would be the paternalism we are trying to leave behind, wearing a more fashionable coat. Each community is sovereign over its own customs and its own pace.

So we commit only to what is ours to commit: the conduct of our own work.

- No council, committee or working group that **we** convene or fund will proceed without meaningful participation by women — with parity as our standard and our working commitment. In the Community Steering Council, as the Vision Document states, women's participation is treated as essential to governing wisely, not as a courtesy extended after the fact.
- We will resource **Women's Assemblies** wherever they are wanted, so that women may deliberate together and arrive at mixed forums with a consolidated voice rather than an isolated one.
- We will fund training in legal advocacy, financial management and negotiation for women who want it — because a seat at a table is not the same as the fluency to use it.
- And we will accept, without argument, that a community may organise itself differently. Our commitment binds us. It does not bind them.

Link Four · Knowledge that cannot be taken

If traditional knowledge is a living science, then the question of who owns it is not academic. Allin Kawsay's position, already set out in Chapter Eleven of the Vision Document, is that the community owns its own data, its own stories, and its own images — and that nothing is given away in exchange for convenience.

- **Data sovereignty.** Photographs, recordings, interviews, maps, seed and soil data, curricula, and any documentation of ceremony or practice belong to the community from which they came. The cultural archive is built and held by the community, with clear protocols protecting sacred knowledge not meant for open circulation. Nothing is published, licensed or shared externally — by us, by researchers, by funders, or by visitors — without specific written permission for that specific use.
- **Benefit-sharing.** Where any commercial product, publication, curriculum or policy derives from community knowledge, a binding agreement returns value to the community fund. Not gratitude. Value.

Two legal instruments support this, and it is worth naming precisely what each one does — and does not do.

Peru's Law No. 27811 (2002) is the primary and correct instrument. It establishes a *sui generis* national regime for the protection of the collective knowledge of indigenous peoples linked to biological resources, providing for registers of collective knowledge, licensing requirements for its use, and a fund for the development of indigenous peoples. It was designed for exactly this situation. We intend to work within it, with the communities, from the beginning.

Andean Community Decision 486 (2000) is a regional industrial property regime, and its relevance here is narrower but real: within the Andean Community, a patent granted over traditional knowledge without the prior informed consent of the community it came from is subject to absolute nullity. It is a safeguard against misappropriation through the patent system. It is *not* a general shield over all cultural knowledge, and we will not represent it as one.

We are deliberate about this distinction. A vision document that overstates its legal protections is not being bold. It is setting a community up to discover, at the worst possible moment, that a promise it relied on was decorative.

Link Five · Begin with the children

The last link is the oldest thing we know, and the one we would keep if we had to give up all the rest.

We begin with the children — never through them, but with them.

Amistad Sagrada has always entered a community by beginning with its children. That is how the work took root in Pampallacta and Paru Paru, and it remains the model. But the preposition carries the whole ethic, and it is worth stating plainly why.

Development work in indigenous territories has a long and well-documented habit of using children as an instrument: as the soft opening into a family's trust, as the photograph that raises the funds, as the generation to be re-made in the image of somewhere else. Even done tenderly, this treats a child as a means.

A child is not a route to a community. A child is a member of one — already whole, already belonging, already an heir to a language and a mountain and a name. We begin with the children because they are the beginning, and for no other reason. It is written into our governance so that nobody who comes after us can quietly forget it.

The Architecture of Consent

Principles committed. Instruments proposed. Nothing here is finalised without Peruvian counsel — and, above all, without the communities themselves.

An architecture of consent designed without consent would refute itself in its first line. What follows is therefore a proposal, offered for the communities' own examination, amendment or refusal, and for review by qualified Peruvian legal counsel before anything is signed.

Why these structures exist

They are not a defence against anyone. Peru's institutions are our partners, not our adversaries: Amistad Sagrada intends to register what should be registered, comply fully with national and regional law, work openly with the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Health, IPEBA, the municipality of Písaq and the regional government of Cusco — and to welcome scrutiny from all of them.

These structures exist for a simpler and more humbling reason.

Good intentions are not inheritable.

Sanan will not always be here. Directors change. Boards change. Funders change, and so do their priorities. Seventeen years of trust can be undone by one successor who means well and does not understand. The one thing that must not depend on the character of whoever happens to be in the room is **who decides**. So we propose to write that into structures that will outlast every individual involved — beginning with ourselves.

The six instruments

1 · The Community Steering Council — already governing

This one is not a proposal. It is the Vision Document's Chapter Ten, and it is the foundation the rest rests on. The Community Steering Council — elders, parents, youth representatives, traditional authorities from all twelve communities, teachers, healers, and the leadership of Amistad Sagrada — is *governing*, *not advisory*. Quechua community members lead it. Decisions are reached by the consensus process that has organised Andean community life for centuries. Alongside it, the Healers' Council holds autonomous authority over the healing philosophy and practice of Sumaq Kawsay.

Two provisions of that chapter deserve to be read again in the light of this document, because they are quietly radical. First: in each mountain community, authority over what happens on that community's land remains with the community itself. Second: major funder commitments above a threshold set by the Council require the Council's approval before they may be accepted — so that no source of money can quietly reshape the work beyond what the community itself endorses. That is FPIC, in a funding clause, already written down.

2 · The Community Agreement

The Vision Document's operational plan already provides for formal land-use agreements with each participating mountain community, under which community land remains in the community's name. We propose to deepen those agreements into full Community Agreements whose core provision is this: consent is a *continuing condition* of every phase, not a signature at the outset. Should a community assembly withdraw consent, the agreement triggers a pause and, if the community wishes, an orderly and pre-agreed wind-down — with no penalty, no clawback, and no forfeiture of what has already been built for and with them. What is theirs remains theirs.

3 · Biocultural Heritage Territory recognition

There is already a working precedent in this valley. The *Parque de la Papa* — six Quechua communities collectively stewarding over twelve thousand hectares and conserving more than thirteen hundred native potato varieties, repatriating seed from international gene banks and bridging ancestral practice with contemporary science — is not a theory of indigenous governance. It is our neighbour. We intend to explore a similar path, seeking recognition *in partnership with* the Ministry of Culture, so that customary governance of the territory is formally acknowledged within the Peruvian state rather than outside it.

4 · Community-majority control of any shared enterprise

The Vision Document describes a community economy of cooperatives and social enterprises — artisan goods, organic surplus, natural medicine, certificate programmes. Where a joint legal entity is formed to hold assets or operate any of these, we propose that community representatives hold majority voting control by statute, with supermajority thresholds for the decisions that matter most: land, budget, leadership. This is structure rather than sentiment. Sentiment is subject to revision; a bylaw is not.

5 · Protection of collective knowledge

Registration and licensing under Peru's Law 27811 regime; Decision 486 as a backstop against patent misappropriation within the Andean Community; and contractual benefit-sharing and data sovereignty provisions carried into every agreement with every partner, researcher, filmmaker and funder — without exception, and including Amistad Sagrada itself.

6 · Layered dispute resolution

Disagreement is not the failure of a relationship; it is a feature of every real one. We propose to meet it in three layers. **First**, the community's own justice mechanisms and councils of elders — because a matter settled where it arose is usually settled best. **Second**, an independent mediator chosen by mutual agreement. **Only then**, formal process. Alongside this, a confidential grievance channel will allow any community member to raise a concern about our conduct without fear of consequence. ILO Convention 169, which Peru has ratified, and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples serve throughout as our reference standards. The design goal is that disputes are resolved early, locally and relationally — so that they rarely need to travel any further.

Summary of the architecture

INSTRUMENT	WHAT IT PROTECTS	BASIS	STATUS
Community Steering Council	Who decides — including which funding may be accepted	Vision Document, Chapter Ten; Andean consensus practice	Committed — already governing
Community Agreement	Consent as a continuing condition; the right to pause or stop	Peruvian civil law; existing land-use agreements	Proposed — counsel review
Biocultural Heritage Territory	Customary governance of the territory	Ministry of Culture (Potato Park precedent)	To be sought in partnership
Community-majority entity	Structural control of shared enterprises	Peruvian company / association law	Proposed — counsel review
Law 27811 registration	Collective knowledge linked to biological resources	Peruvian sui generis regime (2002)	To be pursued with communities
Decision 486	Against patent misappropriation of traditional knowledge	Andean Community industrial property law	Standing safeguard
Layered dispute resolution	The relationship itself	Customary justice; ILO 169 and UNDRIP as reference	Proposed

Legal note. This document describes proposed structures and states the reasoning behind them. It does not constitute legal advice and is not a legal opinion. Every instrument described here will be reviewed, revised and validated by qualified Peruvian counsel, and submitted to the participating communities and the Community Steering Council for their own examination, before any of it is executed.

Measuring Allin Kawsay

We will report against the SDG indicators. We will also measure what they do not reach.

Every metric encodes a judgement about what matters. That is not a flaw in measurement; it is what measurement is. It becomes a problem only when a community is measured entirely by someone else's judgement of what its life is for.

Movement Three of the Vision Document already sets out the indicators this work holds itself to — children speaking Quechua in daily life, young people choosing to stay, elders cared for and teaching, spring flow through the dry season, native tree cover, seed diversity held and planted, ceremonies actively practised, community cohesion assessed through dialogue rather than survey. Those indicators stand. What this document adds is the frame around them.

Four registers of good living

The Vision Document's indicators fall naturally into four registers. Naming them makes the whole legible to institutions that speak the language of frameworks, without asking the communities to adopt anyone else's.

Territorial health

Soil vitality. Water quality, and water actually flowing from restored *amunas* in the dry months. Hectares of *andenes* returned to cultivation. Native tree cover across reforested watersheds. Native seed varieties held, planted and exchanged — not merely archived.

Social harmony

The strength of *Ayni* and *Minka* in ordinary weeks. Real participation of youth, women and elders in assemblies and in the Council. Disputes resolved within the community rather than escalated out of it. Whether people are, in a plain sense, helping each other.

Cultural vitality

Quechua spoken in homes, in the school, and in the operations of the work itself. Ceremonies held because they are meant, not because they are scheduled. Elders teaching. Knowledge moving from one generation to the next in the ordinary way — which is to say, in kitchens and fields, not only in classrooms.

Economic autonomy

Value retained within the valley. The share of the budget coming from community-controlled sources. Declining dependency on external aid — measured as a success and pursued as one, including by us, whose long-term intention is to become unnecessary.

Who decides what counts

The Community Steering Council does, with the communities, in assembly, each year. A metric imposed from outside measures the outsider's hopes. A metric chosen together measures a shared life.

And some of what matters most will always resist a spreadsheet. The Vision Document says it best: the elderly woman in Paru Paru who receives a hot meal each day is not a data point. She is the whole vision in miniature — a community remembering how to care for its own.

CLOSING

The Roots Beneath the Goals

The Sustainable Development Goals are branches: visible, necessary, reaching toward light, and worth every effort spent on them. We support them. We will work within them, report against them, and be glad they exist.

But branches are held by something. What we tend, in the mountains above Písaq, is the root system — the part that appears in no photograph and can be counted in no indicator, and without which nothing above the ground stands through a hard season.

A community that decides for itself. Knowledge that stays in the hands that made it. Women at the centre rather than at the margin. Elders needed. Children accompanied rather than used. Language spoken at dinner. Water in the *amunas*. Seed in the hands that bred it.

None of this is a rejection of Agenda 2030. All of it is what the Agenda asked for when it promised to leave no one behind — and then, in the ordinary way of large and well-meant human undertakings, did not quite finish the sentence.

We do not write to finish that sentence for anyone. We write to say that we intend to live it: here, in one valley, with twelve mountain communities and a school and a healing centre and a great many children — and to make what we learn freely available to anyone who wants it, including the institutions of the Agenda themselves, who we suspect want the same thing we do and are working with harder constraints than ours.

By 2030 we hope to offer not an argument, but an example.

It will be walkable. You will be able to come here, and see whether the water is running, and ask the people themselves.

Allin Kawsay — the good life, lived well together. Not a target to be reached by a deadline, but a way of being alive with one another, which either exists on a given Tuesday or does not.

Sources & Acknowledgements

With gratitude

This document exists because of an essay. We are indebted to its authors, and we name them with respect and with thanks:

Oliva Martínez, Juan Daniel, and Elías Ángeles-Hernández. “¿Desarrollo sostenible sin los pueblos indígenas?” *Ojarasca* (La Jornada), 10 July 2026.
<https://ojarasca.jornada.com.mx/2026/07/10/desarrollo-sostenible-sin-los-pueblos-indigenas-6630.html>

Juan Daniel Oliva Martínez — expert in indigenous peoples, sustainability, inclusion and cultural diversity; dean, researcher and professor at the Universidad Carlos III de Madrid (UC3M).

Elías Ángeles-Hernández — doctor of law; researcher at UC3M and professor at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM); specialist in indigenous law, ethnic minorities, multiculturalism and interculturality.

Their essay gave shape to the questions taken up here. The analysis in Part One follows their argument closely and is theirs, not ours. Any error in its restatement is entirely our own.

Instruments and frameworks referenced

United Nations, *Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* (2015), and the seventeen Sustainable Development Goals.

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), 2007 — in particular its articles concerning free, prior and informed consent.

International Labour Organization, Convention No. 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples (1989) — ratified by Peru, in force since 1995.

Peru, **Law No. 29785** (2011) — Law of the Right to Prior Consultation of Indigenous or Native Peoples, recognised in ILO Convention 169.

Peru, **Law No. 27811** (2002) — establishing the protection regime for the collective knowledge of indigenous peoples linked to biological resources.

Andean Community, **Decision 486** (2000) — Common Regime on Industrial Property, including the absolute nullity of patents granted over traditional knowledge without the prior informed consent of the community concerned.

Constitutional Bench of the High Court of Lima, ruling of 26 January 2024, on the constitutional requirement of free, prior and informed consent for legislative measures affecting indigenous peoples.

Constitutional Tribunal of Peru, ruling of 2 March 2024, in the case of the peasant communities of Chila Chambilla and Chila Pucará (Puno).

Parque de la Papa and the ANDES Association, Písaq, Cusco — six Quechua communities, over 12,000 hectares, more than 1,300 native potato varieties: the living precedent nearest to our own door.

Amistad Sagrada, *Allin Kawsay: A Regenerative Vision for the Indigenous Communities of the Sacred Valley of the Inkas* — the Vision Document this companion accompanies.

A note on accuracy

Where this document makes a legal claim, it has been checked, and where a claim could not be verified it has been removed rather than softened. Where an instrument's reach is narrower than we might wish, we have said so plainly. We would rather present a smaller argument that holds than a larger one that collapses under the first competent question — particularly since the people who would be harmed by that collapse are not us.

AMISTAD SAGRADA

Pisac · Sacred Valley · Cusco · Peru

www.amistadsagrada.com · amistadsagrada@gmail.com

Companion to the Allin Kawsay Vision Document · 2026

Allin Kawsay — The Good Life, Lived Well Together