NIILM University Shodh Manjusha: An International Multidisciplinary Journal

ISSN: 3049-2785 Vol.03, Issue 01, Jan- Jun 2026

Community-Led Sustainability Models Based on Indigenous Ecological Knowledge

Singh, Pooja Kumari[1] & Abhinandan, Madhavendra[2]

[1]Head of Institutional & Community Partnerships, Varad Pvt. Ltd., Nalanda, Bihar

[2] Assistant Librarian & IQAC – Coordinator, Rishihood University, Sonipat, Haryana

CITATION

Singh, P. K. & Abhinandan, M. (2026). Community-Led Sustainability Models Based on Indigenous Ecological Knowledge *Shodh Manjusha: An International Multidisciplinary Journal*, *03*(01), 144–159. https://doi.org/10.70388/sm250196

Article Info

Received: Oct 21, 2025

Accepted: Nov 23, 2025

Published: Jan 10, 2026

https://doi.org/10.70388/sm250196

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a theoretical examination of community-led sustainability models grounded in Indigenous Ecological Knowledge (IEK). In the context of growing ecological crises and the limited effectiveness of centralized and technocratic sustainability approaches, the study argues for the relevance of indigenous knowledge systems as alternative and complementary frameworks for sustainable development. Indigenous Ecological Knowledge is understood as a holistic, place-based, and intergenerational system of understanding that emphasizes balance, reciprocity, and ethical relationships between humans and nature. The paper conceptually explores how community agency, collective decision-making, and local governance structures enable sustainability models that are environmentally sound, socially inclusive, and culturally rooted. By linking IEK with key dimensions of sustainability environmental, social, cultural, and economical the study highlights how community-led approaches promote long-term ecological resilience rather than short-term growth. The analysis also contrasts IEK-based models with mainstream sustainability paradigms, demonstrating their potential to address issues of equity, participation, and ecological responsibility. The paper further discusses theoretical challenges in integrating indigenous knowledge into formal sustainability discourse, including epistemic marginalization and ethical concerns. Overall, the study contributes to sustainability theory by emphasizing the importance of indigenous epistemologies and community-led governance in shaping more just and sustainable futures.

Keywords: Indigenous Ecological Knowledge; Community-Led Sustainability; Sustainability Theory; Indigenous Epistemology; Ecological Governance; Community Agency; Cultural Sustainability; Environmental Ethics; Sustainable Development Models; Knowledge Systems

1. Introduction

The current age is marked by serious and interconnected sustainability challenges such as climate change, biodiversity loss, soil degradation, water scarcity, and growing social and ecological inequalities. These problems threaten food security, public health, cultural continuity, and the long-term resilience of both human and natural systems. Global frameworks like the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have tried to provide common targets and indicators, but progress remains uneven and slow, especially in vulnerable regions. Many communities still face environmental risks and livelihood insecurities, which shows that existing responses are not sufficient to deal with the complexity of the crisis. Much of mainstream sustainability thinking has been shaped by top-down and technocratic models. In these models, decisions are often made by governments, experts, and large institutions using standardized tools, quantitative indicators, and large-scale technologies. While such approaches can generate useful data and broad strategies, they are frequently criticized for being distant from the everyday realities of communities. They may ignore cultural values, spiritual relations with nature, and local histories of land and resource use. In many cases, policies designed far from the ground fail during implementation because they do not fit the local ecological, social, or cultural context. This gap between central planning and local experience weakens trust, reduces participation, and limits the long-term effectiveness of sustainability initiatives. Technocratic approaches also tend to privilege one way of knowing, usually modern Western science, as the main or even the only legitimate source of knowledge. Other forms of knowledge, especially those of Indigenous peoples and local communities, are often treated as secondary, "traditional," or only of practical interest in narrow fields like agriculture or forestry. This creates an epistemic hierarchy in which some knowledge systems are seen as universal and rational, while others are seen as particular, emotional, or outdated. Such hierarchies are increasingly questioned in debates on decolonization, environmental justice, and knowledge democracy. They raise ethical questions about whose knowledge counts, who decides, and how benefits and burdens are distributed in sustainability policies. In this context, there is a growing shift in research, policy, and practice towards community-led sustainability approaches. These approaches see communities not just as passive receivers of policies, but as active agents who can shape, implement, and monitor sustainability initiatives. Community-led approaches emphasize participation, local leadership, collective decision-making, and strong ties between people and their environment. They highlight that communities hold deep understandings of local

ecosystems, seasons, species, and resource cycles, and that these understandings are built through lived experience, daily practice, and long-term interaction with the land. By placing communities at the center, these models seek to create more legitimate, fair, and durable forms of sustainability. Indigenous Ecological Knowledge (IEK) has a central place within this shift towards community-led sustainability. IEK can be described as the cumulative body of knowledge, practices, values, and beliefs that Indigenous peoples develop over generations through direct contact with their territories and ecosystems. It includes detailed knowledge of plants, animals, soils, water, and climate, as well as cultural norms about how to use and care for these elements. IEK is usually transmitted orally and through practice, ceremony, stories, rituals, and everyday work. It is also dynamic: it changes and adapts as communities respond to new environmental conditions, social pressures, and technological changes. Because IEK is closely linked to identity, language, spirituality, and social organization, it is not just a technical resource but a holistic way of understanding and living in the world.

Research from diverse regions shows that IEK can support sustainable land and water management, climate adaptation, disaster risk reduction, and biodiversity conservation. For example, Indigenous farming systems may protect soil fertility and crop diversity; Indigenous fire management can reduce the risk of large wildfires; and Indigenous water practices can sustain wetlands and river systems. Such contributions are now being recognized in global discussions on climate change, conservation, and sustainable development. At the same time, IEK itself is under pressure from land dispossession, environmental degradation, forced displacement, cultural assimilation, and language loss. This situation creates an urgent need to protect IEK, respect the rights of its custodians, and avoid forms of extraction where knowledge is taken without fair recognition, benefit sharing, or consent. The purpose of this theoretical paper is to explore community-led sustainability models that are grounded in Indigenous Ecological Knowledge, without using empirical fieldwork, case studies, or primary data collection. The paper aims to show how IEK can enrich sustainability thinking at conceptual and policy levels. First, it seeks to clarify the meaning and scope of IEK and related terms, such as Indigenous and local knowledge, traditional ecological knowledge, and biocultural heritage. These concepts are sometimes used interchangeably, but they also carry different legal, political, and ethical implications, which need to be discussed carefully. Clarifying these terms will help to avoid confusion and to build a more precise conceptual language for further research. Second, the paper intends to critically examine the limitations of dominant technocratic sustainability models and to argue that community-led, IEK-based

approaches address several key gaps. Among these gaps are the lack of attention to local context, the marginalization of Indigenous voices, and the narrow focus on technical fixes rather than social and cultural transformation. By drawing on theoretical work in sustainability science, political ecology, Indigenous studies, and environmental governance, the paper will discuss how IEK can contribute principles such as relationality, reciprocity, respect, and responsibility. These principles help to rethink the human–nature relationship not as a one-way extraction of resources, but as a set of mutual obligations and long-term care. Third, the paper will propose a conceptual model of community-led sustainability grounded in IEK. This model will highlight core elements such as community governance and self-determination, collective rights to land and resources, intergenerational transmission of knowledge, and the ethical co-production of knowledge between Indigenous and scientific communities. In doing so, it will pay attention to the risks of co-optation and tokenism, where IEK is selectively used to support pre-existing agendas without real power-sharing. The conceptual model will stress that meaningful integration of IEK into sustainability policies requires recognition of Indigenous rights, protection of cultural and intellectual property, and mechanisms for equitable participation in decision-making. The scope of the study is thus deliberately theoretical and analytical. It relies on secondary literature and conceptual arguments rather than on new empirical data. This choice allows the paper to synthesize insights across different disciplines and regions, and to develop a more general framework that can guide future research and practice. By focusing on theory, the paper seeks to contribute to the growing conversation on decolonizing sustainability and reconfiguring global knowledge systems. It suggests that community-led sustainability models based on Indigenous Ecological Knowledge can offer more context-sensitive, just, and resilient pathways for addressing the current ecological crisis. Indigenous Ecological Knowledge (IEK) and community-led sustainability provide the main conceptual pillars for understanding how local communities can shape more just and resilient pathways for living with nature. This section explains these foundations using clear definitions and simple academic language.

2. Conceptual Foundations

The conceptual foundations of this paper rest on two main ideas: Indigenous Ecological Knowledge and community-led sustainability. Together, they show how knowledge, culture,

and local agency can guide sustainable practices that are rooted in place and history. The focus is on theory and meaning, not on measurement or empirical testing.

- **Indigenous Ecological Knowledge (IEK)**

Indigenous Ecological Knowledge can be understood as the body of knowledge, practices, skills, values, and beliefs that Indigenous peoples develop through long-term, intimate relationships with their lands, waters, and ecosystems. It is not a single document or set of rules, but a dynamic living system that grows and adapts as communities respond to environmental and social change. IEK covers many domains, such as agriculture, hunting, fishing, forest use, water management, weather observation, and healing practices, and it is deeply connected to language, spirituality, and social organization. A core characteristic of IEK is its holistic nature. Knowledge is not separated into narrow disciplines, but understood as an interconnected whole that links physical, emotional, spiritual, and social dimensions of life. Plants, animals, rivers, mountains, ancestors, and spirits may all be part of the same moral and relational universe. This means that decisions about land and resources are often guided by ethical principles such as respect, reciprocity, responsibility, and balance, rather than by purely economic or technical criteria. The environment is viewed as a network of relationships rather than as a stock of isolated resources to be exploited. IEK is also experiential and practice-based. It is generated through direct observation, trial and error, careful listening, and repeated engagement with places over long periods of time. Knowledge holders learn by doing things through farming, fishing, gathering, herding, and participating in rituals—rather than only through formal schooling or written texts. Seasonal cycles, animal behavior, plant growth, soil changes, and water flows are read and interpreted through daily experience. This experiential dimension gives IEK a high level of local specificity and makes it finely tuned to landscapes and climates. Intergenerational transmission is another defining feature of Indigenous Ecological Knowledge. Knowledge is passed from elders to youth through stories, songs, ceremonies, proverbs, and shared work. This process of transmission is not only about transferring information; it is also about shaping identity, values, and a sense of belonging to a community and territory. When languages are lost or when younger generations are removed from their lands, the continuity of IEK is put at risk. Thus, protecting IEK requires supporting the social and cultural structures that sustain intergenerational learning. The relationship between culture, ecology, and livelihood is central to understanding IEK. For Indigenous communities, the environment is not an

external backdrop but the foundation of cultural life and economic survival. Traditional farming systems, pastoral routes, fishing grounds, and sacred sites are embedded in cultural narratives and customary laws. Livelihood practices are guided by cultural norms that define what is allowed, what is forbidden, and what must be respected. Harvesting rules, taboos, seasonal restrictions, and rituals can function as informal institutions that regulate resource use and prevent overexploitation. In this way, IEK weaves together ecological understanding, cultural meaning, and everyday livelihood strategies. At the same time, IEK is not static or romantic. Indigenous communities innovate, adapt, and selectively adopt new tools and ideas while maintaining core values and relationships. IEK interacts with scientific knowledge, market pressures, and state policies in complex ways that can produce both opportunities and tensions. Recognizing IEK as a legitimate and sophisticated knowledge system therefore involves acknowledging its dynamism, its political dimensions, and the rights of Indigenous peoples to control how their knowledge is used and shared.

- **Community-Led Sustainability**

Community-led sustainability refers to approaches in which local communities play a central and active role in defining problems, setting priorities, designing solutions, and managing natural resources. Instead of being passive recipients of external interventions, community members exercise agency and leadership throughout the process. This concept is grounded in ideas of participation, empowerment, and self-determination, and it challenges models in which decisions are made mainly by distant authorities or external experts. The concept of community agency highlights the capacity of communities to act collectively, to organize, and to shape their own futures. Agency is expressed when community members identify environmental threats, debate possible responses, and take coordinated action to protect or restore their environment. Participation in this sense is not limited to attending meetings or providing information; it means having real influence over decisions, rules, and institutions. Community-led sustainability therefore requires inclusive spaces where different voices women, youth, elders, and marginalized groups—can contribute to deliberation and decision-making. Local decision-making is a key component of community-led sustainability. Decisions about land use, water allocation, forest management, or agricultural practices are taken as close as possible to the people who are directly affected and who hold detailed knowledge of local conditions. Local institutions, such as village councils, customary authorities, cooperatives, or community associations, often play a central role in this process.

When these institutions are transparent, accountable, and inclusive, they can support fair and adaptive management. Collective responsibility emerges when community members see themselves as jointly responsible for maintaining the health of their environment and for ensuring that resources are available for future generations. Community-led sustainability also understands sustainability as a social and cultural process, not only as a technical or environmental goal. It recognizes that practices such as conserving forests, protecting water sources, or maintaining agrobiodiversity are closely linked to cultural values, beliefs, rituals, and social norms. Celebrations, ceremonies, and local rules can all contribute to reinforcing sustainable behaviors and shared commitments. Change is therefore not limited to introducing new technologies or regulations; it involves transforming relationships, power structures, and ways of seeing the world. When connected with Indigenous Ecological Knowledge, community-led sustainability gains a deeper ethical and epistemic grounding. IEK provides detailed understanding of local ecosystems and long-term cycles, while community leadership ensures that this knowledge guides collective decisions and actions. Together, these concepts suggest that sustainable futures are more likely when communities are recognized as knowledge holders and rights-bearing actors, and when sustainability is approached as a living practice rooted in culture, identity, and everyday life.

3. Philosophical and Epistemological Framework

The philosophical and epistemological framework of this study contrasts Indigenous ways of knowing with modern scientific epistemology and then builds on core ideas such as holism, relationality, reciprocity, and epistemic justice. This framework helps to explain why Indigenous Ecological Knowledge (IEK) must be treated as a legitimate and equal partner in sustainability thinking, rather than as a mere supplement to scientific expertise.

- **Indigenous and scientific epistemologies**

Indigenous epistemologies are grounded in long-standing relationships among humans, the natural world, and the spiritual realm, and they emphasize interconnectedness, responsibility, and balance. Knowledge is understood as situated, place-based, and embodied, emerging from lived experience, oral traditions, and participation in community life, rather than from detached observation alone. In Indigenous perspectives, knowing is inseparable from being and doing: to know something is also to live it, to practice it, and to uphold the ethical responsibilities that come with that knowledge. Modern scientific epistemology, as it

developed in Western traditions, tends to stress objectivity, measurement, standardization, and generalizable laws. It often separates subject and object, mind and matter, nature and culture, and aims to minimize the influence of values, emotions, and particular contexts. This has generated powerful tools for analysis and prediction, but it can also lead to an abstract view of the world in which local meanings, spiritual dimensions, and relational responsibilities are bracketed out as "non-scientific." The long history of colonialism and development has meant that scientific epistemology has been institutionally privileged, while Indigenous and local epistemologies have been disqualified or treated as partial, anecdotal, or inferior forms of knowledge. In the context of sustainability, this epistemic imbalance has practical consequences. When policies rely only on scientific indicators and models, they may overlook subtle ecological signals, culturally grounded norms of care, and long-term experiential knowledge held by Indigenous communities. Acknowledging the coexistence of different epistemologies, and creating genuine dialogue between them, is therefore a central philosophical move in this paper.

- **Holistic and relational worldviews**

Indigenous epistemologies are often described as holistic and relational because they understand reality as a web of relationships rather than a collection of isolated units. Holism means that emotional, spiritual, cognitive, and physical dimensions of life are seen as interconnected, and that human well-being depends on the health of wider social and ecological systems. In such worldviews, it is not meaningful to separate environmental issues from social, cultural, or spiritual concerns, because all are woven together in a single pattern of life. Relationality is a key concept here: humans are related not only to other humans, but also to animals, plants, rivers, mountains, and unseen beings, which are often understood as kin or as people with agency. This relational ontology shapes how knowledge is produced and used: knowing involves entering respectful relationships, listening to more-than-human others, and recognizing that every action affects the broader network of life. In environmental governance, a relational worldview supports practices that maintain harmony, reciprocity, and long-term balance, rather than maximizing short-term extraction or profit.

- **Human–nature reciprocity and ethical ecology**

A central ethical principle within many Indigenous traditions is reciprocity between humans and nature. Reciprocity implies a two-way relationship in which humans receive gifts such as

food, water, materials, and spiritual support from the land and are therefore obliged to give back through respectful behavior, careful stewardship, and ceremonial offerings. This stands in contrast to dominant models that frame nature primarily as a provider of "resources" or "services" for humans, with little emphasis on what humans owe in return. Indigenous notions of kin centricity, where humans see themselves as part of an extended ecological family, deepen this sense of ethical obligation. When forests, rivers, or species are understood as relatives, exploitation without consent or limit becomes a violation of kinship duties. Ethical ecology in this sense is not only about avoiding harm but about actively nurturing the conditions for the flourishing of all beings within the community of life. Such an ethic supports sustainable practices such as rotational farming, careful harvesting, protection of sacred sites, and culturally embedded rules that prevent overuse of resources. This principle of reciprocity challenges instrumental views of nature and calls for a redefinition of sustainability that centers mutual care, gratitude, and responsibility. It also invites reconsideration of policy tools so that they recognize and support reciprocal relationships, rather than undermining them through purely market-based or technocratic interventions.

- **Epistemic justice and legitimacy of Indigenous knowledge**

The philosophical idea of epistemic justice is crucial for understanding why Indigenous Ecological Knowledge has often been marginalized and what is required to address that harm. Epistemic injustice occurs when people are unfairly treated as knowers for example, when their testimonies are given less credibility because of prejudice, or when their concepts and categories are excluded from public reasoning. Indigenous peoples have experienced both testimonial injustice (their knowledge being dismissed as myth, superstition, or anecdote) and hermeneutical injustice (their ways of understanding the world not fitting into dominant interpretive frameworks).Achieving epistemic justice requires more than simply adding Indigenous data to existing scientific models; it involves recognizing Indigenous knowledge systems as legitimate on their own terms, with their own standards of evidence, validation, and ethics. This includes respecting Indigenous sovereignty over knowledge, ensuring free, prior, and informed consent for any external use, and creating equitable benefit-sharing arrangements. It also calls for institutional changes in research, education, and policy so that Indigenous scholars and communities can shape agendas, methods, and interpretations, rather than being confined to the role of informants. Within the framework of this paper, epistemic justice is both a philosophical commitment and a practical requirement for community-led

sustainability. Treating IEK as a fully legitimate knowledge system means building collaborative, respectful relationships in which different epistemologies meet on more equal grounds. This shift opens the way for holistic, relational, and reciprocal approaches to sustainability that honor Indigenous worldviews while engaging critically with contemporary ecological crises.

4. Theoretical Linkages Between IEK and Sustainability

Theoretical linkages between Indigenous Ecological Knowledge (IEK) and sustainability can be understood by seeing IEK as a dynamic system that guides long-term coexistence between communities and their environments. This section explains how IEK operates as a living sustainability system and how it aligns with key dimensions of sustainability in environmental, social, cultural, and economic terms. As required, references and citations are normally provided based on external sources, but tool access is currently unavailable; citations are therefore omitted in this response.

- **Theoretical linkages between IEK and sustainability**

IEK offers more than isolated practices; it provides a coherent way of thinking about life, responsibility, and survival over generations. Theoretically, it links knowledge, values, and institutions in ways that support resilience and long-term ecological care. Understanding these linkages helps to explain why community-led models grounded in IEK can contribute to more just and context-sensitive sustainability pathways.

- **IEK as a living sustainability system**

IEK can be viewed as a living sustainability system because it emerges from continuous interaction between communities and their ecosystems, and because it is constantly renewed through practice, adaptation, and intergenerational learning. Coexistence with nature is not a separate “policy goal” but a basic condition of life: human well-being is understood as inseparable from the health of land, water, plants, and animals. In many Indigenous traditions, the land is treated as a relative or an ancestor, which creates strong moral duties to protect ecological balance and avoid actions that would harm the broader community of life. This system embeds regenerative and adaptive principles at its core. Regeneration refers to practices that restore and enhance ecological fertility, such as maintaining soil health,

conserving water, protecting seed diversity, and allowing ecosystems time to recover after use. Adaptive principles are visible in flexible land-use patterns, seasonal mobility, rotational harvesting, and diversified livelihoods that spread risk and respond to climate and ecosystem changes. Because IEK is based on long-term observation and feedback, it encourages learning from disturbances, adjusting practices, and incorporating new knowledge while retaining core ethical commitments. In theoretical terms, IEK thus functions as an endogenous system of adaptive management, rooted in culture and experience rather than in external technical designs.

- **Alignment with dimensions of sustainability**

IEK aligns closely with the multiple dimensions of sustainability environmental, social, cultural, and economic, while offering a distinctive emphasis on sufficiency, balance, and responsibility rather than unlimited growth. For environmental sustainability, IEK provides detailed, place-based understandings of ecosystems, species behavior, seasonal cycles, and thresholds of use. These understandings support practices such as controlled burning, selective harvesting, protection of key habitats, and maintenance of landscape mosaics that sustain biodiversity and ecological functions. Environmental limits are embedded in customary rules, taboos, and ceremonial obligations, which operate as informal regulations to prevent overuse and to keep human activity within the carrying capacity of the environment. In terms of social sustainability; IEK is tied to community organization, shared norms, and systems of mutual support. Knowledge is produced and held collectively, and decisions about resource use are often made through communal deliberation, which reinforces social cohesion and shared responsibility. Roles for elders, women, and youth in knowledge transmission and environmental care can strengthen intergenerational solidarity and ensure that social structures remain robust under stress. Community-based governance of land and resources thus becomes a foundation for social resilience and local empowerment. Cultural sustainability is directly supported by IEK, since knowledge, language, ritual, and identity are deeply intertwined. Stories, songs, ceremonies, and sacred sites encode ecological knowledge and ethical rules, preserving them in forms that are meaningful and memorable for the community. Protecting IEK is therefore not only an environmental task but also a cultural and linguistic one: when IEK is maintained and respected, cultural continuity and a sense of belonging are reinforced. This cultural grounding gives sustainability efforts depth and legitimacy those purely technical approaches often lack. From an economic perspective, IEK

tends to emphasize economic sufficiency over continuous economic growth. Livelihood strategies informed by IEK aim to meet needs in ways that maintain ecological integrity, rather than maximizing output or profit at any cost. Concepts of "enough," sharing, and reciprocity counterbalance accumulation, while diversified subsistence activities reduce dependence on volatile markets. This does not mean that Indigenous economies are static or opposed to innovation; rather, it means that economic choices are evaluated in relation to long-term ecological health, social obligations, and cultural values. Theoretically, this orientation aligns with post-growth or degrowth perspectives that question the compatibility of endless growth with planetary boundaries. Taken together, these dimensions show that IEK is not a set of isolated techniques but a comprehensive framework that integrates environmental care, social relations, cultural meaning, and economic sufficiency. When communities can exercise leadership based on IEK, sustainability is practiced as a living, relational process rooted in place one that can offer valuable guidance for rethinking dominant models of development and for designing more equitable, resilient sustainability policies.

5. Community-Led Sustainability Models: A Theoretical Typology

Community-led sustainability models describe ways in which communities organize knowledge, values, and institutions to care for their environments. These models do not represent fixed categories; they are analytical tools for understanding patterns of practice and governance. All four models assume that communities hold valid knowledge, exercise agency, and have ethical responsibilities towards the more-than-human world.

- **Stewardship model – community as ecological custodian**

In the stewardship model, the community is understood primarily as an ecological custodian charged with caring for land, water, and species across generations. Stewardship is rooted in the idea that the community has obligations, not just rights, in relation to its territory. These obligations are guided by principles such as respect, responsibility, restraint, and care. The stewardship model emphasizes guardianship rather than ownership. The land is not simply a commodity but a living relative, ancestor, or gift that must be protected and passed on in a healthy state to future generations. Decision-making processes focus on questions such as: What uses are compatible with long-term ecological integrity? What limits are necessary to avoid harming key species or sacred places? Community leaders, elders, and knowledge

holders often play central roles in interpreting signs of ecological change and in advising on appropriate responses. This model can be applied theoretically to community-based monitoring, Indigenous ranger programs, or local conservation initiatives, but in this paper, it is treated conceptually, without empirical examples. Its main function is to highlight the ethical dimension of community leadership and the framing of humans as caretakers within a broader ecological community.

- **Commons-based model – collective resource governance**

The common-based model frames land, forests, fisheries, grazing areas, or water sources as shared resources governed by the community through collective rules and institutions. Rather than seeing resources as open-access or individually owned, this model stresses common rights and common responsibilities. The focus is on how communities define boundaries, allocate use rights, monitor behavior, and enforce norms to prevent overuse. In this model, institutions such as customary councils, village assemblies, or user groups establish rules about who can use which resources, when, and under what conditions. These rules are often informed by IEK, including knowledge of ecological thresholds, seasonal cycles, and species behavior. Sanctions, social pressure, and conflict-resolution mechanisms help to maintain compliance. The commons-based model demonstrates that community-level governance can be capable of sophisticated resource management, countering the assumption that only state or market mechanisms can regulate resource use effectively. Theoretically, this model links IEK to ideas from commons theory and political ecology, showing how local knowledge and collective institutions work together. It also raises questions of internal equity and inclusion, for example, how women, youth, or marginalized groups participate in commons governance and benefit from shared resources.

- **Regenerative model – cyclical and nature-based systems**

The regenerative model focuses on cyclical processes and nature-based systems that restore, rather than deplete, ecological health. Here, sustainability is not defined as sustaining the status quo but as actively regenerating soils, waters, species, and landscapes. The model is built on the recognition that ecosystems are dynamic and that human activity can be designed to support renewal and resilience. In a regenerative model, IEK informs practices such as rotational land use, fallowing, polycultures, agroforestry, and controlled burning, all of which work with natural cycles. Knowledge of local climates, species interactions, and disturbance

regimes guides decisions about timing, intensity, and location of use. Feedback from the environment—such as changes in indicator species, soil structure, or water flow signals when practices need adjustment. Conceptually, this model aligns IEK with emerging discourses on regenerative agriculture, ecosystem restoration, and circular economies, but it emphasizes that regenerative principles have long been present in Indigenous and local practices. The key theoretical point is that communities can design livelihood systems where human activity contributes to ecological improvement and resilience, rather than simply minimizing damage.

- **Cultural–ecological model – integration of culture and ecology**

The cultural–ecological model highlights the deep integration of cultural life and ecological relations in community-led sustainability. In this model, rituals, stories, songs, languages, and artistic expressions are not separate from environmental practice; they are the means through which ecological knowledge and ethical rules are transmitted, remembered, and renewed. Sacred sites, taboos, and ceremonial calendars can, in theory, function as institutions that regulate access to spaces and species, protecting them from overuse or desecration. Myths and narratives encode warnings, instructions, and moral lessons about how to behave towards animals, plants, and landscape features. By embedding ecological rules in cultural forms, the community ensures that sustainability principles are internalized from an early age and linked to identity, belonging, and spirituality. This model underscores that cultural sustainability and ecological sustainability are mutually reinforcing. Threats such as language loss, cultural assimilation, or disruption of ritual life can therefore weaken ecological governance, while environmental degradation can undermine cultural practices tied to specific places. For theoretical work, the cultural–ecological model invites analysis of how cultural revitalization and ecological restoration can be pursued together within community-led initiatives.

- **Integrative perspective**

Although presented separately, these four models are interrelated and often overlap. A single community may act as steward, manage commons, apply regenerative practices, and sustain cultural–ecological ties at the same time. The typology is useful for clarifying different dimensions of community-led sustainability grounded in Indigenous Ecological Knowledge: ethical guardianship, collective governance, regenerative practice, and cultural integration. Even without empirical data, these models provide a conceptual map for analyzing how

communities can shape sustainability pathways that are locally grounded, relational, and attentive to intergenerational responsibilities.

Conclusion

This theoretical paper has explored community-led sustainability models grounded in Indigenous Ecological Knowledge (IEK) as vital alternatives to technocratic approaches. IEK emerges as a holistic, relational system integrating experiential wisdom, intergenerational transmission, and ethical reciprocity to foster ecological balance, social cohesion, and cultural continuity. The proposed typology stewardship, commons-based, regenerative, and cultural-ecological models illustrates how communities can govern resources, restore ecosystems, and embed sustainability in identity and practice. These models hold conceptual significance by advancing epistemic justice, challenging Western knowledge hierarchies, and redefining sustainability as a lived, place-based process rather than abstract metrics. They emphasize human-nature reciprocity, local agency, and sufficiency overgrowth, offering decolonial pathways for environmental governance. Future theoretical research should refine this typology through interdisciplinary dialogue with political ecology, philosophy, and policy studies, while prioritizing collaborative methodologies that respect Indigenous sovereignty. Normative work can explore integrating IEK principles into global frameworks like the SDGs. Ultimately, recognizing IEK-based models elevates community leadership, promoting resilient, equitable futures amid ecological crises.

References:

1. Anjum Buriro, S., Ali Abro, A., & Abbas Abro, A. (2024). Sindhi indigenous ecological knowledge: Sustainable practices for climate change resilience. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, *13*(3), 734–748. https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2024.13.3.61
2. Datta, R., Chapola, J., & Lewis, K. (2025). Rethinking indigenous community-led water sustainability: Decolonial and relational approaches in Western Canada. *Water*, *17*(3), 334. https://doi.org/10.3390/w17030334
3. Muthukrishnan, R., & Datta, R. (2023). *Indigenous practice and community-led climate change solutions*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003389064

4. Parsons, M., Nalau, J., & Fisher, K. (2017). Alternative perspectives on sustainability: Indigenous knowledge and methodologies. *Challenges in Sustainability*, *5*(1), 7–14. https://doi.org/10.12924/CIS2017.05010007
5. (2025). Tribal knowledge system: A modern approach for development sustainable business models. *European Economic Letters*. https://doi.org/10.52783/eel.v14i4.2285
6. Speakman, D. M., & Arciga, D. E. H. (2024). Fungi, forests, and futures: Exploring the Tlahuica'sMycotourism practices as A model for sustainable development. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Innovative Research*, *1*(2). https://doi.org/10.58806/ijmir.2024.v1i2n03
7. Suwono, I. (2024). Community behavior based on traditional ecological knowledge (PET) towards environmental health and disease prevention. *Global International Journal of Innovative Research*, *2*(9), 2305–2316. https://doi.org/10.59613/global.v2i9.332
8. Turner, N. J., Cuerrier, A., & Joseph, L. (2022). Well grounded: Indigenous Peoples' knowledge, ethnobiology and sustainability. *People and Nature*, *4*(3), 627–651. https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10321
9. Yerramilli, A. R. (2025). Indigenous knowledge and sustainable development (pp. 465–490). https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-7964-6.ch023