

53<sup>rd</sup> GEF Council Meeting  
November 28 – 30, 2017  
Washington, D.C.

**REVIEW OF  
GEF'S ENGAGEMENT WITH INDIGENOUS PEOPLES**

(Prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF)

**October 2017**

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

|        |   |
|--------|---|
| ABS    | Access and Benefit Sharing  |
| ACHPR  | African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights                       |
| ADB    | Asian Development Bank  |
| AfDB   | African Development Bank  |
| AIIB   | Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank                                  |
| AIPP   | Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact  |
| APR    | Annual Performance Reports  |
| BD     | Biodiversity  |
| BOAD   | West African Development Bank   |
| CAF    | Development Bank of Latin America                                     |
| CBD    | Convention on Biodiversity  |
| CBR+   | Community-Based REDD+   |
| CC     | Climate Change  |
| CI     | Conservation International  |
| CICA   | Coordinadora Indígena de Centro América                               |
| COP    | Conference of Parties   |
| CPS    | Country Program Strategy  |
| CSO    | Civil Society Organization  |
| DBSA   | Development Bank of Southern Africa                                   |
| EBRD   | European Bank for Reconstruction                                      |
| EES    | World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework                       |
| ESMS   | Environmental and Social Management System                            |
| FAO    | Food and Agriculture Organization                                     |
| FECO   | China's Foreign Economic Cooperation Office                           |
| FPIC   | Free, Prior and Informed Consent                                      |
| FUNBIO | Fundo Brasileiro para a Biodiversidade                                |
| GEF    | Global Environment Facility   |
| GEFIEO | Global Environment Facility - Independent Evaluation Office           |
| GEFSEC | Global Environment Facility Secretariat                               |
| IADB   | Inter-American Development Bank                                       |
| ICCAs  | Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas                              |
| IDB    | Inter-American Development Bank                                       |
| IEO    | Independent Evaluation Office   |
| IFAD   | International Fund for Agricultural Development                       |
| IITC   | International Indian Treaty Council                                   |
| ILO    | International Labour Organisation                                     |
| IPACC  | Indigenous Peoples of Africa Co-ordinating Committee                  |
| IPAG   | The Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group                                 |
| IPCCA  | Indigenous Peoples' Bio cultural Climate Change Assessment Initiative |
| IPFPs  | Indigenous Peoples Focal Points                                       |
| IPO    | Indigenous Peoples Organization                                       |

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| IPs    | Indigenous Peoples   |
| IPTAG  | Indigenous Peoples Technical Advisory Group  |
| IPTF   | Indigenous Peoples' Task Force   |
| IUCN   | International Union for Conservation of Nature                                       |
| IW     | International Water  |
| LD     | Land Degradation   |
| MFA    | Multi-Focal Area   |
| MS     | Minimum Standard   |
| MVR    | Monitoring Verification and Reporting  |
| NGO    | Non-Governmental Organizations   |
| NPIF   | Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund  |
| NSC    | National Steering Committee  |
| OP     | Operational Phase  |
| PAD    | Project Appraisal Document   |
| PIF    | Project Identification Form  |
| PMIS   | Project Management Information System  |
| PPG    | Project Preparation Grant  |
| REDD   | Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries |
| RRI    | Rights and Resources Initiative  |
| SES    | UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards  |
| SGP    | Small Grant Programme  |
| STAR   | System for Transparent Allocation of Resources                                       |
| TE     | Terminal Evaluation  |
| TER    | Terminal Evaluation Review   |
| UN     | United Nations   |
| UNCCD  | United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification                                  |
| UNDP   | United Nations Development Programme   |
| UNDRIP | United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples                       |
| UNEP   | United Nations Environment Programme   |
| UNFCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change                                |
| UNIDO  | United Nations Industrial Development Organization                                   |
| UNPFII | United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues                                  |
| WB     | World Bank   |
| WWF    | World Wildlife Fund  |

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| List of Acronyms.....  | ii   |
| Acknowledgements.....  | iv   |
| Executive Summary.....   | ix   |
| Purpose of the Review .....  | ix   |
| GEF and Indigenous Peoples – An Overview .....   | ix   |
| Review Findings .....  | ix   |
| Layered initiatives building on each other.....  | ix   |
| Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group – capacity and performance.....  | x    |
| GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards –<br>protection for indigenous peoples and application across the GEF Partnership..... | xi   |
| GEF Portfolio - analysis of inclusion of indigenous peoples .....  | xiii |
| Review Recommendations.....  | xiv  |
| Introduction.....  | 1    |
| Evaluation Objectives.....   | 1    |
| Methodology .....  | 1    |
| Desk Research.....   | 1    |
| Portfolio Analysis .....   | 1    |
| Online surveys .....   | 2    |
| Interviews .....   | 2    |
| Limitations .....  | 2    |
| Background.....  | 4    |
| The Relevance of Indigenous Peoples Within GEF Activities .....  | 4    |
| The presence of indigenous peoples and biodiversity are mutually reinforcing.....  | 4    |
| Increasing alignment of “best” practices with traditional and customary practices .....  | 4    |
| A wide differential existing between customary rights and land tenure.....   | 6    |
| Impacts of Climate Change .....  | 6    |
| GEF’s Poverty Reduction, Inclusive Governance and Gender Equality Commitments .....  | 7    |
| Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities .....   | 7    |
| A Retrospective of GEF Engagement with Indigenous Peoples.....   | 8    |
| Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples.....  | 13   |
| The Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group (IPAG) .....   | 15   |
| IPAG – Perceived Limitations .....   | 17   |
| Communication .....  | 17   |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| IPAG capacity .....  | 18 |
| Role delineation .....   | 19 |
| Staffing capacity in GEFSEC and Agencies .....                               | 19 |
| Capacity within Indigenous Peoples' Networks .....                           | 19 |
| GEF Indigenous Peoples Safeguard: Analysis and Agency Comparative View ..... | 20 |
| Background .....   | 20 |
| A Comparative View of GEF and GEF Agency Indigenous Peoples Safeguards ..... | 21 |
| Examining Minimum Standard 4 .....   | 26 |
| Design .....   | 26 |
| Identification of Indigenous Peoples .....                                   | 26 |
| Consultations, Consent and Participation .....                               | 27 |
| Human Rights .....   | 28 |
| Safeguard Application and Monitoring .....                                   | 31 |
| Minimum Standard 4 - Concluding Remarks .....                                | 32 |
| Portfolio Analysis .....   | 34 |
| Methodology .....  | 34 |
| Portfolio highlights .....   | 34 |
| Portfolio Trends .....   | 35 |
| Modality and Focal Area .....  | 36 |
| Regional Distribution of projects .....                                      | 38 |
| Degree of Indigenous Peoples Engagement .....                                | 40 |
| Performance of the Portfolio .....   | 41 |
| Small Grants Programme Portfolio Analysis .....                              | 45 |
| Conclusions .....  | 49 |
| Recommendations: .....   | 52 |
| Annex 1: List of Documents Reviewed .....                                    | 55 |
| Website Articles: .....  | 59 |
| Annex 2: Method Notes .....  | 60 |
| Annex 3: Indigenous Peoples Engagement Projects .....                        | 62 |
| Annex 4: Survey to SGP National Coordinators .....                           | 85 |
| Annex 5: List of interviewees .....  | 91 |
| Annex 6: Issues raised regarding Agency conformity with GEF MS4 .....        | 93 |
| Annex 7: Case Studies of GEF Projects Involving Indigenous Peoples .....     | 96 |

## TABLES, FIGURES AND BOXES

### Box

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Box 1: Indigenous Peoples Task Force Issues Paper Recommendations.....  | 10 |
| Box 2: Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group .....  | 11 |
| Box 3: The Nagoya Protocol – An Example of Achievement .....  | 11 |
| Box 4: Quote from GEFIO interview .....   | 17 |
| Box 5: A Characterization of IPAG from the Inside - I.....  | 18 |
| Box 6: A Characterization of IPAG from the Inside - II.....   | 19 |
| Box 7: Recommendation from Review of GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards for<br>Environmental and Social Safeguards..... | 31 |

### TABLES

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1: GEF and Agency Indigenous Peoples Safeguards, by Year Published.....                     | 21 |
| Table 2: Summary of GEF Agency Conformity with GEF Minimum Standard 4: Indigenous<br>Peoples..... | 23 |
| Table 3: Corresponding areas between GEF Minimum Standard 4 and the UNDRIP .....                  | 29 |

### FIGURES

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Figure 1: Comparison of Investment Volume and Number of Projects, by GEF Phase (note:<br>GEF-6 ~50% complete).....                    | 36 |
| Figure 2: Distribution of Indigenous Peoples Grant Projects, by Agency.....   | 36 |
| Figure 3: Distribution of Indigenous Peoples Grant Projects, by Project Type .....  | 37 |
| Figure 4: Distribution of GEF Projects, by Focal Area .....   | 37 |
| Figure 5: Focal Area Distribution of Indigenous Peoples Grant Portfolio, by GEF Phase (note:<br>GEF-6 ~50% complete).....             | 38 |
| Figure 6: Investment and Number of Indigenous Peoples Grant Projects, by Region .....   | 39 |
| Figure 7: Regional Distribution of Investment in Indigenous Peoples Grant Projects, by GEF<br>Phase (note: GEF-6 ~50% complete) ..... | 39 |
| Figure 8: Degree of Indigenous Peoples Involvement in GEF Projects.....   | 41 |
| Figure 9: Degree of IPs Involvement, by Project Number and GEF Phase (note: GEF-6 ~50%<br>complete).....                              | 41 |
| Figure 10: Moderately Satisfactory or Above Outcome Ratings, by GEF Phase .....   | 42 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Figure 11: Indigenous Peoples Portfolio Project Outcome Ratings, by Focal Area and Region .....        | 43 |
| Figure 12: Moderately Likely or Above Sustainability Ratings, by GEF Phase .....                       | 44 |
| Figure 13: Distribution of Ratings on the Project Sustainability.....                                  | 44 |
| Figure 14: Number of IP Projects Funded in Eleven Thematic Areas .....                                 | 46 |
| Figure 15: Number GEF-SGP projects Benefiting Indigenous Peoples (Project IDs available) 47            |    |
| Figure 16: Mechanisms for Assisting Indigenous Peoples to Access SGP Grants (Number of Countries)..... | 48 |



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This is a review of the GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples. GEF IEO has undertaken the study to inform the replenishment process for the GEF-7 period.

## PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW

2. The aim of this review is to provide: (a) an historical analysis of the GEF's engagement with Indigenous Peoples and background for indigenous peoples' participation in GEF projects, (b) a rendering of good practices and lessons learned from GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples, (c) an analysis of GEF agency conformity with GEF policies and guidelines concerning engagement with indigenous peoples and (d) recommendations for roles and initiatives that the GEF could incorporate in GEF-7.

3. The review was undertaken from February to August 2017 using desk research, portfolio analysis, online surveys and interviews.

## GEF AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES – AN OVERVIEW

4. The GEF has engaged with indigenous peoples since its pilot phase of project financing in 1991. A review of the portfolio shows that since that time, the level of engagement, consultation and policy review with indigenous peoples has increased through each GEF funding period. Trends show an increasing number of GEF projects involving indigenous peoples, increased mechanisms for engagement and a greater number of related GEF publications.

5. At the same time, the literature and the patterns of response from key informant interviews point to trends that provide a backdrop for this deepening level of engagement:

- (a) Strong correlations are known to exist between the locations of indigenous peoples' territories (where cultural diversity is at its richest) and the places where biological diversity is most concentrated.
- (b) Indigenous peoples are recognized for the efficacy of their traditional knowledge and customary practices *vis a vis* resource management and conservation; however, a wide differential between customary rights and land tenure means that in many places indigenous peoples are restricted from asserting those rights.
- (c) The impacts of climate change significantly affect indigenous peoples and local communities because of their dependence on natural resources for livelihoods and of the locations of their territories.

## REVIEW FINDINGS

### ***Layered initiatives building on each other***

6. Significant steps have been taken by GEF to increase the engagement and participation of indigenous peoples in GEF activities. Included in these was the formation of the agenda setting Indigenous Peoples' Task Force (IPTF) in 2011.

7. In its widely circulated Issues Paper, launched in 2012, the Task Force identified policy options that remain relevant today. The document makes proposals to GEF related to: individual and collective rights to land, territories and resources; rights to Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC); the principle of full and effective participation of indigenous

peoples; recognition of the importance of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices; and equitable access and benefit sharing *vis a vis* the utilization of genetic resources of indigenous peoples

8. The Issues Paper also proposes mechanisms for enhancing the engagement and participation of indigenous peoples with the GEF and its operations. The formation of the Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group (IPAG) was one such mechanism, established with a mandate to advise the development of a GEF policy on indigenous peoples. The inclusion of three Indigenous Peoples Focal Points (IPFPs) in the GEF-CSO Network added further profile to indigenous peoples' issues as have the half dozen GEF publications highlighting indigenous peoples' participation in GEF.

9. In 2011, the GEF issued a policy on Agency Minimum Standards and Social Safeguards, largely drawn from those of the World Bank. It did so acknowledging the possibility that funded activities might inadvertently create adverse social and economic impacts. The policy recognizes, as a matter of principle, that indigenous peoples are important partners in GEF's mission and that the identities and cultures of indigenous peoples are inextricably linked to the lands on which they live and the natural resources on which they depend. And it mentions concerns related to indigenous peoples that are articulated in the Issues Paper. Minimum Standard 4 in the Policy pertains to indigenous peoples.

10. The 2012 *Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples*, is viewed by most key informants to the review as an important reference in the implementation of GEF funded projects involving indigenous peoples. Drawing heavily on the Issues Paper, this document illustrates indigenous peoples' role in GEF operational activities, deficiencies in the realization of indigenous peoples' rights, and calls for further action to improve inclusion of indigenous peoples in GEF activities.

11. What the *Principles and Guidelines* document does not provide are specific commitments related to indigenous peoples. Nor does it provide practical guidance on project design or on indicators, or a specific list of requirements that might be useful to aid operationalization of relevant GEF policies. These are viewed as a shortcoming by many key informants. In addition, some of the internal mechanisms proposed in the document to uphold the standards for indigenous peoples remain to be comprehensively actioned.

### ***Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group – capacity and performance***

12. Consistent with its design, the IPAG provides advice to the GEF Secretariat on indigenous peoples' issues including: consultation; capacity building; inputs on policy, practice resources and tools related to indigenous peoples. It also provides recommendations on access to project financing, and outreach. Since inception, IPAG is acknowledged to have:

- (a) Input into GEF 6 programming strategy
- (b) Co-hosted events at international fora such as UN conferences the Convention on Biological Diversity meetings among others to raise awareness about IP related financing opportunities
- (c) Initiated the creation of a global and national fellowship program for indigenous peoples through the SGP

- (d) Advanced the principle of “free, prior and informed consent” in GEF projects.
- (e) Fostered the inclusion of an indigenous women’s vision/perspective in GEF’s gender discussions.
- (f) Improved coordination and interaction with civil society organizations, and
- (g) Assisted in developing indicators to better measure benefits and outcomes from GEF funded projects to indigenous peoples.
- (h) Developed a Financing White Paper with reviews and recommendations on financing options for GEF projects focused on indigenous peoples’ issues
- (i) Contributed to discussions on the GEF’s draft Stakeholder Engagement Policy

13. Constraints on IPAG’s performance, against its Terms of Reference, are identified and summed up under the following headings:

- (a) **Communication to and between indigenous peoples** – The diversity and dispersion of indigenous peoples around the world challenges the IPAG’s ability to communicate meaningfully. Most of IPAG’s working documents are only available in English.
- (b) **IPAG capacity** - Lack of IPAG members’ familiarity with aspects of GEF and GEF Agencies hampers informed interaction. Training, dissemination and formalizing communication and roles between IPAG and GEF have been constrained by financial resources and limited time allotted for IPAG meetings.
- (c) **Staffing capacity in GEFSEC and Agencies** – Dedicated staff experienced and trained in indigenous peoples’ issues in GEF is less than optimal. In some GEF Agencies, focal points are stretched in their abilities to meet competing responsibilities and address inputs from indigenous peoples.
- (d) **Coordination with indigenous peoples networks** – IPAG’s relations are constrained by the levels of understanding among the leadership of indigenous peoples organizations and networks over how best to engage with the GEF and GEF Agencies.

***GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards – protection for indigenous peoples and application across the GEF Partnership***

14. GEF’s safeguard for indigenous peoples was published in 2011 as part of the *GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards*. Minimum Standard 4 was designed to ensure that all GEF Agencies meet certain social, cultural and environmental criteria including social and environmental impact assessments, indigenous peoples plans and consultation alongside references to land, culture, traditional knowledge and livelihoods. The policy also sets out the provisions of the GEF’s grievance mechanism.

15. In general, the wording of GEF Agencies safeguard policies are in alignment with the requirements of GEF Minimum Standard 4. Of the nine provisions of Minimum Standard 4, Agencies show high levels of conformity in the areas of environmental and social impact assessments, appropriate socioeconomic benefits, indigenous peoples’ plans and document disclosure. In the areas of consultation, participation and the application of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), the wording of GEF Agency safeguards tends to exceed Minimum

Standard 4 provisions by insisting on greater protections for indigenous peoples or greater participation within project frameworks. To a lesser extent, Minimum Standard 4 standards are also exceeded in terms of access, participation and benefits in protected areas, the use of cultural resources and traditional knowledge, and with the monitoring of GEF-funded projects. Eleven of the Agencies have indigenous peoples safeguards published in 2015 or later, some prompted by the minimum standards required by GEF. In general, these more recent policies show elaborated and, in some instances, enhanced approaches. For example, regarding:

- (a) **Identification of indigenous peoples:** Minimum Standard 4 establishes some brief criteria regarding the identification of indigenous peoples. Some Agency safeguards elaborate on these criteria, in some instances referencing other widely accepted international criteria for identifying indigenous peoples to ensure that project implementing bodies and states have clarity regarding when to apply Minimum Standard 4. In some country contexts, the absence of recognition creates a significant challenge for the GEF partnership. In these situations, and where broader issues are being addressed, some Agencies have included indigenous peoples with the broader nomenclature of “local communities.” This term is sometimes used to avoid discrimination in places where populations are diverse in their makeup. The current consensus by the UN and climate convention bodies, adopted by the Convention on Biological Diversity in 2014, is that in these cases use of the term “indigenous peoples and local communities” enables inclusive approaches, while avoiding presumptions of common identity or that such groups are subject to the same circumstances.
- (b) **Consultations, Consent and Participation:** Regarding Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) - GEF limits FPIC application to the twenty-two ILO C169 signatory states, while Agency safeguard policies of ten GEF Agencies have put in place mandatory FPIC processes for all projects involving indigenous peoples. A further three Agencies have widened scope of FPIC application.
- (c) **Terminology related to FPIC** - GEF’s use of the term “free, prior and informed consultations” suggests ambiguity when it comes to “consent”. It appears to lack the element of consent. At the same time, other wording in the Minimum Standards seems to assert the importance of “consent”.
- (d) **IP participation in project processes** - While the involvement of indigenous peoples in environmental and social impact assessments is mandated, the level of participation is not specified. Some GEF Agencies have elaborated expectations or requirements for participation by indigenous peoples both in assessments and project monitoring processes.
- (e) **Alignment with Rights-Based Approach** – While the context of GEF support for UNDRIP is provided in several GEF publications on indigenous peoples, there is little in the GEF Principles and Guidelines on Engagement with Indigenous Peoples directly associated with human rights instruments. That noted, analysis does show that a number of UNDRIP Articles encapsulate elements of GEF’s approach with indigenous peoples. Other Agencies have gone further, directly referencing provisions set out in UNDRIP in the application of safeguards for indigenous peoples.

16. Regarding safeguard application and monitoring, the 2017 *Review of The GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards* recommends the implementation of tracking and checks of safeguard procedures under partner agencies.

17. The safeguards analysis carried out for this review indicates that high levels of consistency exist between the GEF Minimum Standard 4 and GEF Agency safeguard policies, though a limited number of instances were identified where GEF Agency safeguard policy wording does not conform with GEF Minimum Standard 4. In these instances, where gaps in standards are perceived between GEF and Agency safeguards, ensuring “the flow-through of monitoring information on safeguards implementation” is suggested to be of importance. It is also noted in the analysis that, despite the upcoming implementation of a new environmental and social safeguard framework for the World Bank, the GEF Minimum Standards continue to exclude the World Bank under GEF policies.

### ***GEF Portfolio - analysis of inclusion of indigenous peoples***

18. The review’s analysis of the GEF Portfolio shows an increased engagement with indigenous peoples, with projects involving indigenous peoples gaining in presence and performing in line with those in the broader GEF portfolio.

- (a) The indigenous peoples portfolio identified for OPS6 is comprised of 426 projects within a time frame spanning from the pilot phase to middle of GEF-6. The portfolio represents approximately 10% of projects approved and about 11% of the total GEF portfolio investment across focal areas. 304 are Full-Size Projects (71%), and 122 are Medium-Size Projects (29%). Altogether, they represent US\$2,503 million in GEF grant investment and US\$12,893 million via co-financing.
- (b) By number of projects and by investment, the proportion of Full-sized and Medium-sized projects that include indigenous peoples has increased substantially since the beginning of GEF.
- (c) The greatest concentration of investment is in Latin America and the Caribbean (34%), followed by Asia (29%) and Africa (25%).
- (d) Most of the projects involving indigenous peoples fall into the Full-sized category, and have been implemented by four of the GEF accredited agencies (UNDP, WB, UNEP, FAO). This is not unexpected as these are also the main GEF implementing agencies.
- (e) The biodiversity focal area dominates the indigenous peoples portfolio, accounting for a total of 55 percent of projects, though a shift is evident toward a greater concentration of indigenous peoples projects in the Multi-focal and Climate Change focus areas.
- (f) Two-thirds of all indigenous peoples projects show “limited” (participation) or “moderate” involvement (beneficiaries) of indigenous peoples; thus far, exclusively indigenous peoples driven projects are in a minority.
- (g) From the outcome perspective, the indigenous peoples portfolio is comparable to the performance across the entire GEF portfolio as per the Annual Performance Report (APR) 2015. Seventy-five percent of Indigenous People projects are rated as moderately satisfactory or above, while 80% of the overall GEF portfolio are

rated above the same threshold. Future studies could further analyze correlation between indigenous peoples' participation and performance of the projects.

- (h) The performance of the indigenous peoples portfolio improved in outcome achievement from the pilot phase to GEF-1 and kept consistent in GEF-2 and GEF-3. The outcome rating increased from GEF-3 to GEF-4, with 90 percent of the projects rated as moderately satisfactory or above. There are only two indigenous peoples projects rated thus far in GEF-5, both have outcome ratings of moderately satisfactory or above.
- (i) Outcome ratings have been highest across indigenous peoples projects focused on land degradation, climate change and biodiversity. Indigenous Peoples projects are comparable to the GEF portfolio on the likelihood of being sustainable; over half of projects show moderate or greater likelihood of being sustainable. Project efficiency also measures comparably with the GEF portfolio.

19. The GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP), administered by UNDP is the primary modality for the GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples, though accessing SGP grants remains a challenge due to administrative and language hurdles. This limits the extent to which the mechanism can address needs and opportunities among indigenous peoples. SGP provides grants of up to US\$50,000 to local communities for projects involving Biodiversity, Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation, Land Degradation and Sustainable Forest Management, International Waters and Chemicals in 125 countries. Approximately 15 percent of the 20,300 SGP grants awarded from 1992 up to 2016 benefitted indigenous organisations or communities of the projects are awarded to indigenous peoples or involve Indigenous communities.

20. A survey of SGP National Coordinators on engagement with indigenous peoples highlighted benefits of SGP funding to indigenous peoples including: access to training/capacity building, Income and livelihoods improvements, and increased inclusion for consultation and project design. Barriers for indigenous peoples to access to SGP funding focused on limited administrative and management skills, timing requirements for application, language limitations, and geographic or communication barriers.

### ***Review Recommendations***

21. **Recommendation 1: Establish and strengthen dedicated funding opportunities for indigenous peoples' projects/ organizations.** Indigenous peoples remain limited as beneficiaries in the support they receive from GEF. To date, support has come primarily through the SGP which, by design, is limited in scale and scope. Dedicated funding outside STAR would address the systemic challenges and operational constraints to increased indigenous peoples' engagement. Simultaneously, strengthening the SGP and other GEF project oriented grant mechanisms, such as the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, or creating incentives to engage IPLCs could also help improve access. The World Bank's Dedicated Grants Mechanism serves as a model of a funding window that could be adapted for GEF.

22. **Recommendation 2: Update relevant Policies and Guidelines to reflect best practice standards concerning indigenous peoples, including a rights-based approach to engagement.** Internationally, safeguard norms regarding indigenous peoples have changed. This manifests in several GEF Agency standards that have emerged since 2012. To remain at

the leading edge and continue to serve the field of practice with advanced thinking about how best to safeguard the rights of indigenous peoples, a recalibration is required. Attention should be given to provisions related to the **right to self-determination** and to **free, prior and informed consent (FPIC)** as they pertain to consultations with indigenous peoples concerning GEF projects. Revisions should be reflected in pertinent safeguards documents, including the GEF Principles and Guidelines. As part of this exercise, GEF should also anchor its engagement with indigenous peoples with relevance to UNDRIP and ILO C169 and to progressive advances regarding traditional knowledge, land rights and resource rights. Finally, the GEF should expand its own criteria or directly reference other widely accepted international criteria for identifying indigenous peoples, to ensure clarity by all stakeholders. Specifically, regarding its nomenclature, consideration should be given to the merits and drawbacks of inclusive language such as *indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLC)*.

**23. Recommendation 3: Review the Indigenous Peoples' Advisory Group's role for operational constraints.** IPAG is unequivocally viewed as an important and advantageous body to guide GEF's decision making and engagement with indigenous peoples. To increase its effectiveness, GEF should undertake several steps including a review of succession planning and the introduction of a comprehensive orientation for IPAG members to preserve knowledge of outgoing members and to prepare new ones. Attention in this regard should be drawn to intergenerational leadership. GEF should review the existing scope/limitations of the IPAG's mandate and its relationship with the indigenous peoples Focal Points (IPFP) embedded within the CSO Network, GEF Agencies and with the SGP National Coordinators. As part of this, GEF should clarify IPAG's communication/engagement as it pertains to establishing more formal contacts with regional and global networks of indigenous peoples. It should also consider an increase in the staff time and resources allocated by the GEFSEC indigenous peoples focal point to IPAG activities; translation requirements for relevant documents such that IPAG is able to engage in English, French, Spanish.

**24. Recommendation 4: Facilitate dialogue between indigenous peoples and local communities and GEF Government focal points.** One of the major hurdles for greater engagement of indigenous peoples in GEF projects is acceptance by national governments in some of the countries that GEF operates. The GEF through its relationships with national governments can help to increase prominence of indigenous peoples' activities and encourage mainstreaming of IP issues into environmental programming. In this regard, GEF should seek opportunities for a higher profile of indigenous peoples in GEF projects and processes by developing capacity of IP organizations for project development and management including a higher profile at GEF events such as Extended Constituency Workshops and Council meetings. GEF should document success stories in this regard – showing where engagement is strong or where breakthroughs in building relationships have been made.

**25. Recommendation 5: Monitor application of Minimum Standard 4 and indigenous peoples portfolio.** A greater flow of information should come from tracking the environmental and social risks of the GEF portfolio. Currently there is no requirement that Agencies report on compliance with safeguards, leaving the GEF portfolio vulnerable. Agencies should inform GEF of the safeguard risk categorization assigned to projects involving indigenous peoples and keep GEF informed of safeguards implementation issues

through monitoring and reporting. Ideally this builds off Agency systems rather than duplicates them. Similarly, an accurate monitoring of the portfolio of projects that engage indigenous peoples is currently not possible. Projects need to be tagged to allow for systematic retrieval. As part of the tagging, further definition within the GEF of what is considered indigenous peoples' engagement should ensue. Finally, the extent and type of indigenous peoples' engagement should be a standard evaluation question included in mid-term and terminal evaluations.



## **INTRODUCTION**

1. The GEF has engaged with indigenous peoples since its first phase of project financing in 1991. Since then, the level of engagement, consultation and policy review with indigenous peoples has increased through each GEF funding period. Trends show an increasing number of GEF projects involving indigenous peoples, increased mechanisms for engagement and a greater number of related GEF publications. Hence, as part of the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation (OPS6) of the GEF and to inform the replenishment process for the GEF-7 period, this review presents an analysis of GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples.

## **EVALUATION OBJECTIVES**

2. The aim of this review is to provide insight for the GEF regarding engagement with indigenous peoples through GEF projects and operations. This report provides:
- (a) An analysis of GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples and background for indigenous peoples' participation in addressing environmental issues;
  - (b) Good practices and lessons learned from GEF's engagement, to date, with indigenous peoples;
  - (c) Recommendations for roles that the GEF could incorporate in GEF-7, taking into account the GEF's programming strategy and indigenous peoples' needs and existing peer offerings.

## **METHODOLOGY**

3. The evaluation was undertaken by a team of GEF IEO staff and consultants and is based on desk research, portfolio analysis, online surveys and interviews with relevant stakeholders.

### ***Desk Research***

4. The documents reviewed include relevant Council documents, GEF project documents, including terminal evaluations. Additionally, external leading reports from international Agencies (e.g. World Wildlife Fund, IFAD, IDB, etc.), specialized initiatives (e.g. State of the World's Minorities and Indigenous Peoples), and academic research papers were considered for background and literature review purposes. A list of documents used is presented in Annex 1.

### ***Portfolio Analysis***

5. The team analyzed a portfolio of GEF projects for trends. In developing the portfolio, "engagement with indigenous peoples" was interpreted broadly to extend from engagement with indigenous peoples' organizations as executors of GEF projects to beneficiaries and interested stakeholders.

6. The evidence presented in this portfolio analysis draws on two inter-related sources. The first is the project data pulled from GEF's Project Management Information System (PMIS). An original compilation of a list of projects from PMIS developed by the Secretariat was used as a starting point for developing the portfolio. Projects that are indicated as executed by indigenous peoples organizations were included in the initial list. Project

documents associated with the initial list of projects were also reviewed to ensure the integrity of the list.

7. The second source is the GEF IEO's internal project performance database (Terminal Evaluation (TE) Review Database), which contains ratings on outcomes for projects that have been evaluated through the Office's Annual Performance Reports (APRs). One hundred and eighty-eight of the 426 indigenous peoples' projects identified are also included in the IEO's TE Review database, with 181 projects having ratings on project outcomes. Using this information on project performance, the study compared the relative performance of projects that engaged indigenous peoples with that of projects that did not along the dimensions of outcome quality, likelihood of sustainability, and relative efficiency.

8. The method by which the portfolio was assembled is set out in Annex 2 and the list of project identified with indigenous peoples is in Annex 3.

### ***Online surveys***

9. To better understand the realities in the field for engaging indigenous peoples, an online survey was designed that targeted Small Grants Programme National Coordinators. The contact list for the survey was provided by the Small Grants Programme team at UNDP. One hundred and four National Coordinators were sent the survey and 89 responded (85%). Survey findings are highlighted in the report. The survey questions are set out in Annex 4.

### ***Interviews***

10. In addition to the surveys, 29 in-depth interviews were conducted with different stakeholder group representatives from the GEF Secretariat, the indigenous peoples Advisory Group and external experts from GEF Agencies and the conventions. The GEF staff interviews included multiple conversations with the GEF indigenous peoples' focal persons. An overview of interviewees is provided in Annex 5.

### ***Limitations***

11. The study triangulated evidence from quantitative and qualitative sources, but with limitations. The portfolio analysis relies on the GEF Project Management Information System (PMIS) database to explore GEF engagement with indigenous peoples. The drawback with the PMIS, however, is that it does not allow for a systematic 'tagging' of projects that engage indigenous peoples, be it partnerships with or outreach to indigenous peoples. It is also the case that more attention was paid to tagging starting in GEF-5. In the face of this, the Secretariat developed a listing of projects that involve indigenous peoples. While helpful, it is not possible to match the list by drawing reports from organizational databases. Complicating further the task of assembling a portfolio of projects for analysis, 'engagement with indigenous peoples' is interpreted broadly within the GEF partnership. This factor was also evident in the way SGP National Coordinators interpreted survey questions related to the SGP portfolio. In the end, then, there is no assurance that the portfolio created for IEO's analysis is comprehensive and it is not possible to delineate projects by "type of participation".

12. To mitigate the risk of assembling an unrepresentative portfolio, the IEO carried out a systematic review of project titles, co-financiers, executing agencies, and project descriptions as well as a review of project documents.

13. Resources allocated to the review did not allow for country visits. These would have been useful to substantiate findings, conclusions and recommendations. Regarding the SGP, for example, key informant interviews with the SGP National Coordinators might have shed further insight on responses to the survey regarding the make-up, results and sustainability of projects.

## BACKGROUND

### THE RELEVANCE OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES WITHIN GEF ACTIVITIES

14. GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples stems from GEF's improved understanding of the geographic, cultural and livelihoods linkages between indigenous peoples, and of biodiverse areas and the effects of climate change. It also stems from improvements in the representation of and advocacy by indigenous peoples themselves, and from the increased recognition by states and international organisations of indigenous peoples' rights. Key observations from the literature and interviews are set out below.

#### ***The presence of indigenous peoples and biodiversity are mutually reinforcing***

15. With an estimated population of 370 million<sup>1</sup>, indigenous peoples constitute approximately four to five percent of the world's population. Indigenous peoples' territories encompass up to 22 percent of the world's land surface that, in turn, holds 80 percent of the planet's biodiversity<sup>2</sup>. Across these territories, a strong correlation exists between biological richness and cultural diversity. Indigenous populations represent 95 percent of the world's cultural diversity, and nine out of the 12 main centres of cultural diversity are within biological-rich nations.<sup>3</sup>

16. Moreover, the global land under tenure or designated occupation by indigenous peoples and Local Communities also contains approximately an eighth of the world's forest. As significant as this is, it represents only half of the forested area utilised by indigenous peoples and local communities, according to the World Resources Institute. Resource management practices, where applied, provide protection from over-exploitation and preserve biodiversity while also providing essential carbon sinks. These sinks are estimated to store 37 to 54 billion tonnes of carbon which is, at minimum, equivalent to the total global carbon dioxide emissions in 2014<sup>4</sup>.

17. Most forest areas managed by indigenous peoples and local communities have shown long-term sustainability. This comes from centuries of dependence on forest resources, reinforced by extensive traditional knowledge and cultural practices, such as controlling access to resources, placing limits on their usage and forbidding usage of vulnerable species, protecting certain areas and adopting production techniques that increase biodiversity.<sup>5</sup>

#### ***Increasing alignment of "best" practices with traditional and customary practices***

18. Indigenous peoples are now widely recognized for their traditional knowledge and customary practices that continue to influence understanding of forestry, traditional medicine, conservation, resource management and livelihood patterns, as well as responses to climate change, resilience and adaptation. Furthermore, a scan of the literature reveals evidence from a range of non-GEF projects suggesting that empowering indigenous peoples

---

<sup>1</sup> M. Wiben Jensen, International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (personal communication, 10 May 2017)

<sup>2</sup> World Resources Institute (2005) "Securing Property and Resource Rights through Tenure Reform" in [World Resources Report 2005: The Wealth of the Poor – Managing Ecosystems to Fight Poverty](#), p.83-87

<sup>3</sup> M. Toledo (2000) "Indigenous Peoples and Biodiversity" Institute of Ecology, National University of Mexico

<sup>4</sup> World Resources Institute (2014) "[Securing Rights, Combating Climate Change](#)" and Rights and Resources Initiative (2016) "Toward a Global Baseline of Carbon Storage in Collective Lands" estimates respectively

<sup>5</sup> Collaborative Partnership on Forests (2012) "SFM Fact Sheet 4: SFM and indigenous peoples"

to manage biodiversity in their own territories can result in more sustained and cost-effective ways to protect biodiversity. Several illustrations follow:

- (a) A World Bank funded sustainable forest management project in Panama trained 24 indigenous technicians on forest Monitoring Verification and Reporting (MVR) methods and let indigenous peoples take full ownership of the work.<sup>6</sup> The project included comprehensive monitoring coverage, reaching nine remote areas that previously could only be sampled using a much higher cost method of airborne remote sensing.
- (b) In West Africa, an indigenous soil management system was adopted into a modern sustainable agriculture system. Integration of traditional knowledge led to improved fertility of highly degraded soils and, more broadly, to clues about how to enhance climate change mitigation potential when working with carbon-poor tropical soils<sup>7</sup>.
- (c) From a reviewed study on conservation partnerships in New Zealand, traditional ecological knowledge in ancestral sayings have been analyzed to generate new scientific strategies to retain local floral biodiversity.<sup>8</sup>
- (d) And in Australia, the widespread adoption of indigenous fire management practices has greatly reduced damage to ecosystems, important habitats, agricultural land, infrastructure<sup>9</sup> and has reduced carbon emissions<sup>10</sup> from uncontrolled wildfires. Renewing the practice of traditional targeted early burning, that reduces spread and fuel loads of wildfires, is now strongly promoted by the Government of Australia.<sup>11</sup>

19. Article 8(j) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) specifically recognises the value of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge. As well, policy guidance of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) states that integrating traditional knowledge with modern technologies can improve efficacy in combating desertification. As underscored by indigenous peoples through their input and presentations at each convention's Conference of the Parties, indigenous peoples play an important role in meetings and policy development of the CBD<sup>12</sup>, UNCCD<sup>13</sup> and United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)<sup>14</sup>.

20. Finally, regarding alignment between best practices and traditional knowledge, there are examples of landscape design within some ancestral territories of indigenous peoples that can resist the negative effects of climate change. The community-based *acequia*

---

<sup>6</sup> Mateo-Vega et al. (2017) "Full and Effective Participation of Indigenous Peoples in Forest Monitoring for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+): Trail in Panama's Darien"

<sup>7</sup> Dawit et al. (2016) "Indigenous African soil enrichment as a climate-smart sustainable agriculture alternative". Lancaster University, University of Ghana, University of Sussex, Cornell University

<sup>8</sup> Priscilla M. Wehi. (2009) "Indigenous Ancestral Sayings contribute to Modern Conservation Partnership: Examples Using Phormium Tenax". Department of Biological Sciences, University of Waikato

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.klc.org.au/land-sea/indigenous-fire-management>

<sup>10</sup> Russell-Smith et al. (2013) Managing fire regimes in north Australian savannas: applying Aboriginal approaches to contemporary global problems. The Ecological Society of America

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.environment.gov.au/climate-change/government/international/land-emissions>

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.cbd.int/traditional/participation.shtml>

<sup>13</sup> <http://www2.unccd.int/news-events/land-rights-prerequisite-land-degradation-neutrality>

<sup>14</sup> [https://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/10151txt.php](https://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/10151txt.php)

management in the US and Mexico, the *qanat* ground water system in Syria, and traditional water harvesting practices in India are three such examples<sup>15</sup>. Observers of these traditional practices point out that they constitute an important body of knowledge for innovation in sustainable resource management.

### ***A wide differential existing between customary rights and land tenure***

21. Ownership of rich biological and cultural resources notwithstanding, indigenous peoples are still some of the most vulnerable social groups, often living in remote and socially marginal places<sup>16</sup>. In a recent assessment by the Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI)<sup>17</sup> of 64 countries - totalling over 80 percent of global land - it was estimated that indigenous peoples and local communities assert their customary rights over up to two-thirds of the land analyzed. At the same time, however, tenure rights for indigenous peoples and local communities only exist in ten percent of that area, with another eight percent designated for their occupation without formal tenure. This leaves the remaining 82 percent of customary lands held by states or private entities.

22. The RRI assessment finds that, worldwide, members of indigenous groups are disproportionately suffering displacement, alienation, and cultural loss of a way of life in the name of economic development. Extractive industries (principally oil, gas and mining), logging activity and large-scale agriculture are often cited in this regard. Conservation initiatives are also cited in the literature. They can limit livelihoods or reduce access to resources, and have frequently been imposed upon indigenous groups<sup>18</sup>. Furthermore, a Wildlife Conservation Society study notes that vulnerable peoples with no representation in indigenous organizations are among the most likely to be affected by displacement for conservation reasons<sup>16</sup>.

### ***Impacts of Climate Change***

23. Indigenous peoples and local communities are particularly affected by the impacts of climate change due to their dependence on natural resources for livelihoods and to the location of their territories, often in biodiverse marginal and remote areas. Impacts include changes to precipitation levels, exposure to extreme weather events, and variations in seasonal weather patterns and temperatures which in turn lead to changes in the availability and sustainability of water, food and natural resources. Some of clearest impacts are found in the mild winters and low snowfalls experienced by indigenous peoples in Arctic areas, and in the rising sea-levels that threaten to displace indigenous peoples on Pacific islands such as those in Kiribati<sup>19</sup>.

---

<sup>15</sup> B.R. Johnston (2013) "Human Needs and Environmental Rights to Water: A Biocultural Systems approach to Hydrodevelopment and Management"

<sup>16</sup> Avecita Chicchon (2009) "Working with Indigenous Peoples to Conserve Nature: Examples from Latin America". Wildlife Conservation Society

<sup>17</sup> <http://rightsandresources.org/en/publication/who-owns-the-land-in-africa/#sthash.QJdiRqEH.dpbs>, and as data mapped on <http://www.landmarkmap.org>

<sup>18</sup> Uila Popova (2013) "Conservation, Traditional Knowledge, and Indigenous Peoples"

<sup>19</sup> For example, see <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/climatechange/docs/IUCN.pdf> and [http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/backgroundunder%20climate%20change\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/backgroundunder%20climate%20change_FINAL.pdf)

24. As a result of the factors noted above, indigenous peoples are recognized as crucial actors in the GEF's primary mission to tackle environmental issues. Their territories and rights have become a significant factor in actions to address climate change.

### ***GEF's Poverty Reduction, Inclusive Governance and Gender Equality Commitments***

25. There are other commitments embedded in GEF's mission that are relevant to engagement with indigenous peoples: to reduce poverty; strengthen governance, and achieve greater equality. Progress made on these issues is integral to indigenous peoples realizing their rights as set out in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), a resolution on the rights of indigenous peoples adopted by the UN General Assembly, and to which almost all UN member states are now signatories.

26. While the UNDRIP is non-binding, in signing the resolution states have indicated their approval of its provisions and commitment to the direction given to the development of future legislation. For its part, the GEF Secretariat has indicated support for the provisions of the UNDRIP. Further elaboration has been suggested by consultative bodies to the GEF, the Indigenous Peoples' Task Force (IPTF) and its successor the Indigenous Peoples' Advisory Group (IPAG) on establishing a rights-based policy.<sup>20</sup>

27. Twenty-two states, mainly in Latin America, have ratified the ILO Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (ILO C169), a binding convention that sets strict standards in terms of consultation, territories, land, natural resources, education and culture. As such, the Convention guides GEF-financed projects implemented in those countries

### **INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES**

28. While the terms "local communities" and "indigenous peoples" are applied in many international treaties and domestic laws, ambiguity exists as to their usage and acceptance. Neither term has a fixed or internationally agreed definition. However, there is a consensus between a range of international organisations, academics and community representatives on the meaning of the terms. These have been documented in reports and articles, including those by the CBD<sup>21</sup>.

29. A group of *indigenous peoples* shares common factors that may include: ancestry, heritage, distinct culture, language attachments to lands and territories and social status. Frequently indigenous peoples share a past or current experience of exclusion. Local communities are understood to be comprised of groups of individuals bound by a range of characteristics and/or circumstances that yield a collective identity. Both identification of indigenous peoples and membership of a community rely to a large extent on self-identification, as well as recognition by other groups. A local community therefore may include indigenous individuals as members of the collective.

30. In some contexts, "local communities" or similar terms have been used in place of "indigenous peoples". Often, this is due to a limited acceptance of the concept of

---

<sup>20</sup> See the GEF Indigenous Peoples Task Force (2011) Issues Paper and GEF (2012) Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples

<sup>21</sup> For example, see the summary provided by the CBD in the report "Compilation of Views Received on Use of the Term "Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities", UNEP/CBD/WG8J/8/INF/10/Add.1

indigenous peoples on the part of the national government. The terminology might also be used to avoid discrimination where there is a significant amount of diversity.

31. Given similarities in social, environmental and economic issues affecting local communities and indigenous peoples, implementing organizations have tended to group the two together as “indigenous and local communities” or “indigenous peoples and local communities”. This is to promote a broader range of inclusivity. These terms are used by the CBD, UNFCCC and the GEF to ensure a broader approach to project implementation and policy development, especially for communities reliant upon and contributing to biodiversity, and to those at particular risk from climate change.

32. Overall, the term “indigenous peoples and local communities” appears to be the more widely accepted of the two. It has been adopted by the CBD after discussions at the Conference of Parties (COP) 12 in 2014.<sup>22</sup> The term retains a reference to “indigenous peoples”. This is important for its consistency with the terminology of international human rights law and advocacy. It ensures inclusive approaches to both indigenous peoples and local communities while avoiding presumptions of a common identity or same circumstance.

#### **A RETROSPECTIVE OF GEF ENGAGEMENT WITH INDIGENOUS PEOPLES**

33. Over the last 26 years of operations, aspects of GEF’s work with indigenous peoples have become a feature of GEF policies, strategies and operations. Growth in the international recognition of the role of indigenous peoples in promoting biodiversity, safeguarding protected areas and in the sustainable management of vulnerable ecosystems is mirrored in the progression of GEF Council and GEF Secretariat publications addressing indigenous peoples’ issues, and enhancements *vis a vis* their participation within GEF.

34. GEF-financed projects involving indigenous peoples have been implemented since the GEF Pilot Phase. Of the approximately 4,319 GEF financed projects approved from the Pilot Phase up to September 2016, approximately 426 (9.9 percent) involved indigenous peoples from a limited to a significant level (see *GEF Portfolio Analysis of Projects Involving Indigenous Peoples* section). Additionally, approximately 15 percent of the 20,300 SGP grants awarded from 1992 up to 2016<sup>23</sup> benefitted indigenous organisations or communities. This is estimated to be more than 3,000 projects in total.

35. Much of the information on GEF engagement with indigenous peoples from the Pilot Phase to GEF 3 is limited to that gathered in a retrospective analysis of project documents and evaluations, rather than from comprehensive reporting on these issues at the time. Monitoring systems identifying GEF-financed projects involving indigenous peoples were put into place in GEF 6. The presence of these more sensitive monitoring systems bodes well for project analysis related to indigenous peoples in future evaluations.

36. Formalising the input of indigenous peoples into the design of GEF-financed projects and GEF strategies began in 1995, with the inception of the **GEF-NGO Network**. This consultative group of GEF-accredited NGOs was established by the GEF Council in 1996. Its Coordination Committee included an Indigenous representative. Where possible,

---

<sup>22</sup> <https://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/cop/cop-12/insession/cop-12-L-26-en.pdf>

<sup>23</sup> GEF SGP Annual Monitoring Report 2015-2016



participation of indigenous peoples' organisations in subsequent consultative meetings was encouraged by the GEF. The GEF-NGO Network, renamed as the GEF-CSO Network in 2013 to reflect the wider participation of civil society organizations, currently has three Indigenous Peoples Focal Points (IPFPs) from Asia, Africa and Latin America and a role in promoting GEF engagement with indigenous peoples.

37. In 1996, the GEF Council approved and published Public Involvement in GEF Projects (GEF/C.7/6), a policy for public involvement in the design, implementation and evaluation of GEF-financed projects, that also sets out activities and the resources needed to ensure this involvement. The document recognizes the need for information, consultation and stakeholder participation for all groups involved in GEF-financed projects, including communities and local groups. It also recognises that projects may have impacts on the livelihoods of "disadvantaged groups", which include indigenous peoples, and that involvement activities should "address the social, cultural, and economic needs of people affected by GEF-financed projects". As well, the document highlights the extent to which projects with groups such as indigenous peoples require them to pay particular attention to stakeholder engagement processes. The Public Involvement Policy is currently being reviewed through stakeholder consultations. An updated policy is expected for GEF-7.

38. The first specific publication on indigenous peoples was **Indigenous Communities and Biodiversity** produced in 2008 by the GEF Secretariat. It provides an overview of GEF engagement with indigenous peoples *vis a vis* GEF policies and operations, project financing and work with the CBD COP. The publication also evaluates the engagement of indigenous peoples in identified GEF-financed projects, with analysis of the level of involvement of indigenous peoples in these projects, the thematic areas of the projects, geographic distribution and number of projects per GEF replenishment period. The publication highlights the role of the Small Grants Programme, detailed in a later section of this evaluation, in supporting grassroots indigenous peoples' initiatives since its formation in 1992.

39. During GEF 5 (2010-2014), the visibility of GEF engagement with indigenous peoples increased significantly, with eight specific publications, a formalised strategy and the establishment of a dedicated indigenous peoples reference group. In 2011, consultations began between GEF and indigenous peoples' representatives forming the **Indigenous Peoples' Task Force (IPTF)**, on the development of a GEF policy on indigenous peoples. The IPTF consultations resulted in an issues paper, launched in 2012 but drafted shortly before the launch of the GEF Council's **GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards** (GEF/C.41/10/Rev.1) in November 2011.

40. Consistent with a recommendation from the GEF-NGO Network to strengthen provisions relating to preventing adverse impacts to indigenous peoples, the document describes the importance of indigenous peoples to biodiversity, land and natural resources within indigenous territories, and the need to mitigate any negative effects of GEF-financed projects on indigenous peoples' livelihoods as necessary. Included is "**Minimum Standard 4: Indigenous Peoples**", providing detailed minimum requirements including social and environmental impact assessments, Indigenous Peoples Plans and consultation alongside references to land, culture, traditional knowledge and livelihoods. The policy also sets out the provisions of the GEF's grievance mechanism.

41. The issues identified by the Task Force were further developed by GEF and in 2012 Council adopted the **Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples** (GEF/C.42/Inf.03/Rev.1). In lieu of a policy, this document affirms the importance of indigenous peoples in GEF-financed projects, identifies unintended adverse effects that can result from such projects and expresses a desire for enhanced engagement between indigenous peoples and the GEF. The Principles and Guidelines document builds upon the 2011 GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards, the 1996 Public Involvement Policy, the IPTF issue paper and GEF partner agency standards. GEF guidelines for engagement with indigenous peoples are developed and set out under the areas of: Planning and Development; Participation, Rights and Governance; Resettlement; Traditional Knowledge and Benefit Sharing; Gender Equality; Accountability, Grievances and Conflict Resolution (see the following section).

42. The Principles and Guidelines paper was published without annexes in a brochure format by the GEF Secretariat. It was distributed in English, French and Spanish. Broad reader appeal among Indigenous People's organizations, GEF agency personnel and stakeholders, was the intent behind this action.

#### **Box 1: Indigenous Peoples Task Force Issues Paper Recommendations**

The paper made four key recommendations

- a) Establish an Indigenous Peoples advisory committee to provide advice to the secretariat and to the council on issues related to the implementation of this policy.
- b) Recruit and develop expertise on indigenous issues in the GEF secretariat, including a direct communication and access point for Indigenous Peoples into the secretariat
- c) Establish and administer, through a GEF agency, a direct access financing avenue for Indigenous Peoples' organizations
- d) Establish a recourse mechanism comprising of indigenous representatives, GEF agencies at the local, national and international levels

43. Similarly, the IPTF issues paper developed in 2011 was published in a brochure format in 2012, as the **Issues Paper on Indigenous Peoples prepared by the Indigenous Peoples Task Force to the GEF**. This paper sets out GEF policy options for indigenous peoples in five keys areas: Individual and Collective Rights to Land, Territories and Resources; Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC); Full and Effective Participation; Traditional Knowledge, Innovations and Practices, and Access and Benefit Sharing. The paper called for the establishment of a rights-based approach to GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples, with relevance to the UNDRIP, ILO C169 and ACHPR (African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights), and the progressive advances in GEF's policies towards FPIC, traditional knowledge, land rights and resource rights.

44. The approach of the paper was broad in scope, taking into account comparable activities of other international institutions (including: WB, IDB, IFAD, ADB, UNDP, FAO). It included a comparative review of existing policies on indigenous peoples in GEF Agencies.

45. The first recommendation of the Issue Paper on Indigenous Peoples prepared by the Indigenous Peoples Task Force to the GEF led to the formation of the GEF **Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group (IPAG)** in 2013.

#### **Box 2: Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group**

IPAG consists of four indigenous representatives from regional indigenous peoples' groups who provide advice to the GEF Secretariat on Indigenous Peoples' issues, and coordination for Indigenous Peoples with the GEF-CSO Network. Other members include one independent representative, and one representative and an alternate from a GEF Agency (they have been from the World Bank, UNDP/SGP and IBD. At points, alternates from the CSO Network have been included. The group meets once or twice a year, though IPAG members have a continuous role of input in their individual capacity into meetings and publications, and attend conferences including the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, CBD COP, UNFCCC COP, World Conference on Indigenous Peoples and the IUCN World Conservation Congress and often discuss IPAG matters.

See the IPAG section for further details.

#### **Box 3: The Nagoya Protocol – An Example of Achievement**

1. Access to genetic resources and benefits sharing is one area under the Convention on Biodiversity requiring close attention by GEF and others to the rights of indigenous peoples. The Nagoya Protocol fulfils one of the three core objectives of the CBD: 'the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources.' It is of particular relevance to indigenous peoples and local communities as the first international agreement that governs access to genetic resources, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits from genetic resources while recognizing the rights, roles and customary use and traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities.

Several articles of the Nagoya Protocol respond and provide provisions recognizing indigenous peoples and local communities and traditional knowledge: the interconnectedness of genetic resources and traditional knowledge; diversity of situation and context surrounding traditional knowledge ownership; identification of traditional knowledge owners; and capacity building and awareness generation of indigenous peoples and local communities. Also, the protocol emphasizes on access, participation in equitable benefit sharing, free, prior and informed consent, and mutually agreed on terms, community protocols and model clauses related to ABS of traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources.

The Nagoya Protocol Implementation Fund (NPIF) is a multi-donor trust fund established in 2011 to support and facilitate "early entry into force of the Protocol and create enabling conditions at national and regional levels for its implementation". The GEF administers and monitors the NPIF approved projects. Thirteen projects were approved. NPIF was closed to further projects by a decision of the GEF council and Nagoya Protocol activities are now supported by the BD focal area.

46. Towards the end of the GEF 5 replenishment in mid-2014, the GEF Secretariat published **Partnership in Practice: Engagement with Indigenous Peoples**, with input from IPAG. This provides a concise summary of GEF policy on indigenous peoples, and includes a similar analysis of GEF-financed projects as the 2008 Indigenous Communities and

Biodiversity document, with updated figures. Additionally, a breakdown of projects by GEF agency is provided. The document presents a series of case studies of projects involving indigenous peoples, and a summary of lessons learned and future directions of GEF engagement with indigenous peoples.

47. In the current GEF 6 replenishment (2014-2018), two publications feature indigenous peoples. In 2016, the GEF Secretariat published the **User Guide: Indigenous Peoples and GEF Project Financing**, a guide to the structure of GEF, funding guidelines and thematic areas. The document, drafted with input from IPAG, covers the processes and application procedures for the Small Grants Programme, Medium- and Full-Sized Projects and the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, and is designed to encourage applications by indigenous peoples' organisations and networks as project leads or beneficiaries.

48. The year 2016 marked the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the GEF. To mark the occasion, the GEF Secretariat published a comprehensive report, **25 Years of the GEF**, providing broad coverage of GEF history, agencies, country operations, related conventions and partners. The report gives significant attention to GEF achievements in developing policies on indigenous peoples, the impacts of GEF-financed projects and short section by the Chair of the IPAG.

49. Looking back over these 25 years through GEF Council and Secretariat documents, a growing acceptance of indigenous peoples is evident, both as project beneficiaries and as active partners. Active engagement occurs through consultation, strategy development and project design. Increasingly, indigenous peoples are portrayed as custodians of biodiversity, land and natural resources. While these documents show a lack of specific data on indigenous peoples within GEF-financed projects, the GEF stance on indigenous peoples is now more nuanced than it was when Minimum Standard 4 was formulated in the 2011 Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards. GEF publications elaborate more fully project obligations under ILO C169, and GEF's position on the UNDRIP. At the same time, the participation of indigenous peoples has been secured in GEF consultation structures through IPAG and the GEF-CSO Network, ensuring that these communities have representation to further develop GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples.

## PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

50. The 2012 *Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples* (GEF/C.42/Inf.03/Rev.1) was published by GEFSEC for dissemination to stakeholders in three languages. The document brings together current GEF policies on indigenous peoples (principally the *GEF Policy on Public Involvement in GEF Projects* and *GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards*) with explanations and intentions regarding further engagement, in response to concerns expressed by indigenous peoples. Consultation was carried out with indigenous peoples during the drafting of the document.

51. The Principles and Guidelines are frequently used as a reference in the implementation of GEF funded projects involving indigenous peoples. The survey of SGP National Coordinators carried out during this evaluation indicated that 67% of the respondents always referred to *GEF Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples* in projects involving indigenous peoples.

52. While not containing any enforceable standards regarding indigenous peoples, over and above what is set out in the antecedent documents the *Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples* document does illustrate the recognition of indigenous peoples' role in GEF operational activities, as well as deficiencies in the realization of indigenous peoples' rights including those associated with the UNDRIP, ILO C169 and the ACHPR. The document "acknowledges the importance of the participation and capacity building of indigenous peoples for the identification, development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of projects" (p.5, para.21) and it calls for further action to improve inclusion of indigenous peoples in GEF activities. By reinforcing the application of GEF Agency standards at or above Minimum Standard 4, the document is widely perceived to be significant in GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples.

53. That said, the Principles and Guidelines do not provide specific commitments, nor does it contain practical guidance on project design or indicators, or a specific list of requirements that might be useful to aid operationalization of Minimum Standard 4 and other relevant GEF policies.

54. The document provides internal mechanisms for GEF to use to uphold the standards proposed in the document (para.45, p.13). They are summarized and commented upon below:

**(a) "Designation of an indigenous peoples focal point for effective and timely engagement with indigenous peoples":**

GEF appointed an indigenous peoples focal point in 2010, along with a Gender focal point, and has maintained the position, though over time the responsibilities listed for the position have encompassed a wider area of GEFSEC operations.

**(b) "Enhanced coordination between GEF Partner Agencies, GEF Secretariat staff, and indigenous peoples through the creation of an Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group":**

IPAG was established in 2013.

**(c) “Reviewing and enhancing GEF monitoring systems to track the effectiveness of the implementation of GEF Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines related to indigenous peoples”:**

Adjustments to monitoring have recently been put into place to better track projects involving indigenous peoples within GEF. However, the monitoring of GEF Agency standards and their application remains an area in need of improvement according to the 2017 Review of The GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards (GEF/ME/C.52/inf.08,).

**(d) “Knowledge and capacity development for indigenous peoples to support their active and effective participation in GEF planning, project cycle and other relevant processes”:**

While efforts have been directed at this area, especially through the SGP, it is acknowledged by IPAG and GEF that further substantial support will be needed to achieve effective participation of indigenous peoples in GEF processes.

**(e) “Capacity building among the GEF Secretariat staff, as well as knowledge development and transfer mechanisms”:**

Given the scope of work specifically on projects involving indigenous peoples, an indigenous peoples focal point and the allocated staff time is insufficient capacity to fulfil the focal point role as envisaged. As a case in point, while IPAG fulfils an important communication and dissemination role, no formal system of contact with the larger regional indigenous peoples’ networks appears to exist within either IPAG or GEFSEC.

**(f) “Identification and strengthening of financial arrangements to support indigenous peoples and their efforts to protect their rights and effectively manage their resources”:**

Access to finance through GEF projects has improved for indigenous peoples, especially with targeted programming from SGP. Beyond SGP, however, access to financing remains limited for indigenous peoples due to a range of barriers mentioned in this review including capacity and application processes.

55. The Principles and Guidelines document also provides guidance for the protection of Indigenous People’s tenure rights:

“...where avoidance (of negative impacts) is not possible, adequate mitigation measures should be taken. This will include the preparation of appropriate land tenure evaluations, as needed, protective measures, and social impact assessments, among others” (p.11, para.36 d).

56. With regard to the provision on tenure, comment is made over the level of specificity in the language used. Use of the phrases “*adequate mitigation measures*” and “*among others*” introduces the possibility of flexible responses, but also ambiguity in the interpretation of what constitutes an acceptable measure toward the protection of indigenous peoples’ tenure rights. There also appears to be a missed opportunity here to underline GEF’s commitment to a rights-based approach by drawing upon international standards such as those contained in the UNDRIP and ILO C169.

57. Lastly, it should be noted that Minimum Standard 4 forms the basis of the GEF policy towards indigenous peoples. It makes up a large part of the content within the *Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples*. As such, any updating of Minimum Standard 4 would, by extension, require an update to the *Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples*.

#### **THE INDIGENOUS PEOPLES ADVISORY GROUP (IPAG)**

58. The GEF Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group (IPAG) was launched in 2013. Its genesis can be traced to recommendations by the Indigenous Peoples Task Force (IPTF) and other stakeholders. The IPTF was formed in July 2011, in response to requests from indigenous peoples and their organizations for clarifications regarding various aspects of GEF's involvement with indigenous peoples. The IPTF was comprised of nine indigenous representatives with support from the GEFSEC, GEF CSO Network and an expert consultant on indigenous peoples. The task force provided feedback and recommendations to the GEFSEC on the engagement and participation of indigenous peoples.

59. The first recommendation directly led to the formation of IPAG. IPAG consists of seven members: four indigenous representatives, one selected by the GEF CSO Network to ensure coordination, and the remaining three nominated through meetings and selected by GEF for geographic balance and experience. Nominations for the three positions are reviewed and endorsed by Indigenous leaders and indigenous peoples networks; an expert on indigenous peoples, and two GEF representatives. Most IPAG members' expertise is focused on the BD focal area.

60. IPAG members and GEFSEC staff note that IPAG's structure was designed to include enough members to have adequate geographic representation of indigenous peoples, while keeping the size manageable for dialogue and consensus building as well as within cost parameters. The structure was to include non-indigenous members with expertise in indigenous projects and programming within implementing agencies to ensure IPAG's approaches are realistic and harmonized. This has occurred, though to date this breadth of representation has mostly been achieved within the thematic area of biodiversity. Of late, IPAG has also been focused on issues of indigenous peoples and chemicals and waste.

61. Members have raised the issue that some geographic areas lack adequate representation in IPAG, especially the Asia-Pacific region. In response, a provisional agreement has been made to add another indigenous representative from the Small Island Developing States. Regarding gender representation, IPAG members indicate that there is balance and sensitivity. Several members commented that the creation of membership structures that explicitly welcome advice from indigenous elders and youth should be explored by IPAG in the future.

62. IPAG provides advice to the GEF Secretariat on indigenous peoples' issues including: enhancing dialogue among indigenous peoples and GEF; developing indigenous peoples capacity to engage in GEF projects and processes; providing inputs to the GEFSEC indigenous peoples focal point on policy and practice; providing inputs on resources and tools that can be used to enhance implementation policy and practice in projects involving indigenous peoples; recommendations on financial arrangements to better support indigenous peoples' projects and project development; and on reaching out to indigenous peoples organizations and communities. In one recent initiative, for example, IPAG assisted

in developing indicators for GEFSEC to better measure benefits and outcomes from GEF funded projects to indigenous peoples. These are now being used to improve monitoring systems.

63. Since the inaugural meeting in July 2013, IPAG has met on average twice per year to provide advice to the GEF Secretariat and to coordinate the dissemination of information from GEF and GEF Agencies to indigenous communities. IPAG members have a continuous role of input into meetings and publications, and have attended annual international meetings to discuss issues and present issues related to GEF financing and indigenous peoples' development. In particular, the IPAG is noted for its influence on GEF-6 replenishment discussions on programming direction and focal area strategies, and for encouraging further engagement in GEF projects through various international forums including MEA COPs (particularly CBD COP12 and 13 and at the UNFCCC) and UNPFII (2014 onwards), and the IUCN World Conservation Congress. IPAG and GEFSEC have collaborated on side events including those with the IPs caucus/forum of the MEAs, and GEFSEC funded IPAG members and other indigenous representatives to attend the 2014 Fifth GEF Assembly and Associated Meetings in Mexico. Individually, IPAG members have also been selected to participate in ECWs and GEF Council meetings,

64. IPAG has made significant contributions to two GEF publications so far, 'Partnership in Practice: Engagement with Indigenous Peoples' in 2014 and the 2016 'User Guide: Indigenous Peoples and GEF Project Financing' (both described in A Retrospective of GEF Engagement with Indigenous Peoples), the latter was launched at the 15th session of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII), attended by IPAG members and the GEF indigenous peoples focal point.

65. IPAG members themselves point to the following gains for indigenous peoples, that can be attributed to the activities of the advisory group:

- (a) Creation of a global and national fellowship program for indigenous peoples with respect to the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Nagoya Protocol (See Box 3) and Climate Change. Regarding the former, the first global scholarship recipients were nominated last December during COP 13.
- (b) Ability to influence action by member states on the principle of "free, prior and informed consent" of indigenous peoples regarding potential development projects or other activities carried out on communal lands.
- (c) Inclusion of indigenous women's vision in the development of GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming (2011).
- (d) Coordination and interaction within a framework of mutual respect with civil society organizations. Achieving this required intense lobbying by indigenous peoples to achieve the inclusion of indigenous peoples' requests in various CSO declarations.

66. By all accounts, a key achievement of IPAG is the establishment of the Indigenous Peoples Fellowship Initiative, under the UNDP implemented GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP). The fellowship resulted from discussions by IPAG on increasing access to GEF financing for indigenous peoples, through dissemination of information, capacity building and the development of leadership skills. It has a global and a, still to be launched, national component. At each level, the program is designed to build skills of proven indigenous



leaders for sustainable development and environmental issues, within GEF biodiversity conservation and climate change focal areas.

67. IPAG is continuing to prepare inputs on indigenous peoples' issues for the GEF 7 Replenishment process, including the establishing the following targets from the June 2016 IPAG meeting<sup>24</sup>:

- (a) A review of implementation of the GEF Principles and Guidelines Mechanisms, with focus on what IPAG has achieved and what needs to be addressed further
- (b) Indigenous peoples' inputs into GEF-7 policy and programming directions
- (c) Additional trainings related to indigenous peoples at relevant international and national meetings
- (d) Further work on implementing the recommendations of the IPAG Financing Paper
- (e) Enhanced engagement with GEF Agencies, with focus on their approach and experiences partnering with indigenous peoples, and how to enhance collaborations
- (f) Consideration of ways that IPAG can assist with bringing more diverse indigenous peoples' perspectives to intergovernmental systems and forums relevant to the GEF's work

#### **IPAG – PERCEIVED LIMITATIONS**

68. While the development of IPAG has been an overwhelmingly positive step for GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples, some limitations have been raised during interviews and document reviews for this review that may warrant further development of IPAG's role and scope of work. These are discussed below.

#### **Communication**

69. Diversity of geographic locations and languages, competing priorities and in many cases limited access to communications technology present challenges for communication to and between indigenous peoples. Some GEF documents are translated to Spanish and French. Predominantly, though, the working documents of the GEF and IPAG that might be relevant to regional and other indigenous peoples' networks are available in English only,

#### **Box 4: Quote from GEFIEO interview**

*"Spanish is the official language in the bulk of the countries in the Latin America and the Caribbean region, with the exception of countries that speak in Portuguese and French. Similarly, in Africa besides English speaking countries there are countries that speak Portuguese and French. Although in Asia English is becoming a common language, there are countries where the local language is not English. In addition, due to a lack of resources, there are persistent problems in translation and interpretation. Within regions, Indigenous Peoples can communicate relatively easily using the alternative common language. At the same time, it is essential to recognize that we are people of oral tradition. Therefore, alternative means to communication through reports and brochures must be considered"*

<sup>24</sup> Source; 'Meeting Notes, GEF Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group (IPAG) Meeting, 3 June 2016'

the working language of IPAG. Reaching a wider range of indigenous groups would require a minimum of Spanish, French and Portuguese - common languages for a large number of indigenous peoples. Furthermore, a recurrent periodic drafting and dissemination of materials to indigenous networks with the assistance of GEFSEC may aid communication outreach.

70. Expectations around how IPAG members are to provide feedback to their own regional indigenous peoples' networks and organisations are not clearly set out, according to IPAG informants. Given infrastructure, geographic and language barriers to communication with indigenous peoples, it is vital that GEF engages with indigenous networks and larger national or cross border indigenous organizations. Significant indigenous peoples regional networks include: the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP), Indigenous Peoples of Africa Co-ordinating Committee (IPACC), Coordinadora Indígena de Centro América (CICA), International Indian Treaty Council (IITC), the Indigenous Peoples' Bio cultural Climate Change Assessment Initiative (IPCCA),e among many others. IPAG members are selected for their knowledge and expertise, not as direct representatives. As it stands, the expectation is to disseminate information about the GEF as and when opportunities arise. The concern is that without clearer expectations regarding the dissemination of IPAG meeting recommendations, materials and reports, there may be lost opportunities to engage with (and be reinforced by) indigenous peoples at this larger scale. Ensuring all relevant IPAG minutes and documentation are uploaded and updated on the GEF website would assist with this process, as would consultation with IPAG members and indigenous networks on improving channels of communication.

### **IPAG capacity**

71. Key informant interviews suggested that familiarity of IPAG members with GEF and GEF Agencies is insufficient for informed interaction between IPAG and GEF. They noted that this could be addressed through training and dissemination, and through the incorporation of systems that further define and formalize communication and roles

#### **Box 5: A Characterization of IPAG from the Inside - I**

*"The advances we make during these two-day meetings prior to the meeting of civil society organizations (CSOs) are small but decisive. As there are several issues to be addressed, it would be useful to increase the number of days of these meetings. However, follow-up action to IPAG meetings is minimal because of the lack of resources for this purpose. This creates an environment of frustrated aspirations for Indigenous Peoples. Nonetheless, it is definitely an accomplishment to be able to count on IPAG as a space to deliberate the realities and challenges of the Indigenous People"*

Quote from GEFIEO interview

between IPAG and GEF. IPAG members indicated that there was still not enough financial resources or time allocated aside from travel and meeting days, to fully implement such a system. Interviewees also pointed to the challenge posed by the two-year term, the limited orientation of new members and the loss of capacity when earlier IPAG members leave without succession plans.

### **Role delineation**

72. IPAG is a consultation mechanism, providing policy advice or operational recommendations to GEF. It has a lesser role in providing technical inputs, or inputs on human rights approaches and political issues intrinsic to engaging with indigenous peoples. Some key informants see this as limiting. While an important milestone in its own right, IPAG appears to these individuals to be less optimally positioned to encourage enhancements to GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples and to represent indigenous peoples within GEF activities. Recently two IPFPs from the GEF-CSO Network have joined IPAG, paving the way for greater advocacy and coordination through the GEF-CSO Network. However, according to those close to IPAG at an operational level, greater involvement is ultimately limited by the level of resourcing assigned to the advisory group. It was also noted by key informants that with increased resources IPAG's role could extend to include communication with indigenous peoples involved in GEF funded projects within an IPAG member's country or region.

### **Staffing capacity in GEFSEC and Agencies**

73. Interviewees also highlighted the lack of dedicated staff experienced in indigenous peoples' issues in GEF. In some GEF Agencies this reportedly results in focal points being stretched in their ability to meet competing responsibilities and address the inputs from indigenous peoples.

### **Capacity within Indigenous Peoples' Networks**

74. In general, knowledge of how to engage with the larger GEF partnership is not well established. IPAG members see a need to address issues of capacity within indigenous peoples' leadership and networks with a view to improving engagement with GEF and GEF Agencies, improving the effectiveness and range of inputs at a project level, and with a view to disseminating experience and knowledge from indigenous peoples who have been

#### ***Box 6: A Characterization of IPAG from the Inside - II***

*"What I am concerned about is the lack of concrete resources [either resources or equipment] to realize and put ideas into practice in order to generate expected benefits for Indigenous Peoples. Concretely, we do not have a database to know which Indigenous Peoples' organizations are already receiving benefits from the GEF and for what kind of projects.*

Quote from GEFIEO interview

involved in processes at regional and international levels, including past and present IPAG members.

## **GEF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES SAFEGUARD: ANALYSIS AND AGENCY COMPARATIVE VIEW**

### **BACKGROUND**

75. The GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards (GEF/C.41/10/Rev.1) was launched in November 2011. The development of these safeguards can be traced to the increase in the number of GEF Agencies being accredited, and to a heightened level of recognition across the partnership that projects may have unintended negative consequences, or trade-offs, wherein fundamentally positive impacts have unintended negative consequences. As such, the need for a minimum level of social and environmental compliance in GEF-funded projects across the multiple agencies of differing geographic and implementation focus became an obvious requirement.

76. The GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards was published as a provisional version in May 2011. After comments from key stakeholders (primarily the GEF-CSO Network, Council members and some additional civil society organisations) further efforts were made to strengthen provisions regarding indigenous peoples. This resulted in significant additions to the safeguards regarding indigenous peoples, both in the overview and implementation sections, and in the core text of Minimum Standard 4: Indigenous Peoples.

77. The GEF Safeguards were largely developed from World Bank Safeguards. The specific section on indigenous peoples, the Minimum Standard 4, had its foundation from the widely-referenced World Bank Operational Policy (OP) 4.10: Indigenous Peoples. In several aspects, the GEF Minimum Standard 4 builds upon OP 4.10 to provide increased relevance to GEF activities.

78. The GEF Minimum Standards do not prescribe the formulation of Agency policies. Rather, they provide a range of obligations to GEF Agencies regarding indigenous peoples. GEF MS 4 asks of them the following:

- (a) To ensure the quality of community consultations
- (b) To undertake environmental and social assessments
- (c) To provide appropriate and inclusive community benefits through projects
- (d) To include indigenous peoples in planning and benefits where restricted access to protected areas occurs
- (e) To confirm prior agreement in use of cultural resources or knowledge of indigenous peoples
- (f) To ensure the development of specific comprehensive plans for indigenous peoples affected by projects
- (g) To disclose consultation processes and the indigenous peoples plan in an accessible manner, and
- (h) To monitor benefits and negative impacts of projects on indigenous peoples by social scientists

79. The document states that GEF requires Free, Prior and Informed Consultation (FPIC) where it is required as a consequence of a country's ratification of International Labour Organisation Convention No.169 (ILO C169).

80. It should also be noted that as the GEF Safeguards were modelled after the World Bank's Safeguards, the GEFSEC recommended that the World Bank be considered as having met the newly drafted GEF Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards<sup>25</sup>.

#### **A COMPARATIVE VIEW OF GEF AND GEF AGENCY INDIGENOUS PEOPLES SAFEGUARDS**

81. The evaluation team carried out a comparative analysis of the wording of Agency safeguards for indigenous peoples, to examine consistency with MS 4 in detail.

82. At the time of the GEF Safeguards publication, the landscape of GEF Agency safeguards for Indigenous Peoples was significantly less developed than it is today. A review of the summaries of agency safeguards and limitations, shows that many GEF agencies have either added or updated provisions including specific safeguards on indigenous peoples in the years following the publication of GEF Minimum Standard 4 (MS 4). These developments are illustrated in Table 1. The table shows that MS 4 was published in 2011, while eleven of the seventeen GEF Agencies included in the comparison have safeguards published in **2015 or later**.

**Table 1: GEF and Agency Indigenous Peoples Safeguards, by Year Published**

| <b>GEF Agency</b>  | <b>Policy</b>  | <b>Year Published</b> |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| United National Development Programme (UNDP)             | Social and Environmental Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples  | 2017                  |
| International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)    | ESMS Standard on Indigenous Peoples  | 2016                  |
| World Bank (WB) 2018 onwards                             | Environmental and Social Standard 7: Indigenous Peoples/Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities | 2016                  |
| Conservation International (CI)                          | Environmental and Social Management Framework Policy 4   | 2015                  |
| Development Bank of Latin America (CAF)                  | Environmental and Social Safeguards for CAF/GEF Projects   | 2015                  |
| Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA)               | Social Safeguard Standard 4: Community Stakeholders and Vulnerable Groups  | 2015                  |
| Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)                  | ESS 9 Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage   | 2015                  |
| Foreign Economic Cooperation Office (FECO) <sup>26</sup> | Environmental and Social Safeguard Framework   | 2015                  |

<sup>25</sup> "...because the GEF's minimum safeguard standards are derived from World Bank safeguard policies, and the World Bank already has a best-practice accountability system, the Secretariat recommends that the Council note that the Bank already meets the proposed minimum standards." (para.5, p.iii, GEF/C.41/10/Rev.1)

<sup>26</sup> Not included in comparison

|  |   |      |
|--|---|------|
| United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP)              | Safeguard Standard 5: Indigenous Peoples      | 2015 |
| United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) | Operational Safeguard 4: Indigenous Peoples   | 2015 |
| West African Development Bank (BOAD)                       | Operational Policy 8: Indigenous Peoples      | 2015 |
| World Wildlife Fund (WWF)                                  | Indigenous Peoples Safeguard                  | 2015 |
| European Bank for Reconstruction (EBRD)                    | Performance Requirement 7: Indigenous Peoples | 2014 |
| African Development Bank (AfDB)                            | Integrated Safeguards System                  | 2013 |
| Fundo Brasileiro para a Biodiversidade (FUNBIO)            | Indigenous Peoples Policy                     | 2013 |
| Global Environment Facility (GEF)                          | Minimum Standard 4                            | 2011 |
| Asian Development Bank (ADB)                               | Safeguard Requirements 3: Indigenous Peoples  | 2009 |
| International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)     | Engagement with Indigenous Peoples Policy     | 2009 |
| Inter-American Development Bank (IADB)                     | Operational Policy on Indigenous Peoples      | 2006 |
| World Bank (WB) <i>up to 2018</i>                          | Operational Policy 4.10: Indigenous Peoples   | 2005 |

83. Many key informants have asserted that GEF MS 4, in its current wording, has outlived its utility and needs to be updated to again demonstrate leadership within the partnership. As it is, the foundational World Bank Operational Policy (OP) safeguards, published 12 years ago are about to be superseded by new World Bank Environmental and Social Standards (ESS) in 2018 (also see Table 1).

84. In reviewing MS 4, a comparison has been made between the nine key provisions set out by GEF in the MS 4 section and the wording of provisions among 17 GEF Agency indigenous peoples' safeguard policies. One agency, FECO, is excluded from this analysis due to the agreement between GEF and FECO that no projects affecting indigenous peoples will be proposed by the agency, due to inapplicability of the Minimum Standards<sup>27</sup>. The comparison includes two policies from the World Bank (the current OP 4.10, and ESS 7<sup>28</sup> applied from 2018 onwards), hence 18 policies in total across the 17 Agencies. A summary of this comparison is contained in Table 2, below.

85. It should be noted that though Agencies are expected to meet conditions within the safeguards, GEF does not prescribe the wording of GEF Agency Safeguard policies. The table below therefore indicates the extent of comparable wording and provisions within Agency

<sup>27</sup> See section 4.03 of the Memorandum of Understanding between FECO and the GEF (<https://www.thegef.org/documents/memorandum-understanding-between-feco-and-gef>)

<sup>28</sup> Environmental and Social Standard 7 is titled "Indigenous Peoples/Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities"

policies, not safeguard compliance within projects. However, where inconsistencies between safeguard policies occur, additional focus or provisions would be expected to mitigate any potential risks.

**Table 2: Summary of GEF Agency Conformity with GEF Minimum Standard 4: Indigenous Peoples**

| GEF Minimum Standard 4: Indigenous Peoples  | Summary of GEF Agency Conformity with MS 4                |   |               |
|---|---|---|---------------|
|   | Exceeds   | Consistent  | Partial       |
| 1. Undertake free, prior, and informed consultations with affected IPs to ascertain their broad community support for projects affecting them and to solicit their full and effective participation in designing, implementing, and monitoring measures to (a) ensure a positive engagement in the project (b) avoid adverse impacts, or when avoidance is not feasible, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for such effects; and (c) tailor benefits in a culturally appropriate way (MS 4 para.36) | BOAD CI<br>DBSA FAO<br>FUNBIO<br>IFAD IUCN<br>UNDP<br>WWF | ADB AfDB<br>CAF EBRD<br>IADB UNEP<br>UNIDO<br>WB(4.10)<br>WB(ESS7)  |               |
| 2. Undertake environmental and social impact assessment, with involvement of IPs, to assess potential impacts and risks when a project may have adverse impacts (MS 4 para.37)  | UNDP  | ADB AfDB<br>BOAD CAF<br>CI DBSA<br>EBRD FAO<br>FUNBIO<br>IADB IFAD<br>IUCN UNEP<br>UNIDO<br>WB(ESS7)<br>WWF                     | WB(4.10)<br>) |
| 3. Provide socioeconomic benefits in ways that are culturally appropriate, and gender and generationally inclusive. Full consideration should be given to options preferred by the affected indigenous peoples for provision of benefits and mitigation measures (MS 4 para.38)   |   | ADB AfDB<br>BOAD CI<br>CAF DBSA<br>EBRD FAO<br>FUNBIO<br>IADB IFAD<br>IUCN UNDP<br>UNEP<br>UNIDO<br>WB(4.10)<br>WB(ESS7)<br>WWF |               |

|  |                                       |   |              |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|--------------|
| 4. If access restriction to parks and protected areas, ensure that affected IPs fully and effectively participate in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of management plans for such areas and share equitably in benefits from the areas (MS 4 para.40)  | ADB FAO<br>UNDP<br>UNIDO<br>WB(ESS7)  | BOAD CAF<br>CI DBSA<br>EBRD<br>FUNBIO<br>IADB IFAD<br>IUCN UNEP<br>WB(4.10)<br>WWF                                      | AfDB         |
| 5. Refrain from utilizing cultural resources or knowledge of IPs without obtaining prior agreement (MS 4 para.41)  | EBRD<br>UNIDO<br>WB(4.10)<br>WB(ESS7) | ADB BOAD<br>CAF CI DBSA<br>FAO FUNBIO<br>IADB IFAD<br>IUCN UNDP<br>WWF  | AfDB<br>UNEP |
| 6. Where the economic or social impact assessment identifies adverse effects on IPs, Agency policies require that the project develop an IP plan or a framework that (a) specifies measures to ensure that affected IPs receive culturally appropriate benefits and (b) identifies measures to avoid, minimize, mitigate or compensate for any adverse effects, (c) includes measures for continued consultation during project implementation, grievance procedures, and monitoring and evaluation arrangements, and (d) specifies a budget and financing plan for implementing the planned measures. Such plans should draw on indigenous knowledge and be developed in with the full and effective participation of affected IPs (MS 4 para.42) | -                                     | ADB BOAD<br>CAF CI DBSA<br>EBRD FAO<br>FUNBIO<br>IADB IFAD<br>IUCN UNDP<br>UNEP<br>UNIDO<br>WB(4.10)<br>WB(ESS7)<br>WWF | AfDB         |
| 7. Disclose documentation of the consultation process and the required IP plan or framework, in timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in a place accessible to key stakeholders, including project affected groups and CSOs, in a form and language understandable to them (MS 4 para.43)   | -                                     | ADB BOAD<br>CAF CI DBSA<br>EBRD FAO<br>FUNBIO<br>IADB IFAD<br>IUCN UNDP<br>UNEP<br>UNIDO<br>WB(4.10)<br>WB(ESS7)<br>WWF |              |
| 8. Monitor, by experienced social scientists, the implementation of the project (and any required IP plan or framework) and its benefits as well as challenging or negative impacts on indigenous peoples and address possible   | FAO<br>FUNBIO<br>IFAD UNDP<br>WWF     | ADB BOAD<br>CAF CI DBSA<br>ERBD IADB<br>IUCN UNEP<br>UNIDO  | AfDB         |



|   |  |                      |      |
|---|--|----------------------|------|
| mitigation measures in a participatory manner<br>(MS 4 para.44)   |  | WB(4.10)<br>WB(ESS7) |      |
| 9. GEF SGs require FPIC where it is required by virtue of ratification of ILO 169. Must document mutually accepted consultation process and evidence of agreement as outcome of process (Agency MS Key Principles para.23, p.6) | ADB BOAD<br>CI DBSA<br>EBRD FAO<br>FUNBIO<br>IADB IFAD<br>IUCN<br>UNDP<br>UNEP<br>UNIDO<br>WB(ESS7)<br>WWF | CAF<br>WB(4.10)      | AfDB |

86. In general, the wording of GEF Agencies safeguard policies are in alignment with the requirements of GEF MS 4. Of the nine provisions of MS 4, Agencies show high levels of conformity in the areas of environmental and social impact assessments, appropriate socioeconomic benefits, indigenous peoples' plans and document disclosure (requirements 2, 3, 6 and 7 in Table 2 above).

87. In the areas of consultation, participation and the application of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) (requirements 1 and 9 in Table 2), the wording of GEF Agency safeguards tends to exceed MS 4 provisions by insisting on greater protections for indigenous peoples or greater participation within project frameworks. To a lesser extent, MS 4 standards are also exceeded in terms of access, participation and benefits in protected areas, the use of cultural resources and traditional knowledge, and with the monitoring of GEF-funded projects (requirements 4, 5 and 8 in Table 2).

88. The comparison highlighted one case where UNEP and WB OP4.10 appear to provide a lesser degree of protection than provisions of GEF MS 4, regarding the protection of intangible culture and environmental and social impact assessment respectively (requirements 5 and 2 in Table 2). It should be noted that there is a lack of clarity over the Minimum Standards application to WB projects (see the later section *Safeguard Application and Monitoring*).

89. In the case of AfDB, five instances were identified where the wording of safeguard policy did not appear to provide the same level of protection as stated in MS 4 (requirements 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9 in Table 2). An explanation of the documents reviewed and specific issues raised regarding these instances is provided in Annex 6 of this report.

90. Apparent safeguard inconsistencies, as noted above, do not reflect non-compliance in project implementation. They can only be interpreted as wording differences warranting attention to ward against the risk of a material difference in implementation.

91. The GEF is expected to detect discrepancies through a process of periodic compliance monitoring, as specified in its current policy document.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Monitoring Agency Compliance with GEF Policies on Environmental and Social Safeguards, Gender, and Fiduciary Standards: Implementation Modalities, GEF/C.51/08/Rev. 01, October 27, 2016

92. Regarding application of MS 4, Agencies found non-compliant by independent assessment at the time the GEF MS 4 policy was written (late 2011) were expected to upgrade their safeguards to meet the requirements for the current (GEF-6) replenishment cycle. According to the GEFSEC, all Agencies have satisfied these requirements at the time of writing. As per the Monitoring Policy of 2016 introduced at the 51<sup>st</sup> Council meeting, future self-assessments and risk-based third-party reviews are expected to take place with each replenishment cycle, starting with the final year of the GEF-7, (2022).

93. The evaluators were not able to assess the adequacy of Agency monitoring systems regarding MS 4, except to note from agency interviews that the development of these systems is in the formative stages in several instances and are yet to be developed in others.

#### **EXAMINING MINIMUM STANDARD 4**

94. The evaluator's analysis of Minimum Standard 4 (MS 4) is divided into the following areas: design elements, identification of indigenous peoples, consultations, consent and participation, alignment with human rights, and safeguard application and monitoring. The analysis is based on a review of safeguard documents and the commentary of key informants familiar with them.

#### ***Design***

95. Minimum Standard 4 and some GEF Agency safeguards related to indigenous peoples provide clear and concise standards and guidance. Reviewed against criteria including utility and clarity, it was noted that some Agency safeguards were designed with concise language and sub-sections that made comparison and implementation options clear. Others were more difficult to analyse due to a lack of concise language and standards set out across multiple documents.

#### ***Identification of Indigenous Peoples***

96. MS 4 establishes criteria regarding the identification of indigenous peoples within project areas, as follows:

“(Indigenous peoples) are identified through criteria that reflect their social and cultural distinctiveness. Such criteria may include: self-identification and identification by others as indigenous peoples, collective attachment to land, presence of customary institutions, indigenous language, and primarily subsistence-oriented production” (p.24, para.35).

97. Organizations such as the UN, ILO and ACHPR provide a widely-accepted range of criteria to identify indigenous peoples, while avoiding exacting definitions which may prove difficult given the diversity of indigenous peoples and the lack of recognition of such groups in some states. A number of GEF Agencies present a fuller explanation than GEF within their safeguard policies on the identification of indigenous peoples. One, in particular, is the UNDP with its Social and Environmental Standards (SES). The UNDP SES also reduces possible inconsistencies in the national application of the term by stating:

“For purposes of this Standard, “indigenous peoples” refers to distinct collectives, regardless of the local, national and regional terms applied to them, who satisfy any of the more commonly accepted definitions of indigenous peoples” (UNDP Social and Environmental Standards, p.37)

98. Overall, then, there appears to be scope for GEF to either expand its own criteria or directly reference other widely accepted international criteria for identifying indigenous peoples, to ensure clarity by all stakeholders. This would ensure that project implementing bodies and states have greater clarity over when to apply MS 4. This is of particular relevance in countries where states do not recognize indigenous peoples and/or dispute their identification in national projects.

### ***Consultations, Consent and Participation***

99. There are several observations to be made about these aspects of engagement

- (a) **FPIC coverage** - Currently, GEF requires FPIC approaches only from ILO C169 signatory states (see next section). By contrast, the Agency safeguard policies of BOAD, CI, DBSA, FUNBIO, IFAD, FAO, IUCN, UNEP, UNIDO and WWF have put in place mandatory FPIC processes for all projects involving indigenous peoples. As well, the EBRD, UNDP and WB ESS7 require FPIC for projects involving a potential loss of land, natural resources and cultural heritage, and those involving resettlement.
- (b) **Expectations on Agencies regarding alignment** - The Minimum Standards state that “GEF Partner Agencies will rely on their systems for consultation with indigenous peoples” (para.24, p.6). Expectations regarding the quality of engagement *vis a vis* the Minimum Standards are not spelled out, however.
- (c) **IP participation in project processes** - While the application of environmental and social impact assessments is clearly defined in MS 4, and the involvement of indigenous peoples in such assessments is mandated, the level of participation is not well defined, as illustrated below:

“(Agency is to) undertake the environmental and social impact assessment, with involvement of indigenous peoples, to assess potential impacts and risks when a project may have adverse impacts. Identify measures to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate adverse impacts” (MS 4, para.37)

100. Some GEF Agencies have specified the level of required participation by indigenous peoples. The UNDP SES, for example, requires that:

“Projects with potentially significant adverse impacts require a full social and environmental assessment conducted by an independent and capable entity. Reviews and assessments will be conducted transparently and with the full, effective and meaningful participation of the indigenous peoples concerned” (Requirement 10, UNDP SES Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples)

101. Further, a number of GEF Agency safeguards (including those of FAO, FUNBIO, IFAD, UNDP and WWF) also require the participation of indigenous peoples in project monitoring processes. Precedents exist within the GEF partnership for elaborating IP participation in project processes beyond what is currently set out in MS 4.

- (a) **GEF’s terminology related to FPIC** - Some ambiguity exists around GEF’s use of the term “free, prior and informed consultations”, a term borrowed from the World Bank Operational Policies that includes elements of, but is not the same as, Free,

Prior and Informed Consent – the exact wording behind FPIC. While the construction of the term “free, prior and informed consultations” indicates a positive relation to elements of FPIC, opting for such a similar term introduces opacity. In content and in use of acronym, the phrase is similar but the meaning is emphatically different; it lacks the element of consent. As GEF is promoting an engagement with indigenous peoples that is transparent and participatory, wording along the lines of, “consultations that are free, prior and informed” would give more clarity to GEF’s position.

102. That said, it is also important to note that while the use of “free, prior and informed consultations” lacks the requirement for consent, the Minimum Standards also state that GEF Partner Agencies must “ensure that such consultations result in broad community support for the GEF-financed operation being proposed” (para.24, p.6). This suggests that what is called for is consent. As such, adopting an inclusive approach to FPIC may be unlikely to generate operational changes, as it seems unlikely that GEF would finance projects that lack community consent (within the accepted definitions of consent that align with broad agreement, and not unanimity).

### ***Human Rights***

103. While the GEF Minimum Standards sought to address requests from the GEF CSO Network and others to clarify GEF’s relationship with the UNDRIP and the ILO C169<sup>30</sup>, little explanation of the relationship is given in the document itself. More context is provided in subsequent GEFSEC publications. By contrast, FUNBIO, UNDP and WWF directly reference provisions set out in UNDRIP in the application of safeguards for indigenous peoples, and FAO, IUCN and UNIDO link to specific aspects of the UNDRIP.

104. The GEF Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples does state that GEF “supports the realization of the provisions articulated in the Declaration, and believes that GEF-financed projects can positively contribute to the realization of the principles of the Declaration” (para.34, p.9). However, the nature of this support remains undefined in GEF publications and is yet to be reflected in other GEF policies.

105. The analysis carried out for this review, and summarized in Table 3 below, shows that UNDRIP Article 29(1) broadly encapsulates much of GEF’s approach with indigenous peoples. As such, it paves the way for defining a rights based approach within the GEF partnership, bringing clarity to the alignment that exists between GEF’s policy positions *vis a vis* the provision of the UNDRIP. It says that, “indigenous peoples have the right to the conservation and protection of the environment and the productive capacity of their lands or territories and resources. States shall establish and implement assistance programmes for indigenous peoples for such conservation and protection, without discrimination”.

---

<sup>30</sup> UNDRIP is a non-binding international convention signed by nearly all UN member states and adopted by the General Assembly, and International Labour Organization Convention 169 is a binding convention signed by 22 states, 15 of which are in Latin America

**Table 3: Corresponding areas between GEF Minimum Standard 4 and the UNDRIP**

| <b>GEF Minimum Standard 4: Indigenous Peoples</b>  | <b>Corresponding UNDRIP Article</b>  |
|--|--|
| <b>MS 4 para.38:</b> Provide socioeconomic benefits in ways that are culturally appropriate, and gender and generationally inclusive. Full consideration should be given to options preferred by the affected indigenous peoples for provision of benefits and mitigation measures | <b>Article 21(2):</b> States shall take effective measures and, where appropriate, special measures to ensure continuing improvement of their economic and social conditions. Particular attention shall be paid to the rights and special needs of indigenous elders, women, youth, children and persons with disabilities.   |
| <b>MS 4 para.40:</b> If access restriction to parks and protected areas, ensure that affected IPs fully and effectively participate in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of management plans for such areas and share equitably in benefits from the areas     | <b>Article 32(1):</b> Indigenous peoples have the right to determine and develop priorities and strategies for the development or use of their lands or territories and other resources.   |
| <b>MS 4 para.41:</b> Refrain from utilizing cultural resources or knowledge of IPs without obtaining prior agreement   | <b>Article 31(1):</b> Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures, including human and genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs, sports and traditional games and visual and performing arts. They also have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their intellectual property over such cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions. |

| GEF Minimum Standard 4: Indigenous Peoples   | Corresponding UNDRIP Article  |
|--|---|
| <p><b>MS 4 para.42:</b> Where the economic or social impact assessment identifies adverse effects on IPs, Agency policies require that the project develop an IP plan or a framework that (a) specifies measures to ensure that affected IPs receive culturally appropriate benefits and (b) identifies measures to avoid, minimize, mitigate or compensate for any adverse effects, (c) includes measures for continued consultation during project implementation, grievance procedures, and monitoring and evaluation arrangements, and (d) specifies a budget and financing plan for implementing the planned measures. Such plans should draw on indigenous knowledge and be developed in with the full and effective participation of affected IPs</p> | <p><b>Article 18:</b> Indigenous peoples have the right to participate in decision-making in matters which would affect their rights, through representatives chosen by themselves in accordance with their own procedures, as well as to maintain and develop their own indigenous decision-making institutions.</p> |

106. The Minimum Standard’s adoption of “free, prior and informed consent for GEF-financed projects for which FPIC is required by virtue of the relevant state’s ratification of ILO Convention 169” (par.22) shows one area of linkage between human rights mechanisms and MS 4. While FPIC is not specifically referred to within ILO C169’s text, consultation with the objective of “achieving agreement or consent” is guaranteed under Article 6, and Article 7 affirms the right for indigenous peoples to:

“...decide their own priorities for the process of development as it affects their lives, beliefs, institutions and spiritual well-being and the lands they occupy or otherwise use, and to exercise control, to the extent possible, over their own economic, social and cultural development.”

107. Hence, taken in context with Articles 14 to 17 containing specific provisions on land and natural resources and rulings by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights on the application of FPIC<sup>31</sup>, signatory states are compelled to obtain indigenous peoples’ consent for all projects affecting them. As such, GEF’s adoption of FPIC in these countries appears to be a necessity rather than a choice.

108. Additionally, while MS 4 (para.22) states “there is no universally accepted definition of FPIC”, it is also the case that in Latin American signatory states to C169, there is domestic and regional jurisprudence providing a clear basis for FPIC processes, and FPIC processes have been clarified by various UN agencies and civil society organisations<sup>32</sup>. A key reference in this regard is the UN Development Group FPIC guidelines that form Annex 2 of the GEF Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with indigenous peoples.

<sup>31</sup> See for example *Saramaka People v. Suriname*, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. (Ser. C) No. 172, Judgment of November 28, 2007 or *Kichwa Indigenous People of Sarayaku v. Ecuador*, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R., Judgment of June 27, 2012

<sup>32</sup> For example, see UN REDD FPIC guidance <http://www.unclearn.org/sites/default/files/inventory/un-redd05.pdf> and FAO’s FPIC manual <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i6190e.pdf>

### ***Safeguard Application and Monitoring***

109. With reference to page 6, paragraph 24, the Minimum Standards state that for projects in ILO C169 non-signatory states “GEF Partner Agencies will rely on their (own) systems for consultation with indigenous peoples and will ensure that such consultations result in broad community support for the GEF-financed operation being proposed”. In this context, the way Agencies monitor consultation and project implementation is up to them. Indeed, there is no requirement that agencies report to GEF on compliance with safeguards, including those of Minimum Standard 4.

110. The 2017 Review of The GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards (GEF/ME/C.52/inf. 08), recommends that GEF should consider tracking and/or providing independent control checks of consultation procedures under partner agencies.

#### **Box 7: Recommendation from Review of GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards for Environmental and Social Safeguards**

**“Recommendation 2. Improve safeguards monitoring and reporting.** GEF should consider tracking social and environmental risks at the portfolio-level and ensuring a “flow-through” of monitoring information on safeguards implementation. Agencies should inform GEF of the safeguards risk categorization assigned to projects/ programmes and keep GEF informed of safeguards implementation issues through monitoring and reporting. Where available, this should ideally build off Agency systems rather than duplicating them. GEF could issue guidance regarding safeguards-related reporting in annual reporting and project/programme evaluations. Increased GEF attention of safeguards implementation reporting may support and strengthen relatively new safeguards systems among some GEF Agencies and promote greater consistency” (p.iv)

111. On another note, it was recommended in the Minimum Standards to exclude the World Bank from assessment in demonstrating compliance with GEF safeguards:

“Because the GEF safeguard standards are derived from a version of the WB's safeguard standards it is understood that the World Bank already meets the standards. For this reason, the GEF will not assess the World Bank according to the minimum standards in this policy.” (GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards, p.10, para.41).

112. However, there is also a lack of clarity regarding the active application of Minimum Standards to the World Bank:

“GEF will apply the standards in an equitable manner to all GEF Partner Agencies. However, because the GEF's minimum safeguard standards are derived from World Bank safeguard policies, and the World Bank already has a best-practice accountability system, the Secretariat recommends that the Council note that the Bank already meets the proposed minimum standards.” (GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards, p.ii, para.5).

113. While this approach may reduce administration in terms of applying similar safeguards, it is also the case that the two institutions are separate and have independently developed and approved their safeguards. Hence it would have been more transparent to apply all Minimum Standards processes equally to all GEF Agencies. During the drafting of the World Bank's EES 7, the Agency faced criticism from indigenous peoples organisations<sup>33</sup>. In this instance, elements of the approved EES 7, including the necessity for Indigenous Peoples Plans obligated under MS 4, appeared less robust than what is contained in OP 4.10<sup>34</sup>. The concern here is that Agency safeguarding processes, including those of the World Bank are largely evolving independently of each other. As such, to not apply GEF Minimum Standards universally to Agencies, including the World Bank, increases the risk over time of financing GEF projects with sub-standard safeguard applications.

114. Finally, regarding FECO, while a moratorium on GEF financing of FECO projects involving indigenous peoples may have been agreed by both parties, China has a high population of indigenous peoples. Almost one third of the world's indigenous peoples by International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs estimates.<sup>35</sup> GEFSEC's position regarding the moratorium is that FECO has the same opportunity as other Agencies to submit their materials supporting their eligibility to undertake projects that engage indigenous peoples.

#### ***Minimum Standard 4 - Concluding Remarks***

115. As highlighted earlier in the section, GEF Minimum Standard 4 provided an important baseline in 2011 for Agency activities; this at a time when safeguards for indigenous peoples were less well developed across GEF's Partner Agencies. In subsequent years, MS 4 has been a basis for the progressive development and acceptance of indigenous peoples' rights manifested in revised policies among GEF Agencies. And so, today, there is a high level of consistency between MS 4 and GEF Agency safeguards. Indeed, a number of GEF Agencies have exceeded the requirements of MS 4, especially in areas of consultation, defined participation, the application of FPIC (see above sub-section section ii) Consultation and Consent) and the acceptance and support of various international human rights mechanisms, principally the UNDRIP (see above sub-section iii) Human Rights).

116. As an organization, GEF has continued to be a proponent of progressive scientific and technical approaches to environmental conservation, management and adaptation, an approach that has recognized and embraced the enormous contribution of indigenous peoples to environmental conservation and management practices. That said, this

---

<sup>33</sup> For examples see submissions from IWGIA

[https://consultations.worldbank.org/Data/hub/files/iwgia\\_letter\\_to\\_world\\_bank.pdf](https://consultations.worldbank.org/Data/hub/files/iwgia_letter_to_world_bank.pdf), Forest Peoples Programme and Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact: <http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/safeguard-accountability-issues/news/2015/02/joint-aipp-and-fpp-submission-world-bank>, and compiled feedback: [https://consultations.worldbank.org/Data/hub/files/submission\\_from\\_members\\_and\\_secretariat\\_of\\_the\\_international\\_land\\_coalition\\_ilc.pdf](https://consultations.worldbank.org/Data/hub/files/submission_from_members_and_secretariat_of_the_international_land_coalition_ilc.pdf)

<sup>34</sup> See for example, Forest Peoples Programme:

<http://www.forestpeoples.org/sites/fpp/files/news/2016/07/WB%20article%20July%2021%20near%20final.pdf> and US Government response to WB ESS7 p.3-4: <https://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/international/development-banks/Documents/US%20Position%20on%20the%20Review%20and%20Update%20of%20the%20World%20Bank's%20Safeguard%20Policies.pdf>

<sup>35</sup> See Patrinos and Hall (2010) Indigenous Peoples, Poverty and Development, p.9-11, and IWGIA: The Indigenous World 2017: [http://www.iwgia.org/publications/search-pubs?publication\\_id=760](http://www.iwgia.org/publications/search-pubs?publication_id=760)



commitment remains an area that could be better reflected in GEF Safeguards, and could further influence the recognition of indigenous peoples' rights and roles in the realization of environmental conservation efforts.

117. More specifically, in any future GEF policies pertaining to indigenous peoples, consideration should be given to either clarifying the GEF position on the use of the FPIC universally, or to defining GEF's position on indigenous peoples' right to self-determination, a core component of FPIC principles that links to many of the provisions within the UNDRIP and ILO C169. Additionally, further linkages could be made from current MS 4 requirements and any future safeguard development to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights<sup>36</sup> and to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights<sup>37</sup>, both of which are widely applied and carry relevance to all projects partnered with communities.

---

<sup>36</sup> <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CESCR.aspx>

<sup>37</sup> <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CCPR.aspx>

## PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS

### METHODOLOGY

118. For portfolio development, the concept of “indigenous peoples” is interpreted broadly within the GEF partnership to include projects that have engagement activities with indigenous peoples, traditional local communities, tribes, ethnic minorities and other groups that share the same ancestry, culture, language and social status.

119. The evidence presented in the following analysis draws on two inter-related sources:

- (a) **Documents in the GEF’s Project Management Information System (PMIS)** – this includes project documents, the Safeguard datasheet, and project review sheets. This review was used as a starting point for developing the indigenous peoples portfolio. The final portfolio is derived from a combination of a GEF-Secretariat list, a new list developed in 2017<sup>38</sup>, and a list of projects provided by the Terminal Evaluation (TE) team in June 2017<sup>39</sup>.
- (b) **GEF-IEO’s internal project performance portfolio (Terminal Evaluation Review Database)**, which contains ratings on outcomes, sustainability and efficiency that have been evaluated through the Office’s Annual Performance Evaluation (APRs). One-hundred-eighty-eight (188) of the 426 GEF indigenous peoples project are included in the Evaluation Office’s TER database, with 181 projects having ratings on project outcomes. The other seven projects did not have sufficient information on the TE reports to assign performance ratings. Using this information on project performance, this study compared the relative performance of projects that engaged indigenous peoples with the overall GEF portfolio along the dimensions of outcome, likelihood of sustainability, and outcome efficiency.

### PORTFOLIO HIGHLIGHTS

120. Analysis of the GEF portfolio covers from the pilot phase to mid-way through GEF6<sup>40</sup> and shows that projects that engage Indigenous peoples are gaining in presence and are performing comparably. Highlights include:

- (a) By number of projects and by investment, the proportion of Full-sized and Medium-sized projects that include indigenous peoples has increased substantially since the beginning of GEF

---

<sup>38</sup> In October 2016, the GEF IEO received a list of 223 projects engaged indigenous peoples from the GEF Secretariat. The Secretariat’s list collected projects that were approved up to May 2014, using methods of keyword searching and project document review. The Secretariat’s list was further reviewed in December 2016 to update their categorization (moved 13 projects to the new category “Others”), and 5 non-Indigenous Peoples projects were removed. Followed the same methodology and applied additional text-analysis software, the IEO also reviewed the GEF 5 & 6 projects and added in 154 projects to compile the final 372 projects portfolio.

<sup>39</sup> In June 2017, the IEO-TE review team provided a list of 69 OPS6 projects that had substantial effects on indigenous peoples. The TE team reviewed project documents of 355 closed projects from OPS6, and focused on indigenous people’s engagement and consultation activities. Among the reviewed projects, 69 projects included activities that are likely to have substantial effect on indigenous peoples.

<sup>40</sup> Projects approved as of September 30, 2016.

- (b) At the same time, project holders have improved their ability to leverage co-financing for projects engaging indigenous peoples
- (c) Most of the projects involving indigenous peoples fall into the Full-sized category, and have been implemented by just four of the GEF accredited agencies (UNDP, WB, UNEP, FAO)
- (d) Over half of funded projects fall into the Bio-diversity focal area, though a shift is evident toward a greater concentration of projects engaging indigenous peoples in the Multi-focal and Climate Change focus areas
- (e) The greatest number of projects and the largest concentration of investment occurs in Latin America and the Caribbean
- (f) Two-thirds of all projects identified with indigenous peoples show “limited” (participation) or “moderate” involvement (beneficiaries) of indigenous peoples; thus far, projects exclusively driven by indigenous peoples are in a minority
- (g) In the last two GEF cycles, performance lags between Indigenous People focused projects and the GEF portfolio have been replaced by consistently high levels of satisfaction across the two groups
- (h) Outcome performance levels have been highest across Indigenous People projects focused on land degradation, climate change and biodiversity and among projects operating globally and in the Latin America and the Caribbean
- (i) Indigenous People projects are comparable to the GEF portfolio on the likelihood of being sustainable; however, attaining sustainability poses a challenge for the portfolio, as a whole, with just over half of projects showing moderate likelihood or greater of being sustainable
- (j) On project efficiency, Indigenous People projects measure comparably with the GEF portfolio, though there is scope for improvement (with over half rated as moderately satisfactory or lower)


## **PORTFOLIO TRENDS**

121. The indigenous peoples portfolio identified for OPS6 is comprised of 426 projects within a time frame spanning from the pilot phase to part of GEF-6 (See Annex 2). The portfolio represents approximately ten percent of the 4,319 projects approved as of September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2016. From a financial perspective, this portfolio comprises about 11 percent of the total GEF portfolio investment across focal areas.

122. Among the 426 projects, 304 are Full-Size Projects (71%), and 122 are Medium-Size Projects (29%). Altogether, they represent US\$2,503 million in GEF grant investment and US\$12,893 million via co-financing.


123. The trends in project number and grant amount are presented in Figure 1. The graph shows a prominent increase from GEF-4 to GEF-5. Here, though, it should be noted that the portfolio development process before and after GEF-5 were conducted by different groups. There is some uncertainty about the exact number of projects with the involvement of indigenous peoples and their actual investment amount due to the lack of systematic tagging in the PMIS.

**Figure 1: Comparison of Investment Volume and Number of Projects, by GEF Phase (note: GEF-6 ~50% complete)**



124. The lead implementing Agencies in this portfolio, in order of magnitude are: UNDP (44%), World Bank (23%), UNEP (14%) and FAO (8%). The remaining 11 percent of projects were implemented by ADB, AfDB, IADB, UNIDO, Funbio, CI, IUCN, IFAD and WWF. Figure 2 presents the number of projects and the corresponding GEF grant amount and co-financing amount with these implementing agencies.


**Figure 2: Distribution of Indigenous Peoples Grant Projects, by Agency**



### **Modality and Focal Area**


125. In the indigenous peoples portfolio, 304 projects are full-size (71%), and 122 projects medium-size (29%). As shown in Figure 3, full-size projects greatly outnumber medium-size projects in terms of GEF grant amount and co-financing amount.

**Figure 3: Distribution of Indigenous Peoples Grant Projects, by Project Type**




126. As illustrated by Figure 4, the Biodiversity (BD) focal area dominates the indigenous peoples portfolio with a total of 205 projects (55%), though indigenous peoples have been increasingly engaged in the other focal areas as well: 80 projects (22%) are Multi-Focal Area (MFA) projects, 52 projects (14%) are Climate Change(CC) projects, 22 projects (6%) are Land Degradation (LD) projects, and the remaining 4 percent of projects are with focal areas of International Water (IW) and POPs.

**Figure 4: Distribution of GEF Projects, by Focal Area**



127. Indeed, as shown in Figure 5, the relative number of Biodiversity projects in the indigenous peoples portfolio declined over time, with an increase of projects especially in the Multi-Focal Area and Climate Change focal area.


**Figure 5: Focal Area Distribution of Indigenous Peoples Grant Portfolio, by GEF Phase**  
(note: GEF-6 ~50% complete)



### ***Regional Distribution of projects***


128. Based on the analysis captured in Figure 6, the greatest concentration of investment is in Latin America and the Caribbean (34%), with Asia (29%) and Africa (25%) in second and third place in terms of project number, GEF grant amount and co-financing amount. Regional projects are the smallest in number, in grant amounts and in co-financing.

**Figure 6: Investment and Number of Indigenous Peoples Grant Projects, by Region**



129. Figure 7 illustrates the increasing number of Global projects funded over the years, and the growth in projects in Asia, Latin America and Caribbean over GEF phases.

**Figure 7: Regional Distribution of Investment in Indigenous Peoples Grant Projects, by GEF Phase (note: GEF-6 ~50% complete)**



### ***Degree of Indigenous Peoples Engagement***

130. Involvement of indigenous peoples may take several forms. Indigenous People's Organizations might act in lead or partnering roles in projects. Indigenous People may comprise part or all of the beneficiary profile of a project. And, at times, Indigenous communities may be in receipt of payments for ecosystem services. Engagement mechanisms also vary widely, from inclusion in stakeholder consultations to full blown participatory project design and monitoring by indigenous peoples. GEF has established four categories to encompass the range of intensity of engagement, used previously in the analyses of projects in the GEF 2008 Indigenous Communities and Biodiversity and 2014 Partnership in Practice: Engagement with indigenous peoples, as set out below:

- (a) **Significant involvement:** Projects designed exclusively to benefit indigenous peoples or projects where the executing and/or implementing agency was an indigenous organization.
- (b) **Moderate involvement:** Projects that had distinct components and/or sub-projects benefiting and targeting indigenous peoples.
- (c) **Limited involvement:** Projects where indigenous peoples participated in a few project activities.
- (d) **Others:** Projects that involve local stakeholders identified as ethnic/religious minorities, marginalized populations or faith-based organizations, but did not use term "indigenous peoples".

131. The review team sorted 372 out of the 426<sup>41</sup> projects, as shown in the Figure 8. Highlights include:


- (a) Involvement of indigenous peoples
  - (i) 39 projects (11%) Significant Involvement
  - (ii) 145 projects (39%) Moderate Involvement
  - (iii) 143 projects (38%) Limited Involvement
  - (iv) 45 projects (12%) involved local stakeholders such as ethnic/religious minorities and faith-based organizations, or other groups that share the same ancestry, culture, language and social status.

---


<sup>41</sup> Fifty-four projects were added to the portfolio based on an analysis of terminal evaluations by the IEO performance team. The late receipt of these projects prevented an analysis of level of IP engagement.



**Figure 8: Degree of Indigenous Peoples Involvement in GEF Projects**



**Figure 9: Degree of IPs Involvement, by Project Number and GEF Phase (note: GEF-6 ~50% complete)**



### ***Performance of the Portfolio***


132. The evaluators examined completed projects for overall performance, broken down according to the following performance indicators:

- (a) Achievement of planned outcomes (181 projects)
- (b) Likelihood of sustainability (179 projects)
- (c) Efficiency (123 projects)

133. From the outcome perspective, the Indigenous People portfolio is comparable to the performance across the entire GEF portfolio as per the Annual Performance Report (APR) 2015. Figure 10 compares performance ratings between projects in the Indigenous People portfolio and the GEF portfolio. Seventy-five percent of Indigenous People projects are rated as moderately satisfactory or above, while 80% of the overall GEF portfolio are rated above the same threshold. Future studies could analyse the correlation between indigenous peoples' participation and project performance.


134. According to Figure 13, the performance of the indigenous peoples portfolio improved in outcome achievement from the pilot phase to GEF-1 and kept consistent in GEF-2 and GEF-3. The outcome rating increased from GEF-3 to GEF-4, with 90 percent of the projects rated as moderately satisfactory or above. There are only two indigenous peoples projects rated thus far in GEF-5, both have outcome ratings of moderately satisfactory or above.

**Figure 10: Moderately Satisfactory or Above Outcome Ratings, by GEF Phase**




135. As illustrated in Figure 11, Global (83%) and Latin America and Caribbean (80%) projects have the highest percentages of projects that are rated as moderately satisfactory and above. Europe and Central Africa has the lowest percentage of projects in the same satisfaction range with 55 percent of the projects holding outcome ratings as moderately satisfactory and above. Regarding the distribution of ratings by focal area, Land Degradation (100%), International Waters (75%), Biodiversity (79%), Multi-Focal Area (69%) and Climate Change (89%) focal areas all received strong performance ratings.

**Figure 11: Indigenous Peoples Portfolio Project Outcome Ratings, by Focal Area and Region**




136. On measures of sustainability (Figure 12 and 13), the performance of indigenous peoples portfolio ranks slightly below the overall GEF portfolio by GEF phase. Sixty-one percent of the overall GEF portfolio has sustainability ratings of moderately likely or above, while only 54 percent of the indigenous peoples portfolio has ratings of moderately likely or above. At the same time, the performance of the indigenous peoples portfolio indicates improvements in the likelihood of project sustainability since the pilot phase.

**Figure 12: Moderately Likely or Above Sustainability Ratings, by GEF Phase**



**Figure 13: Distribution of Ratings on the Project Sustainability**



137. To illustrate the application of GEF-financing to projects involving indigenous peoples, three examples are summarized in Annex 7. A few best practice themes emerge in their descriptions and in review of additional projects involving indigenous peoples, notably the importance of:

- (a) involving indigenous peoples in governance and in implementation around the project cycle – specifically in project steering committees/planning/strategy processes, through incorporation of local/traditional knowledge, and through support of indigenous network for sharing/collaboration
- (b) aligning support across major stakeholder groups indigenous and non – i.e. across sectors; government, non-government and private sector
- (c) embedding initiatives within policy and planning
- (d) protecting and re-enforcing initiatives by paying attention to demarcation/rights and livelihood options

## **SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS**

138. The GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) provides funding for projects that promote conservation, climate adaptation and environmental sustainability while also paying attention to local livelihoods and community well-being. Administered by the UNDP, SGP provides grants of up to US\$50,000 to local communities for projects involving Biodiversity, Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation, Land Degradation and Sustainable Forest Management, International Waters and Chemicals in 125 countries. A substantial number of SGP-funded projects are awarded to indigenous peoples or involve indigenous communities. Indeed, because of the sheer number of projects involved around the world, SGP is regarded as the main modality for GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples.


139. In April 2017, a survey was distributed to 104 National Coordinators for GEF/UNDP SGP to gather information on the SGP's engagement with indigenous peoples. Of the 89 National Coordinators who responded to the survey, about half (44) did not identify existence of significant populations of indigenous peoples in their countries. In some instances, governments of those countries do not define indigenous peoples in line with the definitions used by the international conventions under which GEF operates. For example, some countries have populations of indigenous peoples according to accepted international definitions but, in line with national policy, declined to recognize their existence in the survey. Others noted the presence of indigenous peoples but explained that the concept of indigenous peoples is not applied in their country. In this situation, projects involving indigenous peoples were not distinguished from those with ethnic groups, the vulnerable and the poor. This presents a challenge in terms of accurately defining and assessing GEF global engagement with indigenous peoples, and is also applicable to some GEF country offices.

140. Overall then, the number of SGP projects reported to involve indigenous peoples may be higher than stated in this data collection.

141. The survey asked country respondents to provide lists of projects that work collaboratively with indigenous peoples since July 2010. In total, 43 national coordinators reported more than 630 SGP projects that have involved indigenous peoples since July 2010. The review team are in receipt of 485 individual project IDs. Among the 630 SGP projects, more than 362 projects were direct funding to indigenous peoples or Indigenous Peoples Organizations (IPOs). Since 2010, about US\$25 million has been awarded in grants towards projects working with indigenous peoples.

142. As shown in the Figure 14, Biodiversity is, by far, the most common thematic area covered across the SGP indigenous peoples' portfolio (377 projects). Other thematic areas covered in the portfolio include, in order of magnitude: Protected Areas (149 projects), Other Community Based Natural Resource Management (131 projects), Land Degradation (125 projects), Indigenous People's Traditional Knowledge and Culture (122 projects), Climate Change (120 projects) and Sustainable Forest Management (116 projects). Indigenous peoples' governance, Forests and REDD+ and indigenous peoples' policy development have relatively low frequency. It should be noted that according to interviews, governance and policy development are areas recommended for increased focus by IPAG.

**Figure 14: Number of IP Projects Funded in Eleven Thematic Areas**



143. Of the 45 responding SGP country offices, 34 report an indigenous peoples focal point in their SGP National Steering Committee (NSC), 50% of whom are Indigenous. At the same time 42 of the offices have a specific focus on indigenous peoples in their SGP Country Program Strategy (CPS).

144. Additionally, 26 country respondents included specific emphasis on the inclusion of indigenous peoples in OP5 (OP5, 2011-2014) and 30 countries included indigenous peoples emphasis in OP6 (2015-2018). The types of activities included in projects that focus on indigenous peoples include: capacity building, support to indigenous peoples in grant proposal development, work with indigenous peoples on landscape or seascape conservation, promotion of the Global Support Initiative for indigenous peoples, Community-Conserved Territories and Areas (ICCA-GSI), and the Indigenous Peoples Fellowship Program.


145. Examples of projects working with Indigenous People included:

- (a) **Zambia:** Help to indigenous peoples to create small and medium enterprises at the local communities that contribute to sustainable resource use
- (b) **Belize:** Encouragement in the use of native languages for environmental training activities
- (c) **China:** Establishment of a network in China to promote the recognition of Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas<sup>42</sup> (ICCAs) and empower the ethnic group and vulnerable group people.
- (d) **Panama:** Allocation of 80% of UN-REDD funds (CBR+ Programme) to Indigenous People.

146. Observed benefits of SGP funding to indigenous peoples includes: Access to training/capacity building (53%), Income and livelihoods improvements (47%), and Increased inclusion for consultation and project design (34%). Less frequently mentioned benefits include: indigenous peoples' policy development (8%), increased inclusion on policy level discussion (11%), and increased land tenure of security (11%). Available project IDs were categorized according to 10 benefit areas named above, as illustrated below.

<sup>42</sup> <https://www.iccaconsortium.org/index.php/discover/>

**Figure 15: Number GEF-SGP projects Benefiting Indigenous Peoples (Project IDs available)**




147. The most common barrier to indigenous peoples for access to SGP funding selected in the questionnaire was noted as, the “Limited capacity in administrative management skills and communication technology in indigenous peoples Organizations” (76%). More research would be needed to understand whether the capacity support provided by many SGP offices partially addresses this issue, or whether novel approaches are required.

148. Other barriers selected in the survey included “Timing requirements” (67%), “Language limitations” (64%), and “Geographic or communication barriers to access funds” (51%). Thirteen countries reported other challenges that were not listed in the survey: regional security limiting access to indigenous peoples; a hostile environment for policy dialogue between government and indigenous peoples; a lack of support to indigenous peoples for proposal design and project management; lack of recognized land rights at the national level; lack of recognition of indigenous peoples knowledge by experts and policy makers; an out-migration of indigenous peoples; difficulty for indigenous peoples to justify their projects to the GEF-SGP objectives, and difficulty to engage Women and Youth in Indigenous communities.

149. As indicated in Figure 16, the most common mechanisms adopted by countries to assist indigenous peoples to access GEF SGP grants are the development of participatory video/photo proposal in local languages, and provide planning grants with guidance.

**Figure 16: Mechanisms for Assisting Indigenous Peoples to Access SGP Grants (Number of Countries)**



150. Some National Coordinators also provided possible solutions to the most observed challenges in their open-ended responses:

**(a) Limited Capacity in administrative management skills and communication technology**

- (i) Use local expertise and mentors to guide the implementation of community-based actions, and to build community capacity
- (ii) Provide more training for indigenous peoples on proposal writing, project implementation and management to close the gap in administrative management skills by international NGOs or Community-Based organizations
- (iii) Include money for technical assistance in budgets for indigenous peoples projects. The other suggestion is to give indigenous peoples planning grants, so the indigenous peoples communities' capacities can be built through participatory project design and development.

**(b) Timing requirements**

- (i) Apply for planning grants for proposal development for the IPOs, to allow time for indigenous peoples on preliminary work and to help build their capacity in project design.
- (ii) Support indigenous peoples on concept proposals, guiding them through the process and understanding their process of consultation.
- (iii) Allow additional time to understand socio-economic context and indigenous peoples' relationship with the local resources, including time extensions for proposal development and project implementation.

**(c) Language limitations**

- (i) Develop more culturally appropriate and user-friendly procedures for securing SGP funds, including an increase in innovative methods of using video and non-written grant application. Through the non-written proposal,



it will be easier for the indigenous peoples to present project ideas in their native languages.

- (ii) Provide financial support to community radio to broadcast GEF/SGP information in local languages.
- (iii) Seek help from qualified local NGOs to assist in proposal writing and hiring local translators.

151. With regard to networking and communications, 29 SGP country offices reported collaboration with indigenous peoples' networks and mechanisms, including national, regional and global networks such as the ICCA Consortium and the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. Indigenous peoples in 16 countries reported providing feedback to the GEF via the GEF CSO Network focal point, 11 countries through the GEF Expanded Constituency Workshops, and seven countries through the GEF Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group (IPAG) and only one country through the GEF Secretariat.

## CONCLUSIONS

152. **Conclusion 1: The GEF recognizes indigenous peoples as important stakeholders in its mission to tackle global environmental issues.** The GEF has engaged with indigenous peoples since its first phase of project financing in 1991, and the level of engagement, consultation and policy review with indigenous peoples has increased through each GEF funding period. Indigenous peoples are increasingly recognized for their traditional knowledge and customary practices. Application of these influence broader understanding of forestry, traditional medicine, conservation, resource management and livelihood patterns, as well as responses to climate change, resilience and adaptation. Evidence from projects suggests that empowering indigenous peoples to manage biodiversity in their own territories can result in more sustained and cost-effective ways to protect biodiversity. Other commitments embedded in GEF's mission – reducing poverty, strengthening governance and achieving greater equality - are also relevant to its engagement with indigenous peoples. Progress in these areas is integral to indigenous peoples realizing their rights as set out in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), to which almost all UN member states are now signatories.

153. **Conclusion 2: Recognition of the presence of indigenous peoples by national governments is axiomatic to the application of indigenous peoples' rights.** In some country contexts, the absence of recognition throws a significant challenge to the GEF Partnership, and is reflected in reporting from some GEF and SGP country offices. This can be problematic for accurate assessment of GEF engagement with indigenous peoples. Some implementing organizations have addressed this situation by casting "indigenous peoples" within the broader nomenclature of "local communities". At times, "local communities" is used to avoid discrimination in places where populations are diverse in their make-up. The current consensus from UN and climate convention bodies, and adopted by the CBD in 2014, is that use of the term "indigenous peoples and local communities" enables inclusive approaches, while at the same time avoiding presumptions of common identity or that such groups are subject to the same circumstances.

154. **Conclusion 3: At the Partnership level, the participation of indigenous peoples is well secured in GEF consultation arrangements, and is advancing GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples.** In 2011, consultations began between GEF and indigenous peoples'

representatives forming the Indigenous Peoples' Task Force (IPTF). Discussion was focused on the development of a GEF policy on indigenous peoples. IPTF consultations resulted in an issues paper, launched in 2012 and drafted shortly before the launch of the GEF Council's GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards (GEF/C.41/10/Rev.1) in November 2011. Included is "Minimum Standard 4: Indigenous Peoples", providing detailed minimum requirements including standards for consultation, social and environmental impact assessments and references to land, culture, traditional knowledge and livelihoods. The policy also details the GEF grievance system. The contents of the IPTF Issues Paper were further developed by the GEF in 2012, resulting in the adoption by Council of the *Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples* (GEF/C.42/Inf.03/Rev.1). In lieu of a policy, this document affirms the importance of indigenous peoples in GEF-financed projects, identifies unintended adverse effects that can result from such projects and the desire for enhanced engagement by both indigenous peoples and GEF. The Principles and Guidelines form a useful guide and reinforcement for GEF policy towards indigenous peoples, though they lack practical guidance on project design and indicators, or a specific list of requirements that might be useful to aid operationalization of Minimum Standard 4 and other relevant GEF policies.

155. **Conclusion 4: In general, GEF Agencies are in alignment with the obligations under GEF Minimum Standard 4: Indigenous Peoples.** Of the nine provisions of Minimum Standard 4, seven show high levels of consistency across the Agencies, particularly in areas of appropriate socioeconomic benefits, Indigenous Peoples Plans and document disclosure. Regarding consultation, Free Prior Informed Consent and participation, GEF Agencies tend to exceed Minimum Standard 4 provisions by insisting on greater protections for indigenous peoples, greater participation within project frameworks, use and rights to cultural resources and traditional knowledge and, specific attention to the monitoring of GEF-funded projects. By contrast, there are a few instances where GEF Agency safeguards, in the way they are worded, appear to fall short in meeting all of the provisions of Minimum Standard 4. In these situations, the GEF is expected to detect discrepancies as part of periodic compliance monitoring of the minimum standards.

156. **Conclusion 5: Concerning the GEF Safeguard on indigenous peoples, some restrictiveness and ambiguity exists around GEF's approach to Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC).** Currently GEF requires FPIC approaches from ILO C169 signatory states. In so doing, it misses an opportunity to support self-determination – something intrinsic to Indigenous People's rights. Currently, Agency safeguard policies of BOAD, CI, DBSA, FAO, FUNBIO, IFAD, IUCN, UNEP, UNIDO and WWF all have mandatory FPIC processes for projects involving indigenous peoples, and IADB requires a similar approach while not utilising the term FPIC. As well, GEF's use of the term "free, prior and informed consultations" complicates matters somewhat. This is a term borrowed from the World Bank Operational Policies that includes elements of, but is not the same as free, prior and informed *consent*. Any implied intention to avoid a commitment to "consent" appears to be confounded by Minimum Standard 4 which states that GEF Partner Agencies must "ensure that such consultations result in broad community support for the GEF-financed operation being proposed" (para.24, p.6).

157. **Conclusion 6: The GEF's ability to describe the application of Minimum Safeguard 4 and the benefits that flow from its engagement with indigenous peoples is restricted by the lack of monitoring information.** Some adjustments to monitoring practices have

recently been introduced to better track projects involving indigenous peoples and to report in the corporate scorecard and the Annual Monitoring Report. What is being counted here, though, are instances of projects with indigenous peoples' involvement; there is little in the way of qualitative information. While there is some assurance (through the agency accreditation process) that GEF agencies are prepared to abide by safeguards, there are presently no requirements on GEF agencies to report against them at a portfolio level. Further, there are a few cases where Agency safeguards do not appear to extend to as high a level of protection as GEF Minimum Standard 4. In these instances, there is a lesser basis for assurance that engagement with IPs is occurring to expectations. At the same time, some GEF agencies are recognizing the need for more engagement – through, for example the inclusion of indigenous peoples on staff and setting up indigenous peoples' advisory structures – and more robust tracking of Indigenous People engagement and benefits. The latter appears to be a growth area for GEF.

158. **Conclusion 7: The Indigenous Peoples' Advisory Group (IPAG) provides relevant advice to the GEF Secretariat on Indigenous Peoples' issues.** The development of IPAG has been a positive step for GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples. By the way it is composed and facilitated, the IPAG has drawn together traditional and expert knowledge in dialogues among indigenous peoples and GEF, in developing indigenous peoples capacity to engage in GEF projects and processes, in providing recommendations on financial arrangements to better support indigenous peoples' projects and project development, and in providing outreach with indigenous peoples organizations and communities. IPAG has also assisted in developing indicators for GEFSEC to better measure benefits and outcomes from GEF funded projects to indigenous peoples, that are now being used to improve monitoring systems. A key achievement of IPAG is the establishment of the Indigenous Peoples Fellowship Initiative, under SGP, aimed at developing leadership to advance the work in Indigenous communities, organizations and networks on a national, regional and global scale. It is too soon to draw conclusions about the impact of the Fellowship, with only a few beneficiaries, however anecdotal signals are promising.

159. IPAG fulfils an important technical advisory and dissemination role; however operational limitations require attention, while opportunities for an expanded advocacy role remain limited. The scope of IPAG's mandate and geographic coverage is large for the seven-person advisory group with a limited frequency of face to face contact. No formal system of contact with the larger regional indigenous peoples' networks appears to exist within IPAG or GEFSEC. As well, IPAG members' communication and familiarity with GEF and GEF Agencies is less than optimal for an advisory body. This is also noted for the relationship between the IPAG and the SGP National Coordinators. Thus far, budgetary and staff support for IPAG has been insufficient to engage participants in training, to support information dissemination including at the country and regional levels, and to incentivize IP project innovation.

160. **Conclusion 7: The GEF's ability to systematically gather evidence on elements of GEF's indigenous peoples engagement is hampered by the lack of specificity within the GEF's Project Management Information System (PMIS).** GEF projects that have an element of indigenous peoples engagement are not easily retrieved from the organizational database. This lack of systematic 'tagging' of those projects confounds the generation of accurate project data. Moreover, the quality of the information about indigenous peoples engagement contained in terminal evaluations is extremely variable.

161. By number of projects and by investment, the proportion of Full-sized and Medium-sized projects that include indigenous peoples has increased substantially since the beginning of GEF. The Biodiversity (BD) focal area dominates the indigenous peoples portfolio with a total of 55% of projects. Indigenous peoples have been increasingly engaged in the other focal areas, however, and the relative number of Biodiversity projects in the indigenous peoples portfolio has declined over time, with an increase of projects especially in the Multi-Focal Area and Climate Change focal area. Most of the projects involving indigenous peoples fall into the Full-sized category, and have been implemented by just four of the GEF accredited agencies (UNDP, WB, UNEP and FAO). The greatest number of projects and the largest concentration of investment occurs in Latin America and the Caribbean. Seventy-five (75) percent of indigenous peoples projects are rated as Moderately Satisfactory or Above. Indigenous peoples projects are comparable to the GEF portfolio on their likelihood of being sustainable. However, attaining sustainability poses a challenge for the portfolio with just over half of projects showing moderate likelihood or greater of being sustainable. Capacity issues stand in the way of some IP organizations assuming project management roles.

162. **Conclusion 8: The Small Grants Programme (SGP) of UNDP is the primary modality for GEF's engagement with indigenous peoples, though accessing SGP grants remains a challenge due to administrative and language hurdles. This limits the extent to which the mechanism can address needs and opportunities among indigenous peoples.**

Approximately 15 percent of SGP grants are awarded to the benefit of Indigenous organizations or communities. Flexible approaches to proposal development enable involvement by IP organizations. Biodiversity is, by far, the most common thematic area covered across the SGP IP portfolio. Results from a survey with SGP National Coordinators indicated that 67% of respondents always referred to *GEF Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples* in projects involving indigenous peoples. According to survey respondents, observed benefits of SGP funding to indigenous peoples includes: access to training/capacity building, Income and livelihoods improvements, and Increased inclusion for consultation and project design.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS:

163. **Recommendation 1: Establish and strengthen dedicated funding opportunities for indigenous peoples' projects/ organizations.** Indigenous peoples remain limited as beneficiaries in the support they receive from GEF. To date, support has come primarily through the SGP which, by design, is limited in scale and scope. Dedicated funding outside STAR would address the systemic challenges and operational constraints to increased indigenous peoples' engagement. Simultaneously, strengthening the SGP and other GEF project oriented grant mechanisms, such as the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, or creating incentives to engage IPLCs could also help improve access. The World Bank's Dedicated Grants Mechanism serves as a model of a funding window that could be adapted for GEF.

164. **Recommendation 2: Update relevant Policies and Guidelines to reflect best practice standards concerning indigenous peoples, including a rights-based approach to engagement.** Internationally, safeguard norms regarding indigenous peoples have changed. This manifests in a number of GEF Agency standards that have emerged since 2012. To remain at the leading edge and continue to serve the field of practice with advanced thinking about how best to safeguard the rights of indigenous peoples, a recalibration is required. Attention should be given to provisions related to the **right to self-determination**

and to **free, prior and informed consent (FPIC)** as they pertain to consultations with indigenous peoples concerning GEF projects. Revisions should be reflected in pertinent safeguards documents, including the GEF Principles and Guidelines. As part of this exercise, GEF should also anchor its engagement with indigenous peoples with relevance to UNDRIP and ILO C169 and to progressive advances with regard to traditional knowledge, land rights and resource rights. Finally, the GEF should expand its own criteria or directly reference other widely accepted international criteria for identifying indigenous peoples, to ensure clarity by all stakeholders. Specifically with regard to its nomenclature, consideration should be given to the merits and drawbacks of *inclusive* language such as *indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs)*.

**165. Recommendation 3: Review the Indigenous Peoples' Advisory Group's role for operational constraints.** IPAG is unequivocally viewed as an important and advantageous body to guide GEF's decision making and engagement with Indigenous People. To increase its effectiveness, GEF should undertake several steps including a review of succession planning and "on-boarding" for IPAG members to preserve knowledge of outgoing members and to orient new ones, and a review of the existing scope/limitations of the IPAG's mandate and its relationship with the Indigenous Peoples Focal Points (IPFP) embedded within the CSO Network. As part of this, GEF should clarify IPAG's communication/engagement role for more formal contacts with regional and global networks of indigenous peoples; consider an increase in the staff time and resources allocated by the GEFSEC IP focal point to IPAG activities; translation requirements for relevant documents such that IPAG is able to engage in English, French, Spanish. Regarding enhancements to IPAG capacity, GEF should explore ways of incorporating intergenerational leadership and knowledge.

**166. Recommendation 4: Facilitate dialogue between indigenous peoples and local communities and GEF Government focal points.** One of the major hurdles for greater engagement of indigenous peoples in GEF projects is acceptance by national governments in some of the countries that GEF operates. The GEF through its relationships with national governments can help to increase prominence of indigenous peoples' activities and encourage mainstreaming of IP issues into environmental programming. In this regard, GEF should seek opportunities for a higher profile of indigenous peoples in GEF projects and a higher profile at GEF events such as Extended Constituency Workshops and Council meetings. GEF should document success stories in this regard – showing where engagement is strong or where breakthroughs in building relationships have been made.

**167. Recommendation 5: Monitor application of Minimum Standard 4 and indigenous peoples' portfolio.** A greater flow of information should come from tracking the environmental and social risks of the GEF portfolio. Currently there is no requirement that Agencies report on compliance with safeguards, leaving the GEF portfolio vulnerable. Agencies should inform GEF of the safeguard risk categorization assigned to projects involving indigenous peoples and keep GEF informed of safeguards implementation issues through monitoring and reporting. Ideally this process builds off current Agency internal monitoring systems rather than duplicates them. Similarly, an accurate monitoring of the portfolio of projects that engage indigenous peoples is currently not possible. Projects need to be tagged to allow for systematic retrieval. As part of the tagging, further definition within the GEF of what is considered indigenous peoples' engagement should ensue. Finally,

the mid-term and terminal evaluation templates should include sections that capture indigenous peoples' engagement and results.

## **ANNEX 1: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

### **Internal Documents:**

GEF, [Indigenous Communities and Biodiversity](#) (2008)

GEF/C.41/10/Rev.01, [GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards](#) (2011)

GEF, [Issue Paper on Indigenous Peoples](#) – prepared by the Indigenous Peoples Task Force to the GEF (2011)

GEF/C.42/Inf.03/Rev.1, [Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples](#) (2012)

GEF, SD/PL/01, [Policy on Public Involvement in GEF Projects](#) (2012)

GEF, [Partnership in Practice: Engagement with Indigenous Peoples](#) (2014)

GEF & UNDP, [The GEF Small Grant Programme Annual Monitoring Report FY: 2015-2016](#) (2016)

GEF Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group (IPAG) Meeting Notes, 3<sup>rd</sup> June (2016)

GEF/C.51/08/Rev. 01, [Monitoring Agency Compliance with GEF Policies on Environmental and Social Safeguards, Gender, and Fiduciary Standards: Implementation Modalities](#) (2016)

GEF, [User Guide: Indigenous Peoples and GEF Project Financing](#) (2016)

GEF/ME/C.52/inf. 08, [2017 Review of The GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards](#) (2017)

### **GEF Agency Policy Documents:**

Asian Development Bank (2009), Safeguard Policy Statement

Asian Development Bank (1998), The Bank's Policy on Indigenous Peoples

African Development Bank Group (2016), Development and Indigenous Peoples in Africa

African Development Bank Group (2015), Environmental and Social Assessment Procedures (ESAP)

African Development Bank Group (2015), Integrated Safeguards System Guidance Materials Volume 1: General Guidance on Implementation of OS 1

African Development Bank Group (2015), Integrated Safeguards System Guidance Materials Volume 2: Guidance on Safeguard Issues

African Development Bank Group (2013), Integrated Safeguards System: Policy Statement and Operational Safeguards

Ouest Africaine De Developpement (2015), Operational Policies and Procedures of West African Development Bank Intervention for Environmental And Social Management In The Financing Of Projects

Corporacion Andina de Fomento (2015), Environmental and Social Safeguards for CAF/GEF Projects Manual

Conservation International (2015), CI-GEF Project Agency Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF)

Conservation International (2003), Indigenous Peoples and Conservation International: Principles for Partnerships

Development Bank of Southern Africa (2015), Environmental and Social Safeguard Standards

European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (2014), Environmental and Social Policy

European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (2010), Indigenous Peoples Guidance Note

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2015), Environmental and Social Management Guidelines

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2010), Policy on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples

Foreign Economic Cooperation Office of the Ministry of Environmental Protection of China (2016), Environmental and Social Safeguard Framework of Foreign Economic Cooperation Office

Fundo Brasileiro para a Biodiversidade (2013), FUNBIO Indigenous Peoples Operational Procedures

Fundo Brasileiro para a Biodiversidade (2013), FUNBIO Indigenous Peoples Policy

Inter-American Development Bank (2006), Operational Policy on Indigenous Peoples and Strategy for Indigenous Development

International Fund for Agricultural Development (2009), Engagement with Indigenous Peoples Policy

International Fund for Agricultural Development (2014), IFAD's Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures

International Finance Corporation (2012), Performance Standard 1: Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts

International Finance Corporation (2012), Performance Standard 5 Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement

International Finance Corporation (2012), Performance Standard 7 Indigenous Peoples

International Union for Conservation of Nature (2016), Environmental & Social Management System (ESMS) Standard on Indigenous Peoples

United Nations Development Programme (2017), Guidance Note UNDP Social and Environmental Standards - Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples

United Nations Development Programme (2014), Social and Environmental Standards



United Nations Environmental Programme (2015), Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability Framework

United Nations Environmental Programme (2012), UNEP and Indigenous Peoples: A Partnership in Caring for the Environment Policy Guidance (2012)

United Nations Environmental Programme (2014), UNEP Handbook For Stakeholder Engagement

United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (2015), Director General's Administrative Instruction No. 23: UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP)

World Bank (2005), Operational Manual BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples (2005)

World Bank (2016), Emerging Lessons Series No. 2 - The Inspection Panel: Indigenous Peoples

World Bank (2005), Operational Manual OP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples (2005)

World Bank (2005), Operational Manual OP 4.12 – Involuntary Resettlement (2005)

World Bank (2017), The World Bank Environmental and Social Framework

#### **External Documents:**

Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact and Forest Peoples Programme (2015), "Comments on the World Bank proposed safeguards for indigenous peoples (ESS7: Indigenous Peoples)"

Avecita Chicchon (2009) "Working with Indigenous Peoples to Conserve Nature: Examples from Latin America". Conservation & Society

B.R. Johnston (2013) "Human Needs and Environmental Rights to Water: A Biocultural Systems approach to Hydrodevelopment and Management"

Center for Global Development (2014) "What Drives Deforestation and What Stops It? A Meta-Analysis of Spatially Explicit Econometric Studies."

Collaborative Partnership on Forests (2012) "SFM Fact Sheet 4: SFM and indigenous peoples"

Convention on Biological Diversity (2014) "Article 8(j) and Related Provisions"

Convention on Biological Diversity (2013) "Compilation of Views Received on Use of the Term "Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities" UNEP/CBD/WG8J/8/INF/10/Add.1

Dawit et al. (2016) "Indigenous African soil enrichment as a climate-smart sustainable agriculture alternative". Lancaster University, University of Ghana, University of Sussex, Cornell University

Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (2016) "Free Prior and Informed Consent: An indigenous peoples' right and a good practice for local communities"

International Labour Organization (ILO) (1989). *Convention No. 169 Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries*. Geneva: ILO.

International Land Coalition (2015) "First Draft of the revised World Bank Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework: Synthesis of submissions by members in the ILC network to the World Bank e-consultation"

International Union for Conservation of Nature (2008) "Indigenous and Traditional Peoples and Climate Change".

M. Toledo (2000) "Indigenous Peoples and Biodiversity" Institute of Ecology, National University of Mexico

Mateo-Vega et al. (2017) "Full and Effective Participation of Indigenous Peoples in Forest Monitoring for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+): Trail in Panama's Darien", Department of Biology, McGill University, Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Institute at Brown for Environment and Society, Brown University, Environmental Defense Fund, Researchers from Panama

Patrinos and Hall (2010), "Indigenous Peoples, Poverty and Development"

Priscilla M. Wehi. (2009) "Indigenous Ancestral Sayings contribute to Modern Conservation Partnership: Examples Using Phormium Tenax", Department of Biological Sciences, University of Waikato

Rights and Resources Initiative (2015) "Who Owns the Land in Africa"

Rights and Resources Initiative (2016) "Toward a Global Baseline of Carbon Storage in Collective Lands"

Russell-Smith et al. (2013) "Managing fire regimes in north Australian savannas: applying Aboriginal approaches to contemporary global problems", The Ecological Society of America

Uila Popova (2013) "Conservation, Traditional Knowledge, and Indigenous Peoples"

United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (2007), "Report of the fifth meeting of the Group of Experts of the Committee on Science and Technology"

United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (2016) "Free, Prior and Informed Consent Manual"

United Nations Development Programme (2014) "Social and Environmental Standards"

United Nations General Assembly (1966). *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*.

United Nations General Assembly (1976). *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*.

United Nations General Assembly (1966). *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*.

United Nations General Assembly (2007). *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. A/HRC/24/41/Add.1

United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (2008) "Climate Change and Indigenous Peoples "

UN-REDD Programme (2013) "Guidelines on Free, Prior and Informed Consent"

World Bank (2008) "The Role of Indigenous Peoples in Biodiversity Conservation: The Natural but Often Forgotten Partners. "

World Bank (2017) "Environmental and Social Framework"

World Resources Institute (2005) "Securing Property and Resource Rights through Tenure Reform" in World Resources Report 2005: The Wealth of the Poor – Managing Ecosystems to Fight Poverty, p.83-87

World Resources Institute (2014) "Securing Rights, Combating Climate Change"

### **Website Articles:**

Australian Government Department of Environment and Energy "Australia's support for developing countries" <http://www.environment.gov.au/climate-change/government/international/land-emissions>

Convention on Biological Diversity "Participation of Indigenous and Local Communities" <https://www.cbd.int/traditional/participation.shtml>

Forest Peoples Programme (2016) "Joint AIPP and FPP submission to the World Bank" <http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/safeguard-accountability-issues/news/2015/02/joint-aipp-and-fpp-submission-world-bank>

Forest Peoples Programme (2016) "World Bank undermines decades of progress on building protections for the rights of indigenous peoples" <http://www.forestpeoples.org/sites/fpp/files/news/2016/07/WB%20article%20July%2021%20near%20final.pdf>

International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (2014) "Re.: Serious concerns over revision of World Bank Safeguard Policies" [https://consultations.worldbank.org/Data/hub/files/iwgia\\_letter\\_to\\_world\\_bank.pdf](https://consultations.worldbank.org/Data/hub/files/iwgia_letter_to_world_bank.pdf)

Kimberley Land Council "Indigenous fire management in the Kimberley" <http://www.klc.org.au/land-sea/indigenous-fire-management>

United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification "Land rights: a prerequisite for Land Degradation Neutrality" <http://www2.unccd.int/news-events/land-rights-prerequisite-land-degradation-neutrality>

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (2017) "Multi-stakeholder dialogue on the operationalization of the local communities and indigenous peoples platform" [https://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc\\_calendar/items/10151txt.php](https://unfccc.int/meetings/unfccc_calendar/items/10151txt.php)

United States Department of Treasury (2016) U.S. Position on the Review and Update of the World Bank's Safeguard Policies <https://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/international/development-banks/Documents/US%20Position%20on%20the%20Review%20and%20Update%20of%20the%20World%20Bank's%20Safeguard%20Policies.pdf>

## **ANNEX 2: METHOD NOTES**

### **Projects in OPS6's Indigenous Peoples (IPs) Portfolio**

The OPS6 portfolio of indigenous peoples (IPs) includes 372 GEF projects from 1991 to 2016. The list was a combination of an earlier list updated in May 2014 (List A) and a new list created in December 2016 (List B) and a list of completed projects reviewed by the IEO performance team (List C). This project created a keyword-counting program (in R software) to record the occurrences of IPs-themed terms in each project document, and the final project list was compiled with further document review and experts' consultation. Below are method notes of the compilation process:

#### **List A. 218 IPs project (1991-2014)**

List A was shortlisted from 223 IPs projects between 1991 and May 2014, provided by the GEF Secretariat. The original list was created through manual search, document review, PMIS search, and online materials search. Search terms used include "indigenous, traditional, tribal, tribe, ethnic, pastoral, minority, minorities and marginalized". The PIF or CEO Endorsement documents were reviewed to confirm the projects' IPs involvement. The process was implemented in multi-stages over multiple years.

In December 2016, these 223 IPs projects were further reviewed to count occurrence of IPs-keywords in project documents. The review shortlisted the IPs projects from 223 to 205. The following are detailed review process:

1. Downloaded the project documents from PMIS. Each of the 223 projects refers to one Project Appraisal Document (PAD), CEO Endorsement, Project Document, Project Preparation Grant (PPG) or Project Identification Form (PIF), depending on its project cycle.
2. Converted 223 project documents to .txt format and loaded them into the keyword-search R program.
3. The text analysis function of R allows keyword counting of 223 large documents at one time. Updated keywords are "indigenous people", "indigenous land", "indigenous community/communities", "indigenous territory/territories", "indigenous and local", "traditional land", "traditional knowledge", "tribal", "tribe", "ethnic", "pastoral", "minority/minorities", and "marginalized/marginalized".
4. An additional list of reference words was used in the search to support the accuracy, they are "local community/communities", "native community/communities", "protected area", "park", "conservation area", "aboriginal", "Nagoya protocol", "community based", "community-based", "rural livelihood", "ancestral", "self-identification", and "spiritual".
5. The resulted frequency table shows the numbers of words occurrence in each project documents. IPs involvement of each project was evaluated according to the frequency table and document review when the numbers are ambiguous.

According to the validation, 205 of the 223 projects involve indigenous peoples. 13 projects did not mention "indigenous people" in project documents but involve local stakeholders identified as ethnic/religious minorities, marginalized populations or faith-based

organizations; they were later categorized as “Other” projects in terms of degree of IPs engagement. Five projects were removed from the list as either no indigenous communities living in the project areas or project documents are missing. The final List A was shortlisted from 223 to 218 projects.

#### **List B. 166 IPs Project (2014-2016)**

List B was shortlisted from the 4319 projects approved in OPS-6 as of October 2016.

Following steps identified 145 IP-involved projects:

1. First, projects approved after May 2014 (924 projects) were extracted from the 4000+ projects to avoid overlap with the List A.
2. Removed “Enabling Activities” and cancelled projects, 692 remained.
3. Then the IEO excluded the very unlikely projects by skimming through project titles, and shortlisted the list to 582. The following analyses were based on the 582 projects.
4. [Repeated Step 1 for List A.]
5. [Repeated Step 2 for List A.]
6. [Repeated Step 3 for List A.]
7. [Repeated Step 4 for List A.]
8. [Repeated Step 5 for List A.]

203 projects have moderate to high incidence of IP keywords/reference words. To further validate their IP-involvement, project documents of these 203 projects were downloaded from the PMIS and opened up to review. Thirty-seven projects were removed from the list as they do not have IPs participated in project activities, which give a list of 166 projects.

In addition, the GEF Secretariat identified 4 IPs-relevant projects in their [2016 Annual Portfolio Monitoring Report](#); they are of GEF ID 6931, 6940, 9352 and 6925. And the List B was further cross-referenced with the METT (BD Tracking Tool) database and added in 9 projects that indicated.

Finally, 25 overlapped projects were removed after the merge of List A and B, resulting in 372 IPs projects.

#### **List C. 54 IPs Project Provided by the IEO Performance Team**

By June 2017, as part of the review of terminal evaluations, the IEO Performance Team had reviewed 355 closed projects from OPS6 cohort for their indigenous peoples engagement and consultation activities. The TE team reviewed project documents of these 355 projects and identified 69 projects including activities likely to have substantial effect on indigenous peoples. After a further document review, 54 projects were identified as IPs-engaged projects and are included in this portfolio; these 54 projects include those with Indigenous Peoples Organization as the lead executing agency or co-Executing Agency, had consultations with the IPs in project design, or had consultations during implementation.

Lists A, B and C add up to the final IPs portfolio of 426 projects

### ANNEX 3: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES ENGAGEMENT PROJECTS

| GEF ID | Project Type | Country   | Project Name  |
|--------|--------------|-----------|---|
| 92     | FP           | Argentina | Biodiversity Conservation Project   |
| 95     | FP           | Sri Lanka | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants  |
| 117    | FP           | Nicaragua | Atlantic Biological Corridor  |
| 121    | FP           | Honduras  | Honduras Biodiversity Project   |
| 133    | FP           | Panama    | Atlantic Mesoamerican Biological Corridor Project   |
| 197    | FP           | Guatemala | Integrated Biodiversity Protection in the Sarstun-Motagua Region  |
| 202    | FP           | Regional  | Conservation of Biodiversity in the Lake Titicaca Basin   |
| 243    | FP           | Regional  | Establishment of a Programme for the Consolidation of the Meso-American Biological Corridor                   |
| 248    | FP           | Congo DR  | Rehabilitation of Protected Areas in the Democratic Republic of the Congo                                     |
| 3      | FP           | Venezuela | Conservation of the Biological Diversity of the Orinoco Delta Biosphere Reserve and Lower Orinoco River Basin |
| 16     | MSP          | Guatemala | Management and Protection of Laguna del Tigre National Park   |
| 24     | MSP          | Regional  | Africa Community Outreach Programme for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Resources              |
| 30     | MSP          | Nepal     | Upper Mustang Biodiversity Project  |
| 500    | FP           | Peru      | In-Situ Conservation of Native Cultivars and Their Wild Relatives   |
| 503    | FP           | Paraguay  | Paraguayan Wildlands Protection Initiative  |
| 504    | FP           | Regional  | Management of Indigenous Vegetation for the Rehabilitation of Degraded Rangelands in the Arid Zone of Africa  |
| 505    | FP           | Pakistan  | Mountain Areas Conservancy Project (MACP)   |
| 620    | FP           | Bolivia   | Sustainability of the National System of Protected Areas  |
| 621    | FP           | Cambodia  | Biodiversity and Protected Area Management Pilot Project for the Virachey National Park                       |
| 634    | FP           | India     | Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Gulf of Mannar Biosphere Reserve's Coastal Biodiversity               |
| 642    | FP           | Malaysia  | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Tropical Peat Swamp Forests and Associated Wetland Ecosystems             |
| 650    | MSP          | Peru      | Collaborative Management for the Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Northwest Biosphere Reserve  |

|     |     |                    |   |
|-----|-----|--------------------|---|
| 651 | FP  | Peru               | Indigenous Management of Protected Areas in the Amazon  |
| 653 | FP  | Philippines        | Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation in Mindanao  |
| 661 | FP  | Suriname           | Conservation of Globally Significant Forest Ecosystems in Suriname's Guayana Shield                         |
| 668 | FP  | Bangladesh         | Coastal and Wetland Biodiversity Management at Cox's Bazar and Hakakuki Haor                                |
| 671 | FP  | Costa Rica         | Ecomarkets  |
| 672 | MSP | Costa Rica         | Conservation of Biodiversity in the Talamanca-Caribbean Biological Corridor                                 |
| 681 | MSP | Panama             | Effective Protection with Community Participation of the New Protected Area of San Lorenzo                  |
| 682 | MSP | Peru               | Participatory Conservation and Sustainable Development with Indigenous Communities in Vilcabamba            |
| 762 | FP  | Regional           | Maloti-Drakensberg Conservation and Development Project   |
| 771 | FP  | Brazil             | Amazon Region Protected Areas Program (ARPA)  |
| 774 | FP  | Colombia           | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Andes Region  |
| 775 | MSP | Ecuador            | Choco-Andean Corridor   |
| 776 | FP  | Egypt              | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants in Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems                       |
| 778 | FP  | Mexico             | Indigenous and Community Biodiversity Conservation (COINBIO)  |
| 779 | FP  | Mexico             | Mesoamerican Biological Corridor  |
| 795 | MSP | Algeria            | Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management                                       |
| 796 | MSP | Kenya              | Lake Baringo Community-based Integrated Land and Water Management Project                                   |
| 798 | MSP | Philippines        | Sustainable Management of Mount Isarog  |
| 807 | MSP | Russian Federation | Persistent Toxic Substances, Food Security, and Indigenous Peoples of the Russian North                     |
| 834 | FP  | Brazil             | Promoting Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in the Frontier Forests of Northwestern Mato Grosso |
| 836 | FP  | Global             | Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund (CEPF)   |
| 838 | FP  | Kazakhstan         | Integrated Conservation of Priority Globally Significant Migratory Bird Wetland Habitat                     |
| 846 | MSP | Ecuador            | Albarradas in Coastal Ecuador: Rescuing Ancient Knowledge on Sustainable Use of Biodiversity                |
| 863 | MSP | Belize             | Community-managed Sarstoon Temash Conservation Project  |

|      |     |                    |  |
|------|-----|--------------------|--|
| 864  | MSP | China              | Multi-agency and Local Participatory Cooperation in Biodiversity Conservation in Yunnan's Upland Ecosystem   |
| 877  | FP  | Mexico             | Consolidation of the Protected Areas Program (SINAP II)  |
| 887  | FP  | Mexico             | Biodiversity Conservation in the Sierra Gorda Biosphere Reserve  |
| 906  | MSP | Nepal              | Landscape-scale Conservation of Endangered Tiger and Rhinoceros Populations in and Around Chitwan National Park  |
| 907  | MSP | Nepal              | Arun Valley Sustainable Resource Use and Management Pilot Demonstration Project  |
| 925  | FP  | Colombia           | Conservation of Montane Forest and Paramo in the Colombian Massif, Phase I   |
| 932  | FP  | Russian Federation | Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biological Diversity in Four Protected Areas in Russia's Kamchatka Oblast, Phase I                                   |
| 939  | FP  | China              | Sustainable Forest Development Project, Protected Areas Management Component   |
| 979  | MSP | Costa Rica         | Biodiversity Conservation in Cacao Agro-forestry   |
| 1020 | MSP | Colombia           | Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Mataven Forest   |
| 1021 | MSP | Chile              | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Chiloé Globally Significant Biodiversity   |
| 1086 | MSP | Cambodia           | Developing an Integrated Protected Area System for the Cardamom Mountains  |
| 1164 | FP  | Russian Federation | Support to the National Programme of Action for the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment, Tranche 1   |
| 1170 | FP  | Tanzania           | Conservation and Management of the Eastern Arc Mountain Forests  |
| 1261 | FP  | Papua New Guinea   | Community-based Coastal and Marine Conservation in the Milne Bay Province  |
| 1300 | MSP | Chile              | Ecosystem Management of the Salar del Huasco for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Outside Protected Areas   |
| 1301 | MSP | Ecuador            | Conservation of Biodiversity in Pastaza  |
| 1408 | MSP | Peru               | Biodiversity Conservation and Community Natural Resource Management in the Nanay River Basin (Peruvian Amazon)   |
| 1410 | MSP | Regional           | Biodiversity Conservation and Integration of Traditional Knowledge on Medicinal Plants in National Primary Health Care Policy in Central America and Caribbean |
| 1416 | MSP | Peru               | Community -based Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Atiquipa and Taimara Lomas Ecosystems   |



|      |     |                    |   |
|------|-----|--------------------|---|
| 1477 | MSP | Vietnam            | Conservation of Pu Luong-Cuc Phuong Limestone Landscape   |
| 1637 | MSP | Guatemala          | Community Management of the Bio-Itza Reserve Project  |
| 957  | MSP | Peru               | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Amarakaeri Communal Reserve and Adjoining Indigenous Lands  |
| 1030 | MSP | Vietnam            | Making the Link: The Connection and Sustainable Management of Kon Ka Kinh and Kon Cha Rang Nature Reserves  |
| 1061 | MSP | Peru               | Inka Terra: An Innovative Partnership for Self-Financing Biodiversity Conservation & Community Development  |
| 1063 | FP  | Cameroon           | Forest and Environment Development Policy Grant (FEDPG)   |
| 1064 | FP  | Gabon              | Strengthening Capacity for Managing National Parks and Biodiversity   |
| 1092 | FP  | Regional           | Integrated Ecosystem Management in Indigenous Communities   |
| 1095 | FP  | Regional           | Conservation of Transboundary Biodiversity in the Minkebe-Odzala-Dja Interzone in Gabon, Congo, and Cameroon  |
| 1100 | FP  | Mongolia           | Community-based Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Mountain Landscapes of Mongolia's Altai Sayan Ecoregion   |
| 1101 | FP  | Peru               | Participatory Management of Protected Areas   |
| 1104 | FP  | Rwanda             | Conservation of the Montane Forest Protected Area System in Rwanda  |
| 1107 | FP  | Nepal              | Landscape Level Biodiversity Conservation in Nepal's Western Terai Complex  |
| 1139 | FP  | Guinea             | Conservation of the Biodiversity of the Nimba Mountains through Integrated and Participatory Management   |
| 1152 | FP  | Mali               | Biodiversity Conservation and Participatory Sustainable Management of Natural Resources in the Inner Niger Delta and its Transition Areas, Mopti Region             |
| 1161 | FP  | Russian Federation | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Wild Salmonid Biological Diversity in Russia's Kamchatka Peninsula, Phase I   |
| 1163 | FP  | Russian Federation | An Integrated Ecosystem Management Approach to Conserve Biodiversity and Minimize Habitat Fragmentation in Three Selected Model Areas in the Russian Arctic (ECORA) |
| 1177 | FP  | Russian Federation | Biodiversity Conservation in the Russian Portion of the Altai-Sayan Ecoregion   |

|      |     |            |  |
|------|-----|------------|--|
| 1183 | FP  | Cambodia   | Tonle Sap Conservation Project   |
| 1201 | FP  | Malaysia   | Conserving Marine Biodiversity through Enhanced Marine Park Management and Inclusive Sustainable Island Development  |
| 1217 | FP  | Nepal      | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Wetlands   |
| 1236 | FP  | Chile      | Conserving Globally Significant Biodiversity along the Chilean Coast   |
| 1259 | FP  | Regional   | In-situ Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives through Enhanced Information Management and Field Application  |
| 1296 | MSP | Vietnam    | The Green Corridor   |
| 1299 | FP  | Brazil     | Integrated Management of Aquatic Resources in the Amazon (AquaBio)   |
| 1322 | FP  | Iran       | Conservation of Biodiversity in the Central Zagros Landscape Conservation Zone   |
| 1362 | FP  | Kenya      | Western Kenya Integrated Ecosystem Management Project  |
| 1438 | MSP | Jordan     | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Dibe'en Nature Reserve   |
| 1446 | MSP | Peru       | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Peruvian Amazon by the Indigenous Ashaninka Population   |
| 1489 | MSP | Paraguay   | Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in the Mbaracayu Natural Reserve   |
| 1611 | MSP | Mongolia   | Developing a Model Conservation Programme- Conservation of the Gobi Desert Using Wild Bactrian Camels as an "Umbrella Species".                              |
| 1621 | FP  | China      | Gansu and Xinjiang Pastoral Development Project  |
| 1682 | MSP | Vanuatu    | Facilitating and Strengthening the Conservation Initiatives of Traditional Landholders and their Communities to Achieve Biodiversity Conservation Objectives |
| 1713 | MSP | Costa Rica | Improved Management and Conservation Practices for the Cocos Island Marine Conservation Area   |
| 1721 | MSP | Pakistan   | Conservation of habitats and species of global significance in Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems in Balochistan  |
| 1732 | MSP | Argentina  | In-Situ Conservation of Andean Crops and their Wild Relatives in the Humahuaca Valley, the Southernmost Extension of the Central Andes                       |
| 1733 | MSP | Guatemala  | Consolidating a System of Municipal Regional Parks (MRPs) in Guatemala's Western Plateau   |
| 1836 | MSP | Lao PDR    | Integrated Ecosystem and Wildlife Management Project in Bolikhamxay Province   |
| 1842 | MSP | Global     | Indigenous Peoples' Network for Change   |
| 1855 | FP  | Chad       | Community-Based Ecosystem Management Project   |

|      |     |                    |  |
|------|-----|--------------------|--|
| 1876 | MSP | Colombia           | Naya Biological Corridor in the Munchique-Pinche Sector  |
| 1895 | MSP | Global             | Improved Certification Schemes for Sustainable Tropical Forest Management  |
| 1900 | FP  | Mexico             | Large Scale Renewable Energy Development Project   |
| 2068 | MSP | Belize             | Integrating Protected Area and Landscape Management in the Golden Stream Watershed   |
| 2078 | FP  | Mexico             | Consolidation of the Protected Area System (SINAP II) - Second Tranche   |
| 2099 | FP  | Regional           | Corazon Transboundary Biosphere Reserve  |
| 2102 | FP  | Panama             | Second Rural Poverty, Natural Resources Management and Consolidation of the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor Project                           |
| 2183 | MSP | Ghana              | Community-based Integrated Natural Resources Management Project in Okyeman   |
| 2193 | MSP | Global             | Enabling Sustainable Dryland Management Through Mobile Pastoral Custodianship  |
| 2235 | FP  | Russian Federation | Demonstrating Sustainable Conservation of Biodiversity in Four Protected Areas in Russia's Kamchatka Oblast, Phase 2                           |
| 2443 | FP  | Mexico             | Environmental Services Project   |
| 2492 | FP  | Namibia            | Strengthening the Protected Area Network (SPAN)  |
| 2499 | FP  | Guatemala          | Productive Uses of Renewable Energy in Guatemala   |
| 2517 | FP  | Regional           | Sustainable Environmental Management for Sixaola River Basin   |
| 2549 | FP  | Cameroon           | Sustainable Agro-Pastoral and Land Management Promotion under the National Community Development Program Support Program (PNDP)                |
| 2594 | MSP | Venezuela          | DHEKUANA NONODO: Sustainable Use and Conservation of Biodiversity Resources of Dhekuana Indigenous Lands                                       |
| 2638 | FP  | Turkmenistan       | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Globally Significant Biological Diversity in Khazar Nature Reserve on the Caspian Sea Coast (Resubmission) |
| 2774 | FP  | Global             | Community-based Adaptation (CBA) Programme   |
| 2817 | MSP | Brazil             | Tabuleiro State Park: Conservation of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Rehabilitation  |
| 2884 | FP  | Costa Rica         | Mainstreaming Market-based Instruments for Environmental Management Project  |
| 2949 | FP  | Global             | Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund (CEPF), Phase 2   |
| 1156 | FP  | India              | Mainstreaming Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plant Diversity in Three Indian States   |
| 1837 | MSP | Uganda             | Extending Wetland protected Areas through Community Based Conservation Initiatives   |
| 1999 | MSP | Kenya              | Wildlife Conservation Leasing Demonstration  |

|      |     |             |   |
|------|-----|-------------|---|
| 2100 | FP  | Congo DR    | Support to the Rehabilitation of the Protected Areas System in DRC, in the framework of the National Forest and Biodiversity Sector Program.  |
| 2184 | MSP | Regional    | SIP-Stimulating Community Initiatives in Sustainable Land Management (SCI-SLM)  |
| 2702 | FP  | Nicaragua   | Strengthening and Catalyzing the Sustainability of Nicaragua's PAS  |
| 2820 | FP  | Regional    | Supporting the Development and Implementation of Access and Benefit Sharing Policies in Africa  |
| 2896 | MSP | Mexico      | Sacred Orchids of Chiapas: Cultural and Religious Values in Conservation  |
| 2934 | FP  | Brazil      | SFM Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous Lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems   |
| 2975 | FP  | Philippines | Mindanao Rural Development Program Phase II - Natural Resource Management Project   |
| 3284 | MSP | Liberia     | Consolidation of Liberia's Protected Area Network   |
| 3287 | FP  | Bangladesh  | Community Based Adaptation to Climate Change through Coastal Afforestation  |
| 3361 | MSP | Global      | Assessment and Recommendations on Improving Access of Indigenous Peoples to Conservation Funding  |
| 3367 | FP  | Ethiopia    | SIP-Community-Based Integrated Natural Resources Management in Lake Tana Watershed  |
| 3382 | FP  | Niger       | SIP-Community Driven SLM for Environmental and Food Security  |
| 3385 | FP  | Senegal     | SIP-Sustainable Land Management in Senegal  |
| 3443 | FP  | Indonesia   | SFM Strengthening Community Based Forest and Watershed Management (SCBFWM)  |
| 3445 | FP  | Thailand    | SFM: Integrated Community-based Forest and Catchment Management through an Ecosystem Service Approach (CBFCM)   |
| 3592 | FP  | Honduras    | Conservation of Biodiversity in the Indigenous Productive Landscapes of the Moskitia  |
| 3637 | FP  | Mexico      | SFM Transforming Management of Biodiversity-rich Community Production Forests through Building National Capacities for Market-based Instruments - under the Sustainable Forest Management Program |
| 3717 | FP  | Ecuador     | SFM Sustainable Management of Biodiversity and Water Resources in the Ibarra-San Lorenzo Corridor   |
| 3821 | FP  | Cameroon    | CBSP Sustainable Community Based Management and Conservation of Mangrove Ecosystems in Cameroon   |
| 3829 | FP  | Ecuador     | Sustainable Financing of Ecuador's National System of Protected Areas (SNAP) and Associated Private and Community-managed PA Subsystems   |

|      |    |                    |  |
|------|----|--------------------|--|
| 3909 | FP | Russian Federation | Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Russia's Energy Sector Policies and Operations  |
| 3924 | FP | Global             | Development Market Place 2009: Adaptation to Climate Change (DM 2009)  |
| 3954 | FP | Papua New Guinea   | PAS Community-Based Forest and Coastal Conservation and Resource Management in PNG   |
| 4084 | FP | Cameroon           | CBSP Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Ngoyla Mintom Forest  |
| 4149 | FP | Mexico             | SFM Mitigating Climate Change through Sustainable Forest Management and Capacity Building in the Southern States of Mexico (States of Campeche, Chiapas and Oaxaca)                  |
| 4382 | FP | Costa Rica         | Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme  |
| 4481 | FP | Bolivia            | Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme  |
| 4658 | FP | Russian Federation | ARCTIC Integrated Adaptive Management of the West Bering Sea Large Marine Ecosystem in a Changing Climate  |
| 4665 | FP | Russian Federation | Conserving Biodiversity in the Changing Arctic   |
| 4678 | FP | Global             | GEF SGP Fifth Operational Phase - Implementing the Program Using STAR Resources II   |
| 4700 | FP | Bangladesh         | Integrating Community-based Adaptation into Afforestation and Reforestation Programmes in Bangladesh   |
| 4702 | FP | Niger              | Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural and Pastoral Production for Food Security in Vulnerable Rural Areas through the Farmers Field School Approach                       |
| 4720 | FP | Angola             | Land Rehabilitation and Rangelands Management in Small Holders Agropastoral Production Systems in Soutwestern Angola   |
| 4725 | FP | Solomon Islands    | Solomon Islands Water Sector Adaptation Project (SIWSAP)   |
| 4732 | FP | Malaysia           | Improving Connectivity in the Central Forest Spine (CFS) Landscape - IC-CFS  |
| 4764 | FP | Regional           | Enhancing the Resilience of Pastoral Ecosystems and Livelihoods of Nomadic Herders   |
| 4774 | FP | Ecuador            | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, Forests, Soil and Water to Achieve the Good Living (Buen Vivir / Sumac Kasay) in the Napo Province                                 |
| 4777 | FP | Ecuador            | Mainstreaming of the Use and Conservation of Agrobiodiversity in Public Policies through Integrated Strategies and In situ Implementation in three Provinces in the Andean Highlands |

|      |     |                    |  |
|------|-----|--------------------|--|
| 4780 | MSP | Panama             | Promoting the application of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing in Panama  |
| 4795 | FP  | Russian Federation | ARCTIC Integrated River Basin Management (IRBM) for Major Arctic Rivers to Achieve Multiple Global Environmental Benefits  |
| 4796 | FP  | Russian Federation | ARCTIC Improvement of Environmental Governance and Knowledge Management for SAP-Arctic Implementation  |
| 4822 | FP  | Mali               | Strengthening Resilience to Climate Change through Integrated Agricultural and Pastoral Management in the Sahelian zone in the Framework of the Sustainable Land Management Approach |
| 4860 | FP  | Paraguay           | Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Land Management into Production Practices in all Bioregions and Biomes   |
| 4901 | FP  | India              | India: Sustainable Livelihoods and Adaptation to Climate Change (SLACC)  |
| 4916 | FP  | Colombia           | Conservation of Biodiversity in Landscapes Impacted by Mining in the Choco Biogeographic Region  |
| 4942 | FP  | India              | Integrated Biodiversity Conservation and Ecosystem Services Improvement  |
| 5075 | FP  | Lesotho            | Reducing Vulnerability from Climate Change in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin  |
| 5080 | FP  | Peru               | Transforming Management of Protected Area/Landscape Complexes to Strengthen Ecosystem Resilience   |
| 5137 | FP  | India              | Mainstreaming Agrobiodiversity Conservation and Utilization in Agricultural Sector to Ensure Ecosystem Services and Reduce Vulnerability   |
| 5160 | MSP | Colombia           | The Development and Production of Natural Dyes in the Choco Region of Colombia for the Food, Cosmetics and Personal Care Industries Under the Provisions of the Nagoya Protocol      |
| 5170 | MSP | Fiji               | Discovering Nature-based Products and Build National Capacities for the Application of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing                        |
| 5171 | FP  | Indonesia          | CTI: Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management Program-Coral Triangle Initiative, Phase III (COREMAP-CTI III)   |
| 5172 | MSP | Global             | Global Support for the Entry into Force of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing   |
| 5190 | FP  | Mauritania         | Improving Climate Resilience of Water Sector Investments with Appropriate Climate Adaptive Activities for Pastoral and Forestry Ressources in Southern Mauritania                    |

|      |     |                            |   |
|------|-----|----------------------------|---|
| 5194 | FP  | Rwanda                     | Building Resilience of Communities Living in Degraded Forests, Savannahs and Wetlands of Rwanda Through an Ecosystem Management Approach  |
| 5201 | MSP | Global                     | Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE): Conserving Earth's Most Irreplaceable Sites for Endangered Biodiversity   |
| 5203 | FP  | Nepal                      | Catalysing Ecosystem Restoration for Climate Resilient Natural Capital and Rural Livelihoods in Degraded Forests and Rangelands of Nepal.   |
| 5208 | FP  | Palau                      | R2R: Advancing Sustainable Resources Management to Improve Livelihoods and Protect Biodiversity in Palau  |
| 5220 | FP  | Ethiopia                   | PSG: Sustainable Land Management Project 2  |
| 5228 | FP  | Regional (Djibouti, Kenya) | RLACC - Rural Livelihoods's Adaptation to Climate Change in the Horn of Africa (PROGRAM)  |
| 5252 | FP  | Niger                      | GGW: Third Phase of the Community Action Program  |
| 5264 | FP  | Gabon                      | Sustainable Management of Critical Wetlands Ecosystems Project  |
| 5270 | FP  | Mali                       | GGW Natural Resources Management in a Changing Climate in Mali  |
| 5272 | FP  | Kenya                      | Scaling up Sustainable Land Management and Agrobiodiversity Conservation to Reduce Environmental Degradation in Small Scale Agriculture in Western Kenya  |
| 5276 | FP  | Brazil                     | Sustainable Land Use Management in the Semi-arid Region of North-east Brazil (Sergipe)  |
| 5277 | FP  | Nicaragua                  | Strengthening the Resilience of Multiple-use Protected Areas to Deliver Multiple Global Environmental Benefits  |
| 5281 | FP  | Philippines                | LME-EA Philippine Rural Development Program   |
| 5285 | FP  | Indonesia                  | Strengthening Forest and Ecosystem Connectivity in RIMBA Landscape of Central Sumatra through Investing in Natural Capital, Biodiversity Conservation, and Land-based Emission Reductions (RIMBA project) |
| 5288 | FP  | Colombia                   | Implementing the Socio-Ecosystem Connectivity Approach to Conserve and Sustainable Use Biodiversity in the Caribbean Region of Colombia   |
| 5295 | MSP | Cambodia                   | Generating, Accessing and Using Information and Knowledge Related to the Three Rio Conventions  |
| 5304 | FP  | Regional                   | Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Latin America and Caribbean Trawl Fisheries (REBYC-II LAC)   |
| 5332 | FP  | Djibouti                   | Supporting Rural Community Adaptation to Climate Change in Mountain Regions of Djibouti   |

|      |     |               |  |
|------|-----|---------------|--|
| 5338 | FP  | Argentina     | Mainstreaming Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Production Practices of Small Producers to Protect the Biodiversity of High Value Conservation Forests in the Atlantic Forest, Yungas and Chaco |
| 5339 | FP  | Indonesia     | Market Transformation through Design and Implementation of Appropriate Mitigation Actions in Energy Sector   |
| 5347 | FP  | Yemen         | Support to the Integrated Program for the Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Socotra Archipelago  |
| 5348 | FP  | Cook Islands  | Conserving Biodiversity and Enhancing Ecosystem Functions through a "Ridge to Reef" Approach in the Cook Island  |
| 5351 | FP  | Madagascar    | Strengthening the Network of New Protected Areas in Madagascar   |
| 5352 | FP  | Madagascar    | Conservation of Key Threatened Endemic and Economically Valuable Species in Madagascar   |
| 5363 | FP  | Philippines   | Development for Renewable Energy Applications Mainstreaming and Market Sustainability (DREAMS)   |
| 5367 | FP  | Cameroon      | PCB Reduction In Cameroon Through The Use Of Local Expertise And The Development Of National Capacities  |
| 5368 | FP  | Guinea-Bissau | Strengthening the Financial and Operational Framework of the National PA System in Guinea-Bissau   |
| 5376 | FP  | Chad          | Enhancing the Resilience of the Agricultural Ecosystems  |
| 5382 | FP  | Guinea        | Ecosystem-Based Adaptation Targeting Vulnerable Communities of the Upper Guinea Region   |
| 5386 | MSP | Albania       | Building the Resilience of Kune-Vaini Lagoon through Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA)  |
| 5397 | FP  | Vanuatu       | R2R: Integrated Sustainable Land and Coastal Management  |
| 5398 | FP  | Fiji          | Implementing a "Ridge to Reef" Approach to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Sequester Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Fiji (Fiji R2R)                                  |
| 5401 | FP  | Regional      | Establishment and Operation of a Regional System of Fisheries Refugia in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand  |
| 5403 | MSP | Uzbekistan    | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Agricultural Biodiversity to Improve Regulating and Supporting Ecosystem Services in Agriculture Production  |
| 5405 | FP  | Regional      | EAS: Scaling up the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia   |



|      |     |                  |   |
|------|-----|------------------|---|
| 5410 | FP  | Venezuela        | Sustainable Forest Lands Management and Conservation under an Eco-social Approach   |
| 5420 | MSP | Costa Rica       | Promoting the Application of the Nagoya Protocol through the Development of Nature-based Products, Benefit-sharing and Biodiversity Conservation  |
| 5432 | FP  | Angola           | Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural and Agropastoral Production Systems through Soil Fertility Management in Key Productive and Vulnerable Areas Using the Farmers Field School Approach |
| 5433 | FP  | Mozambique       | Strengthening Capacities of Agricultural Producers to Cope with Climate Change for Increased Food Security through the Farmers Field School Approach  |
| 5435 | FP  | Zambia           | Promoting Climate Resilient Community-based Regeneration of Indigenous Forests in Zambia's Central Province   |
| 5448 | MSP | Bhutan           | Implementing the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing   |
| 5454 | MSP | Regional         | Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) for the Member Countries of the Central African Forests Commission COMIFAC                                 |
| 5456 | FP  | Bangladesh       | Ecosystem-based Approaches to Adaptation (EbA) in the Drought-prone Barind Tract and Haor "Wetland" Area  |
| 5458 | MSP | Peru             | Conservation, Management and Rehabilitation of Fragile Lomas Ecosystems   |
| 5479 | FP  | India            | Integrated SLEM Approaches for Reducing Land Degradation and Desertification  |
| 5481 | MSP | Morocco          | Conservation of Biodiversity and Mitigation of Land Degradation Through Adaptive Management of Agricultural Heritage Systems  |
| 5486 | FP  | Madagascar       | A Landscape Approach to Conserving and Managing Threatened Biodiversity in Madagascar with a Focus on the Atsimo-Andrefana Spiny and Dry Forest Landscape   |
| 5489 | FP  | Lao PDR          | Climate Adaptation in Wetlands Areas (CAWA)   |
| 5503 | FP  | Senegal          | Mainstreaming Ecosystem-based Approaches to Climate-resilient Rural Livelihoods in Vulnerable Rural Areas through the Farmer Field School Methodology   |
| 5510 | FP  | Papua New Guinea | R2R Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the National System of Protected Areas  |
| 5512 | MSP | Thailand         | Conserving Habitats for Globally Important Flora and Fauna in Production Landscapes   |
| 5514 | FP  | Mauritius        | Mainstreaming Biodiversity into the Management of the Coastal Zone in the Republic of Mauritius   |

|      |     |                  |  |
|------|-----|------------------|--|
| 5522 | FP  | Libya            | Sustainable Land Management and Conservation of Oases Ecosystems in Libya  |
| 5528 | FP  | Macedonia        | Achieving Biodiversity Conservation through Creation and Effective Management of Protected Areas and Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Land Use Planning   |
| 5529 | MSP | Gambia           | Gambia Protected Areas Network and Community Livelihood Project  |
| 5531 | FP  | Haiti            | Ecosystem Approach to Haiti Cote Sud   |
| 5533 | FP  | China            | Developing and Implementing the National Framework on Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge   |
| 5534 | FP  | Ecuador          | Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Diversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources  |
| 5535 | FP  | Regional         | Improving IWRM, Knowledge based Management and Governance of the Niger Basin and the Iullemeden Taoudeni Tanezrouft Aquifer System (ITTAS)   |
| 5537 | FP  | Congo            | Creation of Conkouati Dimonika PA Complex and Development of Community Private Sector Participation Model to Enhance PA Management Effectiveness CDC&CPSPM   |
| 5542 | FP  | Regional         | Catalyzing Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Sustainable Management of Shared Living Marine Resources in the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems (CMLE+)             |
| 5544 | FP  | Marshall Islands | R2R Reimaanlok Looking to the Future: Strengthening Natural Resource Management in Atoll Communities in the Republic of Marshall Islands Employing Integrated Approaches (RMI R2R)                               |
| 5546 | FP  | Panama           | Sustainable Production Systems and Conservation of Biodiversity  |
| 5547 | FP  | Congo DR         | Community-Based Miombo Forest Management in South East Katanga   |
| 5549 | FP  | Philippines      | RicePlus-Dynamic Conservation and Sustainable Use of Agro-biodiversity in Rice-based Farming Systems   |
| 5551 | FP  | Kiribati         | Resilient Islands, Resilient Communities   |
| 5552 | FP  | Niue             | R2R Application of Ridge to Reef Concept for Biodiversity Conservation, and for the Enhancement of Ecosystem Service and Cultural Heritage   |
| 5554 | FP  | Regional         | Strengthening of National Initiatives and Enhancement of Regional Cooperation for the Environmentally Sound Management of POPs in Waste of Electronic or Electrical Equipment (WEEE) in Latin-American Countries |

|      |     |                    |  |
|------|-----|--------------------|--|
| 5559 | FP  | Russian Federation | Conservation of Big Cats   |
| 5560 | FP  | Colombia           | Forest Conservation and Sustainability in the Heart of the Colombian Amazon  |
| 5567 | FP  | Myanmar            | Adapting Community Forestry Landscapes and Associated Community Livelihoods to a Changing Climate, in Particular an Increase in the Frequency and Intensity of Extreme Weather Events                          |
| 5579 | MSP | Palau              | Mainstreaming Global Environmental Priorities into National Policies and Programmes  |
| 5580 | FP  | Mauritania         | Development of an Improved and Innovative Delivery System for Climate Resilient Livelihoods in Mauritania  |
| 5581 | FP  | Solomon Islands    | Community Resilience to Climate and Disaster Risk in Solomon Islands Project   |
| 5592 | FP  | Somalia            | Enhancing Climate Resilience of the Vulnerable Communities and Ecosystems in Somalia   |
| 5593 | MSP | Malaysia           | Developing and Implementing a National Access and Benefit Sharing Framework  |
| 5596 | MSP | Nepal              | Sustainable Land Management in the Churia Range  |
| 5605 | MSP | Morocco            | Developing a National Framework on Access to and Benefit-Sharing of Genetic Resources and Traditional Knowledge as a Strategy to Contribute to the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Morocco |
| 5609 | MSP | Gambia             | Greening the Productive Sectors in Gambia: Promoting the Use and Integration of Small to Medium Scale Renewable Energy Systems in the Productive Uses  |
| 5613 | MSP | Cook Islands       | Strengthening the Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing in the Cook Islands   |
| 5622 | FP  | Indonesia          | LME-EA Coral Triangle Initiative Project (COREMAPIII-CTI)  |
| 5626 | MSP | Kenya              | Developing the Microbial Biotechnology Industry from Kenya's Soda Lakes in line with the Nagoya Protocol   |
| 5634 | MSP | Regional           | Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in the Countries of the Pacific Region  |
| 5639 | MSP | Mauritania         | Stocktaking and Update of National Biosafety Framework of Mauritania   |
| 5651 | FP  | Sudan              | Livestock and Rangeland Resilience Program   |
| 5653 | MSP | Vietnam            | Capacity Building for the Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing   |

|      |     |              |   |
|------|-----|--------------|---|
| 5656 | MSP | Global       | Parks, People, Planet: Protected Areas as Solutions to Global Challenges  |
| 5657 | FP  | Turkey       | Conservation and Sustainable Management of Turkey's Steppe Ecosystems   |
| 5660 | FP  | Pakistan     | Sustainable Forest Management to Secure Multiple Benefits in High Conservation Value Forests  |
| 5665 | FP  | China        | A New Green Line: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation Objectives and Practices into China's Water Resources Management Policy and Planning Practice   |
| 5668 | FP  | Paraguay     | Innovative Use of a Voluntary Payment for Environmental Services Scheme to Avoid and Reduce GHG Emissions and Enhance Carbon Stocks in the Highly Threatened Dry Chaco Forest Complex in Western Paraguay       |
| 5681 | FP  | Regional     | Building Climate Resilience of Urban Systems through Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) in Latin America and the Caribbean.   |
| 5692 | MSP | Malaysia     | Mainstreaming of Biodiversity Conservation into River Management  |
| 5694 | FP  | Comoros      | Building Climate Resilience through Rehabilitated Watersheds, Forests and Adaptive Livelihoods  |
| 5703 | FP  | Sudan        | Enhancing the Resilience of Communities Living in Climate Change Vulnerable Areas of Sudan Using Ecosystem Based Approaches to Adaptation (EbA)   |
| 5704 | FP  | South Africa | Promoting Organic Waste-to-Energy and other Low-carbon Technologies in Small and Medium-scale Enterprises (SMMEs): Accelerating Biogas Market Development   |
| 5712 | MSP | Liberia      | Improve Sustainability of Mangrove Forests and Coastal Mangrove Areas in Liberia through Protection, Planning and Livelihood Creation- as a Building Block Towards Liberia's Marine and Coastal Protected Areas |
| 5719 | FP  | Angola       | Promotion of Sustainable Charcoal in Angola through a Value Chain Approach  |
| 5724 | FP  | Global       | Participatory Assessment of Land Degradation and Sustainable Land Management in Grassland and Pastoral Systems  |
| 5725 | MSP | Thailand     | Greening Industry through Low Carbon Technology Application for SMEs  |
| 5731 | FP  | Global       | Strengthening Human Resources, Legal Frameworks and Institutional Capacities to Implement the Nagoya Protocol   |
| 5735 | FP  | Global       | Effectively Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Government Policy and Private Sector Practice  |

|      |     |               |  |
|------|-----|---------------|--|
|      |     |               | Piloting Sustainability Models to Take the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) to Scale   |
| 5736 | FP  | Global        | GEF SGP Fifth Operational Phase - Implementing the Program Using STAR Resources III  |
| 5738 | FP  | Mexico        | Strengthening of National Capacities for the Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity |
| 5744 | MSP | Bahamas       | Strengthening Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS)   |
| 5745 | FP  | Nigeria       | Sustainable Fuelwood Management in Nigeria   |
| 5748 | FP  | Regional      | Integrated Water Resources Management in the Titicaca-Desaguadero-Poopo-Salar de Coipasa (TDPS) System   |
| 5749 | FP  | El Salvador   | Conservation, Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, and Maintenance of Ecosystem Services in Protected Wetlands of International Importance   |
| 5751 | MSP | Mexico        | Maintaining and Increasing Carbon Stocks in Agro-silvopastoral Systems in Rural Communities of the Selva Zoque - Sumidero Canyon Complex as a Climate Change Mitigation Strategy.  |
| 5755 | FP  | Bolivia       | Sustainable Management of Forest Ecosystems in Amazonia by Indigenous and Local Communities to Generate Multiple Environmental and Social Benefits   |
| 5759 | FP  | Indonesia     | Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Inland Fisheries Practices in Freshwater Ecosystems of High Conservation Value (IFish)  |
| 5761 | MSP | Dominica      | Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems by Strengthening the Effectiveness of Dominica's Protected Areas System  |
| 5765 | FP  | Regional      | Integrated Transboundary Ridges-to-Reef Management of the Mesoamerican Reef  |
| 5767 | MSP | Philippines   | Implementation of SLM Practices to Address Land Degradation and Mitigate Effects of Drought  |
| 5774 | MSP | Regional      | Advancing the Nagoya Protocol in Countries of the Caribbean Region   |
| 5782 | FP  | Gambia        | Adapting Agriculture to Climate Change in the Gambia   |
| 5784 | MSP | Global        | Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management in Priority Socio Ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS)  |
| 5785 | MSP | Mexico        | Sustainable Land Management Promotion  |
| 5788 | MSP | Cote d'Ivoire | Assessment of Land Degradation Dynamic in Coffee - Cocoa production and Northern Ivory Coast to promote SLM practices and Carbon Stock Conservation ALDD SLM CSC   |

|      |     |                     |   |
|------|-----|---------------------|---|
| 5789 | MSP | Botswana            | Using SLM to Improve the Integrity of the Makgadikgadi Ecosystem and to Secure the Livelihoods of Rangeland Dependent Communities   |
| 5796 | MSP | Cameroon            | A Bottom Up Approach to ABS: Community Level Capacity Development for Successful Engagement in ABS Value Chains in Cameroon ( <i>Echinops giganteus</i> )   |
| 5797 | MSP | Global              | Securing Tenure Rights for Forest Landscape Dependent Communities: Linking Science with Policy to Advance Tenure Security, Sustainable Forest Management and People's Livelihoods                                 |
| 5798 | MSP | Regional            | Adaptive Management and Monitoring of the Maghreb's Oases Systems   |
| 5808 | MSP | Algeria             | Developing a National Strategy and Legal and Institutional Framework on Access to Genetic Resources and Related Benefit Sharing and Traditional Knowledge in Line with the CBD and Its Nagoya Protocol in Algeria |
| 5811 | MSP | Regional            | Closing the Gaps in Great Green Wall: Linking Sectors and Stakeholders for Increased Synergy and Scaling-up   |
| 5815 | FP  | Regional            | Building Climate Resilience of Urban Systems through Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) in the Asia-Pacific Region.   |
| 5820 | MSP | Argentina           | Promoting the Application of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS   |
| 5824 | MSP | Global              | Sharing Knowledge on the Use of Biochar for Sustainable Land Management   |
| 5826 | MSP | Philippines         | Strengthening National Systems to Improve Governance and Management of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Conserved Areas and Territories   |
| 5847 | MSP | Trinidad and Tobago | Capacity Development for Improved Management of Multilateral Environmental Agreements for Global Environmental Benefits   |
| 5848 | MSP | Indonesia           | Capacity Development for Implementing Rio Conventions through Enhancing Incentive Mechanism for Sustainable Watershed/Land Management   |
| 5882 | MSP | Gabon               | Gabon - Implementation of National Strategy and Action Plan on Access to Genetic Resources and The Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Accruing From Their Utilization   |
| 9325 | FP  | Djibouti            | RLACC - Rural Livelihoods' Adaptation to Climate Change in the Horn of Africa (PROGRAM)   |
| 9512 | MSP | Tuvalu              | Climate Resilience in the Outer Islands of Tuvalu   |
| 6920 | FP  | Global              | Implementation of the Arafura and Timor Seas Regional and National Strategic Action Programs  |

|      |     |                    |  |
|------|-----|--------------------|--|
| 6924 | FP  | Vietnam            | Promoting Climate Resilience in Vietnamese Cities Management   |
| 6925 | FP  | Global             | Umbrella Programme for Biennial Update Report to the United National Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)                                   |
| 6931 | FP  | Global             | GEF Small Grants Programme - Sixth Operational Phase (Part I)  |
| 6940 | FP  | Lao PDR            | Sustainable Forest and Land Management in the Dry Dipterocarp Forest Ecosystems of Southern Lao PDR  |
| 6945 | FP  | Costa Rica         | Strengthening Capacities of Rural Aqueduct Associations' (ASADAS) to Address Climate Change Risks in Water Stressed Communities of Northern Costa Rica |
| 6949 | FP  | Tajikistan         | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Pamir Alay and Tian Shan Ecosystems for Snow Leopard Protection and Sustainable Community Livelihoods              |
| 6955 | FP  | Chile              | Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change in the Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector  |
| 6962 | FP  | Regional           | Advancing IWRM Across the Kura River Basin through Implementation of the Transboundary Agreed Actions and National Plans                               |
| 6965 | FP  | Indonesia          | Strengthening Forest Area Planning and Management in Kalimantan  |
| 6970 | FP  | Regional           | Pacific Islands Regional Oceanscape Program (PROP)   |
| 6984 | FP  | Regional           | Building Resilience of Health Systems in Asian LDCs to Climate Change  |
| 6990 | MSP | Bosnia-Herzegovina | Achieving Biodiversity Conservation through Creation, Effective Management and Spatial Designation of Protected Areas and Capacity Building            |
| 6992 | FP  | Myanmar            | Ridge to Reef: Integrated Protected Area Land and Seascape Management in Tanintharyi   |
| 8025 | FP  | Peru               | Effective Implementation of the Access and Benefit Sharing and Traditional Knowledge Regime in Peru in accordance with the Nagoya Protocol             |
| 9044 | FP  | Peru               | Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Peru  |
| 9055 | FP  | Ecuador            | Sustainable Development of the Ecuadorian Amazon: Integrated Management of Multiple Use Landscapes and High Value Conservation Forests                 |
| 9058 | FP  | Regional           | Impact Investment in Support of the Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (non-grant)                                    |
| 9068 | FP  | Chile              | Establish a Network of National Important Agricultural Heritage Sites (NIAHS)  |

|      |    |              |   |
|------|----|--------------|---|
| 9071 | FP | Global       | Global Partnership on Wildlife Conservation and Crime Prevention for Sustainable Development (PROGRAM)  |
| 9088 | FP | Costa Rica   | Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Costa Rica   |
| 9092 | FP | Peru         | Sustainable Management of Agro-Biodiversity and Vulnerable Ecosystems Recuperation in Peruvian Andean Regions Through Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems GIAHS Approach       |
| 9094 | FP | Regional     | Integrated Natural Resources Management in Drought-prone and Salt-affected Agricultural Production Systems in Central Asia and Turkey (CACILM2)   |
| 9103 | FP | Cambodia     | Building Adaptive Capacity through the Scaling-up of Renewable Energy Technologies in Rural Cambodia (S-RET)  |
| 9129 | FP | Indonesia    | Eco-system Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) in Eastern Indonesia (Fisheries Management Area (FMA)- 715, 717 & 718)   |
| 9199 | FP | Bhutan       | Enhancing Sustainability and Climate Resilience of Forest and Agricultural Landscape and Community Livelihoods  |
| 9212 | FP | Gabon        | Wildlife and Human-Elephant Conflicts Management  |
| 9215 | FP | Djibouti     | Mitigating Key Sector Pressures on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity and Further Strengthening the National System of Marine Protected Areas in Djibouti                                      |
| 9232 | FP | Regional     | Sustainable Management of Peatland Ecosystems in Mekong Countries   |
| 9243 | FP | India        | Green-Ag: Transforming Indian Agriculture for Global Environmental Benefits and the Conservation of Critical Biodiversity and Forest Landscapes   |
| 9255 | FP | South Africa | Development of Value Chains for Products derived from Genetic Resources in Compliance with the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing and the National Biodiversity Economy Strategy |
| 9262 | FP | Honduras     | Agroforestry Landscapes and Sustainable Forest Management that Generate Environmental and Economic Benefits Globally and Locally  |
| 9270 | FP | Malaysia     | Sustainable Management of Peatland Ecosystems in Malaysia (SMPEM)   |
| 9271 | FP | Brazil       | National Strategy for Conservation of Threatened Species (PROSPECIES)   |
| 9272 | FP | Regional     | Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program   |
| 9277 | FP | Regional     | Risk Mitigation Instrument for Land Restoration (Non-Grant)   |



|      |     |             |   |
|------|-----|-------------|---|
| 9288 | FP  | Suriname    | Improving Environmental Management in the Mining Sector of Suriname, with Emphasis on Gold Mining   |
| 9289 | MSP | Albania     | Enhancing Financial Sustainability of the Protected Area System   |
| 9340 | FP  | Ghana       | Food-IAP: Sustainable Land and Water Management Project, Second Additional Financing  |
| 9352 | MSP | Nepal       | Strengthening Capacities for Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in Nepal   |
| 9361 | FP  | Vietnam     | Mainstreaming Natural Resource Management and Biodiversity Conservation objectives into socio-economic development planning and management of Biosphere Reserve in Viet Nam |
| 9370 | FP  | Regional    | The Meloy Fund : A Fund for Sustainable Small-scale Fisheries in SE Asia (Non-grant)  |
| 9380 | FP  | Mexico      | Securing the Future of Global Agriculture in the Face of Climate Change by Conserving the Genetic Diversity of the Traditional Agro-ecosystems of Mexico                    |
| 9407 | FP  | Regional    | Healthy Ecosystems for Rangeland Development (HERD): Sustainable Rangeland Management for Biodiversity Conservation and Climate Change Mitigation                           |
| 9445 | FP  | Mexico      | Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity in Priority Landscapes of Oaxaca and Chiapas   |
| 9449 | FP  | Brazil      | Sustainable, Accessible and Innovative Use of Biodiversity Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge in Promising Phytotherapeutic Value Chains in Brazil              |
| 124  | FP  | Argentina   | Renewable Energy in Rural Markets Project   |
| 135  | FP  | Global      | Small and Medium Scale Enterprise Program (IFC, first replenishment)  |
| 765  | FP  | Indonesia   | West Java/Jakarta Environmental Management Project  |
| 965  | FP  | Vietnam     | Systems Efficiency Improvement, Equitization and Renewables (SEER) Project - Renewables Components  |
| 1089 | FP  | Philippines | Asian Conservation Company (ACC)  |
| 975  | FP  | Regional    | Accelerating Renewable Energy Investments through CABI in Central America   |
| 1169 | FP  | Syria       | Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Area Management   |
| 1234 | FP  | Benin       | Community-based Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Management Project  |

|      |     |             |   |
|------|-----|-------------|---|
| 1239 | FP  | Ethiopia    | Sustainable Development of the Protected Area System  |
| 1273 | FP  | Guinea      | Coastal Marine and Biodiversity Management  |
| 1476 | FP  | Brazil      | Caatinga Conservation and Sustainable Management Project  |
| 2275 | MSP | Morocco     | The Middle Atlas Forest Restoration project   |
| 2366 | FP  | Lao PDR     | Southern Provinces Rural Electrification II Program   |
| 2374 | FP  | Vietnam     | Rural Energy II   |
| 2551 | FP  | Colombia    | Colombian National Protected Areas Conservation Trust Fund  |
| 2670 | FP  | Regional    | Central American Markets for Biodiversity (CAMBio): Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable use within Micro, Small and Medium-sized Enterprise Development and Financing |
| 2761 | FP  | Philippines | National Program Support for Environment and Natural Resources Management Project (NPS-ENRMP)   |
| 2127 | FP  | Global      | CBPF: Conservation and Adaptive Management of Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS)  |
| 2391 | FP  | Regional    | Facilitation of Financing for Biodiversity-based Businesses and Support of Market Development Activities in the Andean Region   |
| 2751 | FP  | Regional    | SFM Rehabilitation and Sustainable Use of Peatland Forests in South-East Asia   |
| 2772 | FP  | Chile       | Building a Comprehensive National Protected Areas System: A Financial and Operational Framework   |
| 2773 | FP  | Costa Rica  | Overcoming Barriers to Sustainability of Costa Rica's Protected Areas System  |
| 2902 | FP  | Regional    | Design and Implementation of Pilot Climate Change Adaptation Measures in the Andean Region  |
| 2931 | FP  | Ecuador     | Adaptation to Climate Change through Effective Water Governance   |
| 3100 | FP  | China       | Enabling China to Prepare Its Second National Communications to UNFCCC  |
| 3101 | FP  | Regional    | Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change Project (PACC)   |
| 3299 | MSP | Thailand    | Strengthening the Capacity of Vulnerable Coastal Communities to Address the Risk of Climate Change and Extreme Weather Events   |
| 3393 | FP  | Uganda      | SIP: Enabling Environment for SLM to overcome land degradation in the cattle corridor of Uganda.  |
| 3469 | FP  | India       | SLEM/CPP: Sustainable Land Management in Shifting Cultivation Areas of Nagaland for Ecological and Livelihood Security  |
| 3472 | FP  | India       | SLEM/CPP: Integrated Land Use Management to Combat Land Degradation in Madja Pradesh  |

|      |     |                    |   |
|------|-----|--------------------|---|
| 3518 | FP  | Russian Federation | Strengthening the Marine and Coastal Protected Areas of Russia  |
| 3532 | FP  | Colombia           | Protecting Biodiversity in the Southwestern Caribbean Sea   |
| 3573 | MSP | Nepal              | Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal of POPs Pesticides and PCBs   |
| 3604 | FP  | Colombia           | Mainstreaming Traditional Knowledge Associated with Agrobiodiversity in Colombian Agroecosystems  |
| 3606 | FP  | Philippines        | Expanding and Diversifying the National System of Terrestrial Protected Areas   |
| 3630 | MSP | Guatemala          | BS Development of Biosafety Mechanisms to Strengthen the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in Guatemala  |
| 3672 | FP  | China              | Phasing-out Incandescent Lamps & Energy Saving Lamps Promotion (PIESLAMP)   |
| 3688 | MSP | Montenegro         | Strengthening the Sustainability of the Protected Areas System of the Republic of Montenegro  |
| 3689 | FP  | Zambia             | Adaptation to the effects of drought and climate change in Agro-ecological Zone 1 and 2 in Zambia   |
| 3693 | FP  | Kenya              | Strengthening the Protected Area Network within the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya   |
| 3713 | MSP | Djibouti           | Establishing Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Djibouti   |
| 3718 | FP  | Congo DR           | Building the Capacity of the Agriculture Sector in DR Congo to Plan for and Respond to the Additional Threats Posed by Climate Change on Food Production and Security |
| 3726 | FP  | Global             | Groundwater Governance: A Global Framework for Country Action   |
| 3749 | FP  | Regional           | Towards Ecosystem Management of the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem   |
| 3818 | MSP | Global             | SFM Capacity Development for Climate Change Mitigation through Sustainable Forest Management in non-Annex I Countries   |
| 3820 | FP  | Mongolia           | Strengthening of the Protected Area Networking System in Mongolia (SPAN)  |
| 3853 | MSP | Regional           | Building Capacity for Regionally Harmonized National Processes for Implementing CBD Provisions on Access to Genetic Resources and Sharing of Benefits                 |
| 3861 | MSP | Belize             | Strengthening National Capacities for the Consolidation, Operationalization and Sustainability of Belize's Protected Areas System                                     |
| 3900 | FP  | Global             | MENARID: GEF IW LEARN: Strengthening IW Portfolio Delivery and Impact   |

|      |     |             |  |
|------|-----|-------------|--|
| 3964 | EA  | Argentina   | Third National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change                                      |
| 3996 | MSP | Honduras    | SFM: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into the Management of Pine-Oak Forests   |
| 4180 | MSP | Suriname    | Coastal Protected Area Management  |
| 4216 | FP  | Samoa       | Integration of Climate Change Risk and Resilience into Forestry Management (ICCRIFS)   |
| 4806 | MSP | Global      | A Global Initiative on Landscapes for People, Food and Nature  |
| 4826 | MSP | Vietnam     | Developing National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Provincial Planning |
| 48   | FP  | Congo       | Wildlands Protection and Management  |
| 54   | FP  | Uganda      | Bwindi Impenetrable National Park and Mgahinga Gorilla National Park Conservation  |
| 78   | FP  | Lao PDR     | Wildlife and Protected Areas Conservation  |
| 79   | FP  | Philippines | Conservation of Priority Protected Areas   |
| 85   | FP  | Cameroon    | Biodiversity Conservation and Management   |
| 348  | FP  | Panama      | Biodiversity Conservation in the Darien Region   |
| 360  | FP  | Regional    | Regional Strategy for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources in the Amazon                                  |
| 377  | FP  | Sudan       | Community Based Rangeland Rehabilitation for Carbon Sequestration  |

#### **ANNEX 4: SURVEY TO SGP NATIONAL COORDINATORS**

##### **Evaluation of GEF Engagement with Indigenous Peoples (IPs)**

##### **To be completed by SGP National Coordinators**

1. Name:
  
2. SGP country programme:
  
3. Number of SGP indigenous peoples projects and amount of funding awarded from your office since July 2010?
  
4. Are there any significant populations of “indigenous peoples”, as commonly defined under international laws and frameworks such as [ILO Convention 169](#) and the [UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples](#), in your country of work?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No

If yes, please provide additional clarifications on the country situation (maximum 300 words):

5. Does the SGP National Steering Committee (NSC) have an indigenous peoples’ focal point?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No

6. Does the SGP Country Programme Strategy (CPS) have a specific focus on indigenous peoples?

If yes, please give brief details:

7.a. Please estimate number of SGP projects working collaboratively with indigenous peoples supported since July 2010

7.b Please estimate number of SGP projects directly funding IP organisations (IPOs) since July 2010

8. If your country programme has supported activities related to indigenous peoples, does your Country programme Strategy in OP5 and OP6 include a specific emphasis on inclusion of IPs?

- a. Yes                      b. No

Please provide brief details:

9. In terms of IP related projects in your country of work, what thematic areas are covered and how frequently? How many projects, approximately, in each thematic area are funded?

| Thematic area   | Rating        |              |           |          | Number of IP projects funded since 2010? |
|---|---------------|--------------|-----------|----------|--|
| Biodiversity  | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |  |
| Climate change mitigation   | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |  |
| Land Degradation  | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |  |
| Sustainable Forest Management   | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |  |
| Forests and REDD+   |               |              |           |          |  |
| Other Community Based Natural Resource Management   | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |  |
| Protected Areas   | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |  |
| Indigenous peoples' territory mapping and ICCAs (Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved territories and Areas) | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |  |

|   |               |              |           |          |  |
|---|---------------|--------------|-----------|----------|--|
| Indigenous peoples' organisational capacity building  | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |  |
| Indigenous peoples' governance                        | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |  |
| Indigenous peoples' policy development                | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |  |
| Indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge and culture | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |  |

Please give details as necessary:

10. Did any SGP project deal with issues of the resettlement of indigenous peoples?

- a. Yes      b. No

If yes, please provide project details of project ID, location and date

11. What are the benefits of GEF funding to indigenous peoples in your country? If possible, add relevant project IDs.

| Benefit   | Rating        |              |           |          | Project IDs |
|---|---------------|--------------|-----------|----------|-------------|
| Increased land tenure or security                       | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |             |
| Increased natural resource rights or security           | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |             |
| Increased inclusion for consultation and project design | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |             |
| Increased inclusion on policy level discussions         | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |             |
| Access to training / capacity building                  | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |             |
| Promotion of public or private partnerships             | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |             |
| Increased awareness or of international conventions     | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |             |

|                                     |               |              |           |          |  |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------|----------|--|
| Income and livelihoods improvements | 1. Frequently | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never |  |
| No benefits observed                | 1. Frequently |              |           |          |  |

Please explain:

12. What are the main challenges of accessing GEF funding (through SGP) for indigenous peoples in your country?

| Challenge  | Rating |    | Possible Solution |
|--|--------|----|-------------------|
| Language limitations [i.e. project proposal writing, communications across different indigenous groups, and others]  | Yes    | No |                   |
| Timing requirements [i.e. longer project preparation time due to consultation processes, lower capacity levels and other local issues]   | Yes    | No |                   |
| Geographic or communication barriers to access funds [i.e. distance or lack of infrastructure]   | Yes    | No |                   |
| Limited capacity in administrative management skills and communication technology in indigenous peoples organisations [i.e. it can delay project design and implementation procedures and bookkeeping, monitoring practices] | Yes    | No |                   |
| Funding criteria are not relevant to indigenous peoples [i.e. funds are thematically or administratively not relevant/suitable to indigenous peoples' situations]  | Yes    | No |                   |
| Lack of consultations with indigenous peoples [i.e. low uptake and dissemination of information and/or understanding of indigenous peoples' needs]   | Yes    | No |                   |
| National policy barriers reduce indigenous peoples' access to funds [i.e. national legislation or processes have the effect of restricting funding to such groups]   | Yes    | No |                   |
| No challenges observed   | Yes    | No |                   |

Other challenges (Please explain):

13. What are some of the main mechanisms (i.e. revised formats, planning grants in local languages, photo-story, participatory video etc.) adopted for assisting indigenous peoples to access GEF funding (through SGP) in your country?

Please explain:



14. What are the main challenges of accessing GEF funding (through MSP and FSPs) for indigenous peoples in your country?

| Challenge  | Rating |    | Possible Solution |
|--|--------|----|-------------------|
| Language limitations [i.e. project proposal writing, communications across different indigenous groups, and others]  | Yes    | No |                   |
| Timing requirements [i.e. longer project preparation time due to consultation processes, lower capacity levels and other local issues]   | Yes    | No |                   |
| Geographic or communication barriers to access funds [i.e. distance or lack of infrastructure]   | Yes    | No |                   |
| Limited capacity in administrative management skills and communication technology in indigenous peoples organisations [i.e. it can upset project design and implementation procedures and bookkeeping, monitoring practices] | Yes    | No |                   |
| Challenges in identifying a GEF Agency willing to partner with an IPO due to a variety of reasons [i.e different priorities, political challenges, national government attitudes]  |        |    |                   |
| Funding criteria are not relevant to indigenous peoples [i.e. funds are thematically or administratively not relevant/suitable to indigenous peoples' situations]  | Yes    | No |                   |
| Lack of consultations with indigenous peoples [i.e. low uptake and dissemination of information and/or understanding of indigenous peoples' needs]   | Yes    | No |                   |
| National policy barriers reduce indigenous peoples' access to funds [i.e. national legislation or processes have the effect of restricting funding to such groups]   | Yes    | No |                   |
| No challenges observed   | Yes    | No |                   |

Other challenges: Please explain:

15. Which policies and guidelines influence your projects with indigenous peoples?

| Policy   | Rating    |              |           |          |                |
|--|-----------|--------------|-----------|----------|----------------|
| GEF Principles & Guidelines on IP Engagement                   | 1. Always | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never | 5. Not certain |
| Existing ministerial guidelines (please provide details below) | 1. Always | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never | 5. Not certain |
| UNDRIP   | 1. Always | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never | 5. Not certain |

|   |           |              |           |          |                |
|---|-----------|--------------|-----------|----------|----------------|
| ILO169  | 1. Always | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never | 5. Not certain |
| UN System Wide Action Plan (SWAP) for indigenous peoples    | 1. Always | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never | 5. Not certain |
| UNDG Guidelines on IPs                                      | 1. Always | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never | 5. Not certain |
| Other national policies                                     | 1. Always | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never | 5. Not certain |
| Other international treaties (please provide details below) | 1. Always | 2. Sometimes | 3. Rarely | 4. Never | 5. Not certain |

Please give further information as relevant:

16. Does your office correspond or work with any indigenous peoples' networks (i.e. national, regional or global)?

- a. Yes      b. No

If yes, please give network(s) name:

17. As far as you know, have indigenous peoples in your country provided feedback to GEF directly through?

- a. GEF CSO network focal point
- b. GEF IPAG processes
- c. GEF Secretariat
- d. GEF ECWs
- e. Others

If yes, please give brief details:

**ANNEX 5: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES**

| <b>Name</b>                | <b>Email</b>   | <b>Affiliation</b> | <b>Title</b>   |
|----------------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| Yoko Watanabe              | <a href="mailto:yoko.watanabe@thegefundp.org">yoko.watanabe@thegefundp.org</a>   | UNDP-SGP; IPAG     | Global Manager, the GEF Small Grants Programme, UNDP; former Senior Biodiversity Specialist and IP focal point, GEF  |
| Terence Hay-Edie           | <a href="mailto:terence.hay-edie@undp.org">terence.hay-edie@undp.org</a>         | UNDP-SGP           | Deputy Global Manager, the GEF Small Grants Programme, UNDP  |
| Sarah Wyatt                | <a href="mailto:swyatt@thegef.org">swyatt@thegef.org</a>                         | GEFSEC             | Operations Analyst, GEFSEC   |
| Laura Ledwith              | <a href="mailto:lauraledwith@aol.com">lauraledwith@aol.com</a>                   | GEFSEC             | Consultant to the GEF Secretariat on indigenous peoples  |
| Hawe Hamman Boubou         | <a href="mailto:hawehamman@gmail.com">hawehamman@gmail.com</a>                   | Attendee UNPFII    | Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association (indigenous peoples' representative at UNPFII)                   |
| Daniel M. Kobei            | <a href="mailto:dkobei@yahoo.com">dkobei@yahoo.com</a>                           | Attendee UNPFII    | Executive Director, The Ogiek Peoples Development Programme (indigenous peoples' representative at UNPFII)           |
| Balkisou Buba              | <a href="mailto:Balkisoububa2013@gmail.com">Balkisoububa2013@gmail.com</a>       | Attendee UNPFII    | Vice National Coordinator Repaleac Cameroon (indigenous peoples' representative at UNPFII)                           |
| Luis Felipe Duchicela      | <a href="mailto:lfduchicela@worldbank.org">lfduchicela@worldbank.org</a>         | WB; IPAG           | Senior Social Development Specialist, World Bank Group   |
| Lucy Mulenkei              | <a href="mailto:mulenkei@gmail.com">mulenkei@gmail.com</a>                       | IPAG               | Executive Director, the Indigenous Information Center (Maasai, Kenya) (indigenous peoples' representative at UNPFII) |
| Edna Kaptoyo               | <a href="mailto:kaptoyoedna@gmail.com">kaptoyoedna@gmail.com</a>                 | Fellowship         | Program coordinator, the Indigenous Information Network (indigenous peoples' representative at UNPFII)               |
| Yeshing Juliana Upun       | <a href="mailto:upunjuliana@gmail.com">upunjuliana@gmail.com</a>                 | IPAG               | coordinator for Indigenous Peoples Rights of Sotzil Association, Guatemala   |
| Maria Yolanda Terán Maigua | <a href="mailto:yolanda.teran7@gmail.com">yolanda.teran7@gmail.com</a>           | IPAG               | Representative, the Andes Chinchansuyo Foundation  |
| Thomas Jalong              | <a href="mailto:rakankomuniti@gmail.com">rakankomuniti@gmail.com</a>             | IPAG               | President, the indigenous peoples Network of Malaysia (or Jaringan Orang Asal SeMalaysia, JOAS)                      |
| Gonzalo Oviedo             | <a href="mailto:gonzaloo@bluewin.ch">gonzaloo@bluewin.ch</a>                     | IPAG               | Former Senior Advisor, the IUCN Social Policy Programme  |
| Giovanni Reyes             | <a href="mailto:shangrila.northwind@gmail.com">shangrila.northwind@gmail.com</a> | IPAG               | Secretary-general, KASAPI  |
| Tina Rai                   | <a href="mailto:mrinalini_rai@yahoo.com">mrinalini_rai@yahoo.com</a>             | IPAG               | Chiang Mai University (Rai, Nepal/India)   |

|                           |  |      |   |
|---------------------------|--|------|---|
| Johnson Cerda             | <a href="mailto:icerda@conservation.org">icerda@conservation.org</a>             | CI   | Indigenous Advisor, Conservation International (Kichwa, Ecuador)  |
| Minnie Degawan            | <a href="mailto:mdegawan@conservation.org">mdegawan@conservation.org</a>         | CI   | Director, Conservation International's Indigenous and Traditional Peoples Program   |
| Carlos Tomas Perez-Brito  | <a href="mailto:cperezbrito@worldbank.org">cperezbrito@worldbank.org</a>         | IPAG | Senior Social Development Specialist, WBG; former Social Scientist, the Inter-American Development Bank   |
| Ramiro Batzin             |  |      | Coordinator of the technical forum indigenous of Abya Yala (Latin America), director of the Association Sotzil and indigenous representative to the National Council for climate change in Guatemala. |
| John Scott                | <a href="mailto:john.scott@cbd.int">john.scott@cbd.int</a>                       | CBD  | Programme Officer, Traditional Knowledge, Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)  |
| Viviana Figueroa          | <a href="mailto:viviana.figueroa@cbd.int">viviana.figueroa@cbd.int</a>           | CBD  | Top of Form Associate Programme Officer, Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Bottom of Form  |
| Jeff Griffin              | <a href="mailto:Jeffrey.Griffin@fao.org">Jeffrey.Griffin@fao.org</a>             | FAO  | Senior Coordinator, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit   |
| Yon Fernandez-de-Larrinoa | <a href="mailto:Yon.FernandezLarrinoa@fao.org">Yon.FernandezLarrinoa@fao.org</a> | FAO  | FAO Indigenous Peoples Team Leader and Gender Advocacy  |
| Valeria Poggi             | <a href="mailto:Valeria.Poggi@fao.org">Valeria.Poggi@fao.org</a>                 | FAO  | Programme and Country Technical Assistance, FAO Indigenous Peoples Team   |
| Guido Agostinucci         | <a href="mailto:Guido.Agostinucci@fao.org">Guido.Agostinucci@fao.org</a>         | FAO  | FPIC Liaison, FAO Indigenous Peoples Team   |
| Daniela Morra             | <a href="mailto:daniela.morra@fao.org">daniela.morra@fao.org</a>                 | FAO  | Natural Resources Officer (Environmental and Social Safeguards), Environmental and Social Management Unit, Climate and Environment Division   |
| Tommaso Vicario           | <a href="mailto:Tommaso.Vicario@fao.org">Tommaso.Vicario@fao.org</a>             | FAO  | M&E project specialist, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit   |
| Chiara Pili               | <a href="mailto:Chiara.Pili@fao.org">Chiara.Pili@fao.org</a>                     | FAO  | GEF project development specialist , FAO-GEF Coordination Unit  |

## **ANNEX 6: ISSUED RAISED REGARDING AGENCY CONFORMITY WITH GEF MS4**

The following issues were flagged during a comparative review of wording between GEF Minimum Standard 4 and Agency safeguard policies, where partial consistency with MS4 requirements was shown. Hence issues raised are not known to be reflective of practice but, for instance, may be of consideration as a focus in monitoring activities related to GEF-funded projects involving Indigenous Peoples.

### **African Development Bank**

Documents reviewed:

1. AfDB Group's Integrated Safeguards System: Policy Statement and Operational Safeguards (2013)
2. AfDB Group's Development and Indigenous Peoples in Africa (2016)
3. AfDB Integrated Safeguards System Guidance Materials Volume 1: General Guidance on Implementation of OS 1
4. AfDB Integrated Safeguards System Guidance Materials Volume 2: Guidance on Safeguard Issues
5. AfDB Environmental and Social Assessment Procedures (ESAP)

#### **General overview:**

The AfDB's policy paper on is clear about the difficulties and opposition with this issue in member states. The foreword details the following as the most progressive of three proposals regarding changing the AfDB policy on :

*"Strengthen existing provisions to protect the rights of Indigenous Persons. This is done through the Integrated Safeguards System and in all the Operational Safeguards (OS) in the ISS, in line with the relevant provisions of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, ILO Convention 169 and the policies of other MFIs that operate in Africa, especially the Global Environment Facility and the World Bank. The consistency with the GEF will particularly ensure that the Bank remains an Implementing Agency of the Fund." (African Development Bank Group's Development and Indigenous Peoples in Africa, 2016)*

Specifically, this last sentence indicates that consistency with GEF is not presumed.

Additionally, the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues made a specific recommendation in its 12<sup>th</sup> session (2013) to the AfDB, on the strength of AfDB protections for :

*"The Permanent Forum appreciates the steps taken by the African Development Bank to include safeguards for indigenous peoples in its integrated safeguards system. The Forum is concerned, however, that the Bank remains the only multilateral bank not to have a stand-alone safeguard policy for indigenous peoples. The Forum recommends that the Bank fast-track, in coordination with the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights and other regional bodies, a regional policy framework for indigenous peoples in line with the provisions of the*

*African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights and report on progress to the Forum at its thirteenth session, in 2014"*<sup>43</sup>

- **"If access restriction to parks and protected areas, ensure that affected IPs fully and effectively participate in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of management plans for such areas and share equitably in benefits from the areas" (MS4)**

Regarding this MS4 requirement, the relevant sections from AfDB safeguard (regarding resettlement including from national parks) appear to be *"...and that they share in the benefits of the project that involves their resettlement"* and *"The project promotes the notion of benefit sharing and improvement of the economic status of communities when designing common property compensation provisions"*.

These statements do not adequately cover the requirement of MS4 in regard to participation of IPs in their (former) territories.

- **"Refrain from utilizing cultural resources or knowledge of IPs without obtaining prior agreement" (MS4)**

AfDB's safeguard states that *"access to and commercialisation of indigenous knowledge is based on equitable benefits"*, but does not require consent for use of indigenous knowledge as within MS4.

- **"Where the E/S impact assessment identifies adverse effects on IPs, Agency policies require that the project develop an IP plan or a framework..."(MS4)**

Regarding the preparation of IP plans or frameworks required by MS4, AfDB plans (SMP/Resettlement Action Plan/Community Development Plans) have similar facets, but lack a "trigger" that is specific to IPs being involved. Safeguard guidance refers to IPDPs, but they are not clarified and the language of the guidance notes is not binding.

The AfDB's own report on indigenous peoples safeguards states:

*"A key recommendation from the Indigenous Peoples' Forum is that the Bank should deliberately design and promote development programs that target Indigenous Peoples, beyond safeguards. This could be in the form of a separate development program targeting Indigenous Peoples or through an Indigenous Community Development Plan that should be prepared for projects that have clear risks for Indigenous Peoples"* p.24 African Development Bank Group's Development and Indigenous Peoples in Africa (2016)

---

43

[https://esa.un.org/unpfiiidata/UNPFII\\_Recommendations\\_Database\\_view.asp?editid=1851&editid2=&editid3=&TargetPageNumber=1&todo=readonly&masterkey=](https://esa.un.org/unpfiiidata/UNPFII_Recommendations_Database_view.asp?editid=1851&editid2=&editid3=&TargetPageNumber=1&todo=readonly&masterkey=)

This language indicates that IPDPs are not mandatory in projects.

- **“Monitor, by experienced social scientists, the implementation of the project (and any required IP plan or framework) and its benefits as well as challenging or negative impacts on and address possible mitigation measures in a participatory manner” (MS4)**

While adequate monitoring processes are described in the AfDB safeguards, mitigation measures may involve consultation but no process for participation is described.

- **FPIC where it is required by virtue of ratification of ILO 169 (MS4)**

Free, prior and informed consent is not addressed in AfDB safeguards. Only one African state (Central African Republic) is a signatory to ILO C169, and due to insecurity implementation has been very limited. However, any GEF-funded project would be necessitated to utilise FPIC approaches.

### **United Nations Environment Programme**

Documents reviewed:

1. [OBJ] UNEP Environmental, Social and Economic Sustainability Framework (2015)
2. UNEP and Indigenous Peoples: A Partnership in Caring for the Environment Policy Guidance (2012)
3. UNEP Handbook For Stakeholder Engagement (2014)

- **“Refrain from utilizing cultural resources or knowledge of IPs without obtaining prior agreement” (MS4)**

The UNEP safeguards for indigenous peoples are well developed and do include the applications of FPIC for all projects. That said, while protection of tangible cultural heritage (UNEP ESES standard 7) is explicit, there is no mention of prior agreement for the use of intangible cultural heritage or for Traditional Knowledge. It may, however, be inferred that the application of FPIC would ensure exploitation is prevented.

### **World Bank (Operational Policy 4.10)**

Documents reviewed:

1. Operational Manual OP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples (2005)
2. Operational Manual BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples (2005)
3. WB Emerging Lessons Series No. 2 - The Inspection Panel: Indigenous Peoples (2016)

- **“Undertake E/S impact assessment, with involvement of IPs, to assess potential impacts and risks when a project may have adverse impacts” (MS4)**

While OP 4.10 ensures Bank clients undertake social assessments for projects involving , there appears to be no mandatory involvement of in the assessment process.

## ANNEX 7: CASE STUDIES OF GEF PROJECTS INVOLVING INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

|   |              |  |   |
|---|--------------|--|---|
| Project Title: <b>Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous Lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems</b> |              |  |   |
| Location: Brazil  |              | Agency: UNDP                                       | Duration: 2009-2016                       |
| GEF ID: 2934  | GEF Phase: 4 | GEF Grant: US\$5,762,185                           | Co-financing: US\$22,548,479              |
| Outcome Ratings: Satisfactory (from TE)   |              | Sustainability Rating: Moderately Likely (from TE) | Efficiency Rating: Satisfactory (from TE) |

Brazil has a great ethnic-cultural diversity, with an estimated indigenous population of 460,000 persons from 225 different ethnic groups. This project aimed to catalyze the consolidation of Indigenous Lands as essential protected areas for biodiversity conservation in Brazilian forest ecosystems. The project execution is a collaborative effort among the Brazilian government, the National Foundation for Indigenous Affairs (FUNAI), UNDP and the Indigenous Organizations. In terms of the co-financing, the FUNAI contributed US\$6,858,983 cash and US\$2,665,494 in-kind to the project, and the Indigenous Organization contributed US\$400,000 in cash.

The and their local associations were significantly involved throughout the project. For institutional arrangement, 6 members of indigenous organizations were in the Project Steering Committee to provide political and strategic supports, along with members from the government and the FUNAI. The project preparation was also a collaborative effort among government agencies and the indigenous representatives and consultation results with indigenous peoples were incorporated into the final proposal to the GEF.

The immediate goal of the project was to put in place a ground-tested and officially recognized strategy for environmental management in Indigenous Lands by for effective conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity. The project fully achieved this goal by adapting the existed National Protected Areas Plan (PNAP) to meet the environmental and social needs of the indigenous lands, and replaced the PNAP with the National Policy for Environmental and Territorial Management of Indigenous Lands (PNGATI). The PNGATI sets the framework for the action planning related to the topic, and is currently the reference for actions by the Brazilian government. In addition, enthno-management activities, dissemination of information on project activities, and trainings of community members on sustainable activities were conducted in 32 indigenous lands of 5 forest biomes across the country.

At the local level, the project activities relied on the experience of and their organizations, and their capacities in conservation were strengthened through the engagement. The project also set up a network of indigenous representatives to enable the experience exchange on environmental management among different indigenous lands.



|  |              |   |  |
|--|--------------|---|--|
| Project Title: <b>Conservation of Biodiversity in the Indigenous Productive Landscapes of the Moskitia, Honduras</b> |              |   |  |
| Location: Honduras   |              | Agency: UNDP                            | Duration: 2009-2014                                    |
| GEF ID: 3592   | GEF Phase: 4 | GEF Grant: US\$2,159,300                | Co-financing: US\$5,455,000                            |
| Outcome Rating: Satisfactory (from TE)   |              | Sustainability Rating: Likely (from TE) | Efficiency Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory (from TE) |

The project aimed to conserve biodiversity in the production landscapes managed by indigenous peoples in the Moskitia. Poverty level among the local indigenous population was high, and many people were struggling to meet daily nutritional requirements.

In this project, local indigenous peoples were involved as direct beneficiaries. This project assisted local indigenous organizations to obtain inter-communal land titles, which provided legal tools for indigenous communities to secure their land rights. It also helped strengthen stronger territorial governance and generate good practices on conserving biodiversity, which also fostered land security for indigenous communities. In addition, the project developed a management plan that integrated traditional fishery resources management methods, which helped the local fishery to revoke from over-harvesting.

These enabling conditions built foundations for securing medium-term funding for “Alliance for the Development of the Moskitia”, a continuing project by Honduras Government, UN, Swiss and German Development Cooperation to continue delivering benefits without GEF support.

|  |              |  |  |
|--|--------------|--|--|
| Project Title: <b>Wildlife Conservation Leasing Demonstration (WCL), Kenya</b> |              |  |  |
| Location: Kenya  |              | Agency: World Bank                               | Duration: 2009-2012                        |
| GEF ID: 1999   | GEF Phase: 4 | GEF Grant: <b>US\$752,270</b>                    | Co-financing: <b>US\$505,000</b>           |
| Outcome Rating: Moderately Satisfactory (from TER)                             |              | Sustainability Rating: Unsatisfactory (from TER) | Efficiency Rating: Satisfactory (from TER) |

The project objective was to ensure long-term ecological viability of the Nairobi National park. This medium sized project used payment for ecosystem services (PES) as a tool to improve land management, and to deliver direct benefits to the indigenous communities. This project demonstrated the interconnection between biodiversity, rural land use and the welfare of .

The payments from ecosystem services generated in the indigenous territories were made to maintain season dispersal areas and migration corridors on adjacent lands owned by indigenous communities. The project achieved its outcomes as indicated by populations of wildlife that were monitored over the duration of the project. Payments were generally being used through a community consensus for the acquisition of agricultural machinery, medical equipment and educational material, among others. This, in turn, helped the community to develop human capital. More than three-quarters of the PES income was spent on education (80% in 2009), including payment of school fees, purchase of school

uniforms, books. The WCL project provided an incentive for conserving private land providing habitat for wildlife use and it enabled pastoral families to invest in education of their children, and helped build the human capital that is critical for the future of the local Maasai youth. Also, the payments were used in the improvement of the living standards in the indigenous communities with access to basic health services.

One lesson learned from this project review is that the PES is not sufficient on its own to ensure the viability of projected ecosystem. The PES mechanism must be complemented with other tools, including conservation easements, predator compensation schemes, and land use regulations.