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Measuring Indigenous Peoples’ and Planet’s Well-Being

By Mauricio Malanes
Eels are among the indicators of well-being among the Maori of Aotearoa (original and pre-colonial name of New Zealand) for good reasons. The life cycle of eels shows that freshwater ecosystems are interconnected with the ecosystems of the seas and oceans.

Eels migrate to the seas or oceans to spawn but they travel back to springs and rivers where they live for some time and grow fat. But once the interconnection between ecosystems of rivers and seas or oceans is interrupted by, say big dams and reclamation projects, the lifecycle of eels is threatened.

The Maori, who have long regarded eels as a significant treasure, know this well, said Tui Shortland, environmental manager of Ngati Hine, a Maori community in northern Aotearoa.

Like other indigenous peoples elsewhere, the Maori actually maintain a holistic view of life and development. For example, the Maori word for forest is ngahere, which means the binding together of all things and that each being is as important as another, said Shortland.

With this perspective, what one does to the forests (e.g., protection and conservation) will have a life-giving impact on other beings such as eels and other species, human beings included. In the same vein, anything destructive that one does to the forests leads to the extinction of other beings and species, and human life itself comes under threat.

Such perspective has long been embedded in Maori traditional knowledge system. And this traditional knowledge system is one of the methods in measuring the state of biodiversity in Ngati Hine territory, according to Shortland.

Shortland was one of 11 indigenous participants and observers from other parts of Asia, the Pacific, Africa, and Latin America who participated in a 25-27 February workshop in Diliman, Quezon City in Metro Manila, which gathered over 60 participants from various indigenous communities in the Philippines.
The workshop aimed to consolidate existing work on community-based monitoring and information systems (CBMIS) as a tool for strengthening indigenous peoples’ sustainable, self-determined development. Guiding the workshop was the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), Indigenous Peoples’ Rights Act or IPRA of the Philippines, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and Aichi Biodiversity Targets under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and other global and national commitments.

The workshop was co-organized by Tebtebba, a global indigenous institution focusing on indigenous peoples’ concerns, PAFID (Philippine Association for Intercultural Development) and KASAPI (Koalisyon ng Katutubong Samahan ng Pilipinas/Philippine Coalition of Indigenous Organizations), both non-government organizations, which are also concerned with indigenous issues.

The workshop was supported by three donor agencies: Norad or the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, the Germany-based Bread for the World-EED, and SwedBio of The Stockholm Resilience Centre, University of Stockholm.

### Traditional knowledge indicators

Shortland particularly shared two methods of measuring traditional knowledge. One is on the realm of gods and goddesses relating to biodiversity.

She cited Rangi or “sky father” whose tears for earth mother bring water. There is also Papa or “earth mother,” who takes charge of the earth, the soil and minerals.

There are other deities, each of who manages or supervises a part of biodiversity. There is Rongo or “god of peace,” who secures the food of the Maori by ensuring the abundant supply of cultivated foods such as sweet potato and taro.

The Maori also have Tane Mahuta, the “god of the forest,” who takes care of trees, plants and birds; Tangaroa, the “god of the ocean,” who takes care of the ocean water and fish; Tumatauenga, the “god of war,” who controls the coastal tidal zone and shellfish; and Haumietiketike, the “god of wild foods” such as berries, mushrooms and other edible plants.

The various gods and goddesses for each realm actually represent the Maori’s holistic view of their environment, biodiversity and life. “We have teams of local people specializing in each realm,” said Shortland.

Another method of measuring traditional knowledge is through biodiversity indicators chosen using what is called “Maori well-being.”
Under this method three biodiversity indicators were chosen: rangi or freshwater, eels (or what locals also call tuna), and tane mutata-ngahere or forests.

The Maori can determine the quality of their freshwater systems through a plant called kwhitiwhiti, which grows in freshwater springs. The presence of kowhai (small, woody legume trees that grow beside streams) also signals that shellfish are fat and creamy. And the presence of spiderwebs and kokopu along springs and rivers are also signs of high water quality. Kokopu is the common name for three species of endemic fish of the genus Galaxias, which are found in rivers, lakes and swamps of Aotearoa.

As a biodiversity indicator, eels are observed at every stage of their lives and their behavior monitored using the maramataka or Ngati Hine traditional calendar. Based on this calendar, the eels’ food requirements, water quality needs and range of representation are also studied and assessed.

“After assessing the current level of health (of eels), we measure risks and prepare response plans such as environmental enhancement, education for fishers and farmers, managing obstructions (e.g., dams) to migration, and laws that criminalize traditional practices,” said Shortland.

Elsewhere forests are perceived in terms of its timber, whose value is computed in board-feet. But to the Maori, the forest, as Shortland described earlier, is called tane muhata-ngahere, “the binding together of all things” in which “each being is as important as another.”

This is so because the forest supplies many life-sustaining needs of the Maori. For example, the Maori are grateful to the forest for its kawakawa, a medicinal plant; kiekie, a delicacy and the sweetest wild edible food; nikau, another sweet food which is also used for housing; puriri, an important food source for the kukupa bird in winter; and taiaha, a weapon made from forest trees and bird feathers. There are other plants and herbs from the forests that ensure the health and wellbeing of the Maori and their ecosystems as a whole.

**Common chord**

The experience of the Maori as shared by Shortland struck a common chord with other indigenous peoples from the Philippines and other Asian countries, Africa and Latin America.

Indigenous peoples in the Philippines also believe that there are gods and goddesses beside spirit guardians, which are guarding every inch of their ancestral territories. For example, the Ayta of central Luzon revere Apo Namalyari, whom they acknowledge as the Creator of all living and non-living entities. Out of this reverence to Apo Namalyari comes a belief and traditional knowledge system from which the Ayta have long based their moral responsibility as stewards of their lands and resources.

Community leader Salvador Dimain, who opened the three-day workshop with a ritual and prayer, attributes to Apo Namalyari his knowledge
about every nook and cranny of his tribe’s territory. He also knows every wild game, every edible and medicinal plant, and every other resource in what he and his tribe have long claimed as their ancestral domain. And as part of their reverence to Apo Namalyari, Dimain and his tribe—as part of their role as stewards—have long protected and conserved these resources.

“The forests and our rivers are our market place,” said the leader of the indigenous Ayta community in Maporac, Cabangan in Zambales. Dimain’s community is part of the environs around Mount Pinatubo, a volcano in central Luzon, north of Manila, which erupted in 1991.

He then detailed how he and his community have maintained, protected and sustained their “market place” through unwritten customary policies. “We catch fish through bamboo traps and trap forest wild game for food,” he said. “But we only catch or trap what we need. So we ban setting so many traps, which we could not immediately monitor. It’s a waste if some trapped animals are left to rot simply because we can’t oversee all our traps.”

The Ayta also strictly follow a hunting calendar, which starts around September until end of November. “Hunting is banned starting December because the female deer and female wild pigs begin to be pregnant,” said Dimain.

The same policy applies to harvesting other forest products. For example, the Ayta harvest only mature rattan so they ensure not to harm any young rattan in the process, said the Ayta leader.

Forest health

That Dimain’s community continues to subsist on resources which it has been protecting through age-old traditional knowledge and practices are among some positive indicators of a healthy environment and material well-being of an indigenous community.

The persisting traditional resource management practices of the indigenous Maeng communities in the upland town of Tubo in northern Philippines’ Abra province is another good example. One such practice is called lapat.

Lapat involves declaring certain areas in a community as off-limits to human activities such as harvesting wood or timber and other forest products such as rattan, hunting and fishing. Once a community declares an area as covered by lapat, those who violate are sanctioned or fined.

Lapat policies are deliberated in the dap-ay, a socio-political institution and decision-making body composed
of the community’s elders. At the dap-ay “roundtable”—the seats of which consist of stones arranged in a circular form—elders meet and hold the community’s religious rituals.

Some lapat areas such as headwaters and watersheds are permanently closed to timber harvesting. In some forest areas, community members can harvest timber and rattan but only for their families’ use. And like the Ayta, the Maeng follow an off-season calendar so as to allow forests and other resources to regenerate and recover.

“We have proved that our lapat and dap-ay are the ways to protect and sustain whatever is left of our forests and other resources,” said young Maeng elder Domingo Lawagan. This is so because “lapat means having full control over our resources.”

Since big mining companies have started to set their eyes on the upland areas of Abra, Maeng community members are confident that their lapat principle and policies will deter any attempts by companies to mine there.

“Lapat is life. So lapat is anti-mining,” said Lawagan, stressing that the mining industry destroys much of the ecosystems, which support life.

PAFID executive director Dave de Vera, whose organization helped the Maeng tribe map its territory, affirmed the role that the lapat practice contributed to Abra’s ecosystem and biodiversity.

A three-dimensional map, which the Maeng tribe did with PAFID’s help, showed that 31 percent of Tubo town’s total area is primary forest and 24 percent, secondary forest. So the primary and secondary forest cover is more than half of the town’s total area.

Tubo’s total forest cover plus the presence of various indigenous trees and native species of wildlife indicate the “good health” of the whole upland town’s biodiversity, according to De Vera.

**Securing lands and seas**

The indigenous Calamian Tagbanwa people of Coron Island in Palawan near central Philippines have the best of both worlds. They have thick forests where some 10 persons cannot embrace some trees. And they have a marine-rich fishing ground surrounded by white sandy beaches.

Their secret was securing their rights of tenure over their lands and seas. They have succeeded in processing an ancestral domain title over some 7,160-hectare forest-rich territory and another title over what they claim as their ancestral fishing ground covering 15,124 hectares. They were the first indigenous group in the country to title a portion of the sea.

“Our lands are useless without our seas,” said Tagbanwa leader Jesse Mayonado.

The community’s elders, he said, have taught and passed on to the next generations about the extent of their ancestral fishing grounds. “Our ancestors knew exactly how far their fishing boats could reach,” he said. “So this was where we placed our boundary monuments.”
And owing to their indigenous resource management practices, their ancestral domain and ancestral fishing ground are acknowledged as among the country’s biodiversity-rich territories.

They have 13 lakes, which they consider sacred, and all have been adjudged thrice as the country’s cleanest.

The presence of giant octopuses indicates how rich the marine life of the Tagbanwa ancestral fishing grounds, said Mayonado.

Impressed by Mayonado’s presentation, Dennis Mairena, executive director of the Centro para la Autonomia y Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indigenas or CADPI, an indigenous organization promoting indigenous peoples’ rights in Nicaragua, asked about how the Tagbanwa have maintained their marine ecosystem from the threats of erosion. Nicaragua’s coastlines have been degraded due to erosion, which has been exacerbated by strong hurricanes, cyclones and tornadoes.

Unlike Nicaragua’s coastlines, Coron Bay, said Mayonado, does not experience strong waves and strong winds. Still, the Tagbanwa, he said, have ensured to protect their forests by regulating swidden farming. They also continue to protect mangroves or marine forests and have banned dynamite fishing to protect vital corals.
Rotational farming and biodiversity

In many countries, rotational farming has been equated with, if not worse than, the destruction wrought by logging. But citing a study he did among the Hmong and Karen in northern Thailand, Prasert Trakansuphakon of the Indigenous Knowledge and Peoples Foundation or IKAP has asserted that rotational farming is sustainable as it strongly relies on a diversity of crops.

IKAP is a Chiang Mai, Thailand-based regional network of indigenous communities throughout mainland and montane Southeast Asia aimed to protect, promote and enhance the practice of indigenous knowledge in various communities.

“Rotational farming is sustainable and culturally-rich but misunderstood,” Trakansuphakon said. “Worse, it is criminalized as the cause deforestation, environmental degradation and climate change.”

The backbone of rotational farming is fallow forests. “Without regenerating fallow forests, productivity in a rotational farm cannot be assured,” he said. “Rotational farmers, therefore, nurture the forests into their fallow periods during the cultivation phase.”

The goal of rotational farming, he said, is self-sufficiency or what is otherwise known as “food security” and “food sovereignty.”

He showed that the Karen and Hmong could not go hungry because their rotational farms alongside their paddy fields, husbandry, kitchen gardens and agro-forestry could provide a wide diversity of crops, livestock and freshwater fish. This is besides what they can hunt from their environs such as wild edible foods and wild game.

Such food security for the indigenous folk could not be assured if their territories would have been converted into plantation farms or some other monocrop tree project, he said.

Since it is based on the principle of regeneration through fallow, rotational farming, according to Trakansuphakon, helps maintain balance of the ecosystem and actually reduces greenhouse gas emissions, the cause of climate change.

He cited that the net carbon storage from fallow fields, covering 236 hectares left to recover for 1 to 10 years, account for 17,348 tons of carbon. The CO2 emission from the burning of rotational farms, he said, is “only 480 tons of carbon.”

Trakansuphakon also found that rotational farms serve as natural seed bank, thereby enhancing biodiversity. He cited at least 207 species found in rotational farms of the Karen and Hmong, which have continued to be propagated as a result of hundreds of years of rotational farming.

Through rotational farming “we can see a connection between agricultural production and the overall ecosystem,” he said. “Rotational farming enhances the balance of land, water and forests; thus, ensuring the regeneration of flora, fauna and biodiversity.”
The various experiences shared during the recent workshop—all of which could not be accommodated in this article—are enough for indigenous peoples to move a step further. It is time to consolidate these experiences and move towards establishing systems, which can finally measure how indigenous peoples are faring in their territories.

From a series of exercises such as workshops and years of engagement with government and inter-government bodies, some indigenous peoples have developed the capacity to help establish mechanisms from which to measure their well-being.

Tebtebba’s global partner organization, which has been working closely with Nepal’s Lamjung District, for example, has gained much headway in its research and documentation of their traditional knowledge, livelihoods and local languages. “To gather the needed data, we have been encouraging our community leaders and members to write their own stories (about their traditional knowledge and practices),” said Pasang Dolma Sherpa, national coordinator of the Nepal Federation of Indigenous Nationalities (NEFIN).

From its research and documentation, NEFIN has been able to gather important data as inputs in helping push policies for indigenous peoples. Among these important policies cover areas such as developing curricula for indigenous peoples and participation in REDD+ projects.

And the groundwork in setting up the infrastructure for a community-based monitoring and information system in Lamjung District has already begun to be laid out. Sherpa said her organization has been working closely with 20 community radios across the country, which are among the much-needed facilities for monitoring and information.

Tebtebba’s other global partner-organizations in Vietnam, Indonesia, Brazil, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, and Kenya have reached various levels in their capacity to implement projects and programs, which can help promote indigenous peoples’ rights and well-being.

Taking off from the February 2013 workshop in Manila, Tebtebba along with its global partners are embarking on a workshop aimed at “establishing Community-Based Monitoring and Information Systems (CBMIS) towards securing rights to land, territories, forests and resources, ensuring integrity of ecosystems and the well-being of indigenous peoples.” This workshop will be held in Bonn, Germany on 25-28 April.

Expected from this global workshop are the following:

1. To be updated on local to global developments and challenges on the implementation of the UNDRIP/ ILO 169, the Strategic Plan on Biodiversity and Aichi Biodiversity Targets, UNFCCC, and sus-
tainable development and to define the role of community-based monitoring and information systems in reaching the targets and goals of these global agreements and processes.

2. To report on existing work on community-based monitoring and information systems as a tool for strengthening indigenous peoples’ self-determined development and other local, national and global goals and commitments;

3. To share experiences and deepen understanding about tools and methodologies in carrying out community-based monitoring and reporting and to try to agree on a common instrument which can already be used by pilot countries and communities and identify next steps for the development of a more comprehensive, user-friendly CBMIS tool kit.

4. To agree on a common general framework and plan of action on CBMIS for pilot countries and communities and to define the roles of support of indigenous organizations and institutions, NGOs, governments, academic/research institutions, and multilateral bodies.

5. To establish the Technical Working Group which will provide support and guidance to the pilot countries and communities.
Solidarity and the Exercise of Self-Determination: The Gurung of Khasur Village

By Jo Ann Guillao

The exchange visit in Nepal surfaced a good story of how the indigenous Gurung of Khasur Village, Lamjung, Nepal work in solidarity to exercise governance over their land, resources and territories.

The lifeways and systems of the Gurung are dependent on their resources, mainly their forests ecosystem. Indigenous Gurung account for the majority of the 70 percent of indigenous population in the district. Lamjung is also inhabited by other indigenous communities like Tamang, Magar, Newar, Hyolmo, Bhujel, Chepang, Kumal, and Dura.

The Gurung of Khasur village are part of the so-called “disadvantaged group,” based on development as categorized by the government. Though the official list of indigenous peoples in Nepal is under dispute, the Gurung are among the 59 indigenous groups recognized by the government.

For years, the Gurung community sustained themselves from the fruits of their labor through the sustainable utilization of their forests and woodlands, rivers, and other resources. This fulfilling community life in Khasur, however, is not without struggles and challenges.

Due to external forces and influences, the Gurung themselves admitted that their well-being as indigenous peoples has been tremendously affected. The change in their system and lifeways, to a large extent, can be attributed to the policies and programs of the government on forests.

The Private Forest Nationalization Act of 1957 and the Pasture Land Nationalization Act of 1975 have caused displacement of indigenous peoples from their own communal land, which they have tilled since time immemorial. The 1957 Act resulted to the nationalization of all forestlands in Nepal. In the process, vast areas of lands were put under the jurisdiction of the government, including that of the forest in Khamjung—ignoring the customary land tenure systems and laws of indigenous peoples.

The implementation of these laws have deprived indigenous peoples of their rights to own, access and use their lands and forests. This has, in effect, undermined the indigenous management system of Gurung communities.

The exchange visit on March 5 to 13, 2012 took place during the spring season in Nepal—a season that prompts one to remember the gains of the Gurung communities when they fought for the recognition and exercise of their rights over their ancestral land and forests.

With great determination and strong concern for the future, the Gurung community—in solidarity with the rest of other indigenous peoples of Nepal—organized themselves to make the government liable for the damage it has done to the resources of indigenous peoples.
Between 1956 to 1990, Khasur community leaders like Bir Bahadure Ghale, Ganga Bahadur Ghale, and Chandra Bahadur Bhale, fought to reclaim ownership of their ancestral territories by strongly opposing the nationalization policies of the government. To advance their cause, the community filed a case before the district court and the Supreme Court. The legal system however did not help the Gurung; instead the court ruled in favor of the government claim. Despite this setback, the movement never stopped. Through time, the movement gained attention and support from different sectors. This has helped in strengthening community efforts to reclaim ownership and management of their lands, territories and resources.

By 1993, Nepal introduced the Forest Act that promoted the concept of community forest users group (CFUG) in the country. With the enactment of this law, the community of Khasur was given the right to manage their forest collectively.

While communities can now manage their forest, this law does not give them full ownership to their forests and resources. The Gurung recognize that while the law allows them to conserve and manage the forests, it does not give them full control over their resources. Ownership is not handed to the community.

For the Gurung, the struggle to fully exercise their right to self-determination has just started. Reflecting on what happened 15 years ago, Prithvi Man Gurung, Chairperson of the Community Forest User Group expressed, “...the struggle of getting back our forests from the government actually continues up to this time; but we are not afraid to demonstrate our solidarity. We have started the fight to regain our right over our forests 15 years back, and we will not stop...”

Education and Knowledge Management: The Role of Women in Educating the Youth in Khasur, Lamjung

Life among the Gurung in Khasur centers around their traditional cultural and social system. To sustain and nurture that life, knowledge transmission is a vital process that has been carried out by the Gurung since time immemorial. For the Gurung, if knowledge is not appropriately transferred and managed then this becomes meaningless. For them, the preservation and continuing practice of their indigenous knowledge, culture and systems lie greatly in the hands of the next generation. And in educating the youth, Gurung women assume and perform a very important role as knowledge keepers and transmitters.

In Khasur, one essential institution that facilitates learning and transfer of knowledge is their system called rhodi. The rhodi is a socially-organized institution of evening gatherings of the Gurung youth. This institution, unique among the Gurung, has been very helpful in the passage of norms and cultural values to the youth.

The purpose of the “rhodi system” is to gather the young boys and girls of roughly the same age, usually between 14 and 17 years old. This group of youths usually work in the fields during the day and gather in the “rhodi homes” in the evening where the youth sing and dance. This house is usually chosen from one of the parents of the members of rhodi. Evenings in the rhodi homes is filled with music-making, usually lasting until after midnight.

A couple would be chosen or assigned as “mother and father” of the rhodi. The couple would be responsible in overseeing the conduct of the young people. They would be present during the evening and would sleep with them at night. The basic arrangement of rhodi can be divided in two parts: daytime and evening activities. At
daytime, the young people would perform their daily chores in their respective homes and then gather in the rhodi house in the evening for music-making. During the music-making, the women are responsible in teaching the girls the dances that go with the music they learn. These include learning the Ghaatu and Krisha Charitra dances that depict epic dramas with religious dimensions.

This simple and useful institution, however, is slowly fading due to pressures from mainstream society and exposure to formal education. Because of this, there is now a growing concern among the elders who are worried about the future of this institution. Elders fear that this practice is now at the verge of disintegration.

Apart from women’s involvement in the rhodi system, women in Khasur also share a very important role in managing their forest ecosystem. The Gurung women have organized the Women Forest Management Group. This group serves as protector of the forests in Khasur. The group’s task is to ensure that their forest is protected from abusive users and prevent any group, e.g., corporations, projects, etc., who might expropriate and control community resources.

To sustain the health of the forest in Khasur, the involvement of the youth is a crucial factor. Thus, the indigenous ways of forest management and utilization are transmitted to the young generation.

To educate the youth, mothers usually take their children to the forest with them to gather some wood, and fodder, among others.

While parent and child gather food or wood in the forest, the mother often maximize this opportunity to teach their children about forest use, management, protection, and ownership. Children are taught indigenous laws/rules long-established by their ancestors. For instance, children are taught the different classification of forests (e.g., the communal forest, protected forest, among others) and techniques of how to collect different varieties of vegetables or fruits. Specific rules on forest protection are also taught to children, e.g., respect for scared sites, not causing any harm to the forest, and punishment or fines to any violations against those rules/policies.

Though this forest management system is in place in Khasur, the community is not insulated from threats posed by government intervention. Both women and elders reiterate their disappointment on some state laws/policies that intervene with their indigenous system of ownership, utilization, protection and management of their forest ecosystem.

The knowledge system and traditional practices of the Gurung significantly demonstrate their ways of life unique to their identity as indigenous peoples. Yet, like so many other indigenous peoples around the world, these systems are vulnerable to further degradation or outright loss. To address this challenge, the Gurung—especially the women—are counting on the youth to perpetuate these knowledge and serve as catalyst to the sustenance of these indigenous knowledge, practices and lifeways.

Endnotes

1 The exchange visit was organized by the Nepal Federation of Indigenous Nationalities (NEFIN) and Tebtebba. This was participated in by 7 partner representatives of the Indigenous Peoples’ Partnership on Climate Change and Forests: 2 from Philippines, 2 from Kenya, 1 from Mexico, 1 from Peru, 1 from Vietnam, 1 from Nicaragua, and 1 from Indonesia.

2 In effect, this law gave the government control over the indiscriminate cutting of trees primarily in the Terai forests. Strategically, the Terai has been identified as the region with the greatest immediate economic potential for the forest sector in Nepal, as the region possesses forests of high economic value and is one of the more biologically diverse areas in Nepal.
The Global Indigenous Peoples’ Dialogue with the FCPF: A Summary*

By Mara Stankovich

The Global Indigenous Peoples’ Dialogue with the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) held in Doha, Qatar, on 10-11 December 2012, was one of a series of meetings held to address indigenous peoples’ concerns with the FCPF and global initiatives for the reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD).

It was the culmination of three regional dialogues with indigenous peoples from Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Asia-Pacific, held in Arusha, Lima and Chiang Mai respectively in 2012.

The global dialogue brought together indigenous participants from Africa, Asia-Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean; FCPF and World Bank staff; representatives from the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues and UN-REDD; representatives of governments participating in the FCPF, whether as implementors or donors; and representatives of civil society organizations (CSOs).

The objectives of the dialogue were:

- To build on the results of the three regional dialogues and, on this basis, produce an Indigenous Peoples’ Global Declaration and Action Plan on Forests and Climate Change;
- To devise concrete proposals for countries to implement the Cancun decision on REDD+ safeguards, the Durban decision on estab-

lishing Safeguard Information Systems, and the Doha decisions on REDD+, within the framework of indigenous peoples’ full and effective participation, and considering the Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ Readiness prepared jointly by the FCPF and the UN-REDD Program;

- To agree on the application of environmental and social safeguards by FCPF and its partners; and

- To agree on future mechanisms, processes and funding for effective engagement of indigenous peoples in decision-making in the FCPF’s Forest-Dependent Peoples’ Capacity Building Program and other relevant REDD+ processes.

The first part of the dialogue focused on sharing of information. Indigenous participants presented concerns and recommendations arising from the regional dialogues. The FCPF provided an update on steps towards REDD+ readiness, explained the World Bank’s due diligence process, and gave a description of the Carbon Fund. UN-REDD provided updates on its program and guidelines, and announced plans for a small grants facility. Indigenous participants and government representatives shared their experiences of stakeholder engagement in REDD+. A US government representative presented an update on discussions related to REDD+ at the Doha Conference of Parties (COP) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The second part of the dialogue was devoted to action plans. Indigenous participants adopted a Global Action Plan, to which the FCPF and UN-REDD gave their responses. The dialogue ended with a discussion on the practicalities of the FCPF Capacity Building Program and agreement on that program’s criteria for selecting regional intermediary organizations for indigenous peoples.

I. The Global Plan of Action

The Indigenous Peoples’ Global Plan of Action relating to FCPF was the main outcome of the dialogue. It addresses four areas of particular concern to indigenous peoples:

- **Indigenous peoples’ rights**, including free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) on any policies and projects related to customary forests and indigenous territories; recognition and security of indigenous peoples’ tenure rights to lands, territories and resources; and prevention of forced eviction;

- **The full and effective participation of indigenous peoples in REDD+**, in particular the need for awareness-raising and capacity building; the plan proposes specific measures to enable participation and representation of indigenous peoples in the readiness phase of REDD+; it also calls for effective grievance mechanisms;

- **The Carbon Fund**, and in particular, the need for information dissemination and enhanced engagement of indigenous peoples with the Fund;

- **The Readiness Package and the FCPF monitoring and evaluation framework**, and in particular, the need to develop criteria and indicators for respect of rights and indigenous peoples’ full and effective participation.

In its response, the FCPF accepted the Plan of Action, noting that it is a plan of indigenous peoples, rather than of all participants in the dialogue. The FCPF noted that some of the plan’s points on indigenous peoples’ rights touch on existing World Bank policies, which FCPF cannot go against. It will, however, strive to meet indigenous peoples’ expectations.

The FCPF acknowledged the legitimacy of the request to increase funds for indigenous peoples’ capacity building and welcomed the proposal for a Global Advisory Committee of indigenous peoples. On the grievance mechanism, FCPF prefers to use national mechanisms where they exist, but acknowledges the need to deal directly with grievances that cannot be addressed at national level. The World Bank’s Inspection Panel also provides a means of addressing grievances.
II. Funding for capacity building and community-based REDD+

FCPF explained the workings of its capacity building fund and UN-REDD announced plans to establish a small grants fund to support community-based REDD+ initiatives.

FCPF financial support for capacity building is currently provided through contracts, but from 1 July 2013, FCPF will switch to a system of grants, disbursed through intermediary organizations. FCPF proposed the following criteria for intermediary organizations:

- An indigenous peoples’ organization;
- Credibility with peers and an established institutional structure with a solid track record in issues related to forestry, climate change and/or REDD+;
- Experience working effectively with other regional organizations;
- Capacity for effective financial management and procurement;
- Capacity to undertake environmental and social screening and ensure compliance with WB safeguard principles;
- Capacity to address grievances and provide a redress mechanism.

The indigenous participants agreed these criteria.

III. Information shared

Reports from the regional dialogues

The concerns and recommendations of indigenous peoples that emerged in the regional dialogues were brought together in a matrix, which showed differences between the regions, but also areas of convergence. The common concerns were capacity building, participation, recognition of rights, research studies and financing. The points presented in the matrix fed into the Global Plan of Action.

Updates from FCPF and UN-REDD

Twenty-six countries have passed the formal assessment of their readiness proposal by the Participants Committee. Nine of the 26 have signed a grant agreement and US$3.8 million has been released.

Some key decisions on the FCPF are expected in March 2013: the reopening of the FCPF to countries on the waiting list; and the adoption of the Readiness Package assessment framework, the Carbon Fund term sheet, and the FCPF Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.

The World Bank’s Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) has conducted a review of the FCPF. It praised the Facility for taking an innovative approach that facilitated inclusive and transparent debate about REDD+ and facilitated a degree of consultation and dialogue at country level rarely seen in forest management projects. The group concluded, however, that FCPF needed to clarify how and in what conditions it would support non-market approaches to REDD+. The IEG suggested that the FCPF should use small grants for micro projects. It also recommended that the World Bank should:

- Hold a strategic discussion on its approach to REDD+; and,
- Consider prioritizing investments to further its wider objectives in the forest sector, such as legal and political support for land tenure and forest government reforms.

A discussion on the World Bank’s due diligence was added to the agenda in response to the questions arising in the discussion of the regional dialogues. Once a Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) is approved and before the grant is signed, the World Bank technical team carries out a due diligence process. This aims to identify problems and gaps, determine which social and environmental safeguards apply, and verify compliance with the FCPF Participant Committee Resolution. The resulting recommendations may be addressed in the short term (before the grant is made) and the longer term (during the readiness phase).

The FCPF’s Carbon Fund was set up to pay for emission reductions from REDD+ programs and deliver them to Carbon Fund Participants (buyers). The FCPF noted that the Fund had always been part of the design of the Facility and
emphasized that its purpose was not to create a carbon market. The Fund went into operation in May 2011 and work is under way to design the methodological framework for estimating the emission reduction potential of programs and for pricing.

The Carbon Fund is directed at large programs which are likely to be complex and include a variety of activities, with a mix of policies and investment. Criteria for these programs are:

1. Progress towards REDD readiness;
2. Political commitment;
3. Consistency with the Methodological Framework;
4. Scale;
5. Technical soundness;
6. Substantial non-carbon benefits;
7. Diversity and learning value.

The pricing guidance is still under discussion, but will be based on the following principles:

1. Fairness, flexibility, simplicity;
2. Combination of fixed and floating portions;
3. Negotiation between Fund participants and the program sponsor;
4. Non-carbon benefits may be taken into consideration.

UN-REDD’s guidelines on FPIC are currently undergoing review by UN-REDD agencies, and the plan is to launch them in mid-January 2013.

UN-REDD is also developing a guidance note on the establishment of grievance mechanisms at national level. Global and national consultations are planned, to ensure the guidance note addresses the key concerns of indigenous peoples and local communities. Pilot activities to support countries to develop grievance mechanism will be carried out in 2013.

**Stakeholder engagement in practice**

**Experience of Forestry Administration, Cambodia**

Current constraints on engagement of indigenous peoples in REDD+ in Cambodia include lack of communication, and lack of clarity about the composition and terms of reference of the national Indigenous Peoples Representative Team. Moreover, plans are still in the development stage and a Safeguards Technical Team has yet to be set up.

Constraints facing the program as a whole include institutional arrangements, a lack of human and financial resources especially at sub-national level, and a general lack of awareness of REDD+.

Sustained technical and financial support for capacity building on REDD+ and safeguards would assist the implementation of Cambodia’s REDD+ Roadmap.

**Experience of Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, El Salvador**

Indigenous peoples are involved in the preparation and implementation of El Salvador’s REDD+ strategy.

Indigenous peoples will be consulted on the design and implementation of the social assessment, and it is envisaged that indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as academics, NGOs and private sector representatives, will support the monitoring process.

A consultative body, the Indigenous Peoples Board, has been set up to work with the Climate Change Committee. The Board is composed of indigenous leaders, including women, and will participate in national advisory, assessment and monitoring bodies, with a voice and a vote.
Experience of indigenous peoples in Asia

There has been progress in terms of representation of indigenous peoples and acknowledgement of the need to consult them.

The substance and conduct of consultations, however, needs to be improved and major challenges remain. These include:

- Recognition of indigenous peoples’ identities and their rights;
- Building the capacity of indigenous peoples to engage fully and effectively with REDD+;
- Building the capacity of governments to understand indigenous peoples’ issues and rights, and to engage with indigenous peoples.

Most importantly, the Joint Stakeholder Guidelines need to be updated to operationalize the Cancun Agreement provisions for respect of indigenous peoples’ rights and traditional knowledge, and their full and effective participation in REDD+.

Experience of indigenous peoples in Cameroon

It was due to the FCPF’s influence that the government engaged with civil society and indigenous peoples on REDD+. Indigenous peoples and CSOs are represented in the National REDD+ Steering Committee.

For indigenous peoples and CSOs, participation in REDD+ holds out opportunities for:

- Encouraging Cameroon to ratify ILO 169;
- Benefiting from REDD+ funding mechanisms;
- Equitable sharing of revenues from REDD+ within communities;
- Participation in decision making;
- Improving forest governance;
- Bringing civil society organizations together in a network;
- Developing a working relationship with the government, despite traditional misunderstandings.

But there are also challenges in the following areas:

- Information and training;
- A need to foster a culture of communication and networking;
- Leadership, management and professionalization;
- Access to finance;
- The relationship between government and CSOs;
- Vulnerability of linguistic and cultural minorities are vulnerable;
- In the English-speaking territory of Cameroon, the protection of the Atlantic coastal, lowland humid forest, montane forest, savanna and existing wetland ecosystems and the rights, culture and livelihoods of local people.

The experience of forest communities in Costa Rica

The country’s institutions are too weak and too slow to respond to the problems of forest communities. Forest peoples want the World Bank to help legitimize participatory processes. Everyone can participate, but the indigenous peoples and rural communities must be there, with privileges. There should be a two-year moratorium on evictions, during which time the government should clarify and improve legal security and land tenure.

Update on decisions from the UNFCCC COP 18, December 2012

There was no agreement on monitoring, reporting and verification. The draft text was not adopted, but was attached as an Annex to the Chair’s Conclusions and will inform discussions in 2013. Matters remaining under discussion include the draft text on National Forest Monitoring Systems.

The text on Long-term Cooperative Action (LCA) was adopted at the last minute. It calls for:

- A one-year work program on results-based finance under the COP;
- A joint effort by the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) to improve coordination of financing for REDD+;
- SBSTA to start work on methodological issues related to non-carbon benefits.
When Tebtebba was established in 1996, our key priority was to raise awareness of indigenous peoples on existing human rights instruments, which can help them assert and claim their rights more effectively. Even at that time, however, we were clear that we will not just limit ourselves to human rights issues but to also address development, environment and trade issues, which affect indigenous peoples. Thus, we worked in the sustainable development arena (UN Commission on Sustainable Development) and took part in some of the World Trade Organization processes.

In the past five years, we intensified our efforts to influence decisions of Multilateral Environmental Conventions like the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). This is to ensure that indigenous peoples’ rights and traditional knowledge are integrated into major decisions taken by these bodies. After the adoption by the UN General Assembly of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in 2007, which Tebtebba helped bring about, we were clear on what our strategic priorities should be. First, was to ensure that this will be implemented by State actors, the UN and other intergovernmental bodies. Second, is to work for the recognition and inclusion of UNDRIP in decisions taken by multilateral bodies and agreements and national laws.

The third priority is to ensure that global agreements, which are relevant for indigenous peoples, are translated into concrete legislations and programs at the national level, which will have positive impacts for indigenous peoples. For us to achieve these priorities, Tebtebba disseminates information and raises awareness of indigenous peoples and governments about these global agreements. Our hope is that this will help them decide on what actions they need to take, as indigenous peoples and as governments. In addition, Tebtebba brings to the attention of states at the national and global levels some of the concerns and perspectives of indigenous peoples so they can take these into consideration when making global and national decisions.
To bring together the gains we achieved so these will have an impact in the communities, we decided to develop a more holistic and integrated framework and approach in achieving indigenous peoples’ sustainable, self-determined development. This was crafted and we have moved towards developing a training course and training modules, which we will use with our partners and others who are willing to undergo such course.

For us to be able to pursue these priorities more effectively, we have forged partnerships with indigenous peoples’ organizations, networks and institutions in various countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. We also work with existing indigenous peoples’ caucuses, such as the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) and the International Indigenous Peoples’ Forum on Climate Change (IIPFCC). The partnership, which was forged four years ago, is the Indigenous Peoples’ Partnership on Climate Change and Forests. We have 14 partners in 11 countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America who are actively implementing a program of work, which has been agreed in several global meetings between the partnership.

In 2011 we released our Strategic Framework Plan which covers 2011 to 2013. Basically, we will maintain what we mentioned in this plan for the year 2013. Greater stress and focus will, however, be placed in establishing community-based monitoring and information systems (CBMIS). It is crucial that indigenous peoples are able to monitor the different changes in their communities, both good and bad, so that they can develop more appropriate approaches and responses to these.

The year 2013 has in store major events which Tebtebba aims to help lead. These are the Indigenous Peoples’ Forum in IFAD, which will be held in February 2013, and the preparatory meetings for the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples.

**Strategic Framework Plan (2013-2016)**

For the next 3 years, we will be working towards achieving the following objectives. Our main implementation areas are in Asia, Africa and Latin America. For global policy advocacy, however, we will work with the global indigenous caucuses, which include indigenous peoples from all regions of the world.

**OBJECTIVE 1:** Enable indigenous peoples to effectively influence climate change policy and program development and implementation at the global, national and sub-national levels to ensure that their rights and knowledge are integrated into these and support them in their efforts to enhance their resilience and adaptation to climate change.

**OBJECTIVE 2:** Enhance capacities of indigenous peoples to ensure the implementation of the CBD Strategic Plan at the national level and further develop and implement their plans to secure customary governance over their lands, territories and resources and pilot the ecosystem approach.

**OBJECTIVE 3:** Work for the promotion and implementation of the UNDRIP and International Human Rights Law at the national level and the integration of indigenous peoples’ rights into climate change and biodiversity policies and programs and increase indigenous peoples’ effective participation and use of multilateral and national complaints bodies and mechanisms to seek redress for violations of their human rights.

**OBJECTIVE 4:** Implement a Philippines National Program for indigenous peoples’ empowerment and policy and program reforms towards the effective implementation of the UNDRIP and the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act.

**OBJECTIVE 5:** Elaborate and develop further the concept of indigenous peoples’ sustainable, self-determined development, which ensures gender equality and inter-generational balance, and support the operationalization of these in some communities.

**OBJECTIVE 6:** Develop and establish community-based monitoring and information systems, which shall feed into the CBD, UNFCCC and Human Rights Bodies.
Launched the global and Asia training-workshop on the Integrated and Holistic Approach to Indigenous Peoples’ Sustainable, Self-Determined Development (IHA-IPSDD)
Did an Asia-wide capacity building on the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in preparation for 2012 COP
Influenced various multilateral bodies such as the CBD and related bodies like IPBES; the UNFCCC and other intergovernmental bodies implementing REDD+ (UN-REDD, FCPF); the Rio +20 or the World Conference on Sustainable Development. Some of the gains include:
• Traditional knowledge has been accepted as a parallel form of knowledge system which is not subsumed under western science
• Reference to the UNDRIP in the CBD, UNFCCC and the Outcome Document of Rio +20
• Safeguards in REDD+, non-carbon benefits, non-market approaches
• Recognition of the contribution of traditional knowledge and culture to sustainable development
Increased the number and quality of indigenous leaders within our partnership and in the Philippines, which include indigenous women and youth
Expanded the number of partners in the Indigenous Peoples’ Partnership on Climate Change and Forests from 10 to 14
Played leadership roles in the preparatory meetings for the IFAD Indigenous Peoples’ Forum and the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples (2014 WCIP)
Generated additional funds for continuation of programs: 2.5 years renewal of Norad funding and additional funding from Tamalpais Trust and IFAD for 2012-2013
Published books; Lumad, Pancur Kasih Movement and Credit Union, and the Extractive Industries
Released several stories of Tebtebba activities and partners (Tebtebba Indigenous Information Service) and disseminated these widely
Organized several global conferences and training-workshops, jointly with others or on our own (Rio +20 Indigenous Peoples’ Conference, jointly with CADPI; Global Dialogue of Indigenous Peoples with the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) of the World Bank; Consultation on the Safeguard Policies of the WB; Global Consultation on Monitoring, Reporting and Verification with the Rainforest Foundation Norway (RFN); Global Workshop on Forests and Indigenous Women, with Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI); Global Training-Workshop on Community Participatory Mapping and Resource Inventory
Reorganized Tebtebba to reflect the integrated approach in our organization—from units based on functions to units based on the strategic programs and themes.
Highlights of Tebtebba’s Major Activities
July to December 2012 Report

By Raymond de Chavez with Grace Balawag, Len Regpala, Jo Ann Guillao & Ellen Dictaan-Bang-oa
For the second half of 2012, Tebtebba was able to overshoot the targets that were identified in almost all areas of work. In popularizing and further enriching the Integrated Holistic Approach for Indigenous Peoples’ Sustainable, Self-Determined Development (IHA-IPSSDD), we were able to launch a series of training of trainors geared towards unifying our partners on this approach, and developing a pool of indigenous trainors that will further educate their communities on the IHA.

We were able to enrich and further develop the manual on IHA. Our partners have started organizing workshops on the approach in the local levels. We continue to effectively manage the Indigenous Peoples’ Assistance Fund (IPAF) of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) in Asia-Pacific, and the Indigenous Peoples’ Fund for Sustainable and Self-Determined Development, supported by the Tamalpais Trust.

In the area of climate change, we continue to implement the ongoing capacity building project, funded by the Norwegian International Climate and Forest Initiative (NICFI), entitled “Enhancing rights protection, ensuring effective participation of and securing fair benefits for indigenous peoples in REDD Plus policies and programmes.”

This project is being implemented in 11 countries with 14 partners from the Indigenous Peoples’ Partnership on Climate Change and Forests. Effective lobbying in the climate change processes and with REDD Plus bodies (UN-REDD, FCPF, etc.) to ensure indigenous peoples’ positions are integrated in the UNFCCC decisions and in policies and programs of these bodies have also been sustained. In the national level, our partners continue to play increased roles in government REDD Plus bodies and continue to be considered as important players in climate change.

In the national implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), we sustained and enhanced our work around customary governance, and in developing our knowledge networks through the Philippine Traditional Knowledge Network and the Baguio Vermi Growers, as part of our work in the urban ecosystem. In key CBD meetings in this period, we actively participated and engaged in lobby and advocacy in SBSTTA16, WGRI4, and COP11 in Hyderabad, India.

Key achievements of our lobby work, together with the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, include decisions with importance to indigenous peoples: the adoption of a new work programme component on customary sustainable use, the holding of an in-depth dialogue on traditional knowledge and IPBES (Inter-governmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem) at the 8th meeting of WG8j and Related Provisions, and follow-up work relating to implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.

An important result of a strong partnership that we have developed through the years was the increase in the number of indigenous leaders that have been developed globally and nationally. Our partners are now considered key leaders among indigenous peoples in their own countries. In the Philippines, we have identified existing and potential leaders whose capacities can further be enhanced for them to be strong and effective leaders and able negotiators.

Through our effective work, we continue to maintain high credibility among indigenous organizations and networks, civil society, UN agencies and bodies, and funders. This is reflected in the increased collaboration and engagement with formations and bodies such as the International Partnership on the Satoyama Initiative, Diversity Liaison Group (UNESCO-SCBD), the Indigenous Peoples Partnership on Agrobiodiversity and
Food Sovereignty, and the Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI), to name a few.

Indigenous organizations continue to put their trust on Tebtebba by requesting us to organize key activities such as the Global Indigenous Peoples’ Dialogue with the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) and nominating us to be the manager for the FCPF capacity building fund for indigenous peoples in the Asia region. UN agencies such as the UN University has also expressed interest in supporting the development of community-based monitoring and information systems or CBMIS.

As a result of effective implementation of our various projects and high visibility in key global processes, we were able to increase funding support from various donors and funders. We were shortlisted in the next funding period of the NICFI, which was finally approved in early 2013. Our proposal on capacity building for indigenous women in Asia was approved in November 2012. Funders such as the Tamalpais Trust, ClimateWorks and The Christensen Fund have also expressed continued support for our work.

A summary of Tebtebba’s Key Activities in the second half of 2012 is discussed below:

**A. Indigenous Peoples’ Sustainable, Self-Determined Development and Indigenous Peoples’ Rights**

1. **Increased training and development of trainors to popularize, educate and influence partners on using the IHA.**

   Towards uniting our partners on the Integrated Holistic Approach (IHA) on Indigenous Peoples’ Sustainable, Self-Determined Development, we held several training of trainors in the second half of the year. These were the Global Trainors’ Training on IHA held on July 14-18, and the IPSSDD Orientation Workshop for Philippine IP Leaders held on Oct. 16-19 and participated in by 35 indigenous leaders, including indigenous women and youth.

   Our partners that participated in the ToTs belong to the Indigenous Peoples’ Partnership on Climate Change and Forests; from those supported by the Indigenous Peoples’ Assistance Fund (IPAF) of the IFAD in Asia-Pacific and Tamalpais Trust through the Indigenous Peoples’ Fund for Sustainable and Self-Determined Development; and with indigenous leaders in the Philippines.

   With the successful holding of the ToTs, our partners have started organizing pools of trainors and have organized IHA orientation seminars in Mindanao (though our partner SILDAP) and in Tinoc, Ifugao in the Philippines, and in Latin America (Peru, Nicaragua).
2. Further elaboration of the module on Basic Orientation to Integrated Holistic Approach based on trainings held

The module that is being enriched through these training and contextualized by partners in their specific country/local settings, will be finalized and published in 2013 to further support our efforts to educate and popularize the approach among other indigenous organizations.

3. Implementation of projects under the IPAF and Indigenous Peoples’ Fund for Sustainable and Self-Determined Development

Tebtebba is overseeing the implementation of the IPAF in Asia-Pacific. These are projects of 9 indigenous organizations in 7 countries: India, Lao PDR, Bangladesh, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Nepal, and Papua New Guinea.

Tamalpais Trust, on the other hand, supports the Indigenous Peoples’ Fund for Sustainable and Self-Determined Development, which is managed by Tebtebba. This Fund currently supports 8 partners (CHIRAPAQ, UEFA, Lelewal, MPIDO, ILEPA, SILDAP, MRDC, and CIR) in 6 countries (Cameroon, DRC, Philippines, Kenya, Brazil, and Peru).

In the 2nd half of 2012, contracts with IPAF partners were finalized and funds transferred to ensure proper implementation of their projects. Technical support for partners funded by IP Fund were also provided, and support given for implementation.


After successfully co-organizing the International Indigenous Peoples’ Conference on Sustainable Development and Self-Determination, the IP Exhibit, and actively working for the inclusion of key indigenous peoples’ demands in Rio +20 in June, Tebtebba is actively engaging in post-Rio +20 processes. We are also finalizing the publication Indigenous Peoples’ Sustainable, Self-Determined Development: 20 Years After Rio.

Alongside indigenous peoples’ efforts for the Rio +20 process, and complementary to these, were the preparations undertaken for the UN World Conference on Indigenous Peoples (WCIP), which will take place in September 2014 at the UN General Assembly, including
a review of implementation of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Key messages for the WCIP were elaborated at regional preparatory meetings, including the Asia Region Preparatory Meeting held in November in Bangkok.

5. Participation in key regional events

Tebtebba co-organized the following activities: the Asia Preparatory Meeting for the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples (WCIP), 8-9 November, Bangkok, Thailand; and the Asia-Pacific Preparatory Meeting and the Indigenous Peoples’ Forum (IPF) at IFAD, 10-11 Nov., Bangkok, Thailand. We facilitated participation of 4 of the IPAF partners (India, Solomon Islands, PNG, and Lao PDR). Results fed into the 1st meeting of the IPF in February 2013 and will feed into the global process of indigenous peoples on the WCIP in 2013.

6. Support for Filing of Cases with Redress Mechanisms of Banks

We have linked up with our partner MPIDO in Kenya to support the indigenous Sengwer communities who are affected by the World Bank-funded conservation park. Documentation is ongoing and we have linked them up with the World Bank Inspection Panel.

B. Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation

We are currently implementing the last year of our capacity building project “Enhancing rights protection, ensuring effective participation of and securing fair benefits for indigenous peoples in REDD Plus policies and programmes” with partners from the Indigenous Peoples’ Partnership on Climate Change and Forests. For July-December 2012, the key activities undertaken were the following:

1. Support efforts of the partners to do research on traditional knowledge and practices on forest ecosystem management and customary governance of forests and analysis of national policies and laws relating to indigenous peoples’ rights and climate change.

The research on the Role of Indigenous Women in Forest Management/Case Study on Traditional Forest Management was completed with the submission of the research outputs from our partners in the Philippines, Vietnam and Cameroon. The papers will be published as second volume of the research on IPs and TFM in 2013.
2. **Exchange and learning Visit of the Partnership**

An exchange learning visit to Roraima, Brazil was organized on October 21-27, 2012. This learning exchange visit aimed to share the traditional forest management practices of indigenous communities (Surumu, Maturuka, Tamandua, Wai-wai) in Roraima and was participated in by 9 partners coming from Vietnam, Nepal, Nicaragua, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, and Kenya. The activity was hosted by Conselho Indigena de Roraima (CIR).

3. **Support for traditional livelihoods in demonstration areas**

Continuing support for traditional forest-related livelihood projects was undertaken among majority of our partners. These include, among others, projects aimed to revive traditional occupation, such as basketry and weaving among indigenous peoples in Manipongol, Maco Compostela Valley in southern Philippines.

In Tinoc, Ifugao in northern Philippines, the project supports traditional agriculture and organic farming. The project has reintroduced “traditional agriculture, which includes retrieving and restoring traditional crop varieties, is aimed at countering the massive conversion of virgin forests into commercial vegetable farms, which rely heavily on chemical fertilizers and pesticides.”

In Viet Nam, our partner CERDA has introduced organic farming among ethnic communities in the Vo Nhai and Dai Tu District, north Viet Nam. This has reduced the reliance of the communities to expensive commercial fertilizers and has helped them supplement their income through production of organic fertilizers as well. MPIDO in Kenya supports beekeeping, a traditional forest-related livelihood for the Maasai.

4. **Influencing key processes in climate change and in REDD Plus bodies**

We supported the participation of our key partners in 2 UNFCCC meetings: the Bangkok Climate Talks in August and the Doha Climate Change Conference from 26 November-8 December 2012.

In both meetings, Tebtebba and its partners were key players in influencing the negotiations and also in the indigenous peoples’ climate change formation, the International Indigenous Peoples’ Forum on Climate Change (IIPFCC). Its partners were the co-chairs of the Forum. Through Tebtebba’s executive director, Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, indigenous peoples were able to ensure that gains in previous negotiations (such as in Durban in 2011) remain in the approved texts.

Tauli-Corpuz was again appointed as co-chair of the UNFCCC’s SBSTA (Subsidiary Body on Scientific and Technical Advice) Working
Group on REDD. She also continued to be part of the Philippine government delegation. Her role was crucial in ensuring that gains of indigenous peoples were supported in the decisions.

Specifically in the Doha Climate Conference, she was effective in including “non-carbon benefits” in the decision in the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long Term Cooperative Action or AWG-LCA, inspite of objections from several northern governments. This decision is on “ways to incentivise non-carbon benefits” (para 29 c.) and also on the non-market approaches (para. 39). This is very important for indigenous peoples as they have consistently argued that forests are not only carbon but should be viewed through the multiple benefits and multiple functions that forests provide. Thus, non-carbon benefit should also be incentivized.

Tebtebba and its partners also led in calling for the Green Climate Fund (GCF) to ensure full and effective participation and direct access by indigenous peoples of the GCF. Specifically, we are calling for the formation of a small grants facility for indigenous peoples. Aside from lobby work, Tebtebba also organized a side event on the Green Climate Fund and also the Partnership Booth were materials of Tebtebba and the partnership were displayed and disseminated.

After the Doha Climate Conference, Tebtebba organized three World Bank activities. These were the Informal Consultation on the WB Safeguard Policies, the Global Indigenous Peoples’ Dialogue with FCPF, and the Sharing of the WB Climate Change Research.

Tebtebba was requested by the indigenous peoples to organize the global dialogue on the FCPF. This was a culmination of regional consultations in Asia-Pacific, Africa and Latin America. In the global dialogue, the participants were able to consolidate action plans based on 3 regional workshops that were conducted. They also came out with an action plan. For Asia, Tebtebba was nominated to be the fund manager for the IP capacity building fund of the FCPF in the Asia region.

5. **Holding of training on 3D Participatory Mapping and workshop for indigenous women**

Two key capacity building activities were held in the second half of the year. These were the Workshop on 3D Participatory Mapping held in Bangkok on 26-28 August, and the Asia Indigenous Women’s Strategy Workshop on Forest/Land Tenure and Climate Change held on 16-18 August in Baguio City.
C. Indigenous Peoples and Biodiversity

1. Securing Customary Governance

In Tinoc, Ifugao, northern Philippines, important accomplishments included completion of the research on “Effects of Climate Change, Community Vulnerabilities, Mitigation and Adaptation Mechanisms.” The research found that the Kalanguyas of Tinoc have developed their knowledge on climate, season and weather, incorporating these into their agricultural system.

Plant indicators, migratory birds, and cloud readings are used to ensure the correct timing of planting the different crops. Major disasters occurred in 1970 and in 1996. People were able to cope with the first due to integrated farming systems and the sound management practices; good yield, value of sharing and their traditional labor exchange network helped them cope and to rise above the disaster. They fared worse the second time due to the decreased yield brought about by erosion of traditional knowledge and practices on fertility enhancement, field sanitation and farm maintenance.

Furthermore, the results of the comprehensive land use planning were collated into a municipal level plan with the following mission and goals:

- To promote people’s well-being through increased food sovereignty, good governance committed to sustainable use and equitable sharing of resources that embodies our values of respect for all life forms;
- Enhanced ecosystems services, increased food sovereignty, developed/improved infrastructures and social services;
- Strengthened good governance that promotes positive values, customs, laws of sustainable and equitable resource use.

Hungduan and Asipulo, like Tinoc, serve as watershed of the Magat Dam. Research documented indigenous knowledge and practices on natural resource management with a focus on forests.

An overview of the small-scale mining industry in Pidlisan in Mt. Province, also in northern Philippines, was accomplished. The local organization Asosasyon Dagiti Umili ti Pidlisan (ASUP) is presently undertaking capacity building and has accepted the challenge to lead the ecosystems assessment and development planning.

The study on “Waste Management in the Urban Ecosystem: The Case of Baguio City and the Municipality of La Trinidad” was carried out. This study takes off from the Scoping Study on Baguio’s Urban
Ecosystem that was conducted in 2011, and takes a closer look at the waste generation and management aspect of the urban ecosystem, which appears to be one of the biggest environmental challenges currently being faced. This was presented in the Workshop on Baguio Garbage, held August 29, 2012.

2. Learning and Knowledge Networks

Research on Sacred Sites and Traditional Knowledge was started with draft case studies written about various Philippine indigenous peoples’ sacred sites (Menuvu, Mansaka, Kankana-ey, Kalanguya, Kalinga, and Mangyan Tagabukid sacred sites). Networking and exploratory interviews with key informants on Ibaloi sacred sites in Baguio and Mt. Pulag were also carried out. A Workshop on Sacred Sites and Traditional Knowledge, was held in October 2012 and attended by more than 60 participants from Luzon and Mindanao.

Experiences were shared by the indigenous Mansaka, Matigsalog, Dibabawan, Manguangan, Egongot, Mangyan Tagabukid, Kalanguya, Erumanen Menuvu participants, who presented on indigenous world-views, knowledge and practices—ways of knowledge transmission; factors contributing to erosion; and initiatives for protect and promotion.

3. Local-Global Policy Advocacy

Important CBD meetings during the year were attended, including SBSTTA16, WGR4, and COP11 in Hyderabad, India. Some significant decisions with bearing on indigenous peoples include the adoption of a new work programme component on customary sustainable use, the holding of an in-depth dialogue on traditional knowledge and IPBES at the 8th meeting of WG8j and Related Provisions, and follow-up work relating to implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.

Other important meetings attended in the Philippines, relate to the updating of NBSAPS (National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plans) and preparation of the 4th National Report to the CBD. Concerns were raised about indigenous rights, traditional knowledge, customary sustainable use of biodiversity and indicators relevant to indigenous peoples.

Tebtebba maintained active linkages with its key collaborating partners and networks. In 2012, important engagements linked to traditional knowledge included the International Partnership on the Satoyama Initiative, Diversity Liaison Group (UNESCO-SCBD) and the Indigenous Peoples Partnership on Agrobiodiversity and Food Sovereignty.

Collaboration with civil society networks on common issues included the CBD Alliance, ESCR-Net (Working Groups on Social Movements and
The theme of linkages between indigenous knowledge and science assumed prominence in 2012, with the establishment of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). Members of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB), in collaboration with Swedbio and NAPTEK, organized a dialogue workshop on “Knowledge for the 21st Century—Linking Indigenous, Traditional and Local Knowledge and Science” in Guna-Yala, Panama. Key messages from the workshop were conveyed to the IPBES meeting in Panama City, and were successfully included in the framework for IPBES future work.

The project made good achievements in undertaking Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA) activities. Its educational resource book on Indigenous Peoples and Biodiversity was launched during a side-event at the CEPA Fair during CBD COP11, and many copies were distributed to indigenous peoples’ organizations. A new training programme promoting an integrated and holistic approach to indigenous peoples’ self-determined development was consolidated in 2012.

This educational course which promotes human rights-based, ecosystems-based and indigenous cultural approaches, builds on Tebtebba’s earlier separate courses on Indigenous Peoples and Human Rights, Biodiversity, and Gender and combines these in a cross-cutting and holistic way. A global workshop, using this integrated course was conducted in July 2012 following the Asia region Capacity Building Workshop for COP11, jointly carried out with the Secretariat of the CBD and the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP).

4. Monitoring and Indicators Relevant for Indigenous Peoples

With the strong focus under the CBD on national implementation, the IIFB Working Group on Indicators has agreed to monitor progress in the implementation of Target 18 of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets through the establishment of community-based monitoring and information systems on biodiversity and traditional knowledge, customary sustainable use and climate change impacts.

Collaboration continues with the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership on the development of methodologies and information systems to monitor trends in land use change and land tenure, the practice of traditional occupation and linguistic diversity.
D. Philippine Program for Indigenous Peoples’ Empowerment

Our work in the Philippines focused on 3 main areas: identification and development of pool of indigenous leaders; implementation of the IHA in pilot areas in the Cordilleras and Mindanao; and continuing policy advocacy and networking.

1. Implementation of the IHA in pilot areas in the Cordilleras and Mindanao

In Mindanao, southern Philippines, we have an ongoing partnership with SILDAP to pilot the IHA in 2 villages of Compostela Valley: Manipongol and Concepcion. Implementation is ongoing. The research on impacts of climate change (changes in land use and tenure, traditional occupations, sacred sites) was submitted by SILDAP as part of data gathering and development of baselines in the communities.

In Ifugao, our pilot areas are in Tinoc and in Hungduan (please refer also to discussion in C.1. above). This is being implemented in partnership with Montañosa Research and Development Center (MRDC). Key results of our work in the areas include the development in Tinoc of a comprehensive land use plan (CLUP) developed by the communities themselves.

The CLUP was eventually adopted by the municipal government. A 3D participatory map of Tinoc was also developed by the community members. This is now being digitized and validated. The climate change assessment research in Tinoc was also finished in this period.

Workshops have also been organized to increase capacities of indigenous peoples in Tinoc. On December 11-12, a workshop was held on the role of the mumbaki (traditional priest) and lessons and initiatives around defense of territories.

In these pilot areas, indigenous leaders and representatives, including indigenous women and youth, have participated in trainings and workshops on the IHA.

2. Development of pool of indigenous leaders, including indigenous women and youth

Efforts to involve indigenous leaders, including indigenous women and indigenous youth, in key activities of Tebtebba is a priority that we have implemented. This is our thrust to develop and train a new gen-
eration of indigenous leaders who are able to articulate their issues and demands, and engage effectively with other relevant stakeholders (e.g., government units and agencies in local and national levels, legislators, multilateral bodies and UN agencies) so that their situations, issues and demands feed into laws and policies at the local and/or national levels.

As such, we have organized several workshops and have ensured that partner communities are able to participate in several trainings such as on the IHA, and the Philippine Workshop with IP Leaders on Good Practices on Sustainable, Self-Determined Development held on Oct 16-19, to name a few.

3. Continuing policy advocacy and networking to influence laws and policies

We continue to undertake active lobby and advocacy with the government and its agencies, UN agencies, multilateral bodies, and civil society formations. Aside from influencing laws and policies to incorporate indigenous peoples’ demands, we also aim to educate and sensitize them on indigenous peoples’ perspectives.

Examples include our engagement with the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), specifically on the 4Ps (Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program). As an offshoot of our input in March on the IHA, we were invited to participate in developing education materials that are indigenous-sensitive.

In Tinoc, our pilot communities have established good working relationship with the municipal government. As a result, they supported the setting up of the 3D map of Tinoc, and have adopted the community-led CLUP.

We also participated in the revision of NCIP (National Commission on Indigenous Peoples) Guidelines; participated in the DENR (Department of Environment and Natural Resources) Workshop on the Philippine NBSAPs and the National Report. We continue to monitor laws, policies with implications on indigenous peoples. These include, among others, the Cordillera Regional Autonomy Bill, the National Land Use Act Bill, the Joint Administrative Order between DENR, LRA (Land Registration Authority), NCIP, and DAR (Dept. of Agrarian Reform), and IP Mandatory Representation.

We continue to be active participants in the several national civil society formations.

Finally, we have further consolidated the Philippine UNDRIP Network, a multistakeholder body monitoring the implementation of the UNDRIP. The network was a co-organizer of the workshop on good practices held in October.
E. Gender

Tebtebba was able to raise funds from the Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI) to organize, together with the Asian Indigenous Women’s Network or AIWN, the Asia Indigenous Women’s Strategy Workshop on Forest/Land Tenure and Climate Change held on 16-18 August in Baguio City. This was participated in by 26 indigenous women and advocates from Cambodia, India, Nepal, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam and representatives from RRI, FECOFUN, REFACOF.

The workshop aimed to have a better understanding on indigenous women and forest tenure and the impacts of climate change. Participants also identified strategies to address these issues and recommendations.

A research on Violence Against Indigenous Girls, Adolescent and Young Women, spearheaded by Tebtebba, was supplemented by three FGDs in Itogon, Benguet. The research fed into the 2013 session of the Commission on Status of Women and will also feed into the 12th session of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues in May 2013.

In November, the UN Women Fund for Gender Equality finally approved Tebtebba’s proposal on capacity building of indigenous women in Asia. The 2-year project will be implemented in 2 countries, the Philippines and Nepal, beginning 2013.

F. Publication and Communication

In the second half, our work in publication and communication achieved two gains. These were the jumpstarting of our communication work; and finishing of long-standing publications.

Our communication and information work received a boost with the entry of an indigenous journalist as part of the Publication and Communication Desk.

As a result, we have regularly come out with articles (mainly feature articles on “stories” on IPSSDD) through the Tebtebba Indigenous Information Service. These releases are deployed through various forms: social media (Twitter and Facebook), the website, e-lists, and as media releases to several local media outlets.
We were also able to finally publish the two Pancur Kasih books with Institut Dayakologi (the PK Empowerment Movement and the Credit Cooperative Movement), and the IPs and extractive industries book, *Pitfalls and Pipelines*.

The latter was soft-launched in Geneva in early December during the Forum on Business and Human Rights, and in another book launch on December 14 in Quezon City, Philippines.

**G. Administration and Finance**

We were able to fully implement the new organizational structure in 2012. This structure places emphasis on work along thematic areas such as indigenous peoples’ sustainable, self-determined development; climate change adaptation and mitigation; CBD national implementation; human rights and indigenous peoples’ rights; and the Philippine program for indigenous peoples’ empowerment.

**Endnotes**

1. This approach integrates the ecosystem approach, the human rights-based approach and the inter-cultural and knowledge-based approaches.

2. The Indigenous Peoples’ Partnership on Climate Change and Forests is a partnership of 14 indigenous organizations and NGOs in 11 countries: Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara (AMAN) and Institut Dayakologi, Indonesia; Nepal Federation of Indigenous Nationalities (NEFIN), Nepal; Mainyoito Pastoralist Integrated Development Organization (MPIDO) and Indigenous Livelihoods Enhancement Partners (ILEPA), Kenya; Centro para la Autonomía y Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas (CADPI), Nicaragua; Centro de Culturas Indígenas el Perú (CHIRAPAQ), Peru; Centre of Research and Development in Upland Areas (CERDA), Viet Nam; Lelewal, Cameroon; SILDAP (Silingang Dapit) Southeastern Mindanao, Inc. and Montanosa Research and Development Center (MRDC), Philippines; Servicios del Pueblo Mixe (SER), Mexico; Conselho Indigena de Roraima (CIR), Brazil; Union pour l’Emancipation de la Femme Autochtone (UEFA), DRC.

3. These UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) processes include the meetings of the Ad-Hoc Working Groups on Long-Term Cooperative Action and Kyoto Protocol, the Subsidiary Bodies, and the Conference of Parties meetings.
AFTER Western (a.k.a. scientific) paradigms dominated most people's thinking, indigenous knowledge and worldviews have been pushed aside, and rendered as “unscientific,” or worst, irrational and superstitious. But the world is seeing a general interest in “indigenous ways of knowing.”

“The encounter between the academe and indigenous peoples oftentimes resembles the encounter between Western Knowledge and Indigenous Knowledge,” noted a concept paper of two institutions, which have been working about indigenous concerns. “How this dichotomy came about is deeply rooted in the history and philosophy of science that has dominated the University and research activities since the advent of modern history (Age of Enlightenment and Renaissance period in Europe).”

The much-praised Age of Enlightenment eventually pushed to the margins age-old traditional and indigenous knowledge and values.

“The intellectual triumph of positivism (based on Newtonian science) since then up to now has indeed defined what valid knowledge is (and what is not),” according to the concept paper. “Overall, indigenous knowledge and cosmologies all over the world have been subjected to the Western scientific, rational and modernist ‘gaze’ and rendered them, for the most part, unscientific (i.e., superstitious, irrational, etc.).”

Many now acknowledge that Western paradigms are in crisis, a situation which has attracted much interest in indigenous knowledge and principles. For example, there is now a revived interest in traditional or indigenous medicine, forest management, agricultural practices and technologies.

Some indigenous scholars, academics, researchers, and activists now have become highly critical of the dominant research frameworks and approaches taught in the academe and used in research work.

“The way indigenous peoples have been used as objects of research has been appropriated by colonizers and ruling elites to justify colonization and domination, contributing to the perpetuation of racism and discrimination against indigenous peoples,” said the concept paper.

The concept paper was done jointly by Tebtebba, a Philippine-based global indigenous institution concerned with indigenous issues, and the government-run University of the Philippines Baguio. Both institutions are co-sponsoring an
international workshop-seminar on 26-28 June 2013, which aims to gather a select group of local and foreign indigenous studies experts, indigenous scholars, researchers and educators, advocates, activists, policymakers and practitioners at Legend Villas, Mandaluyong City in Metro Manila, Philippines.

The co-sponsors expect “provocative discussions” and “fruitful exchanges” around the theme, “Reflections on Indigenous Studies: Taking Stock of Lessons from the Field.”

Indigenous researchers and academics have been researching their own situations, using their own epistemologies (studies of knowledge and justified beliefs) and world views as starting frameworks. In the process, they have arrived at lessons and insights on how research can be done to generate knowledge, which is more relevant and useful for and sensitive to indigenous peoples. For example, Tebtebba established the Indigenous Peoples’ Global Research and Education Network (IPGREN), which brought together indigenous researchers to share their experiences and insights on how to do research in more participatory and culturally-sensitive ways.

In recent years, some universities provided space for a field called Indigenous Studies, seemingly privileging the “indigenous” as a legitimate category of inquiry. Indigenous academics, especially in the developed countries, pushed for the establishment of indigenous studies in their universities. There are now several indigenous studies centers in universities in the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and in the Arctic.

There are also universities and colleges established, run and managed by indigenous peoples, sometimes with the support of government, sometimes set up independently. There are the Sami University College in Norway and the indigenous universities set up in Latin America.

“The creation of spaces within the academe for cross-cultural and intercultural learning has led to more in-depth discussions and use of indigenous epistemologies and pedagogies (the science and art of education),” noted Tebtebba and UP Baguio. “Still, some academics from the dominant populations still view this phenomenon with a ‘methodical distance’ if not skepticism.”

The UP Baguio has committed to studying issues confronting indigenous peoples and communities, particularly those inhabiting the Cordillera in northern Philippines. Thus, it established the Cordillera Studies Center (CSC) in June 1980.

These developments in Indigenous Studies here and in other parts of the world have prompted both Tebtebba and UP Baguio to conceive the idea of holding a forum where participants can share experiences and lessons and discuss the critical issues that tend to unsettle scholars, researchers, and practitioners.

During the three-day activity, participants are expected to wrestle over the following questions: Is the dichotomy between Western Knowledge and Indigenous Knowledge a true dichotomy? Can one think “scientifically” and yet be open to an indigenous worldview? Does the adoption of Western epistemologies, ontologies, and methodologies really entail the wholesale rejection of their indigenous counterparts and vice-versa? Or, is the indigenous way of knowing also a valid way of knowing in addition to the western way?

While Tebtebba and UP Baguio recognize the limitations of Western Knowledge, many mainstream academics and researchers wonder whether the adoption of an indigenous worldview is still possible for one trained in Western-based knowledge systems, especially for one not generally considered an “indigenous person.”

So during the upcoming seminar-workshop, participants are expected to assess themselves based on the following questions: Can a non-indigenous person do indigenous studies? What happens when the indigenous becomes the center of study by academics, advocates and activists? How can indigenous peoples and academics work together to enhance the dialogue, cross-fertilization and connections between indigenous, traditional knowledge systems and scientific knowledge? What are the emerging indigenous (non-Western) epistemologies? Are they changing and challenging the ways of knowing the world?

These fundamental questions had challenged and inspired the organizers to gather prominent scholars, advocates and activists for the seminar-workshop. Participants, especially indigenous researchers, are thus expected to learn vital lessons and insights in pursuing their research activities with their own communities. - Mauricio Malanes
For years the indigenous Ivatan folk of Batanes islands in northern Philippines have learned to cope with strong typhoons, which have since become part of their lives every rainy season.

Long before climate change became the talk of the global village, the Ivatan, whose communities have long been regarded as the “home of typhoons,” had learned to live with and adapt to a hostile climate. They erected stone houses made of limestone, designed to keep them safe and warm amid pounding rains and howling winds.

Fortunately in recent years, Batanes has not been as battered by typhoons as badly as before. But unfortunately, the routes of typhoons lately have shifted to southern and central Philippines, a phenomenon which has caught many affected communities generally unprepared.

Typhoons Pablo (international name Bopha) and Quinta (Wukong) last December and Sendong (Washi) in December 2011 were the latest to devastate big parts of southern and central Philippines. And still reeling from the trauma of these strong typhoons, many parts of Northern Mindanao were recently flooded due to rains brought about by the tail-end of a cold front and amihan or northeast monsoon.

Despite official announcements and warnings from the official weather bureau, affected communities (particularly those affected by Sendong, Quinta and Pablo) lost hundreds of lives as scores were injured, thousands displaced, and wide swaths of farm lands and several infrastructures ruined.

And many of those who proved vulnerable lived in simple houses made of nipa (palm leaves), bamboo and wood. Wide swaths of forests converted into plantations or logged and unregulated mining activities have helped worsen peoples’ vulnerabilities to typhoons in Mindanao, say climate change analysts.

So those closely monitoring climate change trends suggest the need to find new and strategic ways of coping with these abnormal climate patterns in the country.
Holistic approach

When the abnormal has now become the “new normal” in recent climate patterns, the rest of the country might as well learn from other communities such as the Ivatan, whose disaster-preparedness has become a way of life, says Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, executive director of Tebtebba. A Baguio City-based global indigenous institution, Tebtebba deals with the concerns of indigenous peoples such as their rights, climate justice and “self-determined development.”

But in seeking to help confront climate change-related issues, Tauli-Corpuz stressed what she calls an “integrated holistic approach.” This is Tebtebba’s overarching framework in helping address various indigenous peoples’ issues, which include climate change.

So Tebtebba has helped organize integrated-holistic-approach workshops where participants share their experiences, traditional knowledge and practices about how to cope with extreme climate change patterns. Through the workshops, participants would also identify the roots of their vulnerabilities and thereby devise appropriate short-term and long-term responses.

One strategic response to climate change-related concerns is formulating “comprehensive land use plans.” Tebtebba particularly cited the comprehensive land use plan project of its partner-community in Wangwang village in Tinoc town, Ifugao province in northern Philippines.

Through the comprehensive land use plan, village members along with their local government officials identified their primary and secondary forests, creeks, brooks, and agricultural and settlement areas. Also identified were areas not suitable for settlements, all of which were documented through a three-dimensional map that community members helped make.

The comprehensive land use plan’s significance cannot be understated. The land use plan, which was programmed to be replicated in all the villages in Tinoc, can be the basis for policies or ordinances in land zoning, disaster-preparedness, reforestation, watershed rehabilitation, and other related concerns.

Engagement in national and global arena

While simultaneously helping support partner indigenous communities become “climate change-resilient,” empowered and self-reliant, Tebtebba also continues to engage with concerned government parties and representatives in the national and international arena.

For example, Tauli-Corpuz has been actively engaged with government parties and representatives to the UN climate change talks.

As co-chair of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) working group on REDD Plus (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries), she has helped push for measures to address how indigenous peoples’ rights and traditional knowledge can be respected and protected.

“Indigenous peoples are the ones mainly responsible for saving the world’s last remaining tropical rainforests,” she said. “Thus, it is but right that the climate change convention recognizes the direct link of respecting indigenous peoples’ rights—(which include their right to use their traditional knowledge in the conservation and sustainable use of forests)—to how they adapt to and mitigate the impacts of climate change.”

At the 26 November-7 December 2012 UN Climate Change Conference in Doha, Qatar, Tauli-Corpuz has pushed for programs, which will promote indigenous community-based monitoring and information systems. While this concept has not been included in the decisions regarding systems of information on how REDD Plus safeguards are being respected, she believes that strengthening capacities of communities to do their own
monitoring and to establish their information systems is the way to go.

Many governments are putting a lot of obstacles in establishing safeguard information systems. “In this context, enabling communities to do monitoring and reporting will allow them to be more aware of their own forests and forest resources and what needs to be done for more sustainable forest management and governance,” she said.

As a negotiator for the Philippine Government assigned to the REDD Plus negotiations, she also helped convince other climate change negotiators to agree on a decision, which recognized that the work program for scaling up results-based finance for REDD Plus include options to “incentivize” non-carbon benefits from forests.

Results-based finance worked on the assumption that what will be paid for will only be the carbon sequestered by forests. She argued, however, that other non-carbon benefits, which include ecosystem services provided by forests, biodiversity and livelihoods should also be included in the payments. “Forests are not just about carbon, which now has a price tag,” she said.

She likewise helped add her voice to the strong call for rich countries—which are the world’s top emitters of greenhouse gases that cause global warming and thereby affecting climate change patterns—to contribute money to what is called the Green Climate Fund or GCF. The Fund will support climate change adaptation and mitigation programs of developing countries.

But engaging with and participating in international negotiations requires awareness of already established instruments. Tauli-Corpuz thus reiterated the need for those monitoring the UN climate change negotiations and the GCF Board to be aware of Section X of the GCF Governing Instrument on safeguards and Section XI, which is on accountability.

Section X states that the GCF should have safeguard policies, which are consistent with existing internationally accepted environmental and social standards. “We interpret this to mean the rights of indigenous peoples enshrined in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples will be respected and environmental standards that have been agreed upon under environmental conventions such as the Convention on Biological Diversity and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change should be adhered to,” she said.

She also cited Section X1, which calls for redress or grievance mechanisms if ever there are problems with projects or programs funded through the GCF. She urged the Board to establish this grievance mechanism as well.

“Most important of all is ensuring indigenous peoples’ full and effective participation in the GCF and direct access to the GCF, and not only for governments,” she said. “We are thus calling on the Board to establish a small grants facility that will allow indigenous peoples’ better access to these climate funds.”

She also called on the Board to include one or two indigenous peoples’ representative to be observers to the Board meetings. As it is, only two representatives of civil society organizations and two representatives of the private sector are included as observers.

She hopes that the Board considers these proposals when its members meet in Berlin in March.

“When they (Board members) meet (in March), I hope they will elaborate on this Governing Instrument, which is going to matter a lot for indigenous peoples, especially if they are affected by projects funded by the GCF,” Tauli-Corpuz said.

She likewise underscored an underlying basic principle, which must guide governments in implementing climate change-related projects or programs.

“We call on governments to respect the human rights approach as this ensures that we, indigenous peoples, are not disadvantaged both by the impacts of climate change as well as by the proposed solutions that are put on the table to address climate change impacts,” she said. - Mauricio Malanes
Making the Green Climate Fund Respond to Indigenous Peoples’ Needs

By Tebtebba Indigenous Information Service

Even as they have to push for “full and effective participation” at the Green Climate Fund Board meetings and during climate negotiations, indigenous peoples’ representatives are optimistic that the Fund, once available, can help respond to their climate change-related needs, concerns and issues.

“If we can push for equitable access to the Green Climate Fund, we can help our communities to adapt better to the impacts of climate change,” said Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, Executive Director of Tebtebba, a Philippine-based global indigenous institution promoting “self-determined development.”

Tauli-Corpuz moderated on 28 November a side event at the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change meetings, which began on 26 November at this capital city of Qatar. The event was organized by Tebtebba and the Indigenous Peoples’ Partnership on Climate Change and Forests and supported by the Norwegian Agency for Cooperation and Development.

If guided by international standards on environmental and social safeguards, the Fund can strengthen “our gains in the last 50 years” in the areas of “rights-based and socially responsive development” for indigenous and local communities, said Tauli-Corpuz.

For her part, Niranjali Amerasinghe of the Washington D.C.-based Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL), stressed on “principles-based safeguards” in the GCF Governing Instrument as they apply in different disbursement contexts, and consultation.

What is needed, she said, is an “additional operational text providing more definitive guidance to governments on how to comply with them.”

She also suggested that the GCF could channel funds through regional development banks. But the banks’ safeguard measures
should be complementary to those of the GCF, she said.

Meanwhile, indigenous peoples have yet to hurdle some challenges, particularly on how to fully and effectively participate in the policy-decision making process related to the Fund.

During the first two meetings of the GCF Board, indigenous peoples were not differentiated from civil society at GCF Board meetings and had no speaking rights during formal sessions, said Mrinal Kanti Tripura, Executive Director, Maleya Foundation, an indigenous organization based in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh.

He also stressed the need for indigenous peoples to have direct access to the GCF. “The Fund must respect the principles of free, prior and informed consent, and others contained in the UN Declaration on the Right of Indigenous Peoples,” he added.

Given the opportunity to build their capacity, indigenous peoples can help build what some policy-makers call “climate change-proof” communities. “Indigenous peoples cannot always be victims of climate change, but they can also be part of the solution if given the chance,” said Stanley Kimaren, Executive Director of the Indigenous Livelihood Enhancement Partners (ILEPA) in Kenya.

The Maasai leader cited a partnership project between his organization and Tebtebba, which, he said, enhanced indigenous peoples’ capacity to deal with climate change impacts.

He said the partnership enabled the 14 partner-organizations in 11 countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America to visit each other and share lessons and best practices. The partnership, among other things, has promoted the diversification of livelihoods as a climate adaptation measure, he said.

“The partnership also helped build the capacities of indigenous peoples, who can now effectively engage with government about climate change policies,” said Kimaren. “Other partners have shown that given the opportunity, they can also measure carbon and map their territories and ensure the tenure rights over their lands and resources.” - Mauricio Malanes
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CALL FOR PAPERS

2013 International Seminar-Workshop on Indigenous Studies
26-28 June 2013
Legend Villas, Mandaluyong City, Philippines

The University of the Philippines Baguio, through its research arm, the Cordillera Studies Center (CSC), is co-sponsoring with the Tebtebba Foundation (Indigenous Peoples’ International Centre for Policy Research and Education), the 2013 International Seminar-Workshop on Indigenous Studies to be held at the Legend Villas, Mandaluyong City, Philippines on 26-28 June 2013. With the theme “Reflections on Indigenous Studies: Taking Stock of Lessons from the Field,” the three-day event aims to provide a venue where a select group of local and foreign indigenous studies experts, indigenous scholars, researchers and educators, advocates, activists, policymakers, and practitioners can engage in provocative discussions and fruitful exchanges. The organizers are inviting papers—particularly those focusing on key contentious issues in the field of indigenous studies—for presentation at the seminar-workshop. (See attached seminar-workshop concept paper for a brief discussion of some of these issues).

Prospective writers are requested to take note of the following deadlines:

- April 30: Submission of Paper Abstracts (max: 300 words)
- May 15: Notification of Accepted Paper Abstracts
- May 31: Submission of Full Paper (max: 8,000 words inclusive of references & bibliography)

Paper abstracts and/or queries must be sent to:

The Cordillera Studies Center
University of the Philippines Baguio
Baguio City, Philippines
cordillerastudies@gmail.com
Tel/Fax:(63)(74) 442-5794

The seminar-workshop aims to produce a publication containing the papers presented at the seminar-workshop.

*Download the Concept Note at www.tebtebba.org*