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ENSURING INDIGENOUS PEOPLES’ RIGHTS AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE POST-2015 DEVELOPMENT AGENDA

By Galina Angarova
Policy Advocacy and Communications Advisor, Tebtebba

When you follow UN processes, you might as well get used to the idea that once in a while you have to stay overnight or even spend a couple of nights in the UN building, subsisting on junk food, waiting for endless hours, meeting with member states, strategizing with colleagues and catching up on sleep in Qatar Lounge that overlooks the East River.

It might seem romantic. But the romantic flavor quickly fades away, knowing that some major issues are at stake. The final hours before the reached consensus get filled with impatience, sometimes agony and frustration. But hope and a motivation to make the last and final push to include issues at stake into the final document remains high as ever.

Representatives of the Indigenous Peoples Major Group (IPMG)—Roberto Borrero, IITC (International Indian Treaty Council) and Galina Angarova, Tebtebba with support from the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues member Joan Carling—have been working tirelessly in the final two weeks, days and hours leading up to the adoption of the Post-2015 Development Agenda. The adoption finally occurred around 7:00 pm, NY time, evening of Sunday 2 August 2015.

The result of the intensive intergovernmental negotiations of
July 22 - August 2 is the universal agenda, which is comprised of the Sustainable Development Goals or SDGs (17 goals and 169 targets), as well as a political declaration, a chapter on means of implementation, and a conclusion on follow-up and review, which will be in effect for 15 years (Sept 2015 - Sept 2030).

It has been over two years since February 2013 that the Indigenous Peoples Major Group, supported by Tebtebba and its partners, has been actively engaged in the process of developing, formulating, and negotiating the Post-2015 Development Agenda. First, during phase I of the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development, and starting from January 2015 during phase II in the Post-2015 process.

Throughout the process, advocacy for indigenous peoples’ issues has been an uphill battle. In the outcome document of the Open Working Group adopted on July 19, 2014, within the 169 targets, there were only two references on indigenous peoples. One is under Goal 2 on “agricultural productivity and the incomes of small-scale food producers” where indigenous peoples were mentioned between commas along with women, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers. The second one was under Goal 4 on education, which reads to “ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples, and children in vulnerable situations.”

The IPMG had consistently proposed the inclusion of some of the most important issues for indigenous peoples, among which are the right to self-determined development; the right to lands, territories and resources; recognition of traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples; sustainable use and management of biodiversity resources; and respect for the free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) of indigenous peoples. However, none of these issues were recognized and included in the SDGs and even in the final night of the Open Working Group session. Under Goal 15, a target that contained FPIC was eliminated.

This fact reinforced our concerns and stressed the need for a total review on the newly-developed SDGs, especially on economic development, biodiversity and energy.

In order to prepare for the next phase of the SDGs and Post-2015 Development Agenda and ensure continuity of the program, in November 2014, following the adoption of the outcome document of the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples or WCIP, Tebtebba hosted a global consultation in Baguio City, Philippines on November 11-13, 2015, with participation of key indigenous leaders. The consultation was intended to identify key issues and opportunities to influence the Post-2015 development framework and develop indigenous peoples’ key targets and indicators to be used for advocacy in sessions of the Post-2015 process.

The main result was a position paper that was built upon the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), the WCIP Outcome Document, policy briefs, and statements. This paper is available for review on UN NGLS’s website: http://unngls.org/images/PDF/INDIGENOUS_PEOPLES_MAJOR_GROUP_Policy_Brief.pdf

Fast-forward to January of 2015—member states, UN agencies and Major Groups came together for the Post-2015 process to discuss and find a consensus on the outcome document, based on the 17 goals and 169 targets, the Secretary General’s Synthesis Report, and a Report of the Open Working Group.

The IPMG came to the process prepared and used the position paper with key targets and indicators as their main advocacy tool.
In January, during the stock-taking session, Roberto Borrero of the IITC delivered a statement on the importance of “leaving no one behind.” In February, the IPMG invited Grace Balawag of Tebtebba to represent and speak on behalf of the constituency during the session dedicated to the Political Declaration.

In March, during the session dedicated to goals and targets, Joan Carling of the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact or AIPP, in her capacity as UNPFII member, was able to do substantial advocacy work and have one-on-one meetings with member states. In April, Dr. Mirna Cunningham of CADPI (Centro para la Autonomía y Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas) represented the IMPG during the session on the means of implementation and global partnerships. In May, during the follow up and review session, Agnes Leina of Illaramatak Community Concerns in Kenya delivered a statement on monitoring and review.

Once the thematic discourses were over, member states went into the phase of the international negotiations. June and July sessions were our last opportunities to influence the outcome document and advocate for the inclusion of key issues for indigenous peoples.

On June 2, the co-chairs of the Post-2015 process, Permanent Representative of Kenya Macharia Kamau and Permanent Representative of Ireland David Donoghue, released the zero draft of the document.

The document contained almost no references to indigenous peoples except for the two already agreed upon targets under Goals 2 and 4.

It seemed that the voices of indigenous peoples, who have been consistently present and active during the process, were not heard. The document reflected minimal recognition of the role and right of participation of indigenous peoples in the in Addis were disastrous and could potentially influence and set the stage for poor results in the Post-2015 process. The main concerns from observers in the CSO community was that:

“[T]he Addis outcomes were deeply inadequate to support the operational Means of Implementation (MoI) for the Post-2015 Development Agenda as it did not contain the necessary leadership, ambition and practical actions. It failed to address international systemic issues in macroeconomic, financial, trade, tax, and monetary policies, while also failing to scale up existing resources and commit new financial ones.”

Throughout the process, advocacy for indigenous peoples’ issues has been an uphill battle.

It is necessary to mention here, however, that the Addis Ababa Action Agenda had some substantive references to indigenous peoples, and specifically on indigenous peoples’ traditional knowledge. In paragraph 117 it reads:

“...we recognize that traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous peoples can support social well-being and sustainable livelihoods and we reaffirm that indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions.”

---

1 Civil Society Response to the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing for Development.
Note from Galina Angarova (Tebtebba Foundation) and Roberto Mukaro Borrero (International Indian Treaty Council) on behalf of the Indigenous Peoples Major Group (IPMG):

The following are the direct references to indigenous peoples in the final revision of the Outcome Document for the Post-2015 Intergovernmental Negotiations entitled “Transforming Our World,” released on 1 August 2015. Member State delegations came to a consensus and adopted this document on Sunday, 2 August 2015 at 6:25 pm. The document will now move to the United Nations General Assembly for final ratification in September 2015.

In the section entitled “The New Agenda”

23. People who are vulnerable must be empowered. Those whose needs are reflected in the Agenda include all children, youth, persons with disabilities (of whom more than 80% live in poverty), people living with HIV/AIDS, older persons, indigenous peoples, refugees and internally displaced persons and migrants. We resolve to take further effective measures and actions, in conformity with international law, to remove obstacles and constraints, strengthen support and meet the special needs of people living in areas affected by complex humanitarian emergencies and in areas affected by terrorism.

---

1 “The Future We Want,” paragraph 49.
2 UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, paragraph 32.
25. We commit to providing inclusive and equitable quality education at all levels – early childhood, primary, secondary, tertiary, technical and vocational training. All people, irrespective of sex, age, race, ethnicity, and persons with disabilities, migrants, indigenous peoples, children and youth, especially those in vulnerable situations, should have access to life-long learning opportunities that help them acquire the knowledge and skills needed to exploit opportunities and to participate fully in society. We will strive to provide children and youth with a nurturing environment for the full realization of their rights and capabilities, helping our countries to reap the demographic dividend including through safe schools and cohesive communities and families.

In the section entitled “A call for action to change our world”

52. “We the Peoples” are the celebrated opening words of the UN Charter. It is “We the Peoples” who are embarking today on the road to 2030. Our journey will involve Governments as well as Parliaments, the UN system and other international institutions, local authorities, indigenous peoples, civil society, business and the private sector, the scientific and academic community – and all people. Millions have already engaged with, and will own, this Agenda. It is an Agenda of the people, by the people, and for the people – and this, we believe, will ensure its success.

In the chapter on Follow-up and review, section entitled National Level

79. We also encourage member states to conduct regular and inclusive reviews of progress at the national and sub-national levels which are country-led and country-driven. Such reviews should draw on contributions from indigenous peoples, civil society, the private sector and other stakeholders, in line with national circumstances, policies and priorities. National parliaments as well as other institutions can also support these processes.

Additionally, IPs remain in:

**Goal 2. End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture**

2.3 By 2030, double the agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment

**Goal 4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all**

4.5 By 2030, eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations.
INDIGENOUS PEOPLES MAJOR GROUP STATEMENT ON THE ROLE OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

Statement delivered at the high level segment of the HLPF 2015 on “changing approaches to policy making: the role of the SDGs”

Delivered by Galina Angarova
Policy Advocacy and Communications Advisor, Tebtebba

30 June 2015, UN, New York

Dear excellencies, representatives of member states, UN agencies, major groups,

My name is Galina Angarova and I am here as the representative of Tebtebba Foundation, an indigenous rights and education center and a Global Organizing Partner for the Indigenous Peoples Major Group to respond on the issue of integration of SDGs on all levels. I consider this to be an extremely important topic and thank the office of the ECOSOC President as well as UN DESA who have given me the opportunity to provide my comments on this issue.

I would like to speak on several points regarding the SDGs integration: First and foremost, I would like to send a message to everyone who has been and will be engaged in the formulation and the implementation of the SDGs, that it is necessary to check your ideas and aspirations about sustainable development against the reality. It’s important to sometimes go from the abstract and conceptual levels to
the levels of real people. Sitting in New York and philosophizing what the world should be without really experiencing the world, without knowing what lack of access to appropriate nutrition and clean water and air means, how it feels to be a second class citizen just because you have a different skin color or because you are a woman or because you are underaged.

Imagine that you are a young indigenous woman living in poverty in some rural area without access to education, basic health service and clean water and proper nutrition. The scariest fact is that this is not a hypothetical situation and people face multiple discrimination based on their gender, age, ethnic origin and what not and such situations can only be resolved in a holistic manner.

If these projects are environmentally safe, socially just and economically feasible.

Secondly, I would like to highlight the role of traditional knowledge in the context of SDGs. The Global Sustainable Development Report presented here as a basis of discussion, although very important, presents a one-dimensional view, from the point of view of science. It was mentioned yesterday during one of panels that science should present an integrated voice, but I think we should go even further—create an integrated voice of science and traditional knowledge. Traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples is millennial experiential knowledge based on the intimate relationship with their environment. It can be found in agricultural practices, land management, sustainable water use, engineering, architecture, medicine, food, seed banking, etc.

I believe that we need to not only support scientific research but promote effective sharing of information, knowledge, and research and combine local, traditional, and western science perspectives. We need to understand linkages between climate and land, water and people, biodiversity and traditional livelihoods. We have to closely integrated and failure in one aspect of life leads to the collapse of the entire system.

My third point is a reflection on chapter 2 of the Global Sustainable Development Report:

The Indigenous Peoples Major Group supports some of the findings of them scientific community presented in the report which notes that although “the SDGs offered major improvements on the MDGs, it also
pointed out the absence of scenario-based pathways towards the SDGs, and noted that “the level of integration is far lower than justified from a science perspective.”

The report recommends three solutions for integration within and across SDGs:

The first recommendation is the formulating an overarching goal can help communicating the SDGs to a wider public—to create “a prosperous, high quality life that is equitably shared and sustainable,” which highlights the need for new integrated economic metrics of progress beyond GDP and beyond the Human Development Index and other established aggregate indices.

We agree with this approach. Furthermore, we would like to stress the importance of having a universal mission for our mutual endeavor and have a clear understanding why we are doing this. The Indigenous Peoples Major Groups have stressed on numerous occasions that we need to fully integrate the measure of well-being and align SDGs and targets in a way that support human well-being from all three dimensions of sustainable development. This is why, for example, we have from the very beginning opposed a target under poverty eradication 1.1 by 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, currently measured as people living on less than US$1.25 a day.

Most indigenous peoples rely on non-monetary forms of income such as subsistence resources from hunting, gathering, pastoralism, and small-scale agriculture and farming, which make up to 90% of indigenous livelihoods.

Our concern is that the monetary measure of poverty can contribute to impoverishing indigenous peoples. For example, if a large agro-business comes to indigenous territories, removing indigenous peoples’ lands and resources, and indigenous communities are left with nothing but a choice to work for $3 a day for this business—on paper, they are meeting the SDG goal of eradicating poverty. In reality, they are taking away indigenous peoples’ livelihoods and pushing people into poverty. Thus, the concept and measure of well-being should be the cornerstone of SDG implementation.

The second recommendation of the report proposes a way to overcome the siloed approach by providing a composite framework to link interdependent targets that span different goals. While SDGs are presented as 17 separate elements, it is clear from the systems approach that goal areas overlap and it would be highly inefficient to pursue implementation on a goal by goal basis. Therefore, it’s extremely important to identify trade-offs and synergies among different targets as well as potential clashes and inconsistencies that might occur within targets when one target is achieved at the expense of the other.

The report itself gives a great example of a potential clash of targets such as achieving economic growth which can lead to increasing pollution, which would undermine some of the targets on health, water, and marine resources. We have to carefully examine each of the targets and their interlinkages and approach every decision on implementation having in mind all three dimensions of sustainable development.

For example, we currently have 1.3 billion people around the world with no access to electricity. How are we going to achieve the goal of providing these people with energy without building large infrastructure, further contributing to climate change, displacing and impover-
ishing indigenous peoples and local communities, and violating human rights? How do we make this right?

The only right way is to provide these people with safe, affordable, distributed and decentralized energy coming from renewable resources with all appropriate safeguards and mechanisms in place that check against stringent environmental, social and economic standards.

The third recommendation of the report proposes the development of scenario-based stories (or “narratives”) of alternative pathways toward the SDGs. It proposes creation of a UN SDG modellers forum to be held in conjunction with the High-level Political Forum. Such a forum could promote exchange of experiences among all interested SDG modellers and with decision-makers, from national to global scale. The only suggestion I would like to add here is that a forum like this should be open not only to modellers from the scientific community and policy makers but also other to types of knowledge holders such as indigenous peoples who are holders of traditional knowledge.

Finally, in relation to modalities, structure, and integrating SDGs and the three dimensions of sustainable development, at national, regional and international levels as well as the role of the HLPF in fostering policy coherence, I would like to point out that it’s critical that the HLPF guarantees a meaningful and effective participation of Major Groups and other stakeholders in the implementation of SDGs on all levels.

Additionally, Each UN-region should establish mechanisms for peer review, drawing on existing structures. These reviews should be comprehensive and transparent in their coverage of the Sustainable Development agenda - encompassing all SDGs, and their accompanying targets and means of implementation.

Finally, it would be fundamental to strengthen the mandate and the capacity of the HLPF by establishing an appropriate bureau consisting of Member States and representatives of major groups and other stakeholders for their guidance and political support, and a highly-skilled secretariat with enough resources and a clear structure to achieve all ambitions.

In conclusion, I would like to say that our planet is not only the stock pot of natural resources, it is also a territory of human lives, cultures and peoples who managed to create and sustain their day-to-day life, own system of management, values, which align with their natural environment. The world does not tolerate temporary solutions, people and approach. Investment into human dimension, development of human potential, education, health alongside with economic investment will guarantee long-term, innovative and sustainable development.

Our planet is not only the stock pot of natural resources, it is a territory of human lives, cultures and peoples who managed to create and sustain their day-to-day life, own system of management, values, which align with their natural environment.
Aug. 11, 2015/Quezon City, Philippines – “We lament the glaring invisibility of indigenous peoples’ situation and issues in the last State of the Nation Address (SONA) delivered by President Aquino (P’Noy). Five years have passed, we remain invisible to P’Noy.”

This was expressed by Datu Roldan Babelon, an indigenous Erumanen ne Menuvu from Cotabato, reflecting the sentiment of the other 78 women and men leaders from 38 indigenous communities in the Philippines who have gathered together to discuss and deliver their own State of Indigenous Peoples Address (SIPA).

“We are disappointed that we were directly mentioned only once in a speech that lasted 2 hours and 13 minutes, and only in the context of how the Alternative Learning System (ALS) has lessened the number of out of school youth among the indigenous peoples and street children. We reiterate that the ALS is a government program that is not meant specifically for indigenous peoples, and is not always implemented in a culturally-appropriate manner.”

Angelina Ortiz, an indigenous Mansaka from Compostela Valley, said that what they urgently demand is the recognition and respect for indigenous peoples’ schools that they have established themselves, or with assistance of support organizations.

“P’Noy should see and recognize our efforts in providing education for our own children through our own indigenous schools. But the military comes and questions us, and accuses us of being subversives. They camp out in our schools, and harass our teachers.”

According to the SIPA, from 2011 to 2015 alone, there have been 82 documented incidences of military violations involving 57 schools in Mindanao, in southern Philippines. The harassment of school administrators, teachers and community leaders
include threats, intimidation and even burning of school building. In his SONA, P’Noy reported the success of his Sitio Electrification Program (SEP), providing electricity even to the remotest areas. But the indigenous peoples’ groups said that while some indigenous communities have benefitted from this, they are not really the targeted beneficiaries of the program.

This electricity comes with the entry of ecotourism, hydropower and even landfill projects without the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples.

“There are indeed a lot of projects that are coming in to our ancestral domains, but most of these are not those that indigenous peoples want, or need,” Conchita Bigong, an indigenous Alangan-Mangyan from Mindoro Oriental, says. “One of these is large-scale mining, like that of Mindoro Nickel Project of Intex Resources. P’Noy, how can you not see how we do not like this project? I was part of the 10-day hunger strike against this, our provincial government has a 25-year moratorium on open-pit mines. We do not need this project. We want our land, rivers and remaining forest protected.”

Early this year, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources reinstated the Environmental Compliance Certificate of Intex Resources, which was suspended in 2010. The indigenous leaders also said that the President’s focus on infrastructure development, encouragement of domestic and foreign direct investments, and on modernization of the Armed Forces of the Philippines is alarming for them, especially in the context of increased pressure on their lands from extractive industries and the militarization and red-tagging of indigenous leaders that come with the entry of these corporations.

The Jalaur Multi-Purpose Dam is one of these infrastructures that P’Noy proudly announced in his SONA. He said that this year will see the groundbreaking for its stage 2. “How can the president not see that we have been opposing this project for years now? There has been no genuine free, prior and informed consent from the indigenous communities,” says Remia Pastor, an indigenous Tumandok from Iloilo. “The project will submerge 9 barangays. Does he not care about us?”

“For the past years that he was president, we have yet to feel his attention and care for indigenous peoples,” says Jennevieve Cornello, an indigenous Teduray woman leader from Upi, Maguindanao. “We have been raising our concerns in different ways on the peace process between the MILF and the government. Then, and now, we have said that there could be no genuine peace if our identity and rights as non-Moro indigenous peoples are not recognized and respected within the proposed Bangsamoro homeland. We felt we have been sacrificed in the name of peace with the MILF.” (The MILF or Moro Islamic Liberation Front is the main Muslim rebel group in Southern Philippines.)

According to the SIPA, “We recognize that the struggle of our Muslim brothers and sisters for peace and against oppression and historical injustice is a just struggle. But the right to self-determination of indigenous peoples is not lower than that of the Bangsamoro.”

The SIPA declared that the P’Noy administration has been blind to the plight of the indigenous peoples.

Jennifer Corpuz, a Kankanaey from the Cordillera and legal officer of Tebtebba, said that no concrete programs, with culturally-appropriate mechanisms, have been in place to truly address the poverty and vulnerabilities of indigenous communities.

“Instead, our lands and resources have been offered to lure foreign direct investments, and as battlefields for conflicts we are not part of.”

SIPA is an annual declaration of the indigenous peoples, in reaction to the President’s SONA. This year’s SIPA has been presented to the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, and to the different government agencies.

The 3-day event, in celebration of the International Day of the World’s Indigenous Peoples, was co-organized by Tebtebba, LILAK (Purple Action for Indigenous Women’s Rights), TFIP (Task Force on Indigenous Peoples Rights), PAFID (Philippine Association for Intercultural Development), LRC-FoE (Legal Rights Center) and MPPM (Mindanao Peoples Peace Movement).
The UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Ms. Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, conducted an informal meeting in Manila, Philippines on the Draft Bangsamoro Basic Law (BBL).

The July 15 informal meeting brought together several public opinion makers and indigenous peoples to share views and updates on developments regarding the draft bill.

The draft bill is envisioned to formalize the peace agreement between the Philippine government and the Muslim rebels in southern Philippines, led by the Moro Islamic Liberation Front or the MILF.

The draft bill, however, has stoked protests from affected Lumad, the indigenous peoples of southern Philippines.

The current version of the BBL already includes references to IPRA, but the MILF says that it would not “accept in principle” the inclusion of IPRA in the draft bill.

According to Timuay Alim Bandara, an indigenous Teduray, the peace process has not involved the Lumad in the “core” areas that will cover the proposed Moslem autonomous region.

These “core” areas will cover rebel-affected areas where ancestral lands of indigenous Teduray, Dulangan Manobo, Lambangian, Higaonon,
Erumanen ne Menuvu, and the B’laan are located.

One example cited by Datu Roldan Babelon of the indigenous Erumanen ne Menuvu is the case of the Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title or CADT given to the Erumanen-Menuvu in the province of Cotabato.

The CADT straddles lands that are both inside and outside the coverage of the planned autonomous region.

(A timuay or a datu are traditional leaders of Lumad tribes. The CADT is an instrument that legally recognizes an indigenous group’s ancestral domain.)

“If IPRA is not recognized, what happens now to our CADT within the autonomous region?,” he asked.

“If the BBL will pass, this has to be inclusive. This should recognize all our rights as indigenous peoples, specially our rights to our ancestral lands,” Timuay Bandara added.

He also expressed apprehension that if fighting resumes, they would again be caught in the middle of the almost 50-year insurgency.

According to representatives of legislators, there is still a long process that needs to be done in further refining and coming up with a consolidated draft law. Its passage, however, is expected in September this year.

Because of this, the Lumad are actively meeting legislators and policymakers with the support of indigenous peoples’ organizations and non-government organizations, including Tebtebba, a Philippine-based indigenous peoples’ institution.

For Timuay Bandara and Datu Babelon, full inclusion of their rights in the BBL is their battle cry.

**Implementing SR’s mandate**

In the informal meeting, the UN Special Rapporteur (UNSR), Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, said that the meetings and consultations were being done as part of her mandate, “which is to analyze the obstacles and barriers to the realization of the rights of indigenous peoples enshrined in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).”

“I am also mandated to look into good practices in terms of how States are protecting, respecting, and fulfilling the rights of indigenous peoples,” she added.

The Special Rapporteur is one of the special procedures of the Human Rights Council, the UN body that deals with human rights. The Special Rapporteurs, who are considered independent experts of the Council, analyzes how human rights in their specific mandates are being respected by governments.

In January 2015, the Lumad from affected areas requested an informal consultation with the UNSR on the peace process.

According to the UNSR, this initial meeting was a very good opportunity to hear what the views and the concerns of the Lumad are in relation to the peace process. In an article published in rappler.com (see “Non-Moro indigenous peoples aren’t second class citizens”), the Special Rapporteur raised her concern on the current draft of the law.

“There is a high risk of the BBL’s failure to bring about long-lasting peace if the recognition of their rights embedded in the IPRA remains ignored.”

She further added that “it is unacceptable to see a law, which relegates non-Moro indigenous peoples as second class citizens in their own ancestral domains and territories.”

She also said that more consultation with the Lumad need to take place, given that there were insufficient consultations with indigenous peoples undertaken by the Philippine government’s peace panel.

Thus, the legislative process in the Philippine Congress is a good opportunity for the Lumad to have a say on the draft law.

“It would be important to see the various positions and proposals and discuss ways and means of improving the draft BBL to ensure that it adequately protects and fulfills the rights of indigenous peoples in the core territory of the claimed Bangsamoro ancestral domain,” she added. 🌟
As I write this second part of my think piece, the ad hoc House committee already passed its version of House Bill No. 4994 through 50 yes votes. There were 17 representatives who voted no and one who abstained. I will comment on this draft House Bill now renamed as “An Act Providing for the Basic Law for the Bangsamoro and Abolishing the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao.”

In addition to the positive changes, which I mentioned in my first article, I welcome some of the changes found in this new draft. The language in Section 2(o) (Ancestral Domains/Ancestral Lands of the non-Moro indigenous peoples) of Article V (Powers of Government) is very much appreciated. These include the inclusion of the term “ancestral domains,” the transfer of this subsection away from Exclusive Powers to Concurrent Powers, the establishment of a Ministry for Non-Moro Indigenous Peoples, and the reference to RA 8371 or the Indigenous Peoples’ Rights Act (IPRA).

Affirming that the Bangsamoro government and the national government shall cooperate and coordinate through existing national laws such as IPRA to create policies for the identification, delineation, and titling of ancestral domains is crucial. This needs to be further
strengthened, however, to clearly state that the objective of the cooperation is to guarantee the recognition and protection of all the basic human rights of non-Moro indigenous peoples. These rights are listed in Article VIII, Section 5 of the draft. These are also enshrined in the IPRA and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

While these changes will put some balance in the draft bill, I still have a serious concern on an issue, which will derogate the rights of the non-Moro indigenous peoples.

Ancestral lands and domains

The concurrent powers exercised through IPRA and the basic rights of non-Moro indigenous peoples in Section 5, Article VIII are contradicted by this provision: The use of judicial affirmation as the means to recognize rights to land as stated in letter (d) of Section 4 (Other Exclusive Powers) under Article V. The Bangsamoro government is given the exclusive power to “recognize constructive or traditional possession of lands and resources by indigenous cultural communities subject to judicial affirmation... of imperfect titles under existing laws and this applies to ancestral lands.”

Judicial affirmation presumes that the ancestral domains or ancestral lands of non-Moro indigenous peoples are public lands, which they are only occupying and, thus, need judicial affirmation to confirm their rights over these lands. But it is not clear where this judicial affirmation will come from. Will this be from the Shar’iah Court, the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCCP) or the courts?

Ancestral domain and land rights of indigenous peoples are not the same as public lands occupied by landless informal settlers. “Native Title” as defined in IPRA “refers to pre-conquest rights to lands and domains, which, as far back as memory reaches, have been held under a claim of private ownership by ICs/IPs, have never been public lands and are thus indisputably presumed to have been held that way since before Spanish Conquest.” (Para 1, Chapter 11, Section 3, IPRA).

The “Native Title” or Cariño Doctrine, which is the foundation of ancestral domains and ancestral land rights and claims of indigenous peoples, and which has been mentioned several times in the draft approved by the ad hoc committee should not be interpreted or used in a way which will weaken this legal doctrine.

Judicial affirmation is not mentioned at all in the provisions of IPRA, particularly in Chapter III (Rights to Ancestral Domain) and Chapter VIII (Delineation and Recognition of Ancestral Domains).

IPRA states that self-delineation is the guiding principle in the identification and delineation of ancestral domains. Well defined principles, policies, and procedures are laid out in Chapter VIII (13 sections) for the delineation of ancestral domains and ancestral lands.

The non-Moro indigenous peoples should have the option to choose which system they will use for the recognition and delineation of their ancestral domains and ancestral lands.

It is my view that judicial affirmation as used in this draft undermines the rights of the non-Moro indigenous peoples to their ancestral domains and ancestral lands, and their rights to natural resources contained in the IPRA and the UNDRIP.

The draft law mentioned that a law will be enacted by the

The non-Moro indigenous peoples should have the option to choose which system they will use for the recognition and delineation of their ancestral domains and ancestral lands.
Bangsamoro Parliament, which recognizes rights of non-Moro indigenous peoples to natural resources within their native titles as provided for in Section 11, Article XII. This law should be coherent with the standards set in the UNDRIP and in the IPRA.

I view with great concern the comment of MILF chief negotiator Mohagher Iqbal, who said that “among the amendments so far made to which the MILF did not ‘accept in principle’ was the inclusion of the Indigenous Peoples’ Rights Act in the proposed Bangsamoro law.”

He also mentioned that IPRA was not part of the peace deal. This indicates that there is more work to be done.

Clearly, the strong lobby mounted by affected indigenous peoples from Mindanao and their support groups and the efforts of Congresswoman Nancy Catamco and other House members led to the changes. I congratulate them for these achievements.

I hope that the next processes such as the plenary will address the concerns I raised. I also hope that technical working groups will be established by the Senate, ensuring the full and effective participation of the leaders and representatives of the non-Moro indigenous peoples.

It is very unfortunate that this meaningful participation was not seen in the processes undertaken by the ad hoc committee.

I am hopeful that good faith and a sincere commitment to uphold the rights of indigenous peoples will guide the path towards the final enactment of the Bangsamoro Law.

Equality and non-discrimination still remain the bedrock of International Human Rights Law. Therefore, it is unacceptable to see a law which relegates non-Moro indigenous peoples as second class citizens in their own ancestral domains and territories.


Victoria Tauli-Corpuz is the current United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, appointed by the UN Human Rights Council for this mandate from 2014-2017. She is an independent human rights expert focusing on indigenous peoples’ rights and women’s rights. She is an indigenous person, a Kankana-ey Igorot, from the Mountain Province in the Cordillera Region, Philippines.
When we speak of business, we want a production that respects Mother Earth and does not distort our reality.

-Jose Luis Montenegro
Lila inspects the bags and the shawls, and counted them again. Are they complete? Are the buttons of the flap bags intact?

She does her usual rounds, making sure that every one of her products are in order. As a Dayak entrepreneur from Indonesia, she is used to this task.

As Lila counts the bags and packs them carefully to be delivered to the market later, a group of 29 indigenous community representatives are meeting in the Manila, Philippines to exchange stories on how their communities’ lives are changing.

The participants come from different indigenous peoples’ organizations and communities from Africa, Latin America and Asia who belong to a global network called the Indigenous Peoples’ Global Partnership on Climate Change, Forests and Sustainable Development.

According to Tebtebba, a Philippine-based global indigenous institution, the global partnership is composed of 17 partners from 13 countries in Asia, Latin America and Africa.

Tebtebba organized the workshop for partners to share experiences on how indigenous communities are implementing their livelihoods using their age-old traditional knowledge that foster care for the environment and the climate.

This includes looking into experiences that work, and how communities, including the women and youth, are transforming themselves to be self-reliant communities.

The participants are listening carefully and they learned about different livelihoods that the participants are doing in their own communities.

Bead making, beekeeping, cardamom planting, cinnamon tea marketing, natural dyeing, cocoa production, native fish cultivation, coffee business are just some of the livelihoods shared by other indigenous participants.

There are also indigenous communities who are reviving their traditional farming, strengthening their customary governance, and securing and mapping their ancestral lands.

Providing equal opportunities for all

Traditionally, women’s work have no monetary rewards,” said Anice Rimaro Barzola of CHIRAPAQ (Center of Indigenous Cultures of Peru).

Back in Indonesia, Lila is looking at her notebook. She is mulling about their cinnamon drink the previous day. The market demand has steadily grown in the past couple of months.

“This means, good business,” she said to herself satisfactorily.

She used to be an ordinary housewife, doing household chores day in and day out. It is not that she does not love her family, but she learned that having economic rewards for the things she loves doing most feels empowering.

Meanwhile in Manila, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Ms. Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, seemed to have a connection with Lila because what she said next in the workshop are the exact things Lila would have wanted to say.

“Our work on sustainable livelihoods is clearly meant to empower our own communities and to challenge the dominant economy… that allowed our discrimination as indigenous peoples," she stated.

The livelihood activities presented by the participants showed substantial participation of women.

For example, the Maasai women of Kenya who are into bead making were able to earn around US$7,000.00 from their products that were sold at the local market, according to James Twala of ILEPA (Indigenous Livelihoods Enhancement Partners based in Kenya).

Aside from the economic opportunities of cotton and
There is actually no single recipe to doing a successful business. But Redhani asserted that business happens when people stop thinking about taking free from others.

“If you respect a product, you should pay. If you expect something free, you should work. We should stop thinking about taking free from others,” he asserted.

On the other hand, Mairena broached the possibility of doing business through implementation of local fairs and market. “Communities coming and exchanging products in a very dynamic and fun way are a great option,” he proposed.

Meanwhile, Telma Marques da Silva of the Conselho Indigena de Roraima, Brazil said that business is not only about making more money. Rather, this is more about empowerment.

“I am emotional because women in my community need this kind of support very much for our own empowerment,” she clarified.

Balancing economy and culture

Whether they are assisting indigenous peoples to claim legal rights over their territories, reviving traditional forest management systems or marketing
Products using indigenous designs - AMAN, Indonesia. Photo credit: AMAN

Yanesha Women Project on recovery of natural cotton, enhancing natural dyeing techniques, development of textiles and products - CHIRAPAQ, Peru. Photo credit: CHIRAPAQ

Cacao production involves indigenous women of Maco, Compostela Valley - SILDAP, Philippines. Photo credit: SILDAP
indigenous products, all the participants agreed that they have to ensure proper balance between traditional economies and the capitalist market.

Ms. Tauli-Corpuz reminded the participants that indigenous peoples do not live in isolation. As such, they need to define their relationship with the world that is still dominated by a capitalist economy.

The participants were in a resounding agreement that there is a need to move away from the capitalists’ perspective of doing business. They reckoned that the capitalist market is a major culprit of the marginalization of indigenous knowledge and technologies.

“We own our designs, we need not follow the capitalist market, BUT we create our own,” Dennis Mairena emphasized.

For Jose Luis Montenegro, some indigenous peoples have lost their identity as a result of the capitalist economy.

Thus the need to build an economy that is based on indigenous peoples ways and structures.

The workshop focused on how indigenous peoples view their development—one that is holistic, sustainable and determined by them. Thus, development cannot just be economic or social, it has to be comprehensive. It should include other important parts that make up a whole—components such as the environmental, gender and intergenerational dimensions, human rights and culture.

“[I]ndigenous peoples have contributed a lot to sustaining the world through our values, but all of these were considered backward, superstitious and obsolete. [W]e are trying to contribute to challenging the orthodoxies… and this work is so crucial because it will determine if we will be able to protect our lands, forests, our cultures and our total well-being,” the Special Rapporteur commented.

Lila straightened her back and stood up. She shook hands with almost everyone in the room. She just finished a sustainable livelihood meeting with her organization.

“Indigenous peoples’ sustainable, self-determined development,” Lila whispered to herself as she walked away from the room. That is how they call it. For me, I will call it, “The future I want for my children,” she notes. She checks the table one last time. The bags are gone and so are the shawls. Lila smiles contentedly.
The Global Steering Committee (GSC) of the Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (DGM) held its first annual meeting last July 25-27, 2015 in Bali, Indonesia to discuss key issues in relation to the implementation of the fund.

The DGM is under the Forest Investment Program (FIP) of the World Bank’s Climate Investment Fund (CIF) and is supported by the Conservation International (CI) as the Global Executing Agency (GEA).

The GSC serves as the main decision-making body on the planning and implementation of the global program component. This component serves as a platform for knowledge-sharing and capacity building on REDD Plus and climate change issues for indigenous peoples and local communities at regional and global levels, that will help them effectively participate in REDD Plus implementation at national and subnational levels.

(REDD Plus—Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation, enhancement of forest carbon stocks, conservation and sustainable management of forests—is a climate change mitigation measure.)
Prior to this meeting, the DGM had a Global Transitional Committee, which held its preparatory meetings in 2012 and 2014.

The 3-day meeting had a full agenda, starting with an update report of the global component of the DGM by the co-chairs of the GSC and Conservation International (as the GEA). The report focused on the participation on global activities in relation to the information sharing and progress on the DGM as one example of an innovative fund support dedicated for indigenous peoples and local communities.

The National Steering Committee (NSC) representatives, on the other hand, provided update reports from each of the pilot countries in the formation of the NSCs, selection of their National Executing Agencies, their programs and plans, as well as on the challenges that they face and how they proposed to resolve these. The World Bank staff gave an update report on the processes being done in Lao PDR and Ghana on the formation of their NSCs. The staff also reported on the new FIP countries with DGM country allocations, which was approved by the FIP Subcommittee in their May 2015 meeting.

**FIP Pilot Countries**

Brazil, Mexico, Peru, Democratic Republic of Congo, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Indonesia, and Lao PDR.

6 additional new FIP Pilot Countries as of May 2015: Ecuador, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Republic of Congo, Mozambique, and Nepal

**The DGM Global Steering Committee Members**

- Grace Balawag, Co-Chair (Tebtebba, Philippines, Non-FIP Country)
- Kapupu Diwa Mutimanwa, Co-Chair (REPALEAC, Democratic Republic of Congo)
- Zeba Idrissa (Fondation Naturama, Burkina Faso)
- Januario Tseredzaro Rurio (Mobilização dos Povos Indígenas do Cerrado, Brazil)
- Manuel Aldrete (Consorcio Chiclero de Quintana Roo y Campeche, Mexico)
- Jamner Manihuari (AIDESEP, Peru)
- Mina Susana Setra (AMAN, Indonesia)

*Note: Representatives of the NSCs of Ghana and Lao PDR have not been selected in time for the first GSC meeting.*

**Excerpt from the DGM Operational Framework Guidelines**

The DGM is a global initiative that was conceived and developed as a special window under the Forest Investment Program (FIP) to provide grants to Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) intended to enhance their capacity and support initiatives to strengthen their participation in FIP and other REDD Plus processes at the local, national and global levels.

2. Projects and programs under the FIP are designed and implemented under the leadership of the governments of FIP pilot countries, with the assistance of the Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs). The DGM Design was developed by a working group of IPLCs, facilitated by the CIF Administrative Unit (AU). The program will be implemented in the eight FIP Pilot Countries through Country Grants Projects, under an overarching umbrella of a Global Component, which will serve as the learning and knowledge-exchange platform for the DGM. The World Bank has the responsibility to operationalize the Global Component as well as seven of the Country Grants Projects in seven FIP pilot countries. These Framework Guidelines for the DGM define the common framework for implementation of the DGM and will serve as guidance to all stakeholders participating in the program, including FIP Focal Points in the countries, the National Executing Agencies (NEAs), members of the National Steering Committees (NSCs), the Global Executing Agency (GEA) and Global Steering Committee (GSC) of the DGM, civil society, IPLCs, CIF AU and the MDBs.
After the update reports, the GSC reviewed the draft “Rules of Procedure for the function of the GSC” and the “Grievance Mechanism Process” in cases of verified complaints on the DGM. Both draft documents will be revised and adopted in accordance with discussions and decisions made by the GSC.

The next session focused on the draft “Strategic plan for Global Project (5 years)” and “Work Plan and Budget (1 year).” Both draft documents provided detailed plans and budget that were prepared by Conservation International, based on the Global Component Program submitted and approved by the World Bank, and presented at the last Global Transitional Committee of the DGM in September 2014.

All these draft documents were discussed lengthily with comments and recommendations that will be integrated on the revisions of the documents. These would be approved by the GSC after circulation within one month for comments and revisions agreed. The documents will then be finalized and approved by the GSC though email and circulated accordingly to relevant bodies.

After the business meeting, observers were also requested to provide their feedback on the GSC meeting, with their recommendations for the improvement of future meetings and future actions of the GSC. Observers included representatives from the World Bank Team, CIF-Administrative Unit, Royal Norwegian Embassy in Indonesia, Conservation International, and NEA staff from Samdhana Institute for Indonesia, and from Centro de Agricultura Alternativa Do Norte de Minas of Brazil.

This first GSC-DGM meeting was hosted by the Indonesia National Steering Committee and was attended by GSC members from five of the eight FIP Pilot countries. The next meeting in 2016 will be hosted by the National Steering Committee in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

Excerpts from the DGM Framework Operational Guidelines, September 2012

The DGM Framework Operational Guidelines define the common framework for implementation of the DGM and will serve as guidance to all stakeholders participating in the program, including FIP Focal Points in the countries, the National Executing Agencies (NEAs), members of the National Steering Committees (NSCs), the Global Executing Agency (GEA) and Global Steering Committee (GSC) of the DGM, civil society, IPLCs, CIF AU and the MDBs. The DGM is a global initiative that was conceived and developed as a special window under the Forest Investment Program (FIP) to provide grants to Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) intended to enhance their capacity and support initiatives to strengthen their participation in FIP and other REDD+ processes at the local, national and global levels.

The governance framework of the DGM is described as a whole, with the specific key roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders involved, under. It also shows the interrelationship among the institutions involved in governance and management of the DGM. The key constituents of this structure are the two Steering Committees—the National Steering Committee (NSC) and the Global Steering Committee (GSC), which are the main decision-making bodies. Both Committees are comprised primarily of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities as decision-making members. This is a defining feature of the DGM, where IPs/LCs have a key decision-making role in the program with active support from governments and MDB members.
On Thursday, Pope Francis will issue a highly anticipated encyclical on man, religion and the environment, a text that is expected to influence the outcome of the Paris climate talks in December.

We know already what side he is on. During a January visit to typhoon-ravaged villages in the Philippines—my home country—he called on humanity to protect the earth, which he called “a beautiful garden for the human family.” And he captured headlines last year when he called the destruction of South America’s rainforests a “sin.”

To the world’s 370 million indigenous peoples, many of whom live in overlooked and remote corners of the world, the Pope’s words offer hope—regardless of whether they share his spiritual beliefs. As some of the first victims of climate change by virtue of their dependence on the world’s natural resources, these communities are finding themselves on the front lines of the environmental crisis. They are playing David against governments and developers eager to destroy their pristine forests, fields and streams to build mines, dams and agricultural plantations, all in the name of what the Pope calls a “throw-away” economic system.
Far too many indigenous activists have become martyrs of this movement. A recent Global Witness report estimated that last year alone, 116 environmental activists died while trying to protect their lands from developers, as well as illegal loggers, drug traffickers and others whose criminal activities destroy our forests. Among these mostly indigenous fighters were seven activists from Argentina, the Pope’s homeland.

Ecuador, of course, was host to one of the first and most notorious cases of environmental violence against forest-dwelling indigenous peoples. Between the 1970s and the 1990s, Chevron knowingly dumped billions of gallons of toxic waste and oil into the rivers in the Ecuadorian Amazon, destroying streams, forests and farmlands and inflicting birth defects, cancer and poverty on six indigenous groups living there.

These groups fought back with lawsuits in the U.S. and Ecuador, but after more than two decades of protracted court battles, Chevron has failed to concede it did wrong. This case revealed to the world the agonizing difficulty of providing a level playing field to indigenous peoples, who are most vulnerable to climate change, and most vital in finding a way to slow it down. Yet the case hasn’t succeeded in stopping the violence that continues to endanger indigenous peoples.

Though often framed by land developers and government officials in some countries as a selfish refusal to embrace modernity and a new way of life, this quest to save indigenous lands and forests is motivated by a profound spiritual belief in the need to protect Mother Earth. Whether the voices come from the indigenous communities of Paraguay’s threatened Chaco forests or the First Nations of Canada, I hear the same message on every continent: Forest peoples seek to honor the spirits of our elders and ensure that future generations can preserve their traditions and lifestyle.

Their work benefits us all. Curbing the activities of large corporations that grab and destroy our lands means reducing the amount of carbon dioxide released into the atmosphere. Preventing deforestation helps, too: Forests function like the planet’s lungs, filtering and cleaning the air. Studies have shown that the 513 million hectares of forests that indigenous communities protect store 37.7 billion tons of carbon, making indigenous peoples a potent and valuable weapon in global efforts to end climate change.

In recent speeches on the climate, the Pope has stressed humanity’s duty “to till the earth and to keep it.” For centuries, indigenous peoples who sustainably manage their forests have embodied this harmonious relationship between people and their natural surroundings. Communities across the globe have successfully “kept” their forests while “tilling” them with the utmost care to secure sustainable income sources, from wild honey and wax to fruits and fish. They take just enough to live and thrive—nothing more.

The Pope would certainly agree that indigenous peoples offer invaluable lessons to a world seeking a sustainable future that eschews what he calls the “plunder” of nature. It’s time for leaders, CEOs and investors who say they care about the environment to finally acknowledge that indigenous peoples are a major part of the solution to global warming. And governments, on their part,
should grant indigenous peoples strong, unambiguous rights over the land where they live. Researchers have shown that deforestation rates are significantly lower in community-managed forests where rights are strong and reinforced by local and national authorities.

The international community should take notice, too: The upcoming climate talks in Paris will fall short of reaching a comprehensive solution if negotiators do not acknowledge this link between indigenous rights and the health of the world’s natural resources.

As a member of the Kankanay Igorot in the Philippines, I, like the Pope, was deeply touched by the destruction left in the wake of Typhoon Haiyan. My indigenous brothers and sisters lost their homes, boats and livelihoods, and are recovering from the trauma still. They live simple, sustainable lives, in harmony with the forests, oceans and mountains around them, yet end up bearing the worst effects of climate change.

They are not alone. In the Andes of Peru, melting glaciers threaten the lives of the indigenous Quechua, and in the northern stretches of Scandinavia and Finland, Sami herders are seeing reindeer populations drop as the weather warms. And in the Amazon forests of Ecuador, Brazil and Bolivia, indigenous peoples are finding their rainforests are drying out.

We hope that having a visionary Pope on our side will help the world to realize that it is best for indigenous peoples, the environment and the rest of humanity when we are free to focus on preserving our collective “beautiful garden” for future generations—instead of fighting for our lives.

Miguel Bikan, a little known Miskito indigenous community in Waspam under the Regional Autonomous Government of the North Atlantic (RAAN) in Nicaragua, has finally mapped its territories and through this had settled demarcation of boundaries with neighboring communities.

Under the law of the government of Nicaragua, the whole of RAAN is an indigenous territory but its people have to map and demarcate 31 territories and settle boundary disputes between communities.

Miskito leader Rose Cunningham, director of Wangki Tangni, a community development organization concerned with indigenous rights and development, thus helped organize 23 communities of Miguel Bikan to map their lands.

These communities were chosen because they have an existing communal forest management system. They are also a partner of the Center for

---

1 This author and a colleague, Grace Balawag, visited communities of Tebtebba's partner-organization, Center for Indigenous Peoples' Autonomy and Development or CADPI, in Nicaragua on October 1-8, 2013. We visited Waspam and Miguel Bikan, both in RAAN (North Atlantic Autonomous Region).
Indigenous Peoples’ Autonomy and Development or CADPI (as it is known by its Spanish acronym), a research and educational center for indigenous and Afro-descent communities on the North Atlantic coast of Nicaragua.

CADPI is a partner-organization of Tebtebba under the Indigenous Peoples’ Global Partnership on Climate Change, Forests and Sustainable Development. The mapping activity was undertaken with support of Tebtebba through funding provided by the Climate and Land Use Alliance or CLUA.

To prepare for the mapping exercise, the organizers consulted first the communities—who included the elders, women, youth, church leaders and others—whether or not they would like to pursue the activity. The elders played a key role in providing stories and historical data of the communities.

Members of the communities finally agreed to collect data on their history, biodiversity, mountain area/watershed, traditional forest management plans and other details, all of which were needed to help substantiate the map.

For six months in 2013, these communities participated in the mapping exercise, which was also aimed at generating data about the state of their resources. Generated data could also help the communities in devising ways to help mitigate and adapt to the challenges of climate change.

The youth’s involvement during the exercise enabled them not only to become more aware about, but to appreciate more, their culture and traditions. Through the mapping exercise, the elders shared with and inculcated to the youth about how they learned at an early age the importance of protecting the forest from wanton uses. This was an awareness which, the elders stressed, could enhance both ecology and community life.

Through the mapping exercise, the communities in Miguel Bikan were able to set their territorial boundaries and settle boundary dispute with neighbors. Two other communities were also identified to be inside the territory of Miguel Bikan, but the original communities decided to let these two migrant communities stay.

The communities in Miguel Bikan consider the mapping exercise a success, but not without challenges. For example, they have yet to settle other border disputes with neighboring communities.

Today, the communities of Miguel Bikan are seeking help to strengthen their livelihood program and improve their “community school” where they can record, document and keep their indigenous knowledge alive and appreciated. Recognizing the significant role of the youth as the future keeper and user of knowledge, the communities...
have also outlined a program to revitalize their traditional songs and dances. But they need some support to do all these.

Still, the whole mapping exercise was considered a milestone among the Miskitu in Miguel Bikan. For one, the map the communities produced convinced government to recognize their territorial integrity. The map, they hope, would finally put the less known Miguel Bikan in the official government map.

The experience has also opened the eyes of other neighboring communities. As they came to know more about Miguel Bikan, they came to know and learn more about the importance of protecting forests and about the urgency of confronting climate change.

The name of the community, Miguel Bikan, and its recent success at community mapping resonates with something familiar—the story about how the community got its name.

A story was told about Miguel, who came to the community and saw its forests and other abundant resources. In no time, he felled trees for timber for his own use and other selfish interests.

The community found Miguel's acts unacceptable and elders warned him about the wrath of ancestors. If he continued with his selfish acts, Miguel, the elders warned, would be declared “persona non grata” or an unwelcome person in the community.

But Miguel failed to heed the warnings. He continued with his usual selfish ways and went on to exploit the community’s resources. One day, before he could continue to cut more trees, he was stricken with a serious disease, which eventually killed him.

The community believed that Miguel was punished by the gods of the forest. The local folk buried Miguel in the forest and from thereon their community was called Miguel Bikan, which means “buried Miguel.”

The story says that people of Miguel Bikan eventually prospered and their community became more peaceful as they revitalized their lands and forests once exploited by Miguel. But through the years, other outsiders, such as mestizos, continue to threaten the community folk, who have long protected their resources.

They also had struggled to have the government finally recognize their land and resources. With strong resolve, they assert that the community maps they did would finally convince government to help them determine their own kind of development as they cope with current issues such as climate change.
PARTICIPATING IN LEARNING BY DOING

By Maribeth V. Bugtong-Biano
Indigenous Women Program, Tebtebba

When I was endorsed to participate in the Indigenous Women’s Leadership School, I was excited to know what was in store for me. I was certain that the leadership school would be a very good avenue for me to be equipped with important life skills and knowledge.

The leadership school is one of the projects of the International Indigenous Women’s Forum. One of the programs under the leadership school is the Program on Human Rights and International Advocacy Skills that targets indigenous women activists and leaders from the different regions of the world.

I was one of the 27 indigenous women participants coming from the six regions of the world. It was encouraging to meet and learn from my fellow indigenous women-participants, given our diverse background and expertise.

The leadership school

Since the last week of January 2015, we went through three phases of the leadership school.

The first phase was an online learning process, facilitated by a virtual platform where we were introduced to international human rights instruments and treaty bodies and mechanisms of the United Nations relevant to indigenous peoples.

For example, we had topics about the ILO Convention No. 169, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (EMRIP).

The resource materials on specific topics were uploaded weekly and ques-
tions were posted in the virtual forum for participants to exchange their perspectives and experiences on a certain topic. The opinions and information provided by experts who were forked in every subject further clarified questions we posted.

Since the school aims at improving our advocacy skills, the major requirement was the development of an advocacy plan.

During this first phase, each participant identified specific issues or problems of their communities and designed an advocacy plan to address that certain problem. Formulating and building our own advocacy plan was guided by facilitators.

Learning at the UN

The skills program became more interesting at the second phase, which was conducted in New York from 13-17 April 2015, two days of which were spent at the United Nations Headquarters.

We learned how advocacy could be more effective, including negotiation techniques, which can be employed at the UN, from a diplomat's first-hand experience working at the UN.

Ms. Egriselda Arcely Gonzalez Lopez, Counselor, Permanent Mission of El Salvador to the United Nations emphasized that we should first study the UN organization, particularly the body which we are going to engage with.

Studying the outcome documents and specific resolutions adopted by the target body is also important.

Ms. Gonzalez Lopez also advised the group to know which State can table a resolution for a specific indigenous issue and who can guide in the passage of the resolution. Because civil society organizations have no direct access to the UN decision-making, she pointed out that it is best to look for windows of lobbying.

“Establish diplomatic relationship with government representatives and nurture it,” she further remarked.

“One thing more, study the positions of governments and dynamics of government blocks such as the European Union as this guide the group in approaching the representatives.”

Ms. Gonzalez Lopez also stressed the importance of getting updates from the websites of UN agencies to be informed of the submitted reports, inputs and so on, as well as the vitality of social media.

Because part of the leadership school is to build up the capacity of indigenous women leaders to sustain their local and national work, there was a session on fundraising.

Ms. Tia Oros-Peters, Director of the Seventh Generation Fund for Indian Development gave us inspiring tips and advices on fund raising.

“Whom are you getting your food for your body? What does the source want in return?”

She pointed out that traditional principles and values must be at the core of fund raising, not compromising values for money.

She posed another question, which I think is very important for every organization that works with indigenous communities to respond to: “What do you want to accomplish until the seventh generation of your people?”

The challenge of doing something that would sustain generations up to the seventh generation is real, and possible.
At Columbia University Law School, we had a 3-day seminar hosted by the university’s Institute for the Study of Human Rights (ISHR), Indigenous Peoples’ Rights Program.

Professor Elazar Barkan, the director of ISHR, walked us through the history of human rights which he claimed to have begun from antiquity and remains a controversial topic in its own right.

He remarked that human rights symbolizes and signifies the identity of the victim, which should be attended to. He further went on to elaborate the existence of redress and reparation as an attempt to amend the past violence.

In conclusion, he advised us to see what is the best human rights standard to be used. His challenge is for us to see towards where our advocacy is heading.

Professor Yasmine Ergas guided us in understanding the connection today of former US First Lady and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s remark during the Fourth World Conference of Women in Beijing: “Women’s rights are human rights, and human rights are women’s rights.”

She elucidated on the concept of equality and discrimination. Accordingly, there is discrimination when women’s rights are taken away from the whole gamut of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

We were also given an overview of indigenous communications media through film in Latin America by Professor Amalia Cordova of New York University. She stressed that indigenous film making as a part of advocacy is different from the Western practice.

Film making among indigenous peoples is a collective work, which is congruent to the collective process of indigenous peoples. The indigenous cinema evolved from collective pursuits and this makes it distinct as the indigenous media is an alternative media.

Furthermore, Professor Elsa Stamatopoulou, Director of the Indigenous Peoples’ Rights Program and former Chief of the Secretariat of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, made us understand where human rights is situated in international law.

She briefed us on the sources of international law, how human rights treaties are drafted, and the periods in human history when struggles for international human rights law occurred.

She said indigenous peoples have, in the processes, contributed to the concepts of collective rights.

Professor Stamatopoulou also emphasized that although the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) is not formally legally-binding, its stipulations are mandatory because these are customary laws found in existing treaties, which are binding. Thus, the UNDRIP is enforceable.

Moreover, she stressed that the UNDRIP is the boldest symbol of recognition of group rights and the indigenous peoples’ voices are alternative voice to the paradigms of globalization.

On the same discussion of human rights, Professor Stamatopoulou expounded on cultural rights particularly of indigenous peoples.

She claimed that cultural rights are the most neglected among human rights.

It is a collective right as boldly manifested through the UNDRIP and covered by other human rights covenants. As such, the State has the obligation to inform the larger society about the culture of indigenous peoples and the minorities, and not to sensationalize it.

Although the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) is not formally legally-binding, its stipulations are mandatory because these are customary laws found in existing treaties which are binding.
As businesses are coming into indigenous communities and territories and affecting indigenous peoples, we were made to clearly understand the linkage of business and human rights by Professor Joanne Bauer.

She showed us how the concepts of human rights evolved and gradually integrated into the corporate business enterprises.

There are now several frameworks or guidelines and standards set by corporate groups, including the UN, to oblige the business world to respect and protect the human rights of the people as well as to provide access to remedies by those aggrieved in the process.

The duty of the State to protect its peoples in the course of doing business by enterprises was also stressed by Professor Bauer.

Ms. Anne Fosty, UN former principal legal officer, shared her views on the UN’s actions on terrorism and promotion and protection of human rights while countering terrorism. This concern touches on the security issues of indigenous peoples’ advocates who have been accused of terrorism.

Ms. Fosty also echoed the findings of the UN Special Rapporteurs on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism that indigenous peoples are being criminalized and tagged as terrorists for fighting for their rights. Their fights for their land, territories and resources have been met with counterterrorism measures.

She suggested that one way to counter this is to inform and request the UN Special Rapporteur on terrorism to investigate. Other than that, to use other mechanisms, which are not necessarily on indigenous peoples, is helpful to respond to concerns on terrorism.

We were, once again, inspired by one of the women’s rights pillars in the person of Ms. Shulamith Khoenig, founding president of the People’s Movement for Human Rights Learning (PDHRE) and recipient of the 2003 Human Rights Award.

“When did you realize your human rights? When did you realize your human rights are violated?”

These were the questions she laid to bring us to reflect on our own understanding of what human rights are and our experiences on these rights.

“Simply, human rights is a way of life; it is not a law,” she said.

It is a vision with practical mission and to be spoken of, not on the basis of violation, but on its realization.

She challenged us to introduce the study of human rights in the communities as a way of life.

Mr. John Scott from the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Secretariat briefed us on the developments at the CBD which are specifically relevant to indigenous peoples.

There are current work on the effective implementation of CBD Article 8j and 10c.

He also updated the body on the progress of using indicators relevant to indigenous peoples such as language diversity, traditional occupation, land tenure and others.

He emphasized that indicators are important to show that programs are working. Moreover, there are now several key UN agencies that are interested to collaborate to be able to come up with indigenous indicators.

Interspersed with the inputs of speakers at the UN Headquarters and at Columbia University were the presentations of advocacy
plans by the leadership school participants.

Dr. Mirna Cunningham, who is an advisor of FIMI and main facilitator of the face-to-face learning process, together with invited experts provided constructive comments on the advocacy plans.

Doing advocacy at the UNPFII

Our excitement and enthusiasm reached a high point as the practical part of the advocacy skills training approached.

While at the lecture series and advocacy plan discussions, we had been working together in organizing our side events during the 14th session of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) in April.

What we eagerly prepared for were our own statements or interventions on the topics of the session. Our preparatory meeting, including our participation in the Indigenous Peoples Global Caucus meeting, guided us in formulating our interventions.

To develop our interventions, we studied the concept notes and exchanged ideas until the final form came out. Everybody was eager to read the statements in the plenary.

Despite being first timers at the UNPFII session, our inexperience pushed us to observe and follow through the discussions and attend several side events.

More advocacy opportunities were made possible through our meetings with Ms. Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and Ms. Gladys Acosta, member of the CEDAW (Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women) Committee.

Identified key issues of indigenous women were presented to them by the selected speakers from the group.

The third phase, which commenced after the activities in New York in April, was the implementation of the advocacy plans.

Importance of continuing education

My participation has indeed brought me to some realizations.

One, continuing education is very important even if I am not as fully engaged in advocacy as I could be.

Knowing and understanding further the developments, such as decisions at the UN level relevant and important to indigenous peoples, help me become more connected to my work in relation to indigenous women.

I also understand the challenge of reconciling what is being achieved or fought for at that level and the realities on the ground.

There are gazillions of issues being met by indigenous peoples in their communities but only few words or paragraphs are allotted for them, if they are even successful in getting their voices heard and included in whatever talks and decisions arrived at.

On the other hand, it is inspir-
The school is a venue for learning, re-learning and unlearning.

But for Jaime Dugao, an indigenous Applai, the Philippine educational system falls short of indigenous peoples’ expectations.

“We are taught to go to school and study well to earn a degree and be qualified for a job. Period. Our identity as an Igorot and our community is divorced from what is usually taught in school,” Jaime Dugao an indigenous Applai elder lamented.

Dugao spoke in a training workshop on “Indigenous Ways of Learning and Knowing” held in Sagada, northern Philippines.

No less than the head of Philippine Department of Education (DepEd), Secretary Armin Luistro, shares this view.

“We have been mis-educated by a system that perpetuates cultural oppression… which we need to change to undertake reforms,” stated Sec. Luistro, during the Indigenous Peoples’ Day Celebration in 2014.

Thus the DepEd adopted the National Indigenous Peoples’ Education Policy Framework, otherwise known as the Enhance Basic Education Act of 2013.

The Indigenous Peoples Education (or IPEd) spells out the need for an inclusive, relevant, culture-sensitive, contextualized and flexible curriculum.

As such, the department has designated focal persons and coordinators in all the schools in the country for the full implementation of the curriculum.
But with the new curriculum, the 41 teachers-cum-IPEd coordinators from Sagada and other municipalities of Mountain Province who attended the training workshop are hopeful for a better appreciation by the younger generation of their values and cultures as indigenous peoples.

During the training organized by Tebtebba in June 2015, the participants displayed very strong sense of identity and belonging to a territory.

The teacher participants said that traditional baptism rituals (gubbaw), inayan (community taboos), kasiyana (be hopeful, all is going to be well), ayyew (don’t waste resources) and ub-ubbu (helping one another) are only a few of the values that they hold dear as indigenous peoples.

Most of them said they are proud to have been nurtured within a sense of community solidarity (menka-kailyan), respect for elders, cooperation and love of work.

However, the teachers expressed fears in the changing values of the youth where respect for elders and the culture are weakening.

“Adi getken nan ungung-a ay mangsagong sin nagapuan da. Adi da pay respetoen ya dengn-gen nan sululo nan amam-a.” (The youth do not want to return to where they come from. They don’t respect and listen to the teachings of their elders.)

There is also lack of appreciation by the young generation on the link of the past to the present and future.

These changes and differing views have created a major intergenerational gap.

Teachers experience difficulties in their search and efforts to document appropriate knowledge that are more relevant to indigenous peoples.

In the training, comparison of the difference between western and indigenous ways of learning and knowing was presented.

The comparison was seen in terms of five aspects: what is considered as knowledge, where people learn, how people learn, from whom people learn, and what is the purpose of education.

The emphasis was more on the indigenous ways of learning and knowing since this is what is new to the teacher-participants. Different ways to improve indigenous competencies were also presented.

The participants expressed that the concept of “indigenous ways of learning and knowing” can be confusing and are different from what they were taught as teachers.

One teacher aptly said, “[T]he perspective of indigenous peoples that everything is animate is really confusing because this goes against the discipline of natural science.”

He said he has been teaching natural science classes for quite sometime.

“In biology, we classify things according to living and non-living. So when we say everything is animate, then we challenge our western science. As an indigenous person, I know that the soil and the rocks have life.

“But I used to see my perspective as an Igorot as something separate from what I should be.

Source: IRR of the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013
teaching inside the classroom,” he added.

Marie Ngoddo of Tebtebba assured the teachers that it is all right to be confused as this is part of learning.

“When the confusion as an opportunity to take a pause from all the information received during trainings and allow them to settle down in the mind. Learning is also about taking time to digest information.”

Community Research and Documentation

Meanwhile, the teacher participants expressed their need for contextualized and culture-sensitive and appropriate materials for IPEd. The need to consider the indigenous ways of learning and knowing and to develop models more relevant to specific indigenous communities would entail research and documentation and this is not new in the teaching profession.

However, there is a need to rectify the errors of doing research as pure data extraction by the researchers and treating knowledge holders as mere informants or objects of research.

There is an urgent need for a paradigm shift of making research an educational process for both the researchers and knowledge holders.

The participants agreed that community research should go beyond extraction of information but rather a process of a dialogue around a knowledge system for both (researcher and knowledge holders) to gain a higher level of knowledge.

Most of the teacher-participants are already conducting their community documentation and they learn the value of community involvement in doing these.

“This is to recognize the fact that, generally speaking, the knowledge of indigenous peoples has been collectively developed through generations of exchange of ideas, experiences from practice, collective discussions and passed on from generation to generation,” one teacher elaborated.

For the longest time, we have been taught to go to school so that we become successful. But in the process, we forgot the value of an ili (community)—that is, we have to learn to be able to help our community.” - Tadian IPEd Teacher

Participatory action research is an ideal approach to social researches but has not seen much implementation to date.

Challenges of IPEd

Time constraint and knowledge limitation among teachers are among the major challenges of IPEd.

Teaching must be perceived as vocation and not just a source of income.

As such doing the job 24 hours a day, 7 days a week is not enough to be able to live up to the vision and mission of the Department of Education.

Having been taught in the present education system, which caters to the western way, teachers also need time to contribute to the process of “decolonization” of the educational system for cultural renewal.

There is also a felt lack of appreciation by the community, elders and other knowledge holders on the need for their expertise in the educational curriculum.

This can be attributed to the long history of discrimination of traditional knowledge as something inferior to western knowledge.

As such, some regard the need to document their knowledge as “waste of time.”

The rejecting attitude of the youth is probably the most significant challenge in IPEd.

The teacher-participants shared that there is an apparent lack of interest among the students in learning traditional knowledge.

The teachers added that attempts to motivate them in learning traditions are more often met with outright defiance as the youth think these are “id
kasindiyu (old-fashioned) and are no longer important.

Aside from hesitation of elders and the youth, there are also practical considerations such as a) risks in bringing the children outside the four walls of the classroom, b) how to encourage traditional knowledge holders to act as resource persons and how to compensate them for their time, and c) to work out the needed support from concerned office within DepEd.

**The bright IPEd future ahead**

It was inspiring though that against all odds, the teachers expressed commitment to indigenize the educational curriculum and to take advantage of modern technologies.

The participants recommended a thorough education and conscientization process. This, however, would need the cooperation of all sectors of the community.

They also committed to come out with appropriate instructional materials.

The major challenge they see is the research and documentation process.

This should be given enough time and resources so as not to be just a “tungpal bilin” (for compliance) as results are intended to educate and contribute to molding minds of future generation and re-integrating indigenous ways of learning and knowing as a long-delayed process.

While there are limitations within their control, the participants are willing to continue to practice the KSB or “kaut sa bulsa” (they shell out personal money for school expenses) to give solution to the problem of KSB or “kulang sa budget” (lack of budget).

This, they said, would be one of their contributions to advancing promotion of traditional knowledge in the formal education system.

For Jaime Dugao, the IPEd is a good opportunity to interface indigenous culture into the educational curriculum.

“We recognize that there are many things that children have to learn from the classroom to be competitive. But inside the classroom, they also have to learn that they are not different individuals in and outside the room. They are the same. So whatever it is that they learn in their homes and in the community, these should be complemented by the things they learn from the classroom,” he reiterated.
1. Support efforts of partner indigenous organizations and communities in Asia, Africa and Latin America to develop and implement their sustainable, self-determined development plans.

2. Enhance capacities of partner indigenous peoples’ organizations, networks and communities to monitor how indigenous peoples’ rights are being respected, protected and fulfilled and are able to effectively use the Special Rapporteur mechanism and UN treaty bodies as well as complaints and grievance mechanisms of multilateral development banks.

3. Work with partners to establish community participatory monitoring and information processes in partner indigenous communities to show how indigenous peoples’ rights and knowledge are respected and fulfilled at the global and national levels.

4. Further develop and enhance the organizational capacity of Tebtebba and secure adequate funds to be able to effectively implement its programs and priorities.
The implementation of Tebtebba’s work in the past several years has been guided by a holistic framework that we believe best reflects indigenous peoples’ lifeways and worldviews. This is the Integrated Holistic Approach to Indigenous Peoples’ Sustainable, Self-Determined Development or IHA-IPSSDD.

The IPSSDD framework integrates various approaches that puts human rights and indigenous peoples’ rights as central to development; territorial management that is holistic and is guided by indigenous peoples’ governance systems; is knowledge-based, using indigenous peoples’ traditional knowledge, practices and innovations; respects gender and the role of indigenous women; is intercultural; and intergenerational.

In 2014, we finally published our Training Course on IPSSDD. This is being used by partners in their education and training work and some partners have already localized this to their needs and situations.

A key strategy of our work is strengthening indigenous peoples’ communities. Tebtebba has organized in 2009, one of the most vibrant partnership of indigenous peoples working on the issues of climate change, forests and biodiversity; sustainable, self-determined development; implementation of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP); gender empowerment and equality. This is the Indigenous Peoples’ Global Partnership on Climate Change, Forests and Sustainable Development. The partnership is now composed of 17 indigenous organizations and NGOs working with communities in 13 countries form Asia, Latin America and Africa.

Another strategy is sustaining our global advocacy and networking that has already reaped gains
This Partnership was organized by Tebtebba in 2009 and is composed of 17 indigenous organizations in 13 tropical and subtropical countries. The Partnership is composed of the following: Tebtebba, Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara and Institut Dayakologi Indonesia; Maleya Foundation – Bangladesh; Silingang Dapit Sa Sidlakang Mindanao and Naundep ni Napaknuhan ni Kalanguya - Philippines; Nepal Federation of Indigenous Nationalities – Nepal; Centre of Research and Development in Upland Areas – Vietnam; Lelewai – Cameroon; Mainyoito Pastoralist Integrated Development Organisation and Indigenous Livelihoods Enhancement Partners – Kenya; Dignite Pygme – Democratic Republic of Congo; Servicios del Pueblo Mixe and the Asamblea Mixe para el Desarollo Sostenible – Mexico; Centro de Culturas Indígenas el Perú – Peru; Centro para la Autonomía y Desarollo de los Pueblos Indígenas – Nicaragua; Conselho Indigena de Roraima – Brazil; Federacion por la Autodeterminacion de los Pueblos Indigenas – Paraguay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Maleya Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Institute of Dayakologi Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maleya Foundation</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silingang Dapit Sa Sidla</td>
<td>Mindanao and Naundep ni Napaknuhan ni Kalanguya – Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal Federation of</td>
<td>Indigenous Nationalities – Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>Indigenous Livelihood Organization – Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Mainyoito Pastoralist Integrated Development Organization – Cameroon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of</td>
<td>Congo – Dignite Pygme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo – Servicios del Pueblo Mixe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mexico                   | Centro de Culturas Indígenas el Perú – Mexico – Centro para la Autonomía y Desarollo de los Pueblos Indígenas – Nicaragua; Conselho Indigena de Roraima – Brazil; Federacion por la Autodeterminacion de los Pueblos Indigenas – Paraguay.

for indigenous peoples in global processes that we engage in.

These are in the multilateral environmental agreements such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC); in the human rights arena such as in the Human Rights Council, Forum on Business and Human Rights, the recently-held World Conference on Indigenous Peoples (WCIP); and in processes that will identify global sustainable agenda in 2015, i.e., Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)/Post-2015 Development Agenda.

Together with our partners, we have achieved the following gains in 2014:

1. Strengthening of indigenous communities through baseline researches, community participatory mapping and community resource inventory in support of efforts to develop community land-use plans, strengthen traditional livelihood programs, and enhance skills, understanding and unities.

Tebtebba and partners organized series of activities that resulted to enhanced capacities of indigenous partner organizations and the communities that they work with. These capacity building activities included workshop and seminars on the Integrated Holistic Approach to IPSSDD and indigenous peoples’ rights, including rights to lands, forests and resources; climate change and REDD Plus1 and other environmental issues such as water and watershed protection; mining and dams; and developing effective communication strategies. Training activities ranged from participatory mapping and monitoring, conducting socio-environmental surveys to training environmental agents.

Communities also united on the common tool which will be used in the community-based monitoring and information systems (CBMIS). CBMIS is now being piloted in 5 countries where our partners are located.

---

1 REDD Plus is a mitigation measure adopted by UNFCCC. It stands for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation, including enhancement of forest carbon stocks, conservation and sustainable management of forests.
These are Vietnam, Kenya, Nepal, Nicaragua, and the Philippines. Our partners and communities have undertaken a range of activities from participatory mapping to resource inventory towards developing community baselines.

**CADPI**  
(Centro para la Autonomía y Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas)

In the partner community of CADPI in Nicaragua, the Miskitu community of Miguel Bikan was able to do the 3-Dimensional (3D) map of their territory with the participation of the community, including indigenous women and youth. For the community, the map has multiple functions: this will be used to monitor their lands, forests and resources, and as a tool to educate people about their indigenous territory and related knowledge systems. Adjacent communities have also expressed interest in developing their own territorial 3D maps. In Roraima, Brazil, our partner Conselho Indigena de Roraima (CIR) have trained environmental agents to conduct socio-environmental survey that will feed into developing community baselines for monitoring and information.

**CIR**  
(Conselho Indigena de Roraima)

For CIR and its partner communities, the seminar to evaluate how their territorial management plans (PGTA) in the State of Roraima, Brazil were developed, reiterated the importance of sustainable plans that indigenous peoples themselves have identified. CIR has been directly involved in supporting indigenous communities in Roraima develop their sustainable development plans, including climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies.

As the participants of indigenous communities said: “The construction of PGTAs already existed in our land; the PGTA that we are discussing today is simply enforcing a little more our rights and our knowledge. So the PGTA is putting our dreams on paper.”
In Narok County, Kenya the community is documenting and developing the community baseline information for the CBMIS in the Enkutoto-Naimina Enkiyio Forest. They have also developed a Pastoral Bio-cultural Seasonal Calendar.

Our partner, CERDA, has already done their resource inventory in some of their pilot communities in Thai Nguyen Province, Viet Nam such as in Binh Long Commune. They have already started to do carbon accounting of their forests.

Our partners in the Philippines, SILDAP and NNK, have also developed their 3D participatory maps and will now focus on resource inventory.
In relation to research and documentation, the work with the partners focused on doing basic research on the themes, which are highly relevant for indigenous peoples.

**Researches Undertaken**

- Laws and policies related to forests and climate change (Dignite Pygmee, Democratic Republic of Congo; ILEPA, Kenya; FAPI, Paraguay)
- Documentation of indigenous knowledge, which will support the development of an Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development Plan and Programme (Mandaya with SILDAP)
- Meetings and dialogues with the Ministry of Forests, land mapping agency, national REDD body (AMAN, Indonesia)
- Research on the viability and sustainability of small scale mining in Fidelisan in the Philippines (University of the Philippines Baguio)
- Role of indigenous women in forest and water ecosystems (CADPI)
- Traditional practices in relation to environmental management, and Role of indigenous women in land governance (CIR)
- Impacts of climate change (SER-MIXE-ASAMDES)

We also supported traditional forest-related livelihoods as an important pillar in community development. In the majority of communities, it is the women who are involved in traditional livelihoods, thus enhancing these livelihoods support their empowerment.

In Nicaragua, training and assistance to various indigenous women’s organizations were provided to support their traditional livelihoods. These livelihoods included banana vinegar production, setting up of nursery for fruit trees, improvement of climate-friendly stoves, crafts development.

In Oaxaca, a regional fair was organized among various communities of Santo Cristobal to showcase various technologies, both indigenous and modern, and knowledge that can be used for organic food production.

In the Philippines, our partner SILDAP, together with their communities are further expanding their production of cacao and its by-products and are providing needed support to basketry and weaving among indigenous peoples in Manipongol, Maco Compostela Valley. They have also started selling these in their localities.

In Tinoc, Ifugao, NNK is further developing and strengthening their traditional agriculture, organic farming and products such as ginger tea.

---

1 In the DRC the work with the Batwa (Pygmies) and the national advocacy work is being done by Dignite Pygmee, which is a new NGO organized, led and run by the Batwa, themselves.

2 FAPI (Federation for Autonomous Development of Indigenous Peoples) is our latest partner. This is a national network of indigenous peoples in Paraguay which we deemed worthwhile to support because of the good work they have been doing in relation to strengthening the members of the Federation and also the communities covered by these members.

3 Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara/Indigenous Peoples of the Archipelago is our partner in Indonesia. It is the national federation of indigenous peoples.

4 Servicios del Pueblo Mixe and the Asamblea Mixe para el Desarrollo Sostenible is our partner working in the State of Oaxaca in Mexico.
In Kenya, our partner MPIDO supports beekeeping among the Maasai of Loita community and the development and distribution of energy-saving stoves in Kajiado County, while ILEPA is supporting indigenous women in their bead jewelry making.

Our partner CHIRAPAQ wants to further develop and scale-up the Yanesha indigenous women’s livelihoods on natural dyeing techniques, development of textiles and products, such as purses, bags, skirts and others with traditional designs.

Across partners, the value of community learning exchanges was highlighted. These community exchanges were viewed as an important mechanism for exchanging experiences and good practices of indigenous communities on how they are able to deal with issues affecting their communities in relation to, among others, asserting land claims, managing conflicts with settlers in relation to encroachment and landgrabbing, forest management, strengthening traditional livelihoods, adapting to climate change.
Another area where Tebtebba supported its partners is in **further enhancing their capacities to influence their governments and other actors in local and national level.** Most of our partners are already members of government bodies dealing with climate change and REDD Plus or are being consulted by these bodies. These are our partners NEFIN in Nepal, CHIRAPAQ, Peru, AMAN, Indonesia, CADPI, Nicaragua, CIR, Brazil, MPIDO and ILEPA in Kenya. There is a need to further ensure that our partners and their communities are able to sustain their lobby and advocacy work in the countries.

In the community visit to Thai Nguyen province in Vietnam in April organized by our partner CERDA, members of the Global Partnership who joined the visit were able to see first hand how the community members are the ones doing their own carbon inventory of their forests, reclaiming their forests, revitalizing this and reviving their customary practices, and how they are able to support their livelihoods using organic farming. The community visit also showed in concrete terms, how effective implementation of projects on-the-ground, with community support and participation (in this case, the REDD Plus pilot of CERDA), can be leveraged to get governments support and recognition. Such support can enhance the success of these initiatives and open doors for getting indigenous peoples’ issues the attention that these deserve.
Capacity Building

- Communications Strategy of the Global Partnership on IPSSDD on 18-20 February, Philippines
- Global Technical Workshop on CBMIS, February 22-24, Philippines
- Asia Policy and Advocacy Workshop on the WCIP, 26-27 February, Philippines
- Global Dialogue between Indigenous Peoples and Forest Scientists, 22-23 April, Hanoi, Viet Nam
- Learning and Exchange Visit to CERDA’s pilot communities in Thai Nguyen Province, Viet Nam, 25-27 April
- Capacity Building Workshop for Asia on Traditional Knowledge and Customary Sustainable Use under the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Regional Workshop on Intellectual Property Rights, June 1-4, 2014, Chiangmai, Thailand
- Asia Regional Workshop on CBMIS in June 5-6, Chiangmai, Thailand
- Project Development Training for the Global Partnership, 12-13 June, Bonn, Germany
- Trainor’s Training on IPSSDD for Asia Indigenous Women, December 8-18, Baguio City, Philippines

It is important to note that in these activities undertaken by Tebtebba and partners, the majority of participants are community-based and involve indigenous leaders, indigenous women and youth. Among indigenous women, these capacity building activities have brought added confidence to them and provided them with skills for empowerment.
A major development that occurred in 2014 was the appointment of Vicky Tauli-Corpuz, our Executive Director, to be the 3rd UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The commitment, achievements and the high credibility of Tebtebba’s executive director led to her appointment as the new UNSR. This is for a period of 3 years (2014-2017) and is renewable for another 3 years.
Tebtebba and our partners are committed to support the work of the UNSRIP. And this also provides opportunities for Tebtebba to further scale-up our work in relation to human rights and indigenous peoples’ rights’ protection and fulfillment and elaboration of IPSSDD. Thus, Tebtebba returned to the sessions of the Human Rights Council and also the General Assembly. Her support team is based in Tebtebba.

We organized an informal consultation with the UNSR in the Cordilleras, Philippines in July. During the World’s Indigenous Peoples’ Day Celebration, we organized a Philippine National Consultation with the UNSRIP on August 8. This was attended by 100 indigenous peoples’ representatives and a big number of NGOs, government agencies and UN bodies (UNDP, UNESCO, ILO), and academe.

In the latter part of 2014, the UNSR conducted her 1st official visit to Paraguay. Our partner, FAPI, gave needed support in helping organize several consultations and meetings of indigenous peoples with the UNSR.

In the global arena, Tebtebba and its partners managed to influence some of the global processes to reflect indigenous peoples’ concerns and issues. The Post-2015 Development Agenda, which is discussing the next development approach and targets between 2015-2030, is of vital importance to indigenous peoples.

Tebtebba and IITC (International Indian Treaty Council) led the Indigenous Peoples Major Group (IPMG) in the UN in New York. IPMG was in charge of presenting the consolidated views during the meetings of the Open-ended Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals and inviting indigenous representatives from other regions to speak in the relevant sessions. The indicators of indigenous peoples’ well-being were pushed in the Post-2015 Development Agenda processes.

In the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples (WCIP), Tebtebba actively participated the meetings and consultation in the lead up to WCIP in September 2014. During the WCIP Tebtebba and some partners participated in conference. We organized a side event where we shared the results of the study that we conducted together with the Asia Indigenous Peoples’ Pact.

This is the report of UN system efforts for the realization of indigenous peoples’ rights and the research and book launching on Indigenous Peoples and the Extractive Sector: Towards a Rights-Respecting Engagement. The WCIP came out with an Outcome Document which renews states’ commitments to implement the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
The climate change negotiations also required greater presence of Tebtebba and its partners. Tebtebba and its partners sustained its leading role in the indigenous peoples’ formation in the climate change processes, the International Indigenous Peoples’ Forum on Climate Change (IIPFCC). Members of the partnership co-chaired the IIPFCC and were also lead members in its various working groups (e.g., REDD Plus, finance, adaptation) that monitor developments in the UNFCCC negotiations.

In the Climate Talks in June 2014, Tebtebba and the partners, together with the IIPFCC continued to monitor negotiations and lobby governments so that human rights is embedded in the new climate agreement coming out of COP21 in Paris in December 2015.

The other key demand is for the gains achieved by indigenous peoples in REDD Plus are carried over and strengthened in the new climate agreement. Tebtebba, in behalf of the Global Partnership, also made official submissions to the UNFCCC in 2014 on “Providing Incentives and Addressing Methodological Issues Related to Non-Carbon Benefits (NCBs) Resulting from the Implementation of REDD Plus Activities to UNFCCC” and on the Safeguard Information Systems.

3. Significant contributions to the discourses on sustainable development from the point of view of indigenous peoples and also on issues such as extractive industries, the need for community-based participatory processes and indicators to measure the progress of the implementation of the targets and goals of the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

The participation of Tebtebba and its partners in the SDG and Post-2015 processes and the climate change negotiations were attempts to push for a paradigm shift in the thinking of how development should happen after the multiple economic and ecological crises faced by the world in the recent years and which continue to the present.

We can confidently say that we succeeded in putting the issues of indigenous peoples in these global processes. Without our participation, it would have not have been possible to get into the decisions some of our concerns. The processes of getting governments to push our agenda are great learning experiences for advocacy work.

We managed to push for the recognition of the importance of culture as a core element of sustainable development. The cultures, values and knowledge systems of indigenous peoples contribute in developing a framework of development which is more holistic.

We also put some of our indicators such as those related to measuring how collective land rights of indigenous peoples, our indigenous knowledge systems are being recognized and protected in national laws and international decisions.

There is still a long way to go to gain more concrete and long-lasting gains in the work on sustainable development and also in addressing climate change issues and human rights. But the work started through the active participation of indigenous peoples in the relevant processes is a good beginning.

The challenge is how we will be able to get the national governments to reflect these in their development and climate change plans. And how to get better participation of indigenous peoples in decision-making bodies at local, national and global levels so their issues will be integrated.
**LATEST RELEASES**
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IPSSDD puts indigenous peoples’ rights in the center of development and ensures protection and management of natural resources, support for traditional livelihoods, respect for cultural diversity and recognition of the vital role of indigenous women and youth.

**Indigenous Peoples and the Extractive Sector: Towards a Rights-Respecting Engagement**

Year Published: 2014  
Number of Pages: 260  
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The adoption of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples was the first in a series of normative developments, which opened up the prospect of a new era in indigenous and extractive industry relationships… However, the obstacles to translating these normative developments into practice, together with the trend toward increased extractive industry activity in or near indigenous peoples’ territories, mean that for indigenous peoples, such a transformed landscape remains but a mirage on a distant horizon.
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Adapting innovative techniques in indigenous rice cultivation, Ahin Village, Tinoc, Ifugao.
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