

# A desk-based review of the treatment of indigenous peoples' and social issues in large and medium-sized GEF biodiversity projects (2005-2006)

Compiled by Liam Taylor and Tom Griffiths

February 2007



Forest Peoples  
Programme

## *Executive Summary:*

This document contains the findings of a brief overview of the GEF biodiversity portfolio together with a detailed desk study of the treatment of indigenous peoples' issues in the design of 23 full and medium sized GEF conservation projects that began implementation during 2005 and 2006, or which were still under preparation at the start of 2007. Projects selected for analysis are confined to those that involve, or which may have potential impacts on, indigenous peoples. The evaluation finds:

- Three-quarters of the projects give some mention of indigenous peoples' rights, but treatment is generally superficial and a rights-based approach is not used
- Just two projects mention indigenous peoples' right to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), and even in these two exceptional cases there are no details about how this right will be respected in practice
- One third of the project analysed mention or address land tenure issues in project documents, but treatment is usually brief and there is a lack of detail.
- Two of the projects examined will support concrete land demarcation activities.
- Less than 1 in 5 projects have conducted detailed field baseline studies or thorough social assessment as part of project preparation
- All projects emphasise community "participation", but most still apply a minimal "consultation" approach
- GEF and Implementing Agency (IA) documents are often unclear how a project will ensure informed and culturally appropriate participation by affected communities in project design and implementation.
- A high degree of ambiguity regarding the extent to which a project may impose involuntary resettlement or restrictions on customary use of natural resources.
- Although the resettlement is not funded by the GEF, it may still take place as part of project-related activities financed by other donors or the government (e.g., *Support to the Rehabilitation of DRC's National Parks Network*)
- Several projects still identify traditional subsistence practices like hunting and fishing as major threats to biodiversity
- Some implementing agencies, including the UNDP and Inter-American Development Bank, make little or no mention of their own operational and public safeguard policies on Indigenous Peoples, and fail to integrate these standards into project design
- Some projects, such as the *India – Biodiversity Conservation and Rural Livelihoods Improvement Project*, continue to disregard the hard lessons from previous GEF projects that failed to deal adequately with social and indigenous peoples' issues.

This rapid GEF portfolio analysis concludes that while there are signs of more attention to indigenous peoples' issues in a few global and regional GEF conservation projects, in big national projects treatment of critical issues, such as FPIC, informed participation, resettlement and economic displacement often remains perfunctory or ambiguous. The study concludes that as the GEF plans to speed up its project processing and approval procedures, there is a pressing need for the GEF take concrete policy and institutional measures to improve the treatment of indigenous peoples in its policies and operations in line with the demands of indigenous peoples made at the Third GEF Assembly and the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII), and in response to recent calls for GEF policy reform made by the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The conclusion emphasises that rather than a piecemeal approach to change, the GEF needs to undergo systematic institutional, policy and strategic reforms to improve treatment of social equity and poverty issues in its portfolio, including indigenous peoples' issues.

## 1 Background

Indigenous peoples and civil society have consistently criticised large GEF conservation projects for failing to deal adequately with social and rights issues.<sup>1</sup> Scrutiny of GEF project documents has found that social issues have not been properly incorporated into project design and objective and accurate social assessments have been lacking.<sup>2</sup>

Independent critical field studies have documented multiple social failings in the execution of full-size GEF protected area projects affecting indigenous peoples. These criticisms of GEF project design and implementation have been backed up by recent official GEF evaluations conducted by its monitoring and evaluation unit<sup>3</sup>, including the recently published *Local Benefits Study*.<sup>4</sup> The GEF claims that much of these criticisms relate to older projects, and that it is learning from past mistakes in its newer biodiversity projects.

Indigenous peoples and support NGOs have contested this claim.<sup>5</sup> They point out that even large show-case conservation projects presented by the GEF as best-practice, like the *Indigenous Management of Protected Areas in the Amazon Project (PIMA)*, have failed to address indigenous peoples' priorities and concerns, particularly in relation to culturally appropriate consultation, free, prior and informed consent and respect for land and territorial rights.<sup>6</sup>

In some projects under implementation, like the *Paraguayan Wildlands Protection Initiative*, consultation has completely failed to involve the representative bodies of affected indigenous peoples and has disregarded their territorial and land claims, despite the fact that project documents claim that the project would support participatory processes.<sup>7</sup>

In other cases where "consultation" is supposed to have occurred, as in the GEF-assisted transboundary *Dja-Minikébé-Odzala Tri-National Landscape (TRIDOM) Project* being implemented in Cameroon, Republic of Congo and Gabon, meaningful participation by indigenous peoples did not take place during project design, and has so far been minimal during the first phase of implementation.<sup>8</sup>

Indigenous peoples recommend that these ongoing problems in larger GEF conservation projects must be addressed through meaningful reforms to improve due diligence in GEF project design and implementation.<sup>9</sup> In the same way, in 2006, the Eighth Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) called on the GEF to ".....to review and revise, as appropriate, its protected areas' policies in relation to indigenous and local communities."<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Griffiths, T and Colchester, M (2000) *Indigenous Peoples, Forests and the World Bank: policy and practice* FPP, Moreton in Marsh; Griffiths, T (2005) *Indigenous Peoples and the Global Environment Facility: Indigenous Peoples' experiences of GEF-funded Biodiversity Conservation – a critical study*, Forest Peoples Programme, Moreton-in-Marsh

<sup>2</sup> Caruso, E (2005) *The Global Environment Facility in Central Africa - A desk-based review of the treatment of indigenous peoples' and social issues in a sample of 14 biodiversity projects* - March 2005  
[http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/ifi\\_igo/gef/gef\\_caf\\_rev\\_mar05\\_eng.shtml](http://www.forestpeoples.org/documents/ifi_igo/gef/gef_caf_rev_mar05_eng.shtml)

<sup>3</sup> Dublin, H and Volonte, C (2004) *GEF Biodiversity Program Study* September 2004, GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation, Washington, DC

<sup>4</sup> GEF (2006) *The Role of Local Benefits in Global Environmental Programs* Evaluation Report No. 30, GEF Evaluation Office, Washington

<sup>5</sup> Griffiths, T (2005) *Indigenous Peoples and the Global Environment Facility: Indigenous Peoples' experiences of GEF-funded Biodiversity Conservation – a critical study*, Forest Peoples Programme, UK

<sup>6</sup> Gutiérrez-Laya, O (2004) *El Proyecto – Manejo de las Area Protegidas en la Amazonia Peruana por las Comunidades Nativas – un estudio de caso y evaluación independiente* Lima [www.forestpeoples.org](http://www.forestpeoples.org)

<sup>7</sup> Proyecto de "Iniciativa para la protección de áreas silvestres" financiado por el GEF denominado PAR/98/G33. Letter to Paraguayan UNDP office from the *Asociación de Comunidades Indígenas del Departamento de Itapúa (ACIDI)*, 22 November, 2006

<sup>8</sup> John Nelson, pers. comm, January 2007

<sup>9</sup> *Indigenous Peoples' Recommendation to the Third GEF Assembly*, August 2006

<sup>10</sup> CBD COP8 Decision VIII/24 on Protected Areas at paragraph 22(d).

## 2 Purpose of the briefing

This briefing presents the results of a rapid examination of the 2005-06 GEF biodiversity portfolio and a more detailed desk-based review of official documents relating to 23 GEF full-size and medium-sized conservation projects, which involve, or may have potential impacts on, indigenous peoples in ten countries.<sup>11</sup> The analysis aims to:

- Briefly assess trends in the GEF biodiversity portfolio with regard to the treatment of social issues generally, and indigenous peoples in particular.
- Examine a sample of 14 GEF project documents relating to large GEF biodiversity projects to see how indigenous peoples' issues have or have not been addressed.
- Summarise the findings and include a breakdown of the analysis in an annex to this briefing.

## 3 Methodology

A brief assessment of active and "pipeline"<sup>12</sup> large and medium-size GEF biodiversity project documents available from the GEF's on-line project database and the project databases of its implementing agencies<sup>13</sup> was made to try to gauge to what extent poverty, social and indigenous peoples issues are being dealt with in the portfolio.

More detailed screening of the GEF biodiversity portfolio affecting 10 countries (Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Guyana, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Suriname, Venezuela, India and Bangladesh) was undertaken to identify projects with potential direct or indirect impacts on indigenous peoples. The sample was limited to projects approved or under preparation during 2005 and 2006. The survey selected 14 projects active or under preparation or appraisal, and 9 early "pipeline" projects (still at the "project concept development" stage) for closer scrutiny.

The available public documents for these 23 projects and programmes were then evaluated for their treatment of specific issues including: indigenous peoples' rights, land tenure, traditional knowledge, social safeguard policies (where applicable), social assessment, indigenous peoples' project components, relocation and economic displacement (resource use restrictions) and community participation.<sup>14</sup>

Observations in this summary and the annex are based on a desk-based study of project documents. In a few cases, comments and analysis have also been drawn from FPP field studies or recent feedback from local indigenous peoples' organisations and support NGOs.

### *Scope and Limits of the study:*

The scope of this analysis is constrained by the available information in the public domain via the inter-net. More detailed project-related documents may well exist in some cases, that have not been captured by this analysis. Ongoing GEF projects like PIMA and the *Paraguayan Wildlands Protection Initiative* also confirm that even though project documents may address indigenous peoples' rights and participation issues on paper, planned safeguards and targeted measures are not implemented on the ground, or they are implemented late or in a defective fashion. For this reason, a limited survey of GEF project documents will not give a complete picture of GEF policy and practice as they relate to indigenous peoples and conservation.

---

<sup>11</sup> Bangladesh, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Guyana, India, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Suriname, Venezuela. Regional and Global projects involving one or more of these countries are also reviewed.

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.gefonline.org/pipelinelist.cfm>

<sup>13</sup> <http://gefonline.org/home.cfm> ;

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/PROJECTS/0,,menuPK:51563~pagePK:95873~piPK:95910~theSitePK:40941,00.html> and <http://cfapp2.undp.org/gef/site/>

<sup>14</sup> These documents included GEF Work Programme documents as well as Implementing agency Project Information documents (PIDs) and Project Appraisal documents (PADs) and specific project instruments like Indigenous Peoples Plans (IPPs).

## 4 Summary of main findings

Within the sample of 23 biodiversity projects under preparation or recently active, progressive treatment of indigenous peoples' issues was detected on paper in some cases (Table 1). However, it was found that such treatment often remains superficial and there are ambiguities with regard to the way project design and budgets deal with critical issues such as FPIC, informed participation, resettlement and economic displacement.

### 4.1 Brief assessment of GEF biodiversity portfolio (2005-2006)

The increase in the number and diversity of GEF executing agencies since 2004 appears to be generating greater attention to social and poverty issues in *some parts* of the GEF's overall portfolio – beyond its biodiversity programme. Under the GEF's formal partnership with the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), for example, IFAD is preparing and implementing new projects geared towards support for poverty reduction and sustainable natural resource management and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG-1, MDG-3 and MDG-7).<sup>15</sup> Most of these IFAD-implemented projects are clustered under the GEF's 'Land Degradation' focal area.

Some full-size GEF conservation projects, such as the UNDP-implemented *Integrated Biodiversity Protection in Sarstún Motagua Region* in Guatemala, are starting to directly address indigenous peoples and related issues like traditional knowledge, and are involving indigenous communities in project monitoring and implementation.<sup>16</sup> In Colombia, plans for a full-size GEF project for the *Strengthening of Indigenous People for the Preservation and Sustainable Use of the Colombian Amazon Ecosystem* will support indigenous peoples to develop integrated management strategies for their ancestral territories, based on traditional land and resource use practices, strengthened self government and recuperation of traditional knowledge and values.<sup>17</sup>

This survey finds that some medium-sized projects under the controversial *Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund* (CEPF)<sup>18</sup> have supported the demarcation and titling of indigenous territories in Ecuador and elsewhere, through most projects still support conservation NGOs and conventional protected area programmes.<sup>19</sup>

Notwithstanding the support for indigenous issues under a few larger GEF conservation projects and a handful of global and regional projects (see below), more socially sensitive and participatory projects still appear to be mostly confined to the GEF-UNDP Small Grants Programme.<sup>20</sup> In a few cases, the GEF and IAs have made efforts to scale-up successful small-grants initiatives, through, for example, the GEF *Country Partnership Program for Sustainable Land Management* has some funds to support sustainable traditional land management practices. GEF Projects and programmes directly supporting indigenous peoples' organisations and promoting indigenous issues appear to be more prominent at the regional and global levels. The GEF-assisted *World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism*, for example, includes support for "building capacities of pastoralists to advocate for their rights to a sustainable future".

---

<sup>15</sup> IFAD (2006) *Bridging the gap between local development and the global environment*, GEF Unit, IFAD, Rome

<sup>16</sup> UNDP (2005) *Partners for Change: experiences from UNDP's work with civil society organizations through the GEF UNDP-GEF*, New York at page 10.

<sup>17</sup> Request for a PDF Block B Grant from Fundación Gaia Amazonas.

<sup>18</sup> The GEF-assisted CEPF, hosted by Conservation International, had been criticised for failing to address indigenous rights issues and for allocating a significant number of grants direct to Conservation International and its subsidiaries. See, for example, Chapin, M (2004) "A Challenge to Conservationists" *WorldWatch* November/December 2004:17-31

<sup>19</sup> Conservation International (2005) *Protecting Nature's Hotspots for People and Posterity: Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund Annual Report 2005* CEPF, CI, Washington at page 23

<sup>20</sup> See, for example, Griffiths, T and Solis Librado, C (2006) Una Evaluación Rápida y Participativa de algunos proyectos del Programa COMPACT, Quintana Roo (México) financiados por el Programa de Pequeñas Donaciones (PPD) del PNUD-Fondo Mundial para el Medio Ambiente (FMAM) ANIPA and FPP, Mexico City and Moreton-in-Marsh [www.forestpeoples.org](http://www.forestpeoples.org)

Since 2005, the GEF has provided support to the *Indigenous Peoples' Network for Change* which is a global project that aims to promote improved awareness and effective participation of indigenous peoples in CBD and GEF processes (see below).<sup>21</sup>

#### 4.2 Desk-based analysis of selected GEF projects<sup>22</sup>

Project documents were analysed in detail for 14 full and medium-sized biodiversity projects in the selected countries that started implementation in 2005/06 or were in an advanced stage of project preparation at the beginning of 2007<sup>23</sup>. The findings were as follows (See also Table 1, below):

- *Indigenous Peoples*: All of the projects mention indigenous peoples, and several projects specifically identify indigenous peoples as “key stakeholders” or “major beneficiaries”. The majority of the projects make some mention of indigenous peoples' rights, most often in the context of resource or access rights. However, this often amounts to little more than noting that these rights exist; the implications are rarely considered. Indigenous peoples are consistently treated as stakeholders rather than rights-holders. Only two documents mention international conventions, despite the fact that 8 projects involve states who have signed ILO Convention 169.
- *Traditional Knowledge*: One project includes a specific sub-component for TK preservation, and two more will document and publish TK (though it is not clear what legal mechanisms will be put in place to protect it). In total, seven projects (50%), to varying degrees, will attempt to preserve traditional knowledge or integrate it into training/evaluation programs. Four projects (29%) make no mention of traditional knowledge, and a further 3 projects (21%) mention it only in passing.
- *Land Tenure*: Seven projects (50%) briefly mention land tenure, and may recognise that it is controversial, but do not directly address the issue; two projects do not mention land tenure issues at all. Two projects will not be directly involved in land tenure issues but hope to complement ongoing demarcation programs carried out by other organizations. Only two projects will provide technical and legal support to land demarcation activities.
- *Safeguard Policies*: The World Bank is the implementing agency for 8 of the projects reviewed. For all but one of these projects<sup>24</sup>, there is a section on safeguard policies in the Project Document. World Bank safeguards relating to indigenous peoples were triggered in 6 projects<sup>25</sup> (75%). Five projects have prepared or are preparing a separate Indigenous Peoples Development Plan (IPDP); one project will include an IPDP as part of its Social Impact Assessment; and two projects will not prepare IPDPs<sup>26</sup>. Among UNDP projects, none make mention of its Policy of Engagement with Indigenous Peoples (2001). The only IADB-implemented project<sup>27</sup> mentions its operational policy on indigenous peoples just once, in a footnote.
- *Restrictions on resource use*: All the documents are ambiguous on the subject of resource restrictions. Documents relating to the second phase of the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund advise that sub-projects “may” directly displace individuals and/or impose resource restrictions (see Annex). Generally, the GEF projects studied seek to promote “alternative livelihoods” – particularly park surveillance and eco-tourism – rather than protect customary resource use. Several projects identify subsistence resource use practices as significant threats to biodiversity.
- *Relocation*: Resettlement “may” take place in three projects<sup>28</sup> (though the GEF claims involuntary resettlement will not be supported in two of these cases). A fourth project will not directly finance resettlement, but will work in a context where resettlement is being carried out by national agencies and partner NGOs.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>21</sup> [http://www.international-alliance.org/network\\_for\\_change.htm](http://www.international-alliance.org/network_for_change.htm)

<sup>22</sup> Refer to Annex 1 for details concerning these projects.

<sup>23</sup> Projects which do not impact indigenous peoples (e.g. those relating to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety) are omitted.

<sup>24</sup> *Dhekuana Nonoodo - Sustainable Use and Conservation of Biodiversity Resources for Dhekuana Indigenous Lands* (Venezuela, IBRD, medium-size project)

<sup>25</sup> The exceptions were: *Dhekuana Nonoodo - Sustainable Use and Conservation of Biodiversity Resources for Dhekuana Indigenous Lands* (Venezuela, IBRD, medium-size project); and *Forestry and Environmental Sector Adjustment Credit* (Cameroon, IDA/IBRD)

<sup>26</sup> *Dhekuana Nonoodo - Sustainable Use and Conservation of Biodiversity Resources for Dhekuana Indigenous Lands* (Venezuela, IBRD, medium-size project); and *Biodiversity Conservation and Rural Livelihoods Improvement* (India, IBRD)

<sup>27</sup> *Integrated Ecosystem Management in the Sixaola Binational River Basin* (Regional, IADB)

<sup>28</sup> *Biodiversity Conservation and Rural Livelihoods Improvement* (India, IBRD); and *Rural Productivity and Consolidation of the Atlantic Mesoamerican Biological Corridor Project* (Panama, IBRD) and the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (Phase II).

<sup>29</sup> *In Support of the Congolese Institute for Nature Conservation (ICCN)'s Program for the Rehabilitation of the DRC's National Parks Network* (Democratic Republic of Congo, IBRD)

- *Baseline studies*: Social assessments or studies have been completed in six projects (43%), and a further two projects<sup>30</sup> (14%) are in the process of carrying them out. In addition, two projects have completed “stakeholder mappings” or “consultation processes”<sup>31</sup>. However, these do not strictly amount to social assessments, which World Bank guidelines require to be done *prior* to project approval. One project relies on previous studies by its partner NGO<sup>32</sup>. One regional project<sup>33</sup> and one global project<sup>34</sup> show no evidence of detailed social studies.
- *Community participation*: All of the project documents emphasise participation; however, many are weak on the details. For example, although five documents (36%) mention co-management, only one clearly describes the institutional mechanisms involved<sup>35</sup>. Most of the projects have held a considerable number of workshops and consultations but only a few discuss the outcomes of these consultations and clearly integrate them into project design. Generally, however, “participation” still appears to mean the right to be consulted, not to actively participate in decision making or to refuse proposed projects.
- *Free, prior and informed consent*: One project mentions the principle of “free, prior and informed consent”, but does not elaborate<sup>36</sup>; another project requires the signature of operating agreements with local communities as a condition of project effectiveness<sup>37</sup>. The fact that “free, prior and informed consent” is mentioned at all is an important step forward. However, the vast majority of projects still do not give it any consideration.

More positively, there are indications of progress in the global medium-size project *Indigenous Peoples Network for Change*, which recognises many of the concerns of indigenous peoples and aims to increase their participation in GEF processes. For example, it admits that “the participation of indigenous peoples in CBD [Convention on Biodiversity] and GEF related processes is currently very limited”. It notes, too, that the implementation of international conventions (including the CBD) “has in many instances led to violation of indigenous peoples’ rights, further marginalizing indigenous peoples in national and international discussions and decision-taking, displacement of indigenous peoples’ from their traditional territories, destruction of norms and values, corrupting indigenous peoples’ cultures, weakening and fragmentation of traditional knowledge systems and practices, commercialization and misappropriation of knowledge and even military violence against ‘non-cooperative’ indigenous peoples [sic]”. This is a significant criticism of past GEF failings; it is important that these criticisms are taken on board and that the aims of the project are more fully integrated into GEF policies and practice. To date, however, notwithstanding the critical findings in its own evaluations like the Local Benefits Study, there are few signs that senior GEF management is willing to take significant action to respond to such criticism.

In addition, nine pipeline projects were reviewed. Project documents were not available for these projects, so analysis was based on project concept and PDF-B documents. Although it is difficult to evaluate projects at this early stage, initial findings show that only two of the pipeline projects (22%) mention rights<sup>38</sup> and only one mentions land tenure issues<sup>39</sup>. Three of the documents (33%) contain sections on stakeholder involvement<sup>40</sup>, and one project will seek “prior, informed consent”<sup>41</sup>, but the details of community participation are often vague.

<sup>30</sup> *Forestry and Environmental Sector Adjustment Credit* (Cameroon, IDA/IBRD); and *Biodiversity Conservation and Rural Livelihoods Improvement* (India, IBRD)

<sup>31</sup> *In Support of the Congolese Institute for Nature Conservation (ICCN)’s Program for the Rehabilitation of the DRC’s National Parks Network* (Democratic Republic of Congo, IBRD); and *Integrated Ecosystem Management in the Sixaola Binational River Basin* (Regional, IADB)

<sup>32</sup> *Dhekuana Nonoodo - Sustainable Use and Conservation of Biodiversity Resources for Dhekuana Indigenous Lands* (Venezuela, IBRD, medium-size project)

<sup>33</sup> *Biodiversity Conservation in Coffee: Transforming Productive Practices in the Coffee Sector by Increasing Market Demand for Certified Sustainable Coffee* (Regional, UNDP)

<sup>34</sup> *Improved Certification Schemes for Sustainable Tropical Forest Management* (Global, UNEP, medium-sized project)

<sup>35</sup> *Expanding Partnerships for the National Parks System Project* (Venezuela, IBRD)

<sup>36</sup> *In Support of the Congolese Institute for Nature Conservation (ICCN)’s Program for the Rehabilitation of the DRC’s National Parks Network* (Democratic Republic of Congo, IBRD)

<sup>37</sup> *Protected Areas System Project, Phase 1* (Guyana, IBRD)

<sup>38</sup> *Conservation and Adaptation of Globally Important Agricultural heritage Systems* (Global, UNDP); and *Conservation and Sustainable Use of Neotropical Native Crops and Wild Relatives of Crops* (Regional, IBRD)

<sup>39</sup> *Conservation and Adaptation of Globally Important Agricultural heritage Systems* (Global, UNDP)

<sup>40</sup> *Conservation and Adaptation of Globally Important Agricultural heritage Systems* (Global, UNDP); *Conservation and Sustainable Use of Neotropical Native Crops and Wild Relatives of Crops* (Regional, IBRD); and *Strengthening Capacities for Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Integrated Coastal Zone Management in Venezuela* (Venezuela, UNDP)

<sup>41</sup> *Conservation and Adaptation of Globally Important Agricultural heritage Systems* (Global, UNDP)

Finally, three recent enabling activities were reviewed (for the DRC, Guyana and Mexico). The Guyanese project was the only one to mention indigenous peoples. The Mexican National Capacity Self-Assessment, in particular, was weak on community participation.

**Table 1: Summary analysis of 14 GEF biodiversity projects (full/medium size)**

Issue	No. of projects dealing with issue	% of projects dealing with issue	Comments
Indigenous Peoples	14	100%	Sometimes as “key stakeholders”; sometimes only mentioned in passing
Indigenous rights	10	71%	Most often in context of resource or access rights. Generally rights are mentioned, but a genuinely rights-based approach is rarely adopted.
Traditional Knowledge (no. of projects integrating or preserving TK)	7	50%	Issues of consent / legal protection not always elaborated.
Land tenure	4	31%	Two projects complement ongoing demarcation programs; two projects will provide technical and legal support to demarcation activities. Other projects mention land tenure issues, but do not seek to address them directly.
Safeguard policies - IBRD - UNDP - UNEP - IADB	7 (out of 8) 0 (2) 0 (3) 0 (1)	88% 0% 0% 0%	World Bank safeguards on indigenous peoples are triggered in six projects. The IADB project briefly mentions its safeguard policies in a footnote.
Resource restrictions (no. projects where restrictions are possible)	13?	93%	Highly ambiguous. Few projects state that restrictions will <i>definitely</i> occur, but no project explicitly rules them out. Many projects emphasise “alternative livelihoods” and identify various subsistence practices (e.g. hunting, fishing, agriculture) as significant threats.
Relocation (no. projects where relocation is possible)	2	14%	Although involuntary resettlement is ruled out, voluntary relocation appears possible in these projects. Another project will not directly finance resettlement, but will work in a context where resettlement is being carried out.
Baseline Studies (prior social assessment completed)	6	43%	A further two projects are in the process of carrying out social assessments, and two more have completed “stakeholder mappings” or “consultation processes”. However, there should be <i>detailed, prior social assessments</i> in all projects.
Community participation	14	100%	Although all projects emphasise participation, many are weak on the details. General focus on consultation rather than active participation in decision-making.
Co-management	5	36%	Only one of these projects details the mechanisms of co-management; others merely hope to “expand existing arrangements” or “develop legal frameworks”.
Free, prior and informed consent	2	14%	Mention of “free, prior and informed consent” is a positive sign. However, there is little detail on what it would involve in practice.

4.2.1 Specific analysis of six recent GEF biodiversity projects (see Annex 1 for project details)

4.2.1.1 *Democratic Republic of Congo – In Support of the Congolese Institute for Nature Conservation (ICCN)’s Program for the Rehabilitation of the DRC’s National Parks Network*<sup>42</sup>

The project *In Support of ICCN’s Program for the Rehabilitation of the DRC’s National Parks Network* was approved in its present form by the GEF on August 1<sup>st</sup> 2006. It aims to strengthen capacity in the DRC to conserve globally important biodiversity. It has three components:

1. Support to the institutional rehabilitation of the Congolese Institute for Nature Conservation, ICCN (national level).
2. Direct support to national parks and their buffer zones (site level). This will be aimed at safeguarding and rehabilitating the Garamba and Virunga national parks.
3. Evaluation and expansion of the protected areas network (national level). The project “will help ICCN and its partners to conduct a country-wide assessment comprising of studies, surveys and local consultations needed to identify/confirm potential new protected areas towards the national 15% target”. (pp.11-15)

The project will take place against a background of controversy which surrounds other World Bank operations in the DRC. Following a formal complaint by indigenous peoples’ organizations, the World Bank Inspection Panel is making a full investigation of the Bank’s TSERO and EESRSP projects. In a preliminary report released on March 8<sup>th</sup>, 2006, the Panel makes a number of criticisms, including failure to adequately consult indigenous peoples and failure to comply fully with appropriate safeguard policies.<sup>43</sup> The Project Document, dated May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2006, mentions these projects but shows no awareness of these criticisms.

The project seeks to build on recent reforms in the DRC, including the 2002 Forest Code. The Forest Code has been criticized for failing to adequately recognize indigenous peoples’ rights to their land and resources. It has been developed and implemented without proper indigenous consent or consultation.<sup>44</sup> Nonetheless, the Project Document hails the Forest Code as a “unique opportunity” (p.19) and does not acknowledge these concerns.

There is some positive language on the subject of indigenous peoples. The project claims to support “community development and participatory management” including the “enhancement of pygmies [sic] community well-being” (p.14). It will help to scale up the model of community-managed reserves, as developed in the Tayna Gorilla Reserve in the eastern DRC. The project will “establish direct lines of communication with local communities including indigenous people” (p.15) and “engage local NGOs in program implementation” (p.16). In Virunga, a specific workshop was held in November 2005 to “discuss and identify a series of ecological, economic and social action that would ensure a more harmonious and equitable cohabitation between pygmies, local Bantu communities, and the Park” (pp.103-104). The project will inform and seek support from the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues with regard to pygmy-related activities (p.82).

---

<sup>42</sup> Based on the Project Document for WP, May 14<sup>th</sup> 2006

<sup>43</sup> The Inspection Panel, Report and Recommendation on Request for Inspection, Democratic Republic of Congo: Transitional Support for Economic Recovery Credit Operation (TSERO) (IDA Grant No. H192-DRC) and Emergency Economic and Social Reunification Support Project (EESRSP) (IDA Credit No. 3824-DRC and IDA Grant No. H064-DRC)

<sup>44</sup> Persistent and Pervasive Racial Discrimination against Indigenous Peoples in the Democratic Republic of Congo: Formal Request to Initiate an Urgent Action Procedure to Avoid Immediate and Irreparable Harm, submitted to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination by 7 NGOs (CAMV, ARAP, CPAKI/RDC, APDMAC, SIPA, UEFA, FPP), 29<sup>th</sup> June 2006, [www.forestpeoples.org](http://www.forestpeoples.org). World Bank ‘questions and answers’ asserts that the new Forest Code “takes into account the customary rights of local communities, including indigenous peoples... However, specific regulations are necessary to enforce these rights effectively and the Bank has advised the DRC Government to undertake in-depth consultations throughout the country on the preparation of regulations on community forests.” *Questions and Answers - World Bank support to sustainable Management of forests in the Democratic Republic of Congo* (last updated: 11/01/06), [www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org)

Furthermore, Component 2 of the project entails a “specific pygmy-oriented program” in the Virunga national park (p.30). The main thrust of this program is directed towards ensuring equal socio-economic opportunities, equitable sharing of benefits, and access to social services. It will also ensure that indigenous “cultural values and specificities” are “[taken] into account” (p.30) and that the project will “promote pygmies’ participation in decision-making and planning processes related to the management of the park” (p.82). No fund is reserved specifically for the pygmy program, though \$550,000 is allocated to a range of activities listed as “community conservation, pygmy program, socioeconomic monitoring, incl. SMP, and tourism” (p.93). In total, \$1.05 million is allocated to community activities in the two national parks (p.93).

However, the Project Document does not elaborate on the processes through which these positive objectives might be achieved, noting only that the pygmy program will be “channelled through ongoing indigenous people programs” (p.131). Collaborative boundary demarcation, community-hunting areas and community reserves (p.77) are to be welcomed, but institutional mechanisms for genuine co-management remain weak; the Project Document notes only that site co-ordination committees (CoCoSi) will “include representatives of local and traditional authorities” (p.20).

Of greatest concern is component 3 of the project, which aims to identify protected areas to increase the total coverage in the DRC from 7.7% to 15% of national territory. The Project Document states that “this component will put emphasis on consultations with local people, in keeping with the principle of free, prior and informed consent” (p.15). There is no discussion of what “free, prior and informed consent” would involve. The Project Document envisages local consultations and socio-economic studies, but it is far from clear that indigenous peoples will have the opportunity to reject proposals for protected areas on their customary lands.

In a section on stakeholder involvement (pp.28-29), it is noted that “the project embodies significant risks and negative impacts for the primary stakeholders (rural population)”. These are listed as: physical and/or economic displacement; crop destruction; income losses due to law enforcement in buffer zones; marginalization of indigenous peoples due to uncertain legal status and lack of participation in decision making bodies; and insufficient benefit sharing due to low level of participation. In addition, a list of structural problems notes the marginalization of indigenous peoples and the low level of legal recognition of their traditional and user rights. In this context, the “legal recognition and protection of customary rights” is suggested as a possible benefit of the project. Unfortunately there is little elaboration on these issues in the rest of the document.

On the contentious issue of resource restrictions, the Project Document is ambiguous, stating that: “the project will not restrict pygmies’ traditional access to natural resources *compared to the situation at start of the project*” (p.82, emphasis added). There is no indication that existing resource restrictions will be reviewed. “Surveillance and anti-poaching” are identified as “the overriding priorities” in Garamba and “high priorities” in Virunga (p.122). Fuel-wood collection and the bush meat trade are seen as significant threats to biodiversity in the region.

There is similar ambiguity on the issue of resettlement. On the one hand, the Project Document states unequivocally that “the proposed GEF-WB project will not finance any resettlement-related activities” (p.30). On the other, it notes the existence of an ongoing resettlement program in the Virunga national park, which “is likely to continue with or without GEF resources” (p.19). This program is aimed at those “who entered the park less than ten years ago because of conflicts” (p.31) and is “being conducted in a highly participatory and consensual manner” (p.27). However, the Project Document admits that there is a “substantial” risk that the Virunga resettlement program “may encounter a higher level of complexity and difficulties down the road and it may result in undesirable social impacts or reputational risks for partners involved”. In this context, a Resettlement Policy Framework and a Resettlement Process Framework will be included in the Social Impact Assessment which is currently under preparation as part of World Bank project appraisal<sup>45</sup>.

---

<sup>45</sup> The project could not be found on the World Bank database so no analysis of the Social Impact Assessment was possible.

The GEF intervention “will cover the costs of socio-economic studies (including a study on pygmies’ traditional forest and land uses)” (p.83). However, there is little sign of detailed baseline studies into the social aspects of the project were carried out as part of the preparation of the Project Document.

There is no mention of traditional knowledge in the Project Document.

***The Rehabilitation of the DRC’s National Parks Network project uses positive language about community participation but its implications are unclear. On the one hand, it claims to scale up the model of community-managed reserves and entails a specific pygmy-oriented program. On the other hand, institutional mechanisms for co-management are weak in detail; relocation and resource restrictions are treated with ambiguity; and the document does not elaborate on its claim that the project will support customary rights. Most worryingly, the project will contribute to the expansion of protected areas in the DRC but only seems to pay lip service to the principle of “free, prior and informed consent”.***

#### 4.2.1.2 *India – Biodiversity Conservation and Rural Livelihoods Improvement*<sup>46</sup>

The *India Biodiversity Conservation and Rural Livelihoods Improvement* project (BCRLI) was approved by the GEF in August 2006. It is due for appraisal by the World Bank on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2007 and is expected to begin in June. It will be implemented in eight landscape sites, many of which contain significant indigenous populations.

The development objective of the project is “to strengthen and mainstream biodiversity conservation at the landscape level by improving rural livelihoods, participation, learning and its replication”. It will explicitly focus on: “(i) scaling up successful conservation models to the landscape level; (ii) raising awareness of the values of biodiversity goods and services and their relevance to the development agenda; (iii) promoting explicit linkages between conservation and poverty alleviation, in both conservation and production landscapes; (iv) mainstreaming biodiversity into policy and development programs at regional and national levels; (v) monitoring, linked to adaptive management, learning and replication; and (vi) replicating participatory conservation mechanisms to other PAs and biodiversity-rich landscapes nationally.”

The project seeks to build on the experiences and lessons learnt from past participatory conservation “successes”, in particular the concluded GEF/IDA India Ecodevelopment Project (IEP). Throughout the Project Document it is assumed that the IEP was a successful model of participatory conservation management; criticisms of Ecodevelopment from indigenous peoples, NGOs and civil society are largely ignored.<sup>47</sup> The section which reviews lessons learned from the IEP (pp.20-23) refers to “poor and marginalized groups” but makes no explicit reference to indigenous or tribal peoples. Nor does it address the need for power-sharing, institutions of genuine co-management, or security of tenure.<sup>48</sup>

The Project Document uses positive language about community participation. Bottom-up planning, decentralization and an integrated multi-sectoral approach are all cited as guiding principles of the project (pp.4-5). One of a number of key outcome indicators is for there to be “at least 50% of key stakeholder including target communities participating in planning and management of project activities” (p.4). Stakeholders have been identified at each of the project sites and are supposedly being consulted during project preparation through formal and informal meetings and workshops. The Stakeholder Consultation Plan claims that there will be collaboration with stakeholders “for joint decision making on project design which reflects their priorities and needs”.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>46</sup> Based on the Project Document for WP, May 15<sup>th</sup> 2006

<sup>47</sup> See for example Devullu, P, Raj, M, Bhanumathi, K, Kumar, S, and Bandhopadhyay, A (2004) *Indigenous and tribal communities, biodiversity conservation and the Global Environment Facility in India – General overview and a case study of people’s perspectives of the India Ecodevelopment Project*, Samata, Hyderabad, [www.forestpeoples.org](http://www.forestpeoples.org)

<sup>48</sup> Kothari, A (2006) *Comments on Biodiversity Conservation and Rural Livelihoods Improvement Project – World Bank Project Appraisal Document, March 21, 2006*, Kalpavriksh, Pune

<sup>49</sup> Attachment 3, Executive Summary

In addition, a “detailed Social Assessment” is being carried out by the Project Tiger Office (Government of India) to “identify social issues at each of the participating landscapes under the project and developing a framework that would help address them in an effective manner” (p.47). There will also be the development of an Operational Manual which “will include a participatory process framework that will provide procedures and principles to guide community decision making on project investments” (p.10). It is claimed that “specific arrangements will be made for addressing the needs of vulnerable groups, ethnic minorities and women” (p.17). Despite triggering the Bank’s safeguard policy on indigenous peoples, it seems a separate Indigenous Peoples’ Development Plan will not be prepared (at the time of writing the FPP is awaiting clarification on this point from the World Bank)

While these measures are an improvement on previous projects, they do not adequately address all the concerns of indigenous and tribal peoples. Although local communities and stakeholders are to be *consulted*, it is far from clear that this consultation process would involve a genuine sharing of authority and power, or that suitable institutional mechanisms for joint management would be put in place. It is also not clear when the Social Assessment will be completed, nor whether it properly takes account of legal changes under new forest rights legislation; it is worrying that a detailed Project Document has already been developed without the results of this assessment. Furthermore, the Project Document does not pay sufficient attention to the prior context of conservation policies in India. For example, it fails to properly consider the history of conflictual relations between local communities and forest departments (some of which were accused of corruption during previous GEF projects).

In particular, the Project Document largely avoids the language of rights and enduring problems of tenurial security. It promises to review the “existing and proposed legal and policy framework”, tracking any relevant changes, in order to “provide explicit information on the legal status of land parcels/unit (including PAs) and their implications for project implementation” (pp.17 and 21). On page 48 it is stated that: “Any desired changes by the communities in the ways in which local populations exercise customary tenure rights in the project sites will not be imposed on them, but will emerge for [sic] a consultative process satisfactory to the World Bank.” Unfortunately the Project Document has nothing else to say about community tenurial and resource rights. Until these issues are properly addressed there is a high risk that the project will pose a threat to indigenous peoples and their livelihoods.

On the subject of resource restrictions, the Project Document expects that they are “unlikely” and “expected to be very limited” but acknowledges that “some adverse impacts might arise from the potential restriction on access to natural resources for communities residing in and around protected areas” (p.48). Any such restrictions would be “based on the consent of the community” and “evolve through an internal community decision making process” (p.48).

Details of the document, however, suggest that resource restrictions are probable. The stakeholder analysis consistently focuses on resource use practices by local communities as a threat to biodiversity. For example, it states of hunter-gatherers in the Askote Landscape (Uttaranchal) that: “if allowed to continue their lifestyle, [they] can have damaging impacts on biodiversity” (p.53), and proposes turning them into trekking guides. Similarly, in the Satpura Landscape (MP) it notes that fishing in the Tawa Reservoir is having a negative impact on “crocodile mortality and disruption of crocodile breeding” (p.56). However, a petition from local Adivasis - who have already been displaced from their homes by the construction of the Tawa Dam - argues that “this is factually not true as the number of crocodiles has increased consistently”<sup>50</sup>. Worryingly, one of the “intermediate outcome indicators” is to reduce dependency on PA resources (fuel wood, grazing etc.) by at least 40% (p.26).

In general, the Project Document is less concerned with avoiding resource restriction than in mitigating its impact. Mitigation involves “alternative income or resource generations measures”

---

<sup>50</sup> *An Appeal: Hoshangabad Adivasis’ Struggle for Survival*, Hoshangabad (MP), <http://www.mail-archive.com/stolengeneration@googlegroups.com/msg00541.html>

(pp.48-49) and “alternate livelihoods” such as eco-tourism and handicrafts (p.59). Nowhere is there recognition of the cultural and spiritual significance that forest resources may have for indigenous peoples.

Relocation is deemed “highly unlikely” (p.48) but is not ruled out. “Enclave habitations” are listed as threats at two of the project sites (p.85). The document emphasises that voluntary relocation would only take place after transparent, participatory and inclusive processes and would be monitored independently (pp.14 and 20). It is yet to be seen how effectively this rhetoric translates into action on the ground.

***In sum, the Biodiversity Conservation and Rural Livelihoods Improvement project contains some positive language about ‘participatory conservation’ and includes progressive steps towards greater inclusion and stakeholder participation. However, it is too uncritical in its assessment of previous GEF projects in India and consequently fails to address important issues such as tenurial rights. It does not elaborate institutional mechanisms for joint management or offer a detailed assessment of risks surrounding resource restrictions and possible relocation. Controversially, no separate Indigenous Peoples Plan will be prepared (as in the Ecodevelopment project before it). Although there are signs of gradual progress, there is no radical break with state-centred “ecodevelopment” initiatives. More innovative approaches (e.g. greater use of community conserved areas) are required in order to properly integrate indigenous peoples’ rights and perspectives.***

#### 4.2.1.3 Mexico – Environmental Services Project<sup>51</sup>

The *Environmental Services Project* was approved by the GEF on November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2005 and the World Bank on 29<sup>th</sup> March, 2006, and is currently active. It aims to enhance the provision of environmental services in Mexico, bringing both national benefits (primarily water services) and global benefits (primarily biodiversity conservation). Basic data for six likely project sites is included in the Project Document (p.116). It indicates that 52,000 indigenous people live in these areas and that they constitute a majority of the stakeholder population.

The focus of the project is on payment for environmental services (PES) schemes. Under these schemes, “providers” of environmental services (e.g. indigenous peoples) are paid by “users” of environmental services (e.g. downstream water users, the eco-tourism industry) to adopt more environmentally sustainable practices. In a section entitled “indigenous communities and forests” (p.32), the Project Document notes that “indigenous communities have a unique perspective about their forests, stemming from the long-term ties that bind them to their ecosystems”. Unfortunately there is no indication that this “unique perspective” will be integrated into project design and implementation. Traditional knowledge, for example, is only mentioned once in the entire document<sup>52</sup> (p.32). Instead, the project adopts a market-driven approach, in which indigenous peoples are “providers” of “environmental goods and services” to which monetary values can be assigned.

A danger of the market-driven approach is that it may disadvantage marginalised groups, who often lack the technical capacity required to get the full benefit from PES schemes. The Project Document admits as much, noting that in previous PES initiatives in Mexico “most contracts have gone to the better organized, more developed communities and *ejidos*<sup>53</sup>, and to private owners” (p.142). As a consequence, \$9.56 million is allocated to facilitating greater participation through technical assistance, capacity building, greater transparency and participation, and the identification and resolution of technical issues. There will also be training and support to “community promoters”, individuals chosen by communities to “act as liaisons in the preparation and implementation of environmental services proposals” (p.11).

<sup>51</sup> Based on the Project Appraisal Document, February 15<sup>th</sup> 2006

<sup>52</sup> Indigenous peoples have “a stock of traditional knowledge about [the ecosystem’s] goods and services, allowing them to obtain more value from the same plot of forest than, for example, new immigrants to the region”.

<sup>53</sup> The *ejido* system is a form of communal land-holding in Mexico.

A “participatory social assessment” of five “promising sites” was carried out during project preparation (p.114). It is not clear what social assessments have been made of other sites for the project. In the five areas where assessments took place, there were a total of 20 workshops, with an overall attendance of 278 inhabitants, and interviews with 74 people, including indigenous community leaders. These consultations have helped design an “action strategy” that “emphasizes strong indigenous community and *ejido* participation” (pp.116-117). In addition, an Indigenous Peoples Development Plan (IPDP) has been prepared and Area Specific Indigenous Action Plans will be developed for each of the eight pilot areas before contracts with local private financing are signed (p.26). However, the Project Document assumes that the local, market-based nature of PES schemes will make any negative socioeconomic impacts unlikely (p.25).

Examination of the IPDP reveals that it is a very general broad-brush document with little substantive detail regarding actual project plans. Instead, the IPDP promises the development of detailed Indigenous Peoples Plans for each Area for Environmental Services Promotion (APROMSA – in the Spanish acronym).<sup>54</sup>

In this way, the preparation of detailed IPPs based on the informed consultation with affected communities has been deferred to project implementation, which is arguably in contravention of participation standards under the World Bank’s previous Indigenous Peoples Policy (OD 4.20) which applies to this project. Nonetheless, the general brief plan does plan to ensure “fully informed” participation during project implementation.<sup>55</sup>

It remains to be seen how participatory the project is in practice. There is no clear role for indigenous representatives in the design, implementation and management of the project, other than as “community promoters” with little influence over the project at national level. Nor is the question of indigenous rights adequately addressed; although the Project Document claims to promote “the assertion of collective rights under specific cultural and sociopolitical conditions” (p.26), it does not suggest how this will be achieved. Indeed, there is no recognition elsewhere in the document of indigenous peoples as rights-holders.

To its credit, the document recognizes that “indigenous peoples, rural poverty, and land tenure issues are all closely related to the maintenance and conservation of forests in Mexico” (p.28). It also includes a section on “land tenure and forests in Mexico” in which it notes that the land tenure rules of common property regimes have important implications for conservation programs (p.31). The main “implication” it has in mind, however, is the “problem of collective action”. In addition, the eligibility criteria for PES contracts require “evidence of legally secure land tenure” (p.27). There is no mention of land titling and it is difficult to tell whether this requirement might be problematic for some marginalized peoples.

***The Mexico Environmental Services Project will be a critical test of payments for environmental services schemes and how they deal with rights and equity issues. Only experience will show whether the provisions in the Project Document are sufficient as regards the rights of indigenous peoples and the degree to which the project will or will not respect their right to prior consent to PES schemes that affect their traditional lands and territories. In particular, it remains to be seen whether the technical assistance and capacity building offered by the project will empower indigenous peoples to fully benefit from the scheme while protecting their rights, perspectives and traditional practices.***

---

<sup>54</sup> Programa de Servicios Ambientales del Bosque: Plan de Pueblos Indígenas, IPP 158

<sup>55</sup> Ibid: at pages 10-15.

#### 4.2.1.4 *Panama – Rural Productivity and Consolidation of the Atlantic Mesoamerican Biological Corridor Project*<sup>56</sup>

The *Rural Productivity and Consolidation of the Atlantic Mesoamerican Biological Corridor Project* was approved by the GEF on June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2005 and by the World Bank on June 15<sup>th</sup> 2006 (though this latter approval date is not clear). According to the World Bank's monthly operational summary, a "decision meeting" was "tentatively scheduled" for January 2007.

The project aims to conserve globally-important biodiversity in Panama while also contributing to increased income and employment of small-scale rural producers. It will support community investments in natural resource management and productive opportunities. Rural community and producer organisations will be provided with matching grants "to implement subprojects that contribute to conservation of biodiversity of global significance and represent viable and sustainable alternatives to improve their livelihoods" (p.9). The project will also strengthen the protected areas monitoring system (SINAP) and enable greater decentralization of natural resources management.

The project will concentrate interventions in 28 districts and two indigenous *comarcas* (territories), namely the Ngöbe-Buglé and Kuna Yala *comarcas*.

The project builds upon the GEF-funded *Panama Atlantic Mesoamerican Biological Corridor Project* (PAMBC, 1998-2005). It claims that the PAMBC's treatment of indigenous peoples was "in general highly successful" (p.77) and states that "the proposed project would adopt similar approaches as those piloted under the PAMBC" (p.10). This is despite criticisms from indigenous communities, who complained that they were not adequately involved in key decisions about the PAMBC, causing delays in project implementation.<sup>57</sup>

Strangely, a section on "lessons learned" in the present Project Document (pp.10-12) makes no mention of these difficulties. Now indigenous representatives are complaining that, once again, they have "not been effectively involved in the elaboration of this new project"<sup>58</sup>. Although OP 4.10 (Indigenous Peoples) is triggered by the project, indigenous communities report that the Bank's new social requirement for Broad Community Support was not implemented effectively, involving in practice little more than the signing of a general letter of agreement<sup>59</sup>. This is arguably in contravention of the Bank's own safeguard policies.

Despite such concerns, the new project is presented as highly participatory. The Project Document observes that "involving local – particularly indigenous – populations and institutions in overall project design and implementation can improve long-term biodiversity conservation" (p.11). A "detailed social evaluation" was therefore conducted during project preparation (p.19) from which a strategy to maximize inclusion was developed. The project aims to fortify existing co-management arrangements - with an overall increase of at least 100% in the number of co-management agreements under implementation - and to increase civic participation in the co-management of Protected Areas. It is worth noting, however, that only about 22% of Protected Areas are currently co-managed; more than half may therefore remain without any form of co-management arrangement.

The Project Document also envisages greater involvement for community/rural associations and it is anticipated that they will implement at least 450 subprojects. The project will support formation of Consultative Environmental Commissions (CCAs), including indigenous representatives, to act as "consultative entities" for civil society regarding environmental matters.

---

<sup>56</sup> Based on the Project Appraisal Document, 26<sup>th</sup> April 2006

<sup>57</sup> Griffiths, T (2005), pp.28-29

<sup>58</sup> Onel Masardule, Foundation for the Protection of Traditional Knowledge – FPCI, Panama, August 2006, quoted in Griffiths, T (2006), *The Global Environment Study and its Local Benefits Study: A Critique*, Forest Peoples Programme, UK [www.forestpeoples.org](http://www.forestpeoples.org)

<sup>59</sup> Fieldwork, Forest Peoples Programme

An Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) was prepared after a consultation process involving 49 events with 350 participants, including 8 workshops, 78 individual interviews, and 20 group interviews (these numbers include events with non-indigenous representatives such as ANAM staff, PAMBC technical teams and local staff of the Health and Education ministries). A seven-page summary of the IPP includes socio-economic and demographic information and a discussion of legal and institutional aspects. Project activities recommended by the IPP include technical assistance, capacity building, the strengthening of *comarcas*, and a “participatory monitoring and evaluation system”. At the level of the Comarcas, however, in June 2006 several community leaders reported that they had not seen the final version of the IPP and were not aware of its contents.

As with many other GEF-projects, there is no recognition in the Project Document of indigenous peoples as rights-holders with the power to reject conservation proposals on their territories. In addition, the project adopts a largely market-oriented perspective to increase rural incomes, seeking to “commercialize products [including artisanal crafts, ecotourism and non-timber forest products] and create markets” (p.44). “Ecotourism” is promoted despite the ambivalent attitude that many indigenous people hold towards such initiatives, and despite the negative environmental impacts of some previous tourist activities in the region.

The Project Document is ambiguous or silent on a number of contentious issues. It states that “restriction to access is unlikely to occur” (p.23), but later identifies subsistence hunting (p.122), subsistence farming (p.128) and fishing (p.128) as “threats” or “problems”. Although the project will not fund involuntary resettlement, voluntary relocation is not ruled out; indeed, “occupation of protected areas” (p.114) and “the physical presence of villages within the [Barú Volcano] Park” (p.131) are identified among the “most important” problems at different project sites.

As for land tenure, the Project Document recognises that tenurial security is a problem, but does not directly address the issue. This is to avoid overlap with another Bank-financed project, the *Panama Land Administration Project* (PRONAT), which is currently engaged in land tenure studies, demarcation and conditional titling within Protected Areas.

There seems to be little role for traditional knowledge in the project. Although it is mentioned in passing, there is no discussion of how it can aid project design.

***In sum, this project contains several positive aspects, including the expansion and strengthening of co-management arrangements. However, it ignores the failings of previous projects and is at risk of repeating the same mistakes, particularly in terms of free, prior and informed consent and indigenous participation. There needs to be a more detailed understanding of indigenous rights, a greater role for traditional knowledge, and recognition of the potential negative impacts of ecotourism.***

#### ***4.2.1.5 Regional (Costa Rica, Panama): Integrated Ecosystem Management in the Sixaola Binational River Basin<sup>60</sup>***

The Sixaola Binational River Basin stretches across the border of Panama and Costa Rica. It is home to an estimated 33,500 people, of whom 58% are indigenous. The Basin contains six indigenous territories (20% of the area), and the upper and middle sub-basins are almost entirely indigenous.

The *Integrated Ecosystem Management in the Sixaola Binational River Basin* project was approved by the GEF on August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006. The project objective is to “contribute to the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity, water and soil resources, through the creation of an enabling environment and integral, cross-cutting management of the Sixaola Binational River Basin.” Its specific objectives are to:

---

<sup>60</sup> Based on Project Document for WP, March 2006

- (i) strengthen the binational institutional framework for integrated basin management and enhance the required technical and operational capacities of the involved institutions, indigenous organizations, and civil society organizations;
- (ii) promote the adoption of productive models that are compatible with the conservation and sustainable use of the water and soil resources;
- (iii) promote the conservation and sustainable use of globally important biodiversity. (p.14)

Indigenous peoples are mentioned throughout the Project Document. As part of its biodiversity component, the project aims to “develop a binationally harmonized legal, policy and regulatory framework for co-management involving indigenous communities and/or local organizations in transboundary protected areas” (p.19). It hopes that “at least two agreements of co-management of some sectors of [La Amistad International Park will be] elaborated, negotiated, and put into action with Indigenous Authorities by the end of the Project” (p.7, annex 1).

The project also seeks to strengthen the environmental management capacity of Indigenous Authorities (p.15) through workshops, training and the creation of two “environmental units” in Indigenous Governments (pp.2-3, annex 1). Capacity building will “embrace traditional knowledge and methods, as well as the introduction of pertinent outside approaches” (p.15). The Project Document notes that traditional knowledge encourages the sustainable use of resources (p.6) and an expected benefit of the project is the “capitalization of traditional indigenous knowledge for sustainable land management” (p.26). A “horizontal learning” scheme (p.16) aims to involve 100 young indigenous people in exchanges of traditional knowledge with grandparents of the community.

The Project Document claims that implementation will involve “ample stakeholder participation” (p.22). The Binational Technical Executing Unit for the Project will include a representative from the Indigenous Authorities in Costa Rica (but no indigenous representative from Panama) (p.22). Sub-basin committees, which will include indigenous representation, will “participate in the definition and prioritization of problems, in the planning of activities and in the social audit of their execution” (p.23). One representative from each sub-basin committee is included in the Binational Commission for the Sixaola River Basin, which will be responsible for the overall supervision of the project (p.22). It is not clear whether Indigenous Authorities will be directly represented on the Binational Commission (see footnote, p.22). Unfortunately there is no detailed budget breakdown, so it is unclear how much will be spent specifically on increasing participation or on the social aspects of the project.

The Project Document also claims that indigenous peoples have been thoroughly consulted about the project. A “comprehensive consultation process”, involving approximately 50 workshops and meetings, was carried out during the formulation of a Regional Sustainable Development Strategy in 2003-04 (p.29). During the PDF-B phase (2005-06) this consultation process was continued under the guidance of an Advisory Group, including indigenous representatives, in order to agree on the specific activities to be included in the project and the responsibilities and roles of the actors (p.29-30). A twelve-page “stakeholder participation summary and plan” is included as an annex to the Project Document.

Although there is positive language on participation and co-management, the project also contains a number of negative aspects. In particular, there is a strong emphasis on “alternative livelihoods” as a solution to unsustainable resource use. A summary of main threats includes “inappropriate subsistence agricultural practices” (e.g. slash-and-burn agriculture), over fishing and hunting in indigenous areas (p.9). It concludes that biodiversity loss “cannot be halted without addressing problems related to the need of increasing alternative livelihoods and sustainable economic activities” (p.11).

“Sustainable economic activities” means, as ever, “agro, eco and/or cultural tourism” and the commercialization of native flora and fauna (p.19). A combination of scenic beauty and indigenous “cultural values” are expected to offer “unique conditions for tourism” (p.3).

The Project Document claims that the preparation of alternative livelihoods guidelines will be participatory (pp.19-20); it is essential that this participation is extensive and meaningful, including the right for indigenous peoples to say no to tourism on their lands.

Generally, the Project Document is very weak on the issue of rights. Although it acknowledges that both countries are signatories of ILO Convention 169 (p.7), it makes no further mention of indigenous peoples' rights.

There is a paragraph on land tenure, which does little more than describe the current situation (p.5). Despite noting earlier in the document that the two indigenous territories in Panama (Bri Bri and Naso) lack legal recognition (p.4), it does not examine any problems this situation may cause for the project. In a footnote, it observes only that "in both countries land regularization and conflict resolution in protected areas and indigenous territories are promoted" by other projects<sup>61</sup> (p.5).

***The Sixaola Binational River Basin project has a number of apparent strengths, including plans to develop co-management frameworks and some attempt to integrate traditional knowledge. At the same time, it remains committed to an "alternative livelihoods" approach while in some instances condemning customary resource use practices. It sidesteps the issue of land tenure and shies away from the language of rights.***

#### 4.2.1.6 *Venezuela – Expanding Partnerships for the National Parks System Project*<sup>62</sup>

The *Expanding Partnerships for the National Parks System Project* was approved by the GEF on August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006. World Bank project appraisal is completed, and negotiations were tentatively scheduled for late January 2007.

The project area comprises the 3 million hectares of Canaima National Park (CNP) and 2.6 million hectares of selected buffer zones. The CNP is home to an estimated 18,500 indigenous people, 95% of which belong to the Pemon culture. In the past, relations between the Pemon and the park authorities have been tense, and conflicts have arisen over issues such as tourism management and the use of fire<sup>63</sup>. Conflict between people and the park peaked in the late 1990s, when the Pemon fought a long campaign against the construction of power lines through the park to export electricity to Brazil.

More recently, efforts have been made to establish a better relationship between the Pemon, the park, and companies operating in the area. This has resulted in an inter-institutional agreement between the Venezuelan Parks Institute (INPARQUES), the state hydroelectricity company (CVG-EDELCA) and the Pemon's indigenous organization (FIEB). The three parties have formally agreed to cooperate around the common objective of preserving CNP's biodiversity, ensuring its environmental services and supporting improvements to the Pemon quality of life (p.2 of Project Document).

The present project aims to "build upon this historical achievement and develop a participatory co-management model for the CNP project area" (p.2). It has four components:

- **Component 1: Implementation of Co-Management Model (Total: \$4.31m, GEF: 0.9m).** This component would finance the establishment, capacity-building and operation of a CNP Co-Management Committee constituted by INPARQUES, FIEB and CVG-EDELCA. It would also design a participatory management plan for CNP in coordination with the Pemon communities' Life Plan.

---

<sup>61</sup> In Costa Rica by the IADB-funded Cadastre Program and in Panama by the World Bank-funded Panama Land Administration Project (PRONAT).

<sup>62</sup> Based on the Project Document for WP (revised), May 2<sup>nd</sup> 2006

<sup>63</sup> Iokiñe Rodríguez (2000), *Indigenous Peoples, National Parks and Participation: a case study of conflicts in Canaima National Park, Venezuela*

- Component 2: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Programs (Total: \$9.15m, GEF: \$1.76m). This component would support specific actions included in the co-management plan to arrest biodiversity loss and promote sustainable production systems.
- Component 3: Pemon Life Plan Environmental Sub-Projects (Total: \$9.27m, GEF: \$2m). A Pemon *Plan de Vida* (Life Plan) was designed during the project preparation phase. This component will provide small grants to finance Pemon environmental sub-projects defined as a priority in their Life Plan.
- Component 4: Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation and Dissemination (Total: 3.26m, GEF: 1.45m). The objectives of this component are: (i) project management; (ii) operation of the project's Monitoring and Evaluation System; and (iii) replication of project lessons learned.

The Project Document asserts that “the project design itself...is predicated on stakeholder participation and co-management” (p.8) and a range of project activities are directed towards Pemon communities. Under component 1, the project will create and support a CNP Co-Management Committee whose functions include overall project coordination, technical oversight, approval of budgets, coordination and promotion of stakeholder participation, and obtaining consensus and collaboration among stakeholders (p.11). This is a positive step, but a couple of concerns remain. Firstly, as the Project Document concedes, “continued trust” is “fundamental” to the agreement (p.12); given the recent history of CNP, this trust may prove difficult to maintain. Secondly, the co-management model is based on “equal participation” in which the Pemon will have no greater voice than the state electricity company, despite the project being based in their ancestral lands. Indigenous peoples and electricity companies are treated alike as stakeholders, with little recognition that the former are rights-holders while the latter are not.

Component 3 of the project is of particular interest. It supports the priorities of the Pemon *Plan de Vida* (Life Plan), which was developed during the project preparation stage (annex 20, pp.121-131). The Life Plan was drafted by the Pemon with wide participation from community Captains, Generals, elders, researchers and youth in eight workshops involving 623 indigenous representatives. It establishes a range of programs, including activities relating to traditional knowledge, land demarcation and titling, bilingual education, organizational strengthening and sustainable development. The GEF project will support the following programs from the Pemon Life Plan: support to the conservation and sustainable traditional use of natural resources; establishment of land use and ancestral use of the Pemon people's territory; strengthening ancestral, scientific and cultural knowledge related to the conservation of biodiversity; and support to the process for the demarcation and titling of indigenous territories and habitat (p.76). It is perhaps disappointing that technical studies for land demarcation and titling supported by the GEF project are expected to cover 35% of the park; it is not clear whether this will area will include all of the Pemon's ancestral lands (p.31). Overall, however, this component is a welcome attempt to integrate indigenous perspectives into project design.

A Social Assessment was carried out during project preparation to identify and consult key stakeholders (p.74). It involved consultation with indigenous authorities and a series of participatory on-site workshops, held in 99 communities with a total attendance of 820 persons (p.75). During the implementation stage, annual socio-economic surveys will be used to monitor Pemon community welfare and the degree of execution of *Plan de Vida* objectives (p.11). Key outcome indicators include:

- activities underway in CNP addressing at least 30% of the Pemon Life Plan's cultural preservation objectives
- 50% of co-management plan implemented by End of Project (the Project Document claims that, within the available timeframe, it is not possible to design and implement the whole of the co-management plan – p.29)

The Project Document also contains a third social outcome indicator: that “at least 60% of Pemon consider the degree of coordination between *Plan de Vida* and project execution adequate by End of Project, as evidenced by annual socio-economic surveys” (p.29). However, in a more recent Project Information Document, dated November 30<sup>th</sup> 2006, this indicator has been removed<sup>64</sup>.

The World Bank safeguard policy relating to Indigenous Peoples is triggered and an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) has been prepared. The IPP includes activities to obtain Pemon participation in monitoring and evaluation, communicate with Pemon communities, and train indigenous leaders for successful execution of the Management Plan and the technical and legal aspects of land demarcation (p.79).

According to the latest Project Information Document, “the activities to be included in the Management Plan within the Protected Area do not involve restrictions to natural resource use that could potentially impact local indigenous communities” (p.10)<sup>65</sup>. Nor will any physical displacement take place, although a Resettlement Plan has been prepared. However, “indigenous subsistence farming” is identified as one of the threats to biodiversity in CNP (p.112). In addition, component 2 of the project includes a “land use surveillance program”, directed partly towards logging, tourism and infrastructure development, but also towards slash-and-burn agriculture (p.48).

Indeed, one of the key outcome indicators for the project is that “12,000 hectares in the most threatened parts of CNP are under improved habitat preservation management (*as measured by reduced incidence of fire and slash and burn practices*)” (p.29, emphasis added). Manmade fires are identified as “the largest environmental impact in CNP” (p.112). However, fire is of critical socio-cultural importance to the Pemon, and is used for agriculture, communication, hunting, signalling, improving access and removing weeds, as well as many other purposes<sup>66</sup>. In recognition of this fact, the project will develop a fire management guide “incorporating ancestral practices regarding fire and sustainable forest use” (p.69). But the Project Document does not question the claim that fire has negative environmental impacts. Nor does it consider the possibility that a reduction in manmade fires may itself have damaging consequences<sup>67</sup>. As such, it is questionable whether the project will truly be able to incorporate the Pemon perspective on fire and its impacts.

***Overall, the Expanding Partnerships for the National Parks System Project appears on paper to be one of the most progressive in the GEF biodiversity portfolio – on paper at least. It supports a range of indigenous activities in the Pemon Plan de Vida, including the preservation of traditional knowledge and support for demarcation and titling of some indigenous territories. It also includes mechanisms for co-management. However, the Project Document could go much further in adopting a rights-based approach. Concerns also remain about the issue of fire management.***

## 5. Conclusions

The recent GEF Local Benefits study has expressed the need for GEF projects to pay greater attention to social and indigenous issues. In response, the GEF Management claims that recent projects have better addressed these concerns. This review suggests that this claim is only partially justified. Although there are indications of progress, many projects still fail to adequately address important issues such as rights, resource access, and land tenure in project design and preparation. Positively, most project documents now give significant consideration to indigenous and community participation. Many projects involve detailed “stakeholder” consultation, and some seek to develop co-management plans.

---

<sup>64</sup> See PID, p.3

<sup>65</sup> This is in contrast to the earlier Project Document for WP, which states that “the ways of life of communities inhabiting in or near the Project area might be affected through restraints on natural resource use” (p.16)

<sup>66</sup> Ronald L. Myers (2006), *Living With Fire: Sustaining Ecosystems and Livelihoods through Integrated Fire Management*, The Nature Conservancy. See also Rodríguez (2000).

<sup>67</sup> A reduction in the incidence of early dry-season fires could lead to “large continuous tracts of grass fuels [persisting] into the late dry season potentially fueling large, intense fires which would cause widespread forest damage”. Myers (2006).

However, “participation” is often limited to workshops and meetings; institutional mechanisms are not elaborated. Rarely do outcome indicators include measures of participation; it is rarer still for clear community consent (e.g. legal agreements) to be a condition of project effectiveness. It should also be remembered that a “participatory approach” in the project document does not always translate into real participation on the ground. A desk-based review can indicate the quantity, but not the quality, of consultations.

Resource restrictions remain a major concern. Customary resource use activities, such as subsistence agriculture, fishing and hunting, are frequently identified as threats. Most projects continue to emphasise “alternative livelihoods” (e.g. tourism, park surveillance); only a few explore the conservation potential of traditional resource use practices. This is despite the findings of the Local Benefits Study, which emphasised the limitations of income-generating activities like ecotourism.

Although social assessments were widely used, many interventions do not fully consider the implications of the prevailing social, political and economic context. Land tenure issues, for example, are addressed tentatively, if at all. Projects are often based on the “successes” of previous GEF interventions, ignoring indigenous criticisms of these earlier GEF project models.

There are also indications in the recent GEF project *Indigenous Peoples Network for Change* that indigenous concerns are finally being internalized by the GEF (though at this early stage it is difficult to assess the success of this project in increasing indigenous participation).

The overall trend is one of gradual and patchy evolution in GEF project design when a more radical shift in GEF policy and practice is urgently required across the GEF biodiversity portfolio. Most of these projects were prepared before the publication of the Local Benefits Study; it is to be hoped that future projects will incorporate its recommendations as well as the calls for a rights-based approach and the development of a specific GEF policy on Indigenous Peoples as called for by indigenous peoples in the GEF Council and at the 3<sup>rd</sup> GEF Assembly in 2006.

The UNDP is currently seeking to fully apply its rights-based approach to development throughout its operations, including GEF conservation and development projects under the Small Grants Programme.<sup>68</sup> This is a welcome process and it is expected that UNDP will extend its rights-based approach to its larger GEF conservation projects.

However, one of the biggest obstacles to progress is the failure of the GEF as a whole to adopt a rights-based approach, including the rigorous application of free, prior and informed consent. Participatory language must be matched by a change of GEF policies and due diligence procedures. Until indigenous peoples are treated as rights-holders, rather than merely stakeholders, GEF interventions will risk neglecting their concerns.

Based on a recent speech given by Monique Barbut to the GEF Council meeting in December 2006, it seems the GEF is soon to undergo deep reform. In her speech, the new CEO of the GEF advised governmental delegates that the GEF must change to become “a leading force in the sustainable development of all people” through far-reaching reforms and a GEF “five-point sustainability compact” that will ensure the GEF provides funding in a timely way to “improve the global environment at the same time that it enhances the quality of people’s social and economic development”.<sup>69</sup>

Closer examination of the CEO’s proposed compact makes clear that her vision is one based on “equity” among countries and “innovation” that aims to involve global capital in environmental initiatives. Likewise, the CEO’s pledge to create GEF Ombudsman suggests this may only be open to

---

<sup>68</sup>

<sup>69</sup> Barbut, M (2006) “The New GEF: a proving ground for our sustainable future” Speech to GEF Council Meeting, Washington, DC, December, 5, 2006.

complaints from “countries”. The proposed compact makes no mention of indigenous peoples, local communities and other rights holders directly or indirectly affected by GEF projects and programmes.

If the GEF is really set to undergo major reforms in order to speed-up and streamline project processing and emphasise programmatic interventions<sup>70</sup>, it is now essential that indigenous peoples and civil society ensure that they are involved to shape the direction of reforms in-line with their long-standing concrete proposals to improve GEF performance and accountability.

---

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.

## Annex 1: Summary of Social Data from Biodiversity Projects

a) 14 Full-Size and Medium-Size Projects, Approved by the GEF or one of its implementing agencies since January 2005<sup>71</sup>

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<p><b>Cameroon: Forestry and Environmental Sector Adjustment Credit</b> IA: IDA/IBRD Category: Full Size OPs: 1, 2, 3, 4 Duration: 5 years Funding: Total \$126.8 M; GEF \$10.267 M; IDA \$15 M; Gov. of Cameroon \$27 M; EU Commission \$2 M; DFID \$13 M; Other (CIDA, WWF etc) \$29.8 M; Funding Gap \$29.733 M Status: Approved by GEF (21/05/04), approved by World Bank (28/02/06), currently active Description: The project development objective is to strengthen public and private efforts to achieve socio-economically and ecologically sustainable use of national forest and wildlife resources.</p>										
3 Project will strengthen Pygmies' "customary and modern rights" (p.35) Notes that "local communities are increasingly aware of their rights" (p.113) Also mentions user rights	1 Notes that past projects have not addressed problems such as "the population's tenurial rights" (p.11-12). Also mentions need for "resolution [of] tenurial disputes" (p.2) but does not appear to have indigenous peoples in mind.	Section on SGPs (pp.36-37). OD 4.20 and OP/BP 4.12 not triggered but operation has been screened against them.	7 Section on "special case of the Pygmy populations" (p.35). Notes that indigenous peoples in Cameroon total around 30,000 individuals and are often marginalized.	0	No	Probably Subsistence resource use identified as threat (p.11). Claims that "continued access by local people to wildlife resources will be ensured by the formal allocation of hunting areas to local communities" (p.112). However, seeks to create 176,000ha of new protected areas.	Yes Aims to ensure that the project will "respect the dignity, rights and culture of the indigenous population" Recommends building technical capacity; facilitating IP representation ; establishing equal technical and financial opportunities; and establishing equal legal conditions, including new national policy on IPs.	Some No social assessment, but "a detailed stakeholder mapping has been drawn to identify the typology and the special needs and opportunities for collaboration with all stakeholders" (p.36).	No detailed budget breakdown.	Section on "participatory approach" (pp.35-36). Stakeholder participation plan (pp.111-115). Operation seeks to "increase local community involvement in and benefits from sustainable management of natural resources" (p.7). Expected benefits include "community empowerment" and decentralization (p.19). Will create 1 million ha of community forests (p.48). But direct community involvement limited to "ten regional workshops" (p.36). Strong on language of participation, but weak on detail.

<sup>71</sup> The information in this table refers to the most recent available Project Documents (either the "Project Document for WP" or the "Project Appraisal Document"). The 'status' of the project is based on the latest available information as of 27<sup>th</sup> January 2007 – due to the shortage of accessible data online, this information may be incomplete. N.B. Where the table refers to "number of mentions", the figure should be taken as a guideline only. It refers to the number of times that a subject is mentioned in the entire document (including annexes). Where a subject is mentioned several times in the same paragraph, or where a sentence is repeated later in the document, only one "mention" is counted.

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<p><b>Democratic Republic of Congo: In Support of the Congolese Institute for Nature Conservation (ICCN)'s Program for the Rehabilitation of the DRC's National Parks Network</b> IA: IBRD Category: Full Size OPs: 3 Duration: 5 years Funding: Total \$55.88 M; GEF \$7.28 M; Gov. of DRC \$6.5 M; EC \$12.5 M; US (CARPE 2) \$23 M; UNESCO/UNF \$3.4 M; European Bilaterals \$1.1 M; NGOs \$2.1 M Status: Approved by GEF (01/08/06), ? Description: To strengthen capacity in the DRC to conserve globally important biodiversity. It has three components: i) support to the institutional rehabilitation of the Congolese Institute for Nature Conservation, ICCN (national level) ii) direct support to national parks and their buffer zones (site level) iii) evaluation and expansion of the protected areas network (national level)</p>										
<p>2 There is currently a low level of legal recognition of traditional and user rights, esp. of indigenous peoples. The legal recognition and protection of customary rights is a "possible benefit" of the project (p.29). The project "will help secure indigenous people's traditional rights to access natural resources for their livelihoods" (p.82).</p>	<p>0 Focus on rights to natural resources and land uses, not land tenure.</p>	<p>Section on SGPs (pp.29-31). Annex on SGPs (pp.102-104). OD 4.20 and OP 4.12 triggered and mitigation measures to be put in place.</p>	<p>11 Project will "enhance pygmies community well-being" (p.14) and "generate new opportunities for local people including indigenous people" (p.9) Marginalization of indigenous peoples is risk to project (p.29) Project will entail a "specific pygmy-oriented program" (p.30) Will consult UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (p.135)</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>Not directly. GEF will not finance resettlement but resettlement will be carried out by ICCN and partner NGOs in Virunga national park.</p>	<p>Unclear. "The project will not restrict pygmies' traditional access to natural resources compared to the start of the project. On the contrary, it will help secure indigenous people's traditional rights to access natural resources for their livelihoods" (p.82, emphasis added).</p>	<p>Yes. Will be included in Social Impact Assessment Not yet available online (as of January 2007).</p>	<p>Not yet. But "socio-economic studies (including a study on pygmies' traditional forest and land uses)" will be carried out (p.83),</p>	<p>Garamba: \$500,000 on community activities. Virunga: \$550,000 (including pygmy program). Additional funds for workshops, consultations.</p>	<p>Will support "community development and participatory management" (p.14). Will scale-up models of community-managed reserves (e.g. Tayna). \$1.05 million for community conservation. Workshop with indigenous peoples held in Nov. 2005. New/expanded PAs to be identified on basis of free, prior and informed consent. But mechanisms for co-management / FPIC are unclear. Little participation in site selection. Can indigenous peoples reject PAs on their lands?</p>

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<b>Global (Brazil, Cameroon, Mexico): Improved Certification Schemes for Sustainable Tropical Forest Management</b> IA: UNEP Category: Medium Size OPs: 3 Duration: 4 years Funding: Total \$1.454 M; GEF \$987,000; NGOs \$374,000; Others \$93,000 Status: Approved by GEF (10/01/05), currently in implementation Description: Aims to develop the tools and incentives to help small forest managers, communities and NTFP collectors in the tropics to identify and protect biodiversity in the forests they manage (the 'Target Forests') through certification, whilst continuing to meet their own management objectives.										
0 Notes only that "according to the local context... stakeholders have different rights, benefits, duties, responsibilities" (p.26).	1 Only notes that "80% of forests in Mexico are legally owned by indigenous or peasant communities" (p.11)	0	5 Notes the presence of indigenous peoples in Brazil and Mexico, and their dependence on forest resources. No mention of indigenous peoples in Cameroon.	1 Under Brazil's National Biodiversity Policy, "actions related to access to the traditional knowledge associated with biodiversity must take place with the prior informed consent of aboriginal peoples, quilombolas and other local communities" (p.10). TK not mentioned in context of this project.	No	Probably. Notes that forest management certification standards "generally include" requirements for the "control of inappropriate hunting, fishing and trapping" (p.14).	No	No	No budget for social / IP issues, though indigenous peoples are expected to benefit from project activities.	Project aimed at "small forest managers, communities and NTFP collectors" (p.3). Section on Stakeholder Involvement (pp.25-27) claims that preparatory workshops included "local communities' representatives" (p.25) but list of participants suggests otherwise (p.43). Locally adapted criteria will be developed based on field survey of existing practices followed by a multi-stakeholder workshop, ensuring "a balance of environmental, social and economic interests" (p.26). Forest Stewardship Council (the executing agency) has social as well as environmental mandate (p.8); FSC-Brazil Director Council includes the Coordination of Indigenous Organizations of the Amazon (COIAB) (p.27). Unclear how participatory certification process will be.

The Global Environment Facility, Biodiversity and Indigenous Peoples 2005-06

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<b>Global: Indigenous Peoples' Network for Change</b> IA: UNEP Category: Medium Size OPs: 1, 2, 3, 4, 13 Duration: 3 years Funding: Total \$1.439 M; GEF \$938,844; Bilateral \$100,291; NGOs \$300,413; In-kind contribution \$99,189 Status: Approved by GEF (26/08/05) Description: Aims to enhance indigenous peoples' awareness and effective participation in CBD and GEF processes through the establishment of communication and information mechanisms that promote an effective exchange of information.										
<p>5</p> <p>Notes that implementation of international conventions has led to "violation of indigenous peoples' rights" (p.6). Notes too indigenous advocacy for their rights and states that "the increasing participation of indigenous peoples as one of the most important rights-holders and stakeholders needs to be further advanced and used in the most effective and efficient way" (p.6).</p>	<p>2</p> <p>Notes that "nature, biodiversity, indigenous peoples and lands are inseparable" (p.6) and that the implementation of international conventions has led to the "displacement of indigenous peoples from their traditional territories" (p.6). Legal issues and territorial integrity are "priority themes" (p.11). Otherwise no mention of land tenure.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p><i>Mentioned throughout.</i></p> <p>Recognises that indigenous peoples "have a special, distinct and holistic relationship with nature and have developed, protected and conserved the diversity of biological species throughout the centuries... Nature, biodiversity, indigenous peoples and lands are inseparable" (p.6). Notes that implementation of international conventions (including CBD) has led to, inter alia, further marginalization of IPs, destructions of norms and values, corruption of cultures and military violence against 'non-</p>	<p>5</p> <p>Will improve dissemination tools and strengthen "a burgeoning indigenous peoples knowledge network for biodiversity" (p.4). Notes that the implementation of international conventions has contributed to the "weakening and fragmentation of traditional knowledge systems and practices [and] commercialization and misappropriation of knowledge" (p.6). Overall capacity building efforts, particularly in relation to women, are expected to aid preservation of TK, but no specific TK-related activities.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Notes that "indigenous communities are all too often accused of unsustainable practices in order to get control over indigenous territories, among other by establishing protected areas" (p.8).</p>	<p>No, but whole project deals with indigenous issues.</p>	<p>Not yet.</p> <p>Baseline data to determine "existing levels of knowledge" about the CBD and GEF will be completed by the end of year 1 (not before appraisal). Policy and strategic papers and ten case studies will be done under outcome 2 of the project (p.11).</p>	<p>Budget pp. 23-24. The whole project is deals with indigenous issues.</p>	<p>Project "has been developed in a collaborative manner between key indigenous peoples organizations on a national and regional level, the International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests (IAITPTF) and the UNEP" (p.3). The entire focus of the project is on improving indigenous participation in CBD and GEF processes, through increased awareness and capacity, regional and international coordination and the establishment of strategic partnerships. It will develop communication strategies e.g. translations, radio programmes, regional workshops. Will also involve "increased, new and wider consultations", the development of an "indigenous advisory expert group" (p.11), and links to the GEF small grants program (p.13). There will be a particular focus on women. Notes that "the participation of indigenous peoples in CBD and GEF related processes is currently very</p>

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
			cooperative' indigenous peoples (p.6).							limited" (p.7) and that biodiversity programs are often developed "without proper consultation of indigenous peoples... There are even examples of GEF supported projects that have adversely affected indigenous peoples, largely due to the insufficient involvement of indigenous peoples in the preparatory and implementation stages of those projects" (p.8).
<p><b>Guyana: Protected Areas System Project, Phase 1</b> IA: IBRD Category: Full Size OPs: 2, 3 Duration: 5 years Funding (proposed): Total \$15.5 M; GEF \$6 M; CI \$6 M; Gov. of Germany \$3.1 M; Gov. of Guyana \$0.4 M Status: The current status of this project is not clear, particularly in terms of financing. There are some indications that the World Bank pulled out of this project in 2006 (though the project still appears on its "pipeline" project database). Description: The long-term goal of the proposed Guyana Protected Areas System (GPAS) Project is to ensure effective protection and sustainable management of representative ecosystems of Guyana through a national system of protected areas which is self-sustained, transparent, decentralized and managed through partnerships.</p>										
17 Mostly in the context of land and resource use rights. "The main social issues concern the potential impact of PA establishment on Amerindian land and resource use rights" (p.17). Indigenous peoples action plans will define proposed user rights (p.36). "Since Amerindian user rights over State lands are	Mentioned throughout. Will "support the resolution of Amerindian land issues in project study areas prior to formal declaration of the PAs or implementation of on-the-ground investment activities." (p.18). Disbursement conditional on adoption of an Amerindian Act that "satisfactorily addresses land and resource use issues" (p.34). Section on land	Section on SGPs (p.80-85). OD 4.20, OD 4.12, OPN 11.03 are all triggered Social SGP issues will be monitored by EPA and Bank technical specialists (p.83).	Mentioned throughout. Project will "bring significant benefits to the Amerindian communities of Guyana" (p.8). Project sites are in Amerindian areas and will affect approximately 40 communities. Detailed information on Amerindians is included in the social assessment summary, the	0	No	Possibly "Amerindian land and resource uses for traditional and subsistence purposes will be upheld" (p.80) but "the possibility exists that...some livelihood activities of people living within the PAs or in surrounding buffer zones might be impacted such as by potential limitations on	Yes (pp. 73-85)	Yes A number of social assessments have been carried out, and further site-specific participatory social assessments of local communities will be carried out during project implementation. (pp. 65-72)	Budget breakdown shown on p.47. Unclear how much will be spent on specifically social issues.	Project seems highly participatory. Section on "participatory approach" (pp.19-20): "the active participation of local communities, NGOs and other interest groups will be sought at all stages of project implementation". Section on "indigenous involvement" (pp.78-80). A key performance indicator is that "agreed participatory processes for PA establishment are adopted and applied" (p.1). Will work closely with Ministry of Amerindian Affairs (p.8). Signature of satisfactory operating agreements with local communities is a

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<p>constitutionally protected, any protected area that is established over such lands must recognize and protect Amerindian rights unless the relevant Amerindian community gives its consent” (p.76)</p>	<p>rights (pp.73-75). Will offer technical assistance to resolution and demarcation of Amerindian land. Table on Amerindian land status (p.72) Indigenous peoples in Guyana have protested that the revised Amerindian Act does not resolve land rights issues and is inconsistent with indigenous peoples’ rights in international law. This critical position has been upheld by UN human rights monitoring bodies in 2006 (CERD).</p>	<p>Estimated cost of implementing safeguard mechanisms is \$970,000 (p.85).</p>	<p>IPDP, and the process framework for mitigating impacts (pp.65-87).</p>			<p>natural resource extraction” (p.86). Livelihood issues would be addressed “in a manner which is fair, just, and in accordance with local laws” (p.86).</p>				<p>condition of project effectiveness (p.9). Multi-stakeholders on National PA Advisory Committee and local PA steering committees (p.9). Capacity building, conflict resolution and grievance mechanisms. PAs “will not be established in Amerindian lands without the agreement of the communities involved” (p.15). Site-specific IP action plans will be prepared (p.36). In early 2007, however, affected communities have not been shown detailed plans of potential PA boundaries and measures to properly respect their land rights and unresolved territorial claims remain unclear.</p>

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<p><b>India: Biodiversity Conservation and Rural Livelihoods Improvement</b> IA: IBRD Category: Full size OPs: 3, 4 Duration: 6 years Funding: Total \$47.43 M; GEF \$11.83 M; World Bank \$23.8 M; Gov. of India \$8.3 M; Others \$3.5 M Status: Approved by GEF (01/08/06), World Bank appraisal due 20/03/07, expected to begin June 2007                      Description: Development objective is to strengthen and mainstream biodiversity conservation at the landscape level by improving rural livelihoods, participation, learning and its replication.</p>										
<p>3 Notes that limited rights of access mean that local people “have little incentive to use natural resources in a sustainable way” (p.1). “Any desired changes by the communities in the ways in which local populations exercise customary tenure rights... will not be imposed on them, but will emerge for [sic] a consultative process satisfactory to the World Bank” (p.48). No detailed discussion of rights.</p>	<p>3 Will review legal framework and relevant changes in order to “provide explicit information on the legal status of land parcels/unit (including PAs) and their implications for project implementation” (p.21). Fails to adequately address land rights or security of tenure.</p>	<p>Section on SGPs (pp.18-19) Annex on SGP issues (pp.45-49) OP 4.10 and OP/BP 4.12 are triggered Not clear how the new Broad Community Support Standard is being applied.</p>	<p>5 Mentioned as stakeholders and in reference to safeguard policies. Also mentioned under rubric of ‘vulnerable groups’, ‘ethnic minorities’ and ‘forest dependent peoples’.</p>	<p>3 “There will be a strong emphasis on community involvement in monitoring including tools based on local ecological knowledge” (p.11). Restrictions on medicinal plant collection could pose a threat to traditional knowledge.</p>	<p>“Highly unlikely” but not ruled out. Dependent upon outcome of Social Assessment “Enclave habitations” listed as threats at two of the project sites. Involuntary resettlement will not be supported.</p>	<p>“Unlikely” but possible. Emphasis on “alternate livelihoods” suggests some restrictions. Aims for “a 40% reduction in dependency on PA resources” (p.26). Admits that “some adverse impacts might arise from the potential restriction on access to natural resources for communities residing in and around protected areas” (p.48) but claims restrictions would be based on community consent and “evolve through an internal community decision making process” (p.48).</p>	<p>No “A separate indigenous peoples development plan will not be prepared” (p.18). [Controversial: according to Bank rules, an IPDP would be required unless IPs are the main beneficiaries.]</p>	<p>Not yet A “detailed Social Assessment” was being carried out at the time of writing (p.47). Is it too late for its findings to affect project design?</p>	<p>\$14m for on-going social services (not GEF-funded). \$24.5m for rural development (\$16.8m of which is from the GEF &amp; IDA). (p.72)</p>	<p>Strong emphasis on “participatory conservation management”. A key outcome indicator is “at least 50% of key stakeholder including target communities participating in planning and management of project activities”. A “participatory process framework” will be developed. A “Stakeholder Consultation Plan” is included in the Executive Summary. Bottom-up planning, decentralization and an integrated multi-sectoral approach are all cited as guiding principles of the project (pp.4-5). But no radical change from past Ecodevelopment initiatives. No clear institutional mechanisms for joint management.</p>

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<b>India: Mainstreaming Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plant Diversity in Three Indian States</b> IA: UNDP Category: Full Size OPs: 3 Duration: 7 years Funding: Total \$11.759 M; GEF \$5.28 M; Gov. of India \$6.448 M; NGOs \$31,000 Status: Approved by GEF (13/09/05) Description: Seeks to achieve the long-term conservation and sustainable use of India's medicinal plant diversity, particularly of its globally significant species. The project will do this by mainstreaming conservation and sustainable use objectives into forest management policy and practice at the national, state and local level in three Indian states (Arunachal Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Uttarakhand).										
<p>3</p> <p>Notes existence of traditional tribal rights in Arunachal Pradesh (p.63). "What is also lacking is an appropriate and strong intellectual property rights regime to safeguard the interests of the tribal people" (p.66). Paragraph on problem of "weak community property rights" (p.9). Also mentions local ownership rights under existing legislation</p>	<p>3</p> <p>Explicitly mentions tribal land rights in Arunachal Pradesh (p.63). 3 ments. of rights to natural resources, NTFP etc.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No mention of UNDP policy on indigenous peoples.</p>	<p>Mentioned throughout.</p> <p>Tribal rights groups not explicitly included in summary of "key stakeholders".</p>	<p>Mentioned throughout.</p> <p>Loss and limitations of TK identified as threats (p.7). TK "comprises an invaluable living legacy" (p.17). Seeks to document and preserve TK, including legal mechanisms to protect it. Preservation of TK not included as key primary indicator of success or expected benefit. Erosion of TK blamed on "changing aspirations" rather than resource restrictions. Also para. on erosion of "traditional systems for natural resource management"(p. 7)</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Unclear.</p> <p>Notes that "low levels of subsistence-related medicinal plant harvesting generally do not pose a threat to the viability of harvested populations". But "lack of alternative sustainable livelihoods" identified as an underlying cause in PDF-B doc. Emphasis is on <i>in situ</i> conservation and sustainable harvesting, not on limiting commercial demand for medicinal plants. Will create "Medicinal Plant Conservation Areas".</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Detailed studies by FRLHT (an Indian NGO). Including analysis of customary law, rights, and livelihood dependence on forest resources (in separate documents).</p>	<p>Budget pp.48-49. No funds for specifically social aspects. But some expenditure may indirectly benefit indigenous peoples (e.g. recording traditional knowledge)</p>	<p>"Extensive consultations" during key planning phase, inc. with Gram Sabhas and PRIs (self-government institutions). Hopes to develop "innovative MAP co-management regimes between Forest Division authorities and local communities". Stakeholder involvement plan: workshops, participatory field surveys, public hearings, capacity building, "information as a prerequisite to participation". \$115,000 allocated to stakeholder consultations in PDF-B doc. But no participation success indicators. No tribal organisations involved in implementation at two of the three project sites.</p>

The Global Environment Facility, Biodiversity and Indigenous Peoples 2005-06

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<p><b>Mexico: Environmental Services Project</b> IA: IBRD Category: Full size OPs: 3, 4 Duration: 4 years Funding: Total \$182.142 M; GEF \$15.35 M; World Bank \$80.725 M; Gov. of Mex. \$53.333 M; Beneficiaries \$32.734 M Status: Approved by GEF (10/11/05), approved by World Bank (29/03/06), currently active Description: The project objective is to improve the provision of environmental services that bring both national benefits (primarily water services) and global benefits (primarily increased biodiversity conservation) by strengthening and expanding existing programs for payment of environmental services (PES) as well as supporting the establishment of new local PES mechanisms.</p>										
<p>1 As part of its “participatory action strategy” the project will support the “assertion of collective rights under specific cultural and sociopolitical conditions” (p.26). No details are given.</p>	<p>5 Short section on “land tenure and forests in Mexico” notes that the land tenure rules of common property regimes have important implications for conservation programs. (p.31). “All eligible landowners... will need to present evidence of legally secure land tenure and long-term residence in the PES-eligible area” (p.27)</p>	<p>Table of SGPs (p.27). Annex on SGP issues (p.111-117). OD 4.20 (being revised as OP 4.10) is triggered OP/BP 4.12 is not triggered</p>	<p>13 Including half-page section on “indigenous communities and forests” (p.32). Also notes that “indigenous peoples, rural poverty, and land tenure issues are all closely related to the maintenance and conservation of forests in Mexico” (p.28).</p>	<p>1 Indigenous peoples have “a stock of traditional knowledge about [the ecosystem’s] goods and services, allowing them to obtain more value from the same plot of forest than, for example, new immigrants to the region” (p.32)</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Possibly. Only as the outcome of PES contracts which are “strictly voluntary with each landowner” (p.113).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Some. A “participatory social assessment” was held at five “promising sites” (p.114) Unclear what studies have been done elsewhere.</p>	<p>\$9.56 million (GEF: \$3.7 million) will focus on increasing community capacity to participate in PES schemes. No budget specifically for IP / social issues.</p>	<p>Component 3 will focus on “removing obstacles that may prevent communities from participating in either national PES program or local PES mechanisms with a particular focus on problems faced by poor communities” (p.11). “Community promoters” will be chosen by communities to act as liaisons. IPDP and site-specific Indigenous Action Plans to assist participation. Participatory social assessment involved 20 workshops and 74 interviews. A participatory action strategy has been developed. Local participation good, but little community influence on overall project design and implementation. It is not clear that the Broad Community Support standard (required by OP 4.10) has been applied. Will market-driven PES system disadvantage indigenous, poor and marginalized communities?</p>

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<b>Panama: Rural Productivity and Consolidation of the Atlantic Mesoamerican Biological Corridor Project</b> IA: IBRD Category: Full Size OPs: 2, 3, 4 Duration: 5 years Funding: Total \$50.275 M; GEF \$6.275 M; World Bank \$36.4 M; Gov. of Pan. \$3 M; Beneficiaries \$4.6 M Status: Approved by GEF (08/06/05), approved by World Bank (15/06/06), currently active Description: Aims to conserve globally-important biodiversity in Panama while also contributing to increased income and employment of small-scale rural producers. It has three components: i) community investments in environmental resources; ii) management of natural resources and strengthening of the Protected Areas Monitoring System (SINAP); iii) monitoring, evaluation and project management										
<p>1</p> <p>The General Environment Law (1998) “recognizes the rights of all indigenous peoples regarding TK for the management and conservation of their natural resources (p.77)</p>	<p>6</p> <p>“The high level of non-legalization of lands” is recognised as a problem within protected areas (p.115). Land tenure studies, demarcation and conditional titling are taking place within PRONAT (another WB-financed project)</p>	<p>Section on SGPs (pp. 21-23). Annex on SGP issues (pp.68-81). OP/BP 4.10 &amp; OPN 11.03 triggered OP/BP 4.12 is not triggered</p>	<p>Mentioned throughout.</p> <p>Section of indigenous issues (pp.74-81). 30% of population in project area is indigenous. IPs and indigenous traditional authorities identified as beneficiaries from the project (p. 20)</p>	<p>1</p> <p>“Communities in the project area have a broad knowledge about traditional use of plants, animals soil and microclimate”. Their rights regarding TK are recognised by the 1998 General Environmental Law. (p.77)</p>	<p>Probably not.</p> <p>Involuntary resettlement will not be financed. No mention of voluntary relocation, but “the physical presence of villages” and the “occupation of Protected Areas” are mentioned as threats and problems.</p>	<p>Possibly.</p> <p>“Restriction to access is unlikely to occur” (p.23). However, subsistence hunting, subsistence farming and overfishing are all identified as threats or problems.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Summary in PD, pp.74-81. A revised IPP was produced in 2006, but a copy is not available in indigenous communities.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>A “detailed social evaluation” was conducted during project preparation (p.19).</p>	<p>No detailed budget breakdown.</p>	<p>Aims to maximize inclusion and extend and strengthen co-management. Will fund 450 community-managed subprojects. Supports formation of consultative environmental commissions (CCAs). 350 participants involved in drawing up IPP. Indigenous people also involved in environmental assessment. But fails to recognise problems of indigenous exclusion in previous projects and indigenous complaints that consultations are inadequate. Initial field reports suggest that the new Broad Community Support standard was not applied rigorously, arguably in contravention of the Bank’s safeguard policy OP 4.10.</p>

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<p><b>Regional (Brazil, Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Peru): Biodiversity Conservation in Coffee: Transforming Productive Practices in the Coffee Sector by Increasing Market Demand for Certified Sustainable Coffee</b> IA: UNDP Category: Full Size OPs: 3, 4 Duration: 7 years Funding: Total \$94.254 M; GEF \$12.64 M; Gov. \$840,000; Bilateral \$2.4 M; NGOs \$7.265 M; Companies \$71.108 M Status: Approved by GEF (10/11/05), operational from mid-July 2006 Description: Aims to transform the way that the participating coffee companies source coffee, establishing new, environmentally and socially responsible ways of doing business that the companies can internalize and replicate after the completion of the GEF project. Specifically, the project will promote the following practices: (i) more direct and transparent purchases by traders and roasters from producers, (ii) the payment of higher prices for sustainable coffee that meets buyers' quality needs, (iii) the use of long-term contracts, and the provision of finance and in-kind investments and/or donations to help coffee farmers meet certification requirements that protect ecosystems, and (iv) improve the quality of life in their communities.</p>										
0	0	0 No mention of UNDP policy on indigenous peoples.	4 Notes that the Northwest Coffee Region in Guatemala has "many small indigenous producers" (p.14). The local NGOs that will be executing the project have "deep roots" in these communities (p.38). Project has links to the GEF-World Bank <i>Int. Eco. Management in Indigenous com.</i> project (p.84)	0	No	Encouraged To comply with Rainforest Alliance certification requirements, local producers must ensure "a stop for hunting and extraction of plants and animals from forested farms" (p.26).	No	No evidence of detailed social studies. Baseline surveys will be done to determine satisfaction levels and economic vulnerability of farmers (pp.103-104). Studies done during implementatn. may be too late to affect project design.	Budget breakdown pp.121-122. No funds specifically for social issues, but several areas of the project should improve local livelihoods (e.g. through promoting better work standards)	Stakeholder analysis (pp.38-39) and Stakeholder Involvement Plan (pp.143-151). Project will "help improve the participatory nature of the certification standard development" (p.62). Civil society involvement mainly through NGOs, including farmers organizations like the Colombia Coffee Federation (FNC) and the El Salvador Small Producers Association (APECAFE). Capacity building and technical assistance will be offered at a local level (pp.55-56). Not much detail on community involvement.

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<p><b>Regional (Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela): Conservation of the Biodiversity of the Paramo in the Northern and Central Andes (Proyecto Paramo Andino)</b>                      IA: UNEP Category: Full size OPs: 1, 4 Duration: 6 years Funding: Total \$15.484 M; GEF \$8.860 M; Gov. \$1.173 M; Bilateral \$424,390; NGOs \$4.015 M; Others \$4.920 M                      Status: Approved by GEF (08/06/05) Description: Aims to ensure conservation of globally significant biodiversity in the Andean Páramo, by implementing a series of initiatives necessary to create an enabling environment for the improved livelihoods of páramo stakeholders based on the conservation and sustainable use of the ecosystem's natural resources.</p>										
<p>1 Baseline assessments collected information on, <i>inter alia</i>, access rights and water rights.</p>	<p>Several Notes that land tenure conflicts “tend to exacerbate” problems surrounding water resources. Land tenure situation considered in site selection. Baseline assessments collected information on land tenure. Site descriptions (pp.54-66) include information on land tenure (e.g. private / communal).</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>Mentioned in <i>passing</i> Notes that IPs form a large part of the population in Zuleta-Mojanda and Llangahua sites (Ecuador). The Colombian side of the Chiles site is an indigenous territory. No serious discussion of indigenous issues / involvement. (Indigenous peoples are given a more prominent role in PDF-B document than in the Project Document)</p>	<p>5 “Underestimation and loss” of TK is a barrier to conservation; the project will therefore have to “take into account the Andean historical and cultural basis and reevaluate indigenous and traditional peasant management of Paramo resources.” (p.12). TK integrated into training programme. Project will include “analysis, application and publication” of TK. Strong emphasis on TK in PDF-B document: e.g. see paragraph on p.13. No mention of free prior and informed consent for the use of TK.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Probably. Common conservation agreements will be designed and initiated for “critical areas of biodiversity”, which “may result in no-use agreements, community reserves, inter-sectoral agreements for protection or extensions of or new protected areas or biosphere reserves” (pp.14-15). Alternative livelihood options will be identified and financial support will be given to farmers who adopt alternative practices.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes PDF-B document allocates \$60,000 for four baseline studies (\$15,000 per country) to “assess the social, economic and environmental situation”.</p>	<p>Budget p.39. No social budget.</p>	<p>Section on “stakeholder participation” (pp.23-27). Farmer organizations and NGOs involved in the site selection process, and farmers were “consulted regularly during the PDF-B phase” (p.24). Plans of Action were developed during the PDF-B phase, which will form the basis for Participatory Management Plans (PMP) developed with the involvement of local stakeholders’ alliances. Local communities identified as site co-ordinators during PDF-B phase but no strong institutional mechanisms for co-management. Indigenous Council of Chiles listed as a site coordinator in Colombia; otherwise little role for indigenous rights organizations.</p>

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<p><b>Regional (Costa Rica, Panama): Integrated Ecosystem Management in the Sixaola Binational River Basin</b> IA: IADB Category: Full Size OPs: 12 Duration: 4 years                      Funding: Total \$11.085 M; GEF \$4.535 M; Co-Fin \$6.551 M Status: Approved by GEF (01/08/06), loan approved by IADB (23/07/04) Description: Aims to contribute to the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity, water and soil resources, through the creation of an enabling environment and integral, cross-cutting management of the Sixaola Binational River Basin.</p>										
1 Brief mention of "concession rights". Notes that both countries are signatories of ILO 169.	3 Paragraph on land tenure (p.5) notes that the "indigenous territories are private collective properties, where the Indigenous Government appears as the legal owner". The two indigenous territories in Panama (Bri Bri and Naso) lack legal status as <i>comarca</i> (p.4)	1 "The operational policy on indigenous communities has been considered during the design of the Project" (footnote p.28). Not referred to elsewhere.	Mentioned throughout. 58% of population in project area is indigenous. Project covers six indigenous territories, within which "Indigenous Governments act with a relative autonomy" (p.7)	5 Capacity building will "embrace TK and methods, as well as the introduction of pertinent outside approaches" (p.15). Notes that TK encourages the sustainable use of resources (p.6). An expected benefit of the project is the "capitalization of TK for sustainable land management" (p.26). 100 young indigenous people will exchange TK with grandparents of the community.	No There is not a single mention of resettlement in the Project Document.	Unclear No mention of resource restrictions, but emphasis on "alternative livelihoods". Subsistence agriculture, hunting and overfishing blamed for biodiversity loss. Aims to promote tourism.	No	Yes "Comprehensive consultation process" was done to identify main social actors, their agendas, and development priorities. (p.29)	No detailed budget breakdown.	Aims to develop framework for co-management and increase Indigenous Governments' capacity. Consultation process during PDF-B phase. Executing Unit for the Project will include a representative from the Indigenous Authorities in Costa Rica. Also indigenous representation on sub-basin committees. "Stakeholder participation summary and plan" included as annex.

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<p><b>Venezuela: DHEKHUANA NONOODO - Sustainable Use and Conservation of Biodiversity Resources for Dhekuana Indigenous Lands</b> IA: IBRD Category: Medium Size OPs: 3, 4 Duration: 3 years Funding: Total \$1.1 M; GEF \$750,000; Gov. of Ven. \$200,000; NGOs \$25,000; Others \$125,000 Status: Approved by GEF (28/01/05), approved by World Bank (01/06/05), currently active Description: The overall objective of the project is to establish the basis for community driven natural resource management, co-management of protected areas, and fair and equitable sharing of benefits through development and implementation of natural resource management plans for Dhekuana lands</p>										
<p>4 Notes that “the rights of the indigenous people of Venezuela are guaranteed in the constitution” (p.22). Will examine “legal territorial rights issues” in 3<sup>rd</sup> year of project (p.33). Expects co-management agreement to recognize customary use rights. Execution of project would “fall fully” under the application of ILO 169 agreement (p.23).</p>	<p>4 Mainly in context of self-demarcation project by Ye’kwana. Expects “areas outside PAs will be officially recognized as Dekhuana territory and areas inside PAs will eventually be part of a co-mangmnt agreement.” Sees PAs as “measure to safeguard tenure rights” (p.19)</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>Mentioned throughout. Indigenous Affairs office also to be consulted.</p>	<p>7 Seeks to “promote the preservation and maintenance of indigenous knowledge, innovation and practices relevant to conservation of biological diversity” (p.3). Monitoring and evaluation of biodiversity would combine TK with “appropriate computer technology”. No mention of how TK would be adequately protected during the project.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes. No-hunting zones will be developed. Development of “hunting management strategy” would require “self-imposed restrictions on one of the subsistence practices of the community” (p.16). “The Dhekuana people would be assisted in acquiring a new equilibrium of living in harmony with their natural resources under changing conditions resulting from their gradual integration into the 21<sup>st</sup> century, with its increased needs for participation in a money-based society and its growing community” (p.29)</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Not in detail. Some studies of Ye’kwana culture carried out by implementing NGO Otro Futuro, but not in specific context of this project. Studies will be done “to document traditional indigenous know-how about the value of natural resources, degree of extraction of financially valuable products, and management practices”.</p>	<p>Detailed budget pp.26-27. \$124,200 for “sust. develop. pilot projects” but these mostly involve “hunting management” and eco-tourism. \$164,850 for co-management, but most of this is for equipment, transport etc.</p>	<p>Goal is “promoting biodiversity conservation, by participatory planning, co-management arrangements, piloting of innovative natural resource management practices, and establishing durable equitable benefits sharing in the traditional lands of the Dhekuana people”. Ye’kwana involved in GIS, data collection and monitoring. 10 Ye’kwana trained as part-time park rangers. Project to be executed from joint project-INPARQUES office at Culebra, one of the larger Ye’kwana villages. Drafting of Project Document involved community workshops and Kuyujani Originario (Ye’kwana org.) But mechanisms of co-management unclear; Ye’kwana mainly involved in patrolling, monitoring, and “assisting” project staff. No mention of a joint-management board with Ye’kwana representation.</p>

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<b>Venezuela: Expanding Partnerships for the National Parks System Project</b> IA: IBRD Category: Full size OPs: 3, 4, 12 Duration: 5 years Funding: Total \$24.87 M; GEF \$6.35 M; Gov. of Ven. \$14.75 M; NGOs \$3.77 M Status: Approved by GEF (01/08/06), World Bank negotiations scheduled for late January 2007 Description: The project aims to develop and implement a participatory, inter-institutional management model for Canaima National Park that will promote biodiversity conservation, provide both global and local environmental services, and ensure the full involvement of indigenous people and local communities.										
<p>4 Project will “respect [indigenous] rights consistent with national legislation and applicable international obligations” (pp.23-24). A consultation process “helped to identify activities in order to enhance the local community participation guaranteeing the indigenous peoples rights” (p.75). Mentions rights to ancestral lands. Also mentions IP rights in national law (pp.20-21).</p>	<p>Sub-component 3.3 will support the demarcation and titling of indigenous lands, including technical and legal support to support the titling of at least 35% of CNP (p.50)</p>	<p>Section on SGPs (pp.15-17). Annex on SGP issues (pp.69-70). OPN 11.03 (revised as OP4.11), OP/BP 4.12 &amp; OD 4.20 (revised as OP 4.10) are all triggered but not clear how Broad Community Support standard is implemented.</p>	<p><i>Mentioned throughout.</i> The Pemon indigenous people are expected to be major beneficiaries of the project and the Pemon Plan de Vida (Life Plan) is included as an annex (pp.121-131)</p>	<p>5 Subcomponent 3.2 is a “cultural and scientific knowledge preservation program”, involving: bilingual education; ethno-historical recovery; recovery of traditional, sustainable natural resource use practices; and cultural strengthening, scientific and traditional education projects.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><i>Unclear</i> The latest PID (30/11/06) claims that project activities “do not involve restrictions to natural resource use that could potentially impact local indigenous communities”. But the PD (02/05/06) suggests that restrictions may occur. List of threats includes “indigenous subsistence farming” (p.112). Restrictions on customary fire use practices seem likely. A Resettlement Plan has been developed detailing impacts on resource access.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes A Social Assessment involved 99 communities and 820 persons (pp.73-89)</p>	<p>In the PD, \$10.9m is allocated to social issues, including \$3m from the GEF (pp. 77-78) However, the budget has since changed (see PID, 30/11/06). No updated social budget is available.</p>	<p>“The project design itself...is predicated on stakeholder participation and co-management” (p.8). Component 1 will create a Co-Management Committee, responsible for overall project coordination, comprising park authorities, the state hydroelectric company, and FIEB (Pemon indigenous organization). Project preparation included the development of a Pemon <i>Plan de Vida</i> (Life Plan) which will be supported by Component 3 activities. Project appears to be highly participatory.</p>

b) 3 Enabling Activities, Approved by the GEF or one of its implementing agencies since January 2005

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<b>Democratic Republic of Congo: National Capacity Needs Self-Assessment for Global Environmental Management</b> IA: UNDP Category: Enabling Activity OPs: EA Duration: 18 months Funding: Total \$250,000; GEF \$225,000; Gov. of DRC \$25,000 Status: Approved by GEF (31/10/05), currently being implemented Description: The main objective of this project is to assess national capacities to manage the global biodiversity in the DRC.										
0	0	0	0	0	Not mentioned.	Not mentioned.	No	Studies will be done as part of the project.	No detailed budget breakdown	Will ensure that "key stakeholders are engaged with the NCSA on a continuous basis" and will organize "periodic workshops to report the results of the NCSA to key stakeholder and to mobilize their support" (p.8). A one-day workshop will be held in each Province prior to national-level validation; traditional authorities will be invited. Project Steering and Coordination Committee includes one representative of Traditional Authorities, one trad. medicine rep, one CBO and local population rep., and five NGO reps. Difficult to tell what the quality of consultation will be.
<b>Guyana: Assessment of Capacity Building Needs, Preparation of Second and Third National Report (CBD) and the Clearing House Mechanism - ADD ON</b> IA: UNDP Category: Enabling Activity OPs: EA Duration: 18 months Funding: Total \$325,000; GEF \$272,000; Co-Fin \$53,000 Status: Approved by GEF (15/08/06) Description: To identify, evaluate and prioritize the capacity building needs and information gaps as regards policies, plans and strategies for access and benefit sharing, traditional knowledge, monitoring programmes and implementation of incentive measures.										
2 A report will be produced detailing the current and needed legislation for preserving the rights of traditional knowledge sources / holders regarding biodiversity uses. (pp.4-5)	1 Notes current revisions of Amerindian Act may "further empower" Amerindians in regard to ownership and use of lands (p.3)	0	5 IPs have "an extremely profound and historical relationship with the environment, and... long-established methods and traditions for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity"	Mentioned throughout. One of the main aims of the project is to preserve and maintain TK. Studies will be done into: resources need to preserve and maintain TK; rights of TK holders; inventory of TK; status of documentation and preservation of TK; need and potential to patent TK; a strategy and action plan. Info.	N/A	N/A	No	The project is designed to fund studies, particularly into traditional knowledge.	Preserving TK: \$49,500. Consulting for 2 <sup>nd</sup> National Report: \$25,000. Consulting for 3 <sup>rd</sup> National Report: \$3000.	Public involvement is "essential" (p.12). Report on TK will involve field interviews, meetings, workshops and consultations. Consultations for preparation of 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> National Reports for CBD would "pay particular attention to stakeholders who reside in the hinterland areas and to indigenous and other community groups" (p.9).

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
			(p.4)	on TK will be incorporated into a database and website. Controversially, it is not clear how indigenous rights to prior agreement will be respected.						
<b>Mexico: National Capacity Self-Assessment for Global Environment Management</b> IA: UNDP Category: Enabling Activity OPs: EA Duration: 18 months Funding: Total \$250,000; GEF \$200,000; Gov. of Mex. \$50,000 Status: Approved by GEF (14/03/05) Description: Aims to assess national capacity for environmental management.										
0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	No indication that social studies will be done.	No	Some involvement for “representatives of civil society – leaders of private enterprise, academic institutions and NGOs” (p.16). No mention of community or indigenous participation.

c) 9 Pipeline Projects in the GEF portfolio<sup>72</sup>

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<b>Global (Brazil, Ghana, Kenya, South Africa, China, India, Nepal, Pakistan) : Conservation and Management of Pollinators for Sustainable Agriculture through an Ecosystem Approach</b> IA: UNEP Category: Full Size OPs: 13 Doc: PDF-B document Duration: 5 years Funding: Total \$12 M; GEF \$6 M; Co-Fin \$6 M Status: PDF-B approved by GEF (13/06/03) Description: The development goal of the project is to conserve, sustainably use and manage pollinators. The project will develop strategies and best practices, build capacity at all levels, and promote international co-ordination and integration of pollinator conservation.										
0	0	0	1 Will “identify, document and disseminate innovations, technologies and best practices of farmers, including indigenous and local communities” (p.9)	4 “At the international level, there is little or no recognition of indigenous knowledge in the conservation and sustainable management of pollinators and on the cultural role pollinators may play in communities” (p.13). TK will be assessed in the PDF-B stage (p.22), but no separate report on TK.	No	Not mentioned.	No	No	No budget for full project.	Community participation sketchy at this stage. “Stakeholder involvement at all stages in the project development and implementation process” (p.20). A stakeholder participation plan will be prepared in PDF-B phase. “Farmers will play an important role in (a) providing local, traditional and indigenous knowledge pertaining to pollinators; (b) demonstrating and/or implementing practices at the field level; and (c) disseminating information at the local level” (p.14).
<b>Global (Peru, Chile, China, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Philippines) : Conservation and Adaptive Management of Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS)</b> IA: UNDP Category: Full Size OPs: 13 Doc: PDF-B document (including Project Concept as annex) Duration: 5-7 years Funding: Total \$25 M; GEF \$6 M; Co-Fin \$19 M Status: PDF-B approved by GEF (12/02/04) Description: The overall project goal is to identify and safeguard Globally Important Ingenious Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS) and their associated landscapes, agricultural biodiversity and knowledge systems, through mobilizing global recognition and support for such systems and enhancing global, national and local benefits derived through their dynamic conservation, sustainable management and enhanced viability.										
2 “A key issue that will need to be addressed is the equitable sharing of benefits and	2 A barrier is the “inappropriate policy and legal environments, particularly in	0 No mention of UNDP policy on indigenous peoples.	5 Indigenous peoples are stakeholders. Examples of Globally Important Agricultural	12 Project seeks to integrate TK. GIAHS systems build on “dynamic local knowledge and experience” (p.11). “Inadequate attention	No	Unclear But may support “improved resource access and rights” (p.18) and	No	A “participatory assessment” will be carried out in the pilot systems. Not explicitly focussed on	No budget for full project. PDF-B includes \$95,000 to “develop and assess	Seems highly participatory, but difficult to tell at this stage. Section on stakeholder involvement (pp.24-26). The PDF-B phase will “establish participatory mechanisms and processes...and design Pilot Frameworks...through a fully

<sup>72</sup> Detailed project documents were unavailable for all but one of these pipeline projects. Information in the table is based on the most recent available document – generally the PDF-B document or, where that was not available, the Project Concept. The document referred to is indicated in the table.

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
producers' rights to ensure that local communities and indigenous peoples are not exploited" (p.20)	the areas of land tenure and access to resource legislation" (p.14). Project activities related to policy support and legal measures could include land tenure (p.20).		Heritage Systems include indigenous maize and root crop systems in Latin America; pastoral systems such as Saami reindeer herding; and hunter-gathering systems in Africa (p.19).	to local knowledge, indigenous technologies and practices" is a barrier to conservation (p.14). Attention will be paid to "the local knowledge and resource management practices that contribute to food and livelihood security" (p.20)		"normative frameworks for use and access to natural resources" (p.21). Emphasis on "sustainable use [rather than] preservation".		social issues, but will look at issues such as resource use and opportunities for integrating TK and enhancing productivity (pp.4-5)	participatory approaches and methodologies" and \$799,100 to "establish multi-stakeholder mechanisms" (p.8).	participatory process" (p.3), including a "code of conduct for working with local people and indigenous communities". Positively, "the leading institutions of each pilot system will seek the prior informed consent of the farming communities involved" (p.4). Local level capacity building to strengthen vulnerable stakeholders (p.4) and "efforts to ensure due responsiveness to gender and other socio-economic differentiation in society" (p.17). The International Indian Treaty Council has been invited to join the Steering Committee and other potential partners include IP's networks, such as the Tebtebba Foundation and Rigoberta Menchu Foundation.

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<b>Global: Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund 2 Project</b> IA: IBRD Category: Full Size OPs: 1, 2, 3, 4 Doc: Project Document Duration: 4 years Funding: Total \$100 M; GEF \$20 M; Bilateral \$25 M; NGOs \$25 M; Other \$30 M Status: Entered GEF pipeline 19/01/06, not yet in PDF-B phase. Appraisal scheduled for March 2007, World Bank approval scheduled for June 22 <sup>nd</sup> 2007 Description: Building on the current CEPF project, this second phase will provide funding to conservation sub-projects in new and existing CEPF regions, strengthening the involvement and effectiveness of NGOs and other sectors of civil society in biodiversity conservation.										
0 Some grants in the first phase of the CEPF project supported indigenous rights issues.	0 Some grants in the first phase of the CEPF project supported land tenure issues.	Section on SGPs (pp. 13-14). OP/BP 4.12, OP/BP 4.10 both triggered Annex on SGP issues (p.45) will be done for project appraisal Sub-projects will comply with World Bank SGPs (p. 26).	9 “It is expected that indigenous peoples... will participate in identifying conservation priorities and have access to CEPF grants for conservation activities.” (p.14). IP reserves are potential project sites. Impacts on IPs “could be potentially positive or adverse depending on the nature of actions taken on the ground” (p.14). An intermediate outcome indicator is that “30% of total projects dedicated to supporting indigenous and local community stewardship of biodiversity and ecosystem services” (p.23)	1 “When local communities are able to express their knowledge about the natural systems that form the basis of their livelihoods and can articulate their economic and cultural interests, better and more enduring decisions are likely to be made at national and international levels” (p.11)	Possible “It is possible that sub-projects may... directly displace individuals” (p.14).	Possible “It is possible that sub-projects... may restrict access to resources through enforcement or protection measure [sic]” (p.14). In these cases, proponents must “demonstrate that they have followed an appropriate process framework” with compensation measures. Aims to create at least 8 million ha of new protected areas (p.4). Will promote alternative livelihoods (p.33).	Not mentioned	No studies mentioned, but an intermediate outcome indicator is that “100% of CEPF regions possess baseline data and indicators and monitor and report against conservation, civil society, policy, and socio-economic targets” (p.23)	\$14.6 M on community /indigenous initiatives (of which \$2.92 M comes from the GEF grant and \$11.68 M from other sources). \$6.4 M to enable civil society groups to play a greater role in key aspects of project implementation (\$1.28 M from GEF; \$5.12 M from other sources). See budget, p. 37.	“A key CEPF-2 goal is empowerment of civil society actors to take part in, and influence decisions that affect local lives and livelihoods and, ultimately, the global environment” (p.6). Regional Implementation Teams, comprised of local civil society groups, “will lead the ecosystem profiling process and implementation within the hotspots” (p.9). Proposed projects should make provisions “for evaluating the potential impacts on indigenous communities and site-specific action plans may be required” (p.14). Technical advice and support will enable “indigenous groups to take part in the design, implementation and management and monitoring of key biodiversity areas” (p.33). Sub-component 1c supports community / indigenous initiatives. Target of at least 50% of global grant funds allocated to national and local civil society groups, and 70% of targeted communities involved in sustainable use projects show socio-economic benefits (p.24). No stakeholder involvement plan. In the first phase of the project most grants went to major conservation NGOs, not communities. Phase 2 rejects the option of placing a cap on grant resources available to international organizations (p. 8).

The Global Environment Facility, Biodiversity and Indigenous Peoples 2005-06

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<p><b>Panama: Sustainable use and conservation of coastal marine ecosystems</b> IA: IADB Category: Full Size OPs: ? Doc: No documents are yet available Duration: ? Funding: GEF \$5 M, remainder unknown Status: Pipeline? (see below) Description: Aims to (i) to set up procedures for strategic planning and interagency coordination for the integral management of coastal marine resources in the Gulf of Chiriquí; (ii) to generate and promote measures for the environmental management and sustainable use of ecosystems in productive activities; (iii) to implement joint management mechanisms involving local users and stakeholders; and (iv) promote applied research, monitoring, and dissemination of information.</p>										
<p>The loan proposal for an IADB project (<i>Multiphase Sustainable Development Program for Chiriqui Province</i>, 25/07/06) includes a GEF project as one of its components (pp.17-18 of loan proposal document). This component is entitled: <i>Sustainable use and conservation of coastal marine ecosystems</i>. It is expected to require \$5 million of GEF funding. A PDF-B proposal has been formulated by the Panamanian government for formal delivery to the GEF (p.39) but this document is not available on the GEF's website. The short description of the GEF component in the IADB document (pp.17-18) suggests that it will include "sustainable management" of fishing resources (implying restrictions) and the promotion of ecotourism. It also mentions "implement[ing] joint management mechanisms involving local users and stakeholders to conserve coastal marine resources and protect biodiversity". It is difficult to know anything more about the project at this stage.</p>										
<p><b>Peru: Strengthening Biodiversity Conservation through the National Protected Areas Program</b> IA: IBRD Category: Full Size OPs: 1, 3, 4 Doc: Project Concept Duration: 5 years Funding: Total \$20-30 M; GEF \$10-15 M; Co-Fin \$10-15 M Status: GEF Council approval decision scheduled for 27<sup>th</sup> February 2007 Description: The goal of the project is the overarching consolidation of the protected areas system m under a new decentralized framework.</p>										
0	0	0	1 But only in reference to other GEF projects in Peru Indigenous peoples are not substantively addressed, but it would be surprising if this project does not have direct or indirect impacts on indigenous peoples.	0	Not mentioned	Not mentioned Project will expand number of protected areas.	No	Social baselines studies will be done in the 1 <sup>st</sup> year of the project as part of strategic planning at regional and national levels for creating new PAs (p.14). The deferral of baseline studies until implementing stage is a cause for concern.	No detailed budget breakdown, but approx. \$0.9 million of GEF funding to "partnerships between communtys and PAs."	Would "seek to implement and strengthen participatory management mechanisms of PAs at all responsible levels, as the main mechanisms to ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of the decentralized management of PAs" (p.5). Would support capacity building for local and regional stakeholders and establish 10 regional and/or local level PAs over, 300,000 ha. Preparation of project proposal does not seem to have involved communities / indigenous organizations.

The Global Environment Facility, Biodiversity and Indigenous Peoples 2005-06

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<b>Regional (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela): Facilitation of financing for biodiversity-based businesses and support of market development activities in the Andean Region</b> IA: UNEP Category: Full Size OPs: 1, 2, 3, 4, 13 Doc: Project Concept and PDF-B document Duration: 4 years Funding: Total \$20 M; GEF \$6 M; Co-Fin \$14 M Status: PDF-B approved by GEF (02/12/03), meeting held to revise national and regional work plans 07/03/05 Description: Aims to build on current initiatives to support 1) the identification and internalization of the costs and benefits associated with protecting biodiversity and (2) the generation of economic activity and the generation of value added that results from the sustainable commercialization of biodiversity, thereby establishing the right incentives for biodiversity conservation.										
0	0	0	5 Indigenous peoples are “a key stakeholder community” (p.7) and the project aims to increase market opportunities for indigenous and local communities.	6 The project will support policy changes to safeguard the value of TK (p.10) and support & initiate certification and standards programs (p.11)	Not mentioned	Not mentioned	No	Reports into regulatory and legal reforms may recommend protection of TK. No indication of social or stakeholder analysis.	No budget for full project.	Unclear. Proposed investment model based on “a local management structure” (p.5) but no indication of what this would involve. Project team involved in the preparation of Project geographical criteria and pilot project evaluation criteria will work with local communities during the PDF-B phase, and stakeholder meetings will be conducted; again, no further detail is given.
<b>Regional (Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama): Conservation and Sustainable Use of Neotropical Native Crops and Wild Relatives of Crops</b> IA: IBRD Category: Full Size OPs: 13 Doc: PDF-B document Duration: 5 years Funding: Total \$20 M; GEF \$10 M; Co-Fin \$10 M Status: PDF-B approved by GEF (06/04/05) Description: Three broad objectives: 1. Application of genetic diversity knowledge for targeting wild relatives of crops in Mesoamerica within overall conservation efforts; 2. Capacity building and promotion of policies fostering agrobiodiversity conservation in the region; and 3. Increasing potential benefits to farmers and rural communities from integrating biodiversity conservation in their agriculture practices and sustainable use of natural resources.										
2 Indigenous Peoples’ Rights is a “principal area of potential risk” (p.10). Will comply with World Bank guidelines on IP rights.	0	Unclear No mentions in the PDF-B document, but according to the Integrated Safeguards Datasheet (22/06/05), OD 4.20 might apply. It is unclear whether OP 4.10 will	4 “The project will have direct and indirect impact on poverty alleviation in rural and indigenous communities” (p.11)	5 Notes “rapid decline” of TK and its potential for conservation (p.4). Component 3 will “tap into” TK to promote sustainable use of agrobiodiversity (p.9). Intellectual property rights issues arising from TK are “complex issues requiring specialized legal expertise” – the project preparation team will include a	No	Not mentioned Component 3 will test and demonstrate “alternative management strategies and practices” for conservation (p.9).	According to the Integrated Safeguards Datasheet an Indigenous Peoples assessment will be done “systematically as site-specific sub-projects are being developed”	A Social Assessment “including Indigenous Peoples’ aspects” will be done during preparation (p.28)	No budget for full project. In the PDF-B phase, \$10,000 is allocated for Social Assessment	Section on stakeholder involvement (pp.14-15). Expected benefit is “stakeholder involvement in conservation (in situ), use, and benefit sharing” (p.12). A “wide participation of stakeholders is foreseen”, including “local farmers and communities” (p.15). Project preparation is “participatory” with actions such as “rapid surveys to ensure the acceptance of local communities for proposed project instruments, prioritization of proposed local activities by communities, wherever possible, consultation with communities on all details of the proposed

The Global Environment Facility, Biodiversity and Indigenous Peoples 2005-06

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
		apply and how Broad Community Support will be ensured.		lawyer and consult specialists (p.11). Protection and conservation of TK is an expected benefit (p.12).						project” (p.15). Generally, not very specific – unclear how participatory it will be.
<p><b>Regional (India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand): Conservation and sustainable use of cultivated and wild tropical fruit diversity: promoting sustainable livelihoods, food security and ecosystem services</b> IA: UNEP Category: Full Size OPs: 13 Doc: Project Concept Duration: 5 years Funding: Total \$11.085 M; GEF \$4.535 M; Co-Fin \$6.551 M Status: PDF-B approved by GEF (24/06/04), three project steering committee meetings held in 2005 Description: The project objective is to improve the conservation and use of tropical fruit genetic diversity in Asia by strengthening the capacity of farmers, local communities and institutions.</p>										
0	0	0	2 “It is estimated that more than 55% of the Asian fruit species are gathered by tribal and other people living in close proximity to forests and other common lands for supplementary income and nutrition” (p.6)	5 Component 1 is an “assessment of farmer/user knowledge and practices with regards to tropical fruit species” (p.13). Will “build understanding of traditional knowledge” (p.12), for example through “diversity fairs” and “community biodiversity registers” (p.16). Not much detail at this stage.	No	Unclear The shifting cultivation practices of tribal people in northeastern India are highlighted as a threat to wild fruit diversity (p.5). Will promote “sustainable utilization” (p.15) and best practices but does not seem to take a strongly regulatory approach.	No	No. PDF-B phase will produce “annotated lists of stakeholders ...with roles defined for each” (p.29) based on a “systematic institutional analysis” (p.27) but no social assessment. Full project will involve an assessment of farmer/user knowledge and practices.	No detailed budget.	“Participatory approaches such as Rapid Rural Appraisal, Participatory Ranking and Participatory Project Planning will be used in the project to involve multiple stakeholder groups” (p.27). Capacity building under component 3 (pp.16-17). Will use a “participatory approach” to assess project sites (p.13). Gives examples of participatory “good practices” (p.16). Positive language, but not much detail - very difficult to tell how participatory it will be at this early stage.

Rights (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	Land Tenure (no. ment. rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment.)	Indigenous Peoples (no. mentions)	Traditional Knowledge (no. mentions)	Relocation	Restricted Resource Use	IPDP	Baseline Studies - soc. aspects	Proposed Budget IP / soc. issues	Community / Local Participation
<b>Venezuela: Strengthening Capacities for Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Integrated Coastal Zone Management in Venezuela</b> IA: UNDP Category: Full size OPs: 2 Doc: Project Concept Duration: 5 years Funding: Total \$12.352 M; GEF \$4.35 M; Co-Fin \$8.002 M Status: Entered GEF pipeline (21/12/04), PDF-B not yet approved Description: Building on pilot activities to be carried out in the Gulf of Paria, capacities of national institutions will be strengthened, permitting the effective mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use principles into planning frameworks and decision-making processes in marine and coastal areas of Venezuela.										
0	0	0 No mention of safeguard policies.	1 Notes the presence of "significant communities of indigenous Warao people, who depend heavily on fishing for their livelihoods" (p.13)	0	Not mentioned	Possibly Project will have an "indirect" influence on "cultural and ethnic groups". This will be "through the support provided... to processes of planning and decision-making, the outcomes of which may affect their productive activities" (pp.13-14)	No	No social studies are mentioned. An ongoing national-level project (ICZN) has "identified" institutional stakeholders (p.7)	No budget.	Section on stakeholder involvement (pp.12-14). The "vertical and centralized nature of planning and decision-making processes" is identified as a barrier to conservation (p.3). Will "ensur[e] that local stakeholders' interests in relation to biodiversity are taken into account" (p.7). Weak on details. Project activities will include support to "the definition and application by local communities or appropriate indicators relating to biodiversity" (p.10). Local operational committees "may" be established (p. 16). Steering committees in the preparation phase which include local stakeholder groups "where feasible" (p.14). Meeting in May 2004 does not seem to have involved communities (p.11)

## **Annex 2 – Some other GEF biodiversity projects of interest**

*Cameroon: Promoting Community-based Conservation of Globally Significant Biodiversity in Priority Forest Sites within Cameroon Mountain Range (UNDP)* – This project was rejected in February 2004 and is currently being redesigned as a smaller project. No documents are available since that date.

*Panama: Central American Markets for Biodiversity (CAMBio): Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within micro-, small, and medium-sized enterprise development and financing (UNDP)* - This project does not currently affect Panama, but will do if Panama becomes a member of the Central American Bank for Economic Integration during the lifetime of the project.