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Executive Summary

This document is a shortened abridged version of a longer scoping exercise commissioned by FPP to assist its internal project planning and formulate strategies for future solidarity and possible livelihood work with forest peoples. This short version contains some of the main findings of a rapid scoping study carried out in late 2016/2017 into specialist organisations and people working on indigenous peoples’ sustainable livelihoods and self-determined development. It was based on interviews with thirty individuals in four continents, as well as complementary desk-based research.

Key findings to emerge from the study include:

- Indigenous peoples should have the ability to envision their futures in order to define for themselves in an open way how they wish to live, while maintaining their cultural and territorial integrity.
- Holistic, territorial and culture-based approaches, which are attentive to indigenous peoples’ own visions and conceptions of the world, have worked better than narrow livelihood approaches.
- It is critical to address the intergenerational dimension of communities’ livelihood strategies, especially in light of the challenges posed by youth migration.
- By supporting participatory action research to establish baseline livelihoods assessments, solidarity organisations can accompany local people as they set out their own priorities and identify potential solutions as the basis for further action. Furthermore, such an approach supports community capacity-building, an important but frequently-neglected aspect of this work.
- Engaging in this work invites solidarity organisations to question their own assumptions, as well as the dominant model of economic development.
- In terms of the market economy, the odds are stacked against indigenous communities and most livelihood projects fail to have lasting, positive effects.
- Regional hubs providing technical and marketing assistance to multiple communities may be the most effective organisational model, in light of experiences in Southern Asia.
- Livelihood projects often lack appropriate funding streams and it can prove particularly difficult to obtain working capital and resources for the kind of grassroots, community-level work which is most congenial to self-determined development.
- Organisational constraints are often just as strong as technical and market constraints. Lack of market access, as well as the powerful social, cultural, political and ecological pressures which markets exert, are recurrent challenges for indigenous communities.
- (Re)localisation – of trade, production and consumption – has proven an important strategy for indigenous communities enhancing their livelihoods and strengthening their autonomy.
- Livelihood gains may have more to do with market forces and policies than interventions and projects, so working on policy reforms may be more effective than community livelihood projects.
- The prohibition and criminalisation of community resource use poses a formidable obstacle to livelihood gains and constitutes important terrain for advocacy work.
- Loss of traditional knowledge and the weakening or even disappearance of customary institutions present significant risks to indigenous peoples’ livelihoods. Project models which are simply imported from elsewhere and applied do not work; they fail to build either trust or mutual respect and devalue local people’s unique histories, cultures, knowledge and practices.
- As part of efforts at reclaiming local food systems and building community food sovereignty and security, food fairs and festivals not only make visible the important role played by traditional forest foods in terms of well-being, health and nutrition but also serve as fora where different generations can gather and dialogue about the cultural significance of these foods, reaffirming their importance and the need to defend them.
- Successful community forestry and NTFP enterprises have generally depended upon high levels of government and donor support, advantageous regulatory frameworks and strong organisation and capacity within communities, which implies that they cannot be easily replicated.
- Whilst producer cooperatives have secured livelihoods gains, notably by improving market access through fair trade and other solidarity networks, these gains remain modest due to the constraints imposed by markets, while achieving scale remains a significant barrier.
- Networks can often support communities’ aspirations to develop in particular ways, construct
solidarity between people engaged in similar productive activities, facilitate for groups to meet and learn together, and forge beneficial relationships with business and scientific communities.

- Indigenous/culture-based education is empowering young people to remain within their communities, reconnect with their elders and ancestral cultures, reclaim traditional knowledge and reinvigorate their customary institutions for governance.
- There have generally been quite mixed experiences with ecotourism initiatives, although in the main, they have tended to work best where communities already displayed a strong level of organisation, as a complement to other livelihood activities.
- Some important livelihood improvements have stemmed from the introduction of appropriate technologies which harness abundantly available local resources, can be constructed and maintained locally and managed in a culturally-appropriate way. However, since all too often the introduction of technologies is donor-driven, it is important for local people to become empowered to decide in a self-conscious way which elements of modernity they wish to adopt, having considered the benefits, risks and likely implications for their long-term cultural integrity, self-reliance and other values.
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Methodology

This scoping study is based in part on the responses obtained through 30 interviews with practitioners, FPP staff and long-term FPP partners working across four continents, albeit mainly confined to Latin America and Southern Asia, held via Skype between late November 2016 - February 2017 and April – May 2017, as well as complementary desk-based research. People to be interviewed were identified initially by FPP staff and subsequently by participants themselves, as the interviews progressed.

Scope of the Study

The study surveys a range of experiences of self-determined development and sustainable livelihoods, including initiatives to strengthen food and nutrition security and community health; the production, processing and marketing of agricultural, timber and non-timber forest products; handicraft and ecotourism enterprises; indigenous education and training programmes, particularly where these are geared toward self-determined development and constructing alternative livelihoods; community finance and enterprise development; options for community-controlled infrastructure, including renewable energy systems, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) systems, housing and community-based telecommunications networks.

The majority of experiences explored in the study are limited to Latin America and Southern Asia; further scoping could seek to engage more specifically with indigenous peoples' experiences of self-determined development across the African continent.

1 For a full list of participants in the study, see Acknowledgements.
PART I: INTRODUCTION

1. Indigenous Peoples, Self-Determined Development & Sustainable Livelihoods

“...decolonization and autonomy necessarily involve the recovery of memory and of autonomous thought processes, and the liberation of the imagination in order to be able, with a clarity that is not manipulated, to envision the horizon that one hopes to achieve in order to live freely. The people must be thinking about, and acting toward, the real possibility of retaking social control.” (Maldonado Alvarado, 2010: 372).

Across tropical forest regions, indigenous peoples sustain their livelihoods by participating in a diverse range of economic systems in greatly varying cultural, socio-political, economic and ecological contexts. These systems for governing the allocation of resources work at various scales - even as they interact, reinforce or conflict with one another - ranging from the household, through the community to the level of the indigenous territory and beyond it, to nation-states and those powerful centres in the globalised market economy such as New York, London, Singapore and Hong Kong.

These economic systems operate according to different logics: from indigenous customary institutions, cultural theories (or ‘emic’ models) and laws for governing commons, which internalise principles and values such as nurture, sharing, reciprocity, complementarity and solidarity; the state, represented by national governments, which provides intermediate goods and services and determines legal and policy frameworks, including property regimes which often undermine indigenous peoples’ collective rights; to markets, which emphasise formal equivalence and exchange, depend upon compound growth and frequently do not register social, cultural and ecological considerations.

![Diagram](image-url)

Illustration 1: Some elements of indigenous peoples’ self-determined development identified in the study.

Whereas the former have historically constituted indigenous peoples’ distinct economic institutions and
the basis for their autonomous self-determination, after centuries of colonisation and nearly seventy years of the ‘development’ era, many indigenous peoples today, particularly in rural areas, find that they continue to occupy a subordinated and peripheral position within the monetary economy, even as they strive to balance their subsistence activities with other forms of work which enable them to generate cash incomes.

Having participated in the monetary economy on deeply exploitative terms – in certain cases for centuries, producing commodities for the global market – some indigenous peoples have sought to improve their livelihoods by developing enterprises and cooperatives which incorporate concerns for communal wellbeing and their territorial integrity that try to go beyond the logic of the market, while embodying values of reciprocity and solidarity; many instances of such initiatives are described and analysed in more detail in Part II and Annex 1 of this study. And yet, as one critic of traditional development approaches argues, increased participation in the market economy ‘demands adherence to a model with built-in winners and losers ... creates dependence on external sources of financing, technology and expertise ... [and] disempowers the local in favour of the impersonal economic forces’ (Chodorkoff, 2014: 49). These characteristics are apparent in the struggles faced by even the most seemingly successful and resilient enterprises developed by indigenous peoples and are indicative of the dilemmas communities face as they try to navigate these forces on their own terms, while retaining their autonomy and cultural integrity.

As was highlighted above in the background to this study, the development industry has been subject to sustained critiques for decades, particularly by indigenous peoples, social movements and activists from the so-called ‘underdeveloped’ countries (see Sachs, 1992; Escobar, 1995; Esteve et al, 2013). ‘Sustainable livelihoods’ perspectives emerged within development circles during the early 1990s, and were later adopted and promoted by DFID in its development programmes (DFID, 1999). To be sure, as Scoones remarks (2009: 14), the ‘livelihoods’ concept itself, like that of ‘development’, is far from neutral, and it is important to be explicit about its underlying normative assumptions, particularly where these imply notions of directionality and ‘progress’ which differ from indigenous peoples’ own conceptions.

At the outset, this suggests that indigenous communities and solidarity organisations should remain critical and be prepared to engage in open and respectful dialogue about these ideas and practices, their uses and limitations, in supporting long-term processes of self-determination. Indeed, a key distinction between conventional development models and self-determined development models is that whereas the former have tended to prioritise products, hence an emphasis on increasing production, particularly of those products defined by the market, the latter are concerned with development as process (Chodorkoff, 2014: 46). Process-oriented approaches to development would tend to centre upon reproduction, finding ways to support and enhance the multiplicity of interrelated processes which together constitute a people-territory, i.e. kinship, community, culture, language, spirituality, ritual, memory, the forests, savannahs, rivers, lagoons and mountains and the living beings which inhabit them etc. Such holistic, cultural and territorial approaches to self-determined development are highlighted throughout this study and examined in greater details in the case studies contained in Annex 1.

Finally, it is important to signal a key limitation of this study: as one participant in this study reflected, the most powerful instances of ‘self-determined development’ emerge precisely from the long-term, autonomous self-organising of indigenous peoples themselves. Ultimately, as another participant put it,  

___

2 In their influential 1991 paper, Chambers & Conway defined livelihoods as comprising ‘the capabilities, assets (stores, resources, claims and access) and activities required for a means of living: a livelihood is sustainable which can cope with and recover from stress and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, and provide sustainable livelihood opportunities for the next generation; and which contributes net benefits to other livelihoods at the local and global levels and in the short and long term’ (1991: 6).

3 Scoones notes several recurrent failures of livelihoods approaches, including: their failure to engage with the realities of economic globalisation; their tendency to overlook questions of politics and power, how governance and livelihoods are connected, the ‘big picture’ of climate and global environmental change, macro shifts in rural economies and possible future scenarios (2009: 181-3).

4 This kind of approach has also been termed endogenous development, defined as ‘development based mainly, though not exclusively, on locally available resources, local knowledge, culture and leadership, with openness to integrating traditional as well as outside knowledges and practices. It has mechanisms for local learning and experimenting, building local economies and retention of benefits in the local area’ (ETC Foundation – Compas, 2007: 12).
“the guarantee that the State and private actors permit indigenous peoples’ self-determination cannot be measured in programmes or projects”⁵, which is the usual currency of governments, NGOs and development agencies. This guarantee stems from indigenous peoples’ own determination to survive, defend their territorial and cultural integrity and define for themselves how they are to live well...

⁵ FPP Interview with Hernando Castro, 25/05/17.
PART II: INTERVIEWS WITH PRACTITIONERS

2. Summary of Interviewees’ Responses

The interviews conducted as part of the study were based around a range of questions intended to explore interviewees’ insights and learnings around supporting indigenous communities to develop sustainable livelihoods and organise for self-determination. The following comprises a selection of the key points raised during the interviews and does not necessarily reflect the views or analysis of FPP.

2.1. Key Lessons Learnt

Self-Determined Development & Livelihoods

Communities must have the ability to envision their future. Self-determination is not just about livelihoods and livelihoods cannot only be understood within a narrow framework of income generation. Be attentive to indigenous peoples’ own conceptions of what makes for abundance, the good life, well-being and economy. Holistic approaches work better than narrow livelihood approaches. It is critical to address the intergenerational dimension of communities’ livelihood strategies. Start with meeting people’s basic needs. Start with community priorities. ‘Development’ projects which ignore people’s own priorities rarely work out. Solidarity organisations must question their own assumptions. Question the dominant model of economic development. Economically, the odds are stacked against indigenous communities.

- The ability of communities to envision their future is key to being able to develop as they see fit, based on their own informed decisions. This involves a journey in which the community thinks through the following: where are we at present? Where are we from? Where do we want to go? Very often, it can be necessary to backtrack, to begin with making the practice of critical analysis widespread within the community, so that people become empowered to decide in a self-conscious way which elements of modernity they wish to adopt, having considered the benefits, risks and likely implications for their long-term cultural integrity, self-reliance and other values. For instance, SeventyThree have worked with the Raja Ampat Homestay Association in West Papua for several years, facilitating a process of deep dialogue, as a result of which they have articulated their ‘Vision for Life in Raja Ampat’, which imagines how the people of Raja Ampat will live as a sustainable society fifty years into the future. Visioning is integral to a number of indigenous education initiatives: community vision is one of the four pillars of the learning both youths and elders engage in at Pamulaan Center for Indigenous Peoples’ Education in the Philippines, and LifeMosaic’s Next Generation Leadership trainings equip youths with tools to facilitate visioning processes within their own communities. Nurturing and acting upon a communal, shared vision also helps in ensuring continuity and sustained momentum in areas where government-sanctioned authority roles have a short duration, which can prove disruptive.

- Self-determination is not just about livelihoods and livelihoods cannot only be understood within a narrow framework of income generation. Whilst communities’ own self-determined visions may include livelihoods as a concern, this should not be taken for granted. In the case of a conversation that constantly happens in communities - “If not oil palm, then what?” - the arena within which this conversation takes place is limited by the dominant paradigm and impinging market forces. Particularly for many Latin American indigenous communities, the question isn’t, “If not the mine, then what?”, but rather, “What is abundance? What is the good life? What does it mean to live life in plenitude? What does it mean to be wealthy?” Such questions move away from narrow livelihoods understandings. This is often missed in debates framed exclusively by development professionals, who live immersed in globalised information exchanges and often fail to pay sufficient attention to local, cultural conceptions of economy, communal well-being and social reproduction.

- Holistic, integral approaches work better than narrow livelihood approaches. It is important to adopt methodologies which demonstrate these qualities. One practitioner working both in the Andean Amazon region and in Central America observed that the only projects which have

6 See 3.3 – Suggestions of Approaches and Methodologies.
sustained themselves through time are those which are rooted in territorial approaches. This means communities defining for themselves the ways in which they desire to develop within their territory, rather than allowing this to be defined for them by the market. Through this process, the different potentialities of a territory can be explored and developed, to support both the reproduction of the community and the regeneration of the territory itself, as well as gaining possible benefits from the market where this is desirable/possible.

- **Address the intergenerational dimension of community livelihoods:** Many indigenous youth are facing strong pressures to migrate from their villages to urban or other areas, a process which may be accelerated by young people’s own desires to find opportunities in cities, parents assuming the attitude that they have somehow failed if their children do not leave for the city, and education systems which undermine the integrity of local cultures by teaching ‘the science of leaving’, as one Indonesian activist has put it. This phenomenon is driving significant changes in indigenous communities’ social composition and subsequent livelihood strategies, often placing a heavier burden on women and the elderly to continue farming. In light of this, many communities and solidarity organisations have found it is vital to nurture ongoing dialogue between adults and youth so that together they can face the question of how they can manoeuvre through these challenges without compromising their society’s basis, evolve a vision for their society and decide what kind of life they would like for themselves (for more detail, see ‘Working With Youth’ below).

- **Start with meeting people’s basic needs:** One participant asserted that when we talk about ‘sustainable livelihoods’, we are really talking about people’s survival strategies; this is fundamentally about how people survive and satisfy their basic needs. These fundamental human needs must be met. Visioning may follow as a next step. Indeed, it may take several years before the community is at a point where they can start to vision their future.

- **Start with community priorities.** If one starts with ‘where the emotion lies’/is strongest in a given community’, one may find that rights recognitions are not what matter most to people; they may be more concerned with how they can continue to survive, not get kicked off their land and resist land-grabbers. In the case of Raja Ampat, in Papua, the community-members did not want to get a piece of paper from the government in order to do this; rather, they wanted to build their own capacity to feed and take care of themselves, to have the strength to be able to say, “Get lost” to the people appropriating their land (to build tourism resorts). One of the strategies they eventually developed in order to do this was the creation of a community-owned ecotourism sector.

- **‘Development’ projects which ignore people’s own priorities rarely work out.** For instance, Kondh communities in Odisha, India, refuse most government-led development schemes because they are individualistic and fail to address the community’s collective wellbeing – which for the Kondh is what development ought to address. The elders value, above all, everyone being together. Objects such as motorcycles are seen as helpful if someone is sick, but also mean that people can leave the village, which can result in less togetherness, weakening internal solidarity. Therefore, it becomes necessary to dialogue about these elements of modernity and whether and how to make use of them.

- **Solidarity organisations must question their own assumptions.** For solidarity organisations to engage with communities as partners, it is important to go through a critical dialogue and reflection process. This enables outsiders to understand them as a people, their ethos, philosophies, worldview and on that basis, negotiate the kinds of projects that are appropriate to them, in such a way that their fundamental values and philosophies are further deepened. For instance, Living Farms, an NGO which supports Kondh communities, emphasises that the people with whom they work are dignified and self-respecting, and so refuse to bracket or categorise themselves as poor. Their own definition of poverty differs from that imposed upon them by the Indian Government and other institutions. People working in solidarity with indigenous communities should be prepared to critically examine their own assumptions about growth, development, modernity, what is scientific etc. Failure to do so can mean that one goes to a community with these unchecked internal biases and fails to really listen to what people have to say.

- **Question the dominant model of economic development.** Several interviewees expressed scepticism towards the notion of ‘economic development’ - which may be taken at face value by community-members - due to how this conditions relationships and expectations between

---

7 This notion comes from the Training for Transformation approach to critical community education. For more, see FPP interview with Maria Latumahina, 09/02/17.
indigenous communities, governments, NGOs etc. in detrimental ways and obscures what it at stake. Development discourses have given rise to promises which are very rarely realized and are often used as a form of control. Furthermore, interviewees expressed their frustration with livelihood projects which impose inappropriate rubrics that regard indigenous peoples as ‘poor’ (based on comparisons with Western consumption patterns) or vitiate against indigenous models of communal ownership, by ignoring emic conceptions of what constitutes well-being, poverty and equity.

- **Economically, the odds are against indigenous communities**: Generally, indigenous communities face considerable obstacles when it comes to income-generating livelihood options, as they tend to live in remote areas with limited market access. Options are limited very quickly because anything they sell has to be high value per volume to justify transportation costs. The small scale of many forestry projects makes it difficult for them to compete on markets and frequently renders these initiatives – and the small but significant returns they generate for local people - ‘invisible’ or unattractive to mainstream investors. For instance, Planting Empowerment, a Panamanian forestry social enterprise, has found that its timber prices are constantly undercut by illegal logging and its small plantation size means it is unable to deliver commercially-viable quantities. Elsewhere, such as in Bolivia, some indigenous communities are generating significant incomes from forestry on the **Tierras Comunitarias de Origen**, where logging is all locally-driven, without any donor support, between local leaders and market intermediaries. However, whilst providing money in the short-term, this doesn’t look to be ecologically sustainable in the long-term, given the rate at which their forests are being depleted. This ‘goldrush’ scenario has also resulted in the corruption of leaders and misuse of funds. Even an otherwise highly successful cooperative, such as the Union of Indigenous Communities in the Isthmus Region, in Oaxaca, Mexico, has found that the basic minimum price for its Fair Trade coffee does not generate sufficient revenues to sustain the families of its producers over the long-term.

**Organisation, Governance & Sustainability**

Most projects fail to have lasting, positive effects. Regional hubs providing technical and marketing assistance to multiple communities may be the most effective organisational model. Livelihood projects often lack appropriate funding streams. Livelihood programmes risk dependency relations between communities and solidarity organisations. Knowledge must be shared, not specialised. Expectations need managing. Networks are crucial. Corruption must be addressed. Perceived bottle necks may not exist. Organisational constraints are often as strong as technical/market constraints. Building community capacity is often neglected. Different types of organisations bring different things to the table.

- **The majority of projects fail to have lasting, positive effects**. Many projects over the years have invested a lot of resources and yet once the project draws to an end, the situation reverts to what it was before.
- **Regional hubs providing technical and marketing assistance to multiple communities may be the most effective organisational model** to serve a widespread need in areas where cultures, ecosystems and resources may be similar, for example, the model developed by NTFP EP Asia. A fundamental problem facing attempts to enhance community livelihoods is that it can prove very hard to make community enterprises cost-effective. This is because technical personnel are expensive; a salary for an extension agent divided among a small number of producers means a high investment, often achieving limited results, with high costs. Adapting a NTFP EP Asia-type model constitutes one strategy for addressing this recurrent issue.
- **Livelihood projects often lack appropriate funding streams**. Whilst many programmes are stuck in funding cycles of three to five years, it can take significantly longer for community enterprises to become established, hence crafting a longer-term engagement is crucial. Furthermore, in this sort of work, it can take time to see changes, such as people eating more diverse, nutritious diets; creating alternative income streams; training the next generation of indigenous leaders. A key challenge is keeping funders engaged over the long-term.
- **Livelihood programmes risk dependency relations between communities and solidarity organisations**. Often, these types of relations arise from paternalistic and disempowering project designs, devised by external agents and technicians with minimal community input, which
encourage passivity and actually inhibit people from taking the initiative and generating solutions for themselves.

- **Knowledge must be shared, not specialised:** Authentic empowerment means leading people through a process of self-discovery and building self-confidence. The approach of placing a paid community-organiser within the community often perpetuates dependency, by holding people back from developing the self-confidence to try things, make mistakes and learn from them. This inhibits the action-reflection cycle and can ultimately dissipate the community’s energy. Participatory action-research is a tried and tested approach through which community-members and solidarity organisations can learn and co-create knowledge together, while supporting the wider community to analyse their situation and identify possible solutions to the problems they face. For instance, Pamulaan in the Philippines supports indigenous students to put their learnings into practice back in their own communities, both during & after their studies, through the Community Service Learning programme i.e. by documenting their community’s cultural beliefs & practices, teaching children or helping develop community enterprises.

- **Networks are crucial:** Establishing good relationships and mutualistic partnerships with other groups and organisations is important to success. Networks also facilitate the sharing of news and information; many indigenous communities are excluded from educational opportunities, scholarships and grants because they never receive this information. More consolidated networks range from reviving or further empowering institutions which enable communities to define their futures at the inter-community/territorial level, such as in ongoing attempts to (re)constitute District Councils in Guyana, to specialised networks focusing on facilitating knowledge exchange and strengthening solidarity between people engaged in similar sorts of livelihood activities, such as the Indonesian Forest Honey Network and the Community Agroecology Network in Central America.

- **Expectations need managing:** Communities engaged in livelihoods initiatives are frequently subject to rising expectations; good communication and dialogue are required to address this in a realistic way, in terms of what a community enterprise can feasibly provide, while continuing to grow. Many initiatives with potential have been derailed for short-term gains. Building understanding within a community of how a given initiative works can help to avoid damaging misunderstandings and setbacks, as in the case of Jambi Kiwa (see below).

- **Corruption must be addressed:** It is important to have protocols in place regarding leadership, potential corruption and how this is to be addressed. Strengthening mechanisms for accountability at the communal level also means that communities can demand that government departments adhere to similar standards.

- **Perceived bottle necks may not exist:** Communities frequently say there is no money, or the government will not act. However, this is rarely the principal barrier to community development. It may well be the case that what is missing is an ‘articulation’ between a given community, their product(s) and the market, which can mean surmounting bureaucratic barriers, developing a sharp analysis of the situation and identifying goals etc.

- **Organisational constraints are often as strong as technical/market constraints.** Issues of governance and mismanagement frequently inhibit initiatives from succeeding. For example, communal fish farms were established in Cofán communities (Ecuador) during the 1990s. However, in the absence of a system of communal control, people began to fish individually at will, with the result that the fish stocks were soon exhausted.

- **Building community capacity is often neglected.** Efforts to strengthen the organisational capacity of local groups and organisations often end up having a significant, indirect impact on livelihoods. However, whilst international agencies are usually willing to pay for fixed assets, they often won’t cover the necessary but neglected aspect of organisational strengthening. One case which demonstrates the consequences of a failure to provide adequate training over time is that of the Jambi Kiwa cooperative, in Ecuador, which produces herbal teas and dried plants for national and international markets. Having installed their own machine to manufacture tea bags, they have been able to move very high up the value chain. However, the cooperative nearly faced bankruptcy after: 1) contracting a non-indigenous university graduate who struggled to understand the local culture, generating misunderstandings and conflict with the producers, eventually leading to her dismissal; 2) replacing her with an indigenous leader, who despite being an excellent political leader in her own right, was not well-suited to the role of company director. Due to the confusion
which ensued, the community forfeited a very good deal to market their products in supermarkets nationally, for lack of understanding of how it all worked. This misunderstanding could have likely been avoided with more training.  

- **Different types of organisations bring different things to the table**, especially in terms of skillsets. For example, farmers’ organisations can be very good at mobilizing farmers around policy etc., but tend to be weaker at working with farmers on livelihood issues. Similarly, brilliant political leaders are very seldom also the best business managers, producers or traditional knowledge-bearers.  

**Markets, Enterprise & Infrastructure**  
Don’t ignore local markets. Working on trade links is vital. Lack of market access is a key challenge for communities. Local consumption patterns should be addressed. Markets can be made, not just accessed. Sustainable support chains and consumption patterns are increasingly in demand. Livelihood gains may have more to do with market forces and policies than interventions and projects. Working on policy reforms may be more effective than community livelihood projects. The prohibition/criminalisation of community resource use poses a formidable obstacle to livelihood gains. Market imperatives can block attempts to address social and ecological issues. Securing public sector support at local levels can prove pivotal. Moving up value chains is important, but requires coordination and a business structure. It is critical to develop an understanding of political relationships within communities. Take care in promoting a community association or enterprise as a first step. Finding the right buyer/market is key. Accessing finance, especially working capital, is a common obstacle. Ensuring local capacity to coordinate work can prove difficult. Training and capacity-building are essential, as is risk assessment.  

- **Don’t ignore local markets.** There is a frequent tendency to look at foreign (especially US/European) markets, and ignore local/regional markets, which have always existed but which have been weakened significantly in recent decades. One strategy has been to focus energy on reviving this trade, through local exchange networks and markets, where people don’t have to rely upon a single distributor.  

- **Working on trade links is vital.** International agencies tend to work ‘from the farm door inwards’ - where many gains are made – but producers still end up having to hand over products to intermediaries, often at a disadvantage. Many of the producer cooperatives profiled in Annex 1, such as the Union of Indigenous Communities in the Isthmus Region (coffee), Tosepan Union of Cooperatives (coffee, allspice and honey) and Kallari (cacao and gourmet chocolate), were created to combat exploitation by intermediaries. Otherwise sound projects have floundered after having failed to line up buyers; for instance, in India, large plant nurseries became stuck with around 50,000 plants, requiring many resources to keep them alive until buyers could be secured.  

- **Lack of market access is a key challenge for communities.** Understanding the logic of markets can be one of the main struggles for indigenous associations, particularly as these tend to be focused on advocacy and rights work. Thus, a common role for solidarity organisations is to focus on developing the marketing arm of operations, as has been the case with NTFP EP Asia and its creation of ‘Green Intermediaries’ to handle commercial activities; and Rainforest Foundation UK and its support for Asháninka cacao producers, Kemito Ene. AIDER, in the Peruvian Amazon, has invested a lot of resources in community forestry projects, yet in several cases, communities have given up on communal forest management and have still ended up negotiating with logging companies, and men must still leave their communities in order to find work. Factors contributing to these failures include: lack of market access and contacts; lack of experience in negotiating favourable deals; lack of market demand for certified timber in an area where illegal logging predominates and insufficient quantities of timber to make the enterprise viable.  

- **Local consumption patterns should be addressed.** Several interviewees described efforts at revitalising local consumption as well as production, since in many regions there has been a general trend towards consuming external products, such as clothing and food. For instance, in Mexico, working to revitalize traditional dress has been important for the local economy. In India, food festivals celebrating the richness and diversity of traditional forest foods – which have tended to be maligned by outsiders - have sparked off intergenerational dialogues about their value and, in an important step to start reclaiming their local food systems, led women to take action to
regenerate the biodiversity of their forests.

- **Markets can be made, not just accessed.** There are many traditional products, especially NTFPs and other wild products, which simply haven’t been identified (for commercialisation) because people tend to 'start with the market’/‘the commodity of the moment’. Yet developing these value chains requires considerable commitment and investment of resources.

- **Sustainable support chains and consumption patterns are increasingly in demand.** More and more campaigns around sustainable consumption are emerging, i.e. in Peru, Brazil, Indonesia etc. which promote more sustainable value chains that very often include indigenous peoples producing goods within their territories. This work with consumers can have important effects, i.e. following a concerted effort to raise the status of alpaca meat in Bolivia, this meat has gone from being disparaged to being served in high profile restaurants. In Brazil, high-profile chefs associated with the Instituto Ata are collaborating with indigenous communities to raise the profile of traditional ingredients (Torres, 2017).

- **Livelihood gains may have more to do with market forces and policies, rather than interventions and projects.** Successes can occur when favourable markets and policies are in place.

- **Working on policy reforms may be more effective than community livelihood projects.** Infrastructure investments tend to have larger impacts, i.e. roads and transport, electricity, certain types of small-scale agroindustrial investments, access to communications and credit. Important contextual aspects, such as price shifts, changes in markets and policies etc. often swamp other factors. In Panama, community forestry projects with considerable donor support, notably from WWF, with the Embera and Wounaan peoples have had limited results. An interviewee highlighted the following key impediments: a bureaucratic state and officials and restrictive inappropriate regulation. Moreover, donors tried to promote community forest enterprises - a collective model - from scratch, which has failed to take hold. In Peru, regulation permitting community forestry has until recently been largely the same as that regulating large scale industrial production and failed to account for the smaller scale and selective harvesting of timber practised by communities. The result of this has been that communities have either been forced to strike unfavourable deals with logging companies who have enabled the community to generate some income from timber extraction albeit from large-scale and unsustainable practices or to continue to practice small-scale and inherently more sustainable logging but outside of the law.

- **The prohibition/criminalisation of community resource use poses a formidable obstacle to livelihood gains.** As highlighted above, almost all small-scale forestry which actually supports local people’s livelihoods is illegal. There are very few cost-effective forestry projects, as regulatory policies across the world make small-scale forestry unprofitable. Without government subsidies, community forestry and NTFP enterprises all too often become a non-starter. As a result, many communities sustain their livelihoods quite effectively by marketing timber and medicinal plants within the informal economy. However, strict regulatory systems make it hard for external organisations to reproduce these effects with other communities. Attempts by indigenous communities in the Peruvian Amazon to commercialise *palo rosa* essential oil have been repeatedly blocked by the government, because of its status as an endangered species (though whether it should actually be accorded this status in Peru is yet to be established, due to a lack of research).

- **Market imperatives can block attempts to address social and ecological issues.** Sometimes, potential solutions can be disregarded in order to ensure short-term productive gains. For instance, in Mexico, as demand for *amate* (fig) paper increased, indigenous producers substituted the use of lime for caustic soda. Although this cut down the production process from ten hours to just three, saving both time and firewood, it has also brought adverse health impacts for the makers and contaminates the local water supply. A team from the Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana de Iztapalapa discovered an alternative method using entirely natural, local materials: by leaving the fibres in water to ferment with orange peel and coffee husks, they could produce the same effect. However, their alternative approach required a lot longer – between three to five days – and some additional labour, to occasionally stir the fibres. Local people did not adopt the fermentation technique; the longer production time and additional work involved wasn’t regarded as viable, given that they sell the paper by volume at a very low price.

- **Securing public sector support at local levels is sometimes vital.** Securing the support of the public sector in the region can make it more straightforward to advance, particularly in trying to bring about changes at the level of a sector, such as coffee, cacao or banana. Accessing state funds
has been essential to the expansive social programmes developed by coffee cooperatives, such as UCIRI in Mexico. In Guyana, securing the contract to provide cassava bread and peanut butter – locally-produced, culturally-valued and nutritious - for the schools hot meals programme has opened significant income streams for local people and prevented those public funds from draining out of Amerindian communities. Similarly, community-leaders have exerted pressure on regional government so that procurement contracts for school furniture are awarded to a local furniture factory, located in Shulinab village, which provides employment for five people.

- **Moving up value chains is important but requires coordination and a business structure.** This in turn will likely require significant external technical assistance (for instance, to facilitate more complex processing of products), over a longer period, i.e. 10-15 years.

- **It is critical to develop an understanding of political relationships within communities.** In supporting the development of community enterprises, it may be important to establish a separation whereby political leaders are not the ones taking business decisions, though they may provide input into decision-making. This delinking of economic initiatives from the territorial political governance structure may prove especially important in the event that these initiatives become successful, as this makes it more likely that they will accumulate power within the territory. Simultaneously, these economic initiatives should remain linked in a limited way to the political structure, so that a percentage of revenues may be directed towards territorial governance issues. A recurrent challenge for community enterprises is to understand how to effectively deliver both social and economic benefits. One possible approach to this issue is demonstrated by the Kapawi Ecolodge run by the Achuar in the Ecuadorian Amazon: they elect a president once every three years who is not involved in the day-to-day administration of the enterprise, but rather is appointed to ensure that the enterprise is managed in accordance with the broader vision outlined by the community.

- **Take care in promoting a community association or enterprise as a first step.** Where such an organisation already exists, try to strengthen it. Otherwise, it may prove worthwhile to consider working at the household level, before trying to support some kind of association to handle marketing efforts. Collective production, such as in the case of large-scale community forest management, has worked in Petén, Guatemala, but not in many other places, which raises doubts as to the replicability of this experience; it has also been very dependent on donor funding. Hence there is good reason to be sceptical of this option.

- **Finding the right buyer/market intermediary is key.** Reaching an agreement takes time, has ups and downs, requires understanding and good communication, but should ultimately allow communities to move up the value chain, i.e. the coffee cooperative UCIRI, in Mexico, was able to establish links with Alternative Trade Organisations and the incipient Fair Trade movement to avoid intermediaries and achieve a much better deal for its members.

- **Accessing finance, especially working capital, is a common obstacle.** Several interviewees stressed the importance of drawing upon successful experiences in leveraging finance, working with banks, credit institutions and other organisations that are willing to finance sustainable livelihoods, (a lot of which currently stems from carbon markets). Cases such as ACOFOP in Petén and the cooperative Salinerito in Ecuador, while extremely successful in their own right, have required huge capital investment, which raises the question of how such approaches can be scaled up/replicated elsewhere. Even where communities have defined their own vision for self-determined development, the system of public investment in many Latin American countries, such as in Peru, fails to take communities’ voices into account; one indigenous leaders argued that public funds are geared towards investing in cement when, by contrast, communities’ own Planes de Vida focus on regenerating forests, soils and rivers.8

- **Difficulty of ensuring local capacity to coordinate work.** Communities can be difficult to reach and remote. In terms of project coordination, the difficulty can be finding someone who can work well with indigenous peoples but also bridge effectively with the world of capitalism.

- **Training and capacity-building are essential** and should be sensitive to local needs. For instance, in the case of Corporación Talleres de Gran Valle (a community enterprise producing bathroom and decorative goods in Valle De Manduricacos, Ecuador), the project coordinator (from outside) trained up three young indigenous people, all of whom had different but complementary studies, over a period of two years. By the end of that time, they formed an effective, small team ready to

---

8 For more on Plan de Vida (‘Life Plan’), see 3.3.
assume his responsibilities. In the case of the peanut butter project in Guyana, a few teachers, amongst others, were instrumental in managing the project. The fact that they were well-trained and that there was continuous monitoring by passionate, committed, local people – not outsiders from the capital city - meant that issues could be addressed more effectively as they arose.

- **Risk assessment is vital.** Ascertain the risks people are/aren't willing to take. For instance, USAID’s BIOREDD+ programme in Colombia, working with indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities has encountered trouble in developing around eight value chains, some more traditional/well-articulated with markets than others, i.e. acai, cacao, annatto and coconut, complemented with subsistence crops. This case demonstrates the difficulties in developing value chains based on unfamiliar products and which require a lot of upfront investment from local people; for many, the requisite starting capital has simply proven prohibitive. The interviewee who highlighted this case suggested that it would have been preferable to secure financing for grant/seed money to help establish these value chains initially, in recognition of the fact that many people are not in a position to invest and assume such considerable risk. Similarly, a practitioner engaged in agricultural projects in the Peruvian Amazon observed that projects which fail to deliver economic benefits swiftly can struggle to sustain people’s motivation.

**Social Context, Traditional Knowledge, Cultural Practices & Innovation**

*Customary institutions for managing livelihood programmes may be very weak or non-existent. Loss of traditional knowledge is a key risk for indigenous peoples’ livelihoods. Many external initiatives don’t succeed for cultural reasons. Build on what is already in place. Systems for technological change based on local people’s knowledge tend to be cheaper and more effective. The introduction of technologies tends to be more donor-driven. Find uses for ‘waste’. Indigenous and rural communities may privilege external ideas over their own. Indigenous technologies and skills may no longer be viable.*

- **Customary institutions for managing livelihood programmes may be very weak or non-existent.** The push to protect indigenous peoples’ rights, especially over territory, is often justified in terms of environmental sustainability, good governance etc. A central assumption is that customary law, institutions and cultural practices are still strong and being practised. But if these are/have been weakened, there is no guarantee that this will necessarily be the case. With the young people gone, how will a given community be able to live well in ten or twenty years? This clearly poses a risk for communities. It is important to look at communities’ attributes and take time to gain a detailed understanding of relevant laws, from the customary to the international; e.g. in Mexico, ejidos exist as a widespread form of communal ownership of land, thus they tend to have more collective mechanisms for decision-making. Simultaneously, some initiatives deliberately or inadvertently undermine the very customary institutions which have underpinned indigenous economies. For instance, in the case of the Pancur Kasih Credit Union, despite its significant gains and monumental expansion, it has been argued that one of its long-term impacts has been to instil an individualistic, materialistic mindset within indigenous communities, to the detriment of customary institutions, such as communal work. Yet, organising work collectively may not always be appropriate and, in the worst cases, can cause tensions and generate conflicts, e.g. when installing rainwater harvesting systems with indigenous communities in the Ecuadorian Amazon, ClearWater learnt that communal systems did not work, resulting in problems with maintenance. Switching to the household level improved the situation. Elsewhere, solidarity organisations have helped to strengthen customary institutions by ensuring that projects are designed and implemented in accordance with customary laws, as is the case with the community-based telecommunications networks installed by Rhizomatica.

- **Loss of traditional knowledge presents a considerable risk for indigenous peoples’ livelihoods.** In many regions, the wider cultural context involves an ongoing, dramatic loss of traditional knowledge across generations. If greater efforts aren’t made to revitalise them, indigenous knowledge-systems and practices and the livelihoods and biocultural diversity they sustain are at risk of disappearing as elders pass away. In the Ecuadorian Amazon, Kallari’s sale of handicraft items has led to a revitalisation of interest among youth in traditional techniques for harvesting, dying, weaving & carving. The Fundación Chankuap is working in the same region with Achuar and Shuar communities to recover traditional crop varieties, which had been neglected with the growing predominance of cattle-ranching. There are many initiatives, i.e. in India and Central
America, to recover local seed varieties at danger of being lost; through the Rede de Sementes do Xingu in Brazil, women and youth from indigenous communities are leading many of the seed collector groups which are supporting reforestation initiatives through the saving and distribution of seeds of native forest species. At the Talaandig School for Living Traditions in Songko, Lantapan Bukidnon, children can play musical instruments, sing songs, listen to the Talaandig stories and learn the Talaandig games and dances from Inay, a Talaandig cultural master. Talaandig provides a haven for children where they can build their foundation on the Talaandig story & self-identity. Other indigenous education initiatives, such as the Pamulaan Center for Indigenous Peoples’ Education (also in Philippines) and LifeMosaic’s Next Generation Leadership trainings, are motivating young people to return to their villages to learn about and help to revitalise and renew ancestral cultural practices and customary institutions and build deeper connections with elders.

- Many external initiatives do not succeed for cultural reasons; the challenge is identifying inputs which resonate with existing cultural practices. One indigenous leader from the Peruvian Amazon expressed his bemusement at repeated attempts by development agencies to promote raising cuy (guinea pig) in Amazonian communities, despite the fact that it is not to local people’s tastes. On a related note, a USAID alternative development programme with a Cacataibo community in Aguaytia, in the Peruvian Amazon (circa 2003), incentivised rubber-tapping and assured the minimum wage to every adult in the community. They received training, tools, daily wages, start-up funds and support to form community enterprises. Nonetheless, the community-members ultimately chose not to submit themselves to rigid working hours and the disciplined, repetitive style of work, instead preferring to let out their rubber forests to non-indigenous people from a nearby settlement. Moreover, cultural preferences for foods must be accounted for: following attempts to introduce certain seeds to people’s vegetable gardens in Nicaragua, the project coordinator realised that vegetables were being fed to pigs because people didn’t know how to cook them. This spurred the creation of a recipe book and cookery workshops. In another case, a cultural preference for easily-cultivated, traditional crops, such as plantain, yucca and maize, prevailed over other introduced varieties.

- Build on what is already in place; models from elsewhere which are simply imported and applied tend not to work; they fail to build trust and don’t value people’s histories, unique cultural identity and traditional knowledge, e.g. ‘biohuertas’ (organic vegetable gardens) which are constantly being implemented in the Amazon, despite being ill-suited to the local climate and conditions. This is also the risk inherent in programmes to promote non-traditional agricultural exports, which tend to have less success. Programmes where traditional communities derived more benefits involved finding new markets for crops they had already been cultivating for a long time, such as cacao, plantains and sesame. Thus, programmes work best when they enhance things which are already part of the community. This returns to the need for sound baseline research at the outset.

- Systems for technological change based on local people’s knowledge tend to be cheaper and more effective, but only work well when they concern relatively simple changes; in the past, the introduction of new soil conservation techniques, seed varieties and farmer-to-farmer extension systems have all worked well. Aquaculture projects where Peruvian Amazonian communities raise paiche in natural lagoons mainly for local consumption represent an adaptation, in light of increased contamination of their rivers, but one which people have made successfully. Once it becomes more complex, e.g. integrated pest management, complex agroforestry systems and business planning, these same systems tend to become far less effective.

- Distinct elements/strategies should be incorporated gradually. Innovations in agriculture, aquaculture can be built in gradually, over the years.

- The introduction of technologies tends to be more donor-driven. Only introduce appropriate technologies where communities identify this as a priority to address a problem they are facing, following critical reflection over the possible benefits, risks and consequences for their long-term autonomy and cultural integrity.

- Find uses for ‘waste’. Keystone Foundation in India has supported traditional honey collectors to find different uses for beeswax, which was previously discarded as a waste product.

- Indigenous and rural communities may privilege external ideas over their own. One practitioner working mainly in the Peruvian Amazon noted how often in indigenous communities there, when outsiders arrive, community-members tend to become enthusiastic and say “Yes” to everything
they propose. Even in communities nearer to the city, where there is a greater level of awareness as to the nature of these programmes and people realise that the overall project isn’t likely to work, they often consent as they realise they are likely to receive at least some material benefit in the near-term.

- **Indigenous technologies and skills may no longer be viable**: Indigenous peoples, such as the Shipibo-Conibo in the Peruvian Amazon, have historically developed and mastered technologies geared towards the use of expansive territories, reflecting the distribution of resources and characteristics of their environment, as seen in their prowess in fishing, hunting and rotational farming. Now that many Shipibo people live in concentrated settlements with much smaller extensions of territory, these well-honed techniques - which were extremely effective before - no longer suffice. For instance, during the 1990s, in the Philippines, indigenous councils supported by the ILO-INDISCO programme reviewed the viability of traditional practices such as rotational farming in light of current realities, given their increased population sizes and much-diminished land-base.

### 2.2 What Has Worked

**Food Sovereignty, Community Forestry & Non-Timber Forest Products**

There are a great breadth of initiatives aimed at reclaiming local food systems and building food sovereignty and security. Successful examples of commercial community forestry and NTFPs generally owe success to high levels of government and donor support, advantageous regulatory frameworks and strong organisation and capacity within communities. Certification and accessing foreign markets can prove costly and communities need to decide whether it is worth the cost and effort. Payments for environmental services are promising in remote areas with few other options for income-generation.

- Often in the face of formidable threats to their territories, such as the expansion of extractive industries and monoculture plantations, indigenous peoples have taken actions to regain control of their local food systems and seeds and celebrate the richness and diversity of their forest harvests. In India, ‘food from the forest’ has emerged as a powerful metaphor and serves as a banner for indigenous peoples to rally around, while solidarity organisations such as NTFP EP and Living Farms have helped to organise popular food festivals, which not only make visible the important role played by traditional forest foods in terms of well-being, health and nutrition, but also serve as fora where different generations can gather and dialogue about the cultural significance of these foods and reaffirm their importance and the need to protect them.

- There are many successful examples from Mexico of commercial community forestry and NTFPs. However, they all exhibit high levels of external financial support, particularly from government subsidies, and a more favourable regulatory situation than exists in most other countries, i.e. a well-established collective tenure regime and a high degree of decentralisation of decision-making over forests, granting communities considerable local autonomy.\(^9\)

- The model of community forestry on community concessions in Petén, Guatemala, has proven successful. Some communities mix timber with NTFPs, particularly date palm and gum from certain trees. Factors for success include extensive donor support to get projects off the ground and supportive government institutions interested in helping it move forward. The communities in question (some indigenous, some not) already exhibited many of the requisite skills and organisation to make the operation successful; some communities were already harvesting mahogany illegally anyway, so they were familiar with the process. All that was required was a special effort to formalise and legalise their activities.\(^10\)

- In Ecuador, many indigenous communities are engaged in commercial forestry, but there it is based on households, rather than community organisations. Community-members sell one or two trees from their family plot within the collective territory; this is an important source of livelihoods. The small scale of logging suggests that it is sustainable. For twenty years, the Ecuadorian Government has been promoting a legal framework which is friendlier to smallholders, both indigenous and non-indigenous (similarly as in Costa Rica). Nonetheless, the


\(^10\) For an analysis of the community forestry concessions in the Maya Biosphere Reserve, see Radachowsky et al. (2012).
legal framework is still overly bureaucratic, meaning informality still occurs, and households find that to comply with forestry regulations, they must cut down more trees than they would wish to otherwise. Investment in batana oil production in Mosquitia, Honduras, also occurs at the household level.  

- Many really successful forestry projects are actually found in peri-urban areas, where tree cover is in fact increasing, as small plantations are established. Across Central America and in countries such as India, Ethiopia and China, these peri-urban forestry projects meet a significant demand for fuel wood, charcoal, medicinal plants and construction timber.  
- Securing government contracts can prove very lucrative. For instance, rubber-tappers in Acre, Brazil, received government support to set up a condom factory, with the Ministry of Health as their main buyer. Similarly, a community forestry and processing enterprise in Mexico has secured a contract to sell school furniture to the Ministry of Education.  
- Certification and gaining access to foreign markets can turn out to be very costly and communities themselves find they have to determine whether it is worth the extra expense. One community forestry organisation in Yucatán, Mexico, ended up deciding to forego certification to sell most of its timber nationally, where certification is not an issue. In other cases, such as the Honduran Mosquitia, batana-harvesting communities have achieved Rainforest Alliance certification for large areas of forest, with donor support. Elsewhere, such as in India, producer associations have made use of alternative, locally-embedded and far cheaper certification schemes, known as Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS). NTFP EP are currently embarking upon a certified rattan programme in Kalimantan, based on a PGS. The Community Agroecology Network, who have worked with Mexican coffee-growers to create AgroEco, an alternative certification model, have encountered a different obstacle: although AgroEco actually adheres to higher socio-environmental standards than Fair Trade, US consumers don’t necessarily understand this and demand the better-known Fair Trade Label, which led one stockist to drop AgroEco after a year.  
- In some cases, payments for ecosystem services (PES) are reported to have provided some positive benefits, particularly in remote areas with poor market access and thus limited income options, for instance, the Sociobosques scheme in Ecuador. Nevertheless, such PES schemes raise numerous legitimate concerns about impacts on rights, freedoms, livelihood security and self-determination: restrictions on forest-use carries risks for food security; breaking the agreement can incur punitive sanctions (this is a concern communities have shared about the Sociobosques scheme); the government’s requirement for long-term commitment has made communities nervous about making agreements which will impact upon the next generation; most money from such schemes goes to technicians and intermediaries rather than indigenous communities themselves...

Agricultural Production, Processing & Marketing

Producer cooperatives have secured livelihoods gains, particularly through fair trade networks and organic certification schemes. Other effective strategies include new crop varieties, soil conservation schemes, improved irrigation systems, teaching composting techniques and complementary livelihood activities, such as bee-keeping. Producers should always remain alert to opportunities to move up value chains. Relatively simple, well-designed solutions can address deeply-entrenched, recurrent problems, such as seasonal hunger.

- There have been significant successes stemming from agricultural cooperatives producing commodities such as coffee and cacao, where growers able to take advantage of fair trade and organic certification have made some important livelihood gains. A strong example from the Ecuadorian Amazon is the cooperative Kallari.  
- Many positive cases involve new crop varieties, which are easy to introduce, can sometimes significantly increase yields and can diminish the threat of disease. Furthermore, these tend to spread by themselves, as farmers imitate their neighbours, as long as they don’t require many inputs or complicated technological packages.

---

11 For more, see the case study of MOPAWI and Moskibatana in Annex 1.  
12 See Annex 1 for case study.
• Some soil conservation schemes have been successful, e.g. a farmer-to-farmer scheme led by the Unión Nacional de Agricultores y Ganaderos (UNAG) in Nicaragua. Farmer organisations promoting cocoa production, use of cover crops etc. constitute rather successful, cost-effective interventions.

• In drier areas, in situations where water is the major limiting factor, and where communities otherwise have market access and decent soils, small-scale irrigation pumps and ram pumps have proven very helpful, creating the opportunity to sell surplus vegetables.\(^\text{13}\)

• Making the most of local inputs: in various contexts, teaching different composting techniques has lessened dependence on externally-produced and bought fertilisers, building self-reliance.

• Look for complementary strategies. For instance, in Liberia, through outreach and mentoring, women learnt bee-keeping, finding that it was an activity they could combine quite easily with existing household responsibilities. The cooperative Salinerito in Ecuador has, over time, formed a number of cooperatives and community enterprises which are mutually-supportive: for example, they have opened a pizzeria within their territory which purchases the cheese and mushrooms produced by another wing of the co-op.

• Communities should remain alert to any opportunities to add value to products themselves; value addition through drying plants is straightforward and does not require complex machinery. Another case concerns brazil nuts, which are classified and bought by size; the indigenous producers realised they could easily assume this task and were able to capture more value for themselves. Simultaneously, it is important to address the question of where the producers can get to in terms of the value chain, i.e. in Brazil, there is a desire on the part of certain NGOs for indigenous communities to assume the role not only of producers, but also processors, traders etc. This is not necessarily realistic, or desirable.

• New marketing opportunities frequently open up for products people have some experience with already: one example is tilapia in Ivory Coast, where bushmeat is becoming increasingly scarce and there are few other sources of protein. There, relatively simple technology has been able to have a powerful, positive effect.

• Initiatives to combat seasonal hunger, such as the ‘grain banks’/centros de acopio y distribución de alimentos (‘food collection & distribution centres’) set up by Nicaraguan and Mexican coffee cooperatives, with support from the Community Agroecology Network. These grain banks also help build up local, food-based economies, keep seeds and grains circulating locally and help producers remain free of debt.\(^\text{14}\)

Breaking Through Regulatory Bottlenecks

Solidarity organisations can act as effective allies in supporting partner organisations to overcome common bottle-necks, such as bureaucratic barriers which prevent them from exporting produce to gain higher prices.

• Some successful initiatives have focused specifically on supporting producers to get past the ‘bottle-neck’ preventing them from exporting their product. In the case of banana producers in Piura, Peru, this meant supporting them to address the issue of organic certification. Solidaridad helped to organise producers in cooperatives and associations, so that for the very first time in Peru, small-producers were able to export containers of organically-grown bananas, cultivated by strongly-organised producers, grouped in their own small company, Grupo Hualtaco.

• In the case of the social enterprise, Runa, which markets guayusa leaf and other herbal teas from the Ecuadorian Amazon in the USA, the challenge was to move a new product past various regulatory hurdles; surmounting US regulations required around $1 million within an 18-month period. Such enterprises need someone on either side, good technical assistance and a reliable partner.

Networks and Marketing

Networks can be effective in supporting communities’ aspirations and facilitating for groups to come together, share experiences and learnings, build solidarity and forge beneficial relationships with the business and

\(^{13}\) See Annex 1 for AIDFI case study.

\(^{14}\) See case study of the Community Agroecology Network in Annex 1.
The Forest Honey Network in Indonesia brings together groups from across nine islands for trainings, to share experiences and learnings and engage with the scientific community. Sumbawa is an example of a particularly successful group, having successfully forged links with a multilevel marketing group, Amway. They also sell finished products, such as lip balm, and hope to open a honey museum soon. A key success factor has been strong links with and consistent support from local government. NTFP-EP is also working with honey producers to promote further research into the associated health benefits of their honey. The fees which NTFP-EP raise from their EXCEED trainings help fund this research.

NTFP-EP also works with the Sunflower Community Weavers, a wild abacá fibre-based weaving enterprise with a natural dye processing facility in the mountains of Malaybalay, Bukidnon. The SCW have been keen to build their business and a deal was struck with the US company, Crate and Barrel, which ordered 9000m of abacá textiles, finished using natural dyes. This proved to be an important learning process both for the community and NTFP-EP’s Philippines office, due to the company’s exacting standards. Having fulfilled such a large order, the community decided to take a break, as they felt they had become overly focused on their enterprise, leading to further reflection on how to balance production of this kind with the cultural and ritual aspects of their lives. Nonetheless, many families benefited, with additional income available to invest in education etc.

Working with Youth

Indigenous/culture-based education is contributing to stemming youth migration and empowering young people to revitalise their communities.

A challenge facing many forest communities is that whilst parents and grandparents still hold traditional ecological knowledge of the forest, this knowledge is fast disappearing, as its transmission to the younger generation is disrupted by social pressures and changing aspirations, displacement or migration. The loss of this knowledge represents a huge opportunity cost for this new generation, as in order for youth to sustain their livelihoods in forest-based communities, they must understand forest ecologies and how to derive their livelihoods from them. Hence the significance of grassroots efforts to encouraging intergenerational learning.

In Mexico, indigenous education initiatives/spaces within local intercultural educational institutions are contributing to stemming the tide of youth migration, as graduates are increasingly likely to return to their communities. This is helping to maintain the strength of traditional productive systems and creating spaces for alternatives over time.

Another initiative to address the important role of youth concerns the Next Generation Leadership trainings LifeMosaic facilitates in Indonesia, which support young indigenous people to deepen their understanding of the challenges facing indigenous peoples, develop more critical analysis, awaken a calling to protect their territory and enable them to question whether leaving their communities is the only option. Youth can facilitate and bridge between the customary and the new, connect and rebuild bonds with the elders, and come up with exciting new ways of being indigenous, through art, music, poetry, tattooing etc. As a result of these trainings, youth have become even more forceful advocates in defending their elders, with many deciding to remain and work within their communities where they are using the tools and participatory methods they have learned to grow and strengthen grassroots leadership; currently, some twenty alumni are actively organising indigenous youth movements within their territories. Furthermore, during the last couple of years, alumni have independently started at least a dozen autonomous indigenous schools, with no external funding.

In Philippines, Negrito hunter-gatherer communities are served by a roaming forest school, enabling their children to learn indigenous knowledge and wisdom, as well as literacy and numeracy skills. In Suriname, Rutu Foundation is working with Saramaka communities to develop culturally-embedded models of education and equipping the non-indigenous teachers who work in indigenous communities with the knowledge and skills to deal with the children’s multilingual requirements, emphasising political and social empowerment through language.

In Mexico, researchers associated with the Universidad Veracruzana have been supporting youths
who work on traditional cafetales (coffee farms), reservoirs of biodiversity which produce many important materials for handicrafts, including *amate* paper. Through participatory mapping, the youths identified which themes were of most interest to them; from this emerged a focus on embroideries and a revival of interest in local cuisine and recipes which had fallen out of use. These are being popularised again through small, inter-village food fairs organised by the youths in conjunction with schools.

- In Guatemala, when teaching sustainable agricultural practices and the cultivation of certain cash crops via a farmer-to-farmer method, the leadership in the indigenous community ensured that technicians selected from the community were youths, to develop and involve them in a way which meant they were integral to the farmers, with the aim of stemming youth migration. As a result, the youths formed and led their own association. Great value was placed on the collaborative nature of the project, particularly between youth and elders, who were valued for their respective qualities and distinct contributions.

**Handicrafts**

Handicrafts tend to be sold locally and regionally. There have been some successful collaborations between traditional makers and designers who support them to present their craft in innovative ways.

- Handicrafts tend to be sold through local and regional markets. For instance, the Guna people in Panama have created a market for their traditional *mola* embroideries which has had major success, helped by their proximity to Panama City and a steady flow of tourists.
- There have been some successes where groups have worked with designers to start making new products, albeit based on traditional techniques and materials. For example, the Otavalo community enterprise, Totora Sisa, in Ecuador, has sold its products both nationally and internationally. Another example is that of traditional rattan bags in East Kalimantan – NTFP-EP ran trainings on how to finish bags in different ways to appeal to different markets and sell more of their products locally, regionally, nationally and even internationally, in Santa Fe, at the largest international market of traditional goods.

**Ecotourism**

Ecotourism initiatives work best where communities already display a strong level of organisation, as a complement to other livelihood activities. At the same time, many ventures have struggled for various reasons: they can be difficult to manage sensitively; poor marketing; too remote and facilities and conditions are too rough; benefits tend to accrue to travel companies; the importance of natural setting and lack of appeal of degraded and deforested areas; the commodification of cultural practices. Nonetheless, ecotourism also offers positive examples of long-term, local capacity-building.

- Tourism has largely only proven a successful option for communities which are already well-organised and able to add tourism to a wider mix of livelihood strategies; e.g. in Mexico, this can be seen with the best-organised coffee cooperatives and community forest enterprises, which already had what they needed to make this work.
- Ecotourism provides some good examples of how to build capacity within communities, in terms of language-learning and marketing, over a period of many years. One example of this is Naku, in Ecuador.
- Those rural tourism projects which tend to be more successful are attempts to take advantage of places where tourists are already going, i.e. by setting up food stands by the roadside, taking handicrafts to hotels etc. In the case of Raja Ampat, an area in Papua with a significant pre-existing tourism sector, local people have been successful in capturing part of this market by creating a community association of homestays.

**Appropriate Technology and Renewable Energy**

Important livelihood improvements have stemmed from the introduction of appropriate technologies which harness abundantly available local resources, can be constructed and maintained locally and managed in a culturally-appropriate way.
In India and elsewhere, there have been successes relieving pressure on community forests by harnessing biogas for cooking, using locally constructed technology and managed through cooperatives.

In the Ecuadorian Amazon, solar energy systems are enabling communities impacted by severe oil contamination to move towards energy independence. Constructing concrete, tangible projects (e.g. renewable energy systems and rainwater harvesting) can help to foster trust with communities and in turn create new possibilities for doing the more intangible, but equally important work, of constructing economic alternatives, around which it can be harder to build consensus.15

2.3 Suggestions of Approaches and Methodologies

The following comprises a selection of interviewees’ suggestions of possible approaches and methodologies for supporting self-determined development and livelihoods initiatives.

- Develop a strong baseline survey, which considers all possible options (including infrastructure to improve local access, if appropriate), based on a thorough understanding of people’s current livelihood strategies and how these fit within the larger structures of the local economy and ecology; for example, see the community livelihood appraisal & product scanning (COLAPPS) approach developed by NTFP EP Asia. Identify what the main bottlenecks limiting livelihood improvements are; determine which are potentially resolvable and which are not.

- Take care to map those potential actors who could help the community move things forward, both figures within and without the community, particularly connectors, such as teachers and religious leaders (in the case of communities where a single religion dominates).

- Identify potential partners with good experiences and a good track record in these areas, although be wary that this can entail assuming additional reputational risks.

- Start with a very small initiative, using limited funds, i.e. $5,000 - 10,000. Accept that this seed fund is essentially risk capital, and some may be lost. It is generally advisable to go with something which doesn’t require constant project funding to sustain itself, even if this means that the results will be much more modest - at least in the short-term - and less visible. For instance, pilot a one-year project, possibly to support an ongoing livelihood activity, e.g. timber-harvesting, cacao, ecotourism. Try to grow slowly. Observe whether there is a positive response, then move forward as appropriate. It should be noted that developing an initiative in this way can prove hard if funding cycles necessitate a quick turn-over.

- As a solidarity organisation, be prepared to offer assistance regarding markets and commercialization, by ascertaining the most relevant, actionable information, identifying trade opportunities and determining how to add value.

- Seek out multi-faceted facilitators, capable of facilitating processes of deep awareness-raising, visioning, allowing the community to decide what their priorities are and supporting them to make them a reality. ‘Light-touch facilitation’, which enables people to ask the right questions and identify solutions for themselves, providing continuity for just the right amount of time, can prove especially valuable.

- Positive experiences emerging from long-term engagements, such as the Central Himalayan Rural Action Group, demonstrate that solidarity organisations should be prepared to work with partner communities on a long-term basis and build up capacity there. Such complex problems are not likely to be solved in five or seven years. Accompany communities over a long period of time, perhaps less intensively, but with a firm commitment and a willingness to build accountability.

- Live for six months in the community. Learn what people’s genuine priorities are. Construct any sort of initiative hand-in-hand with the people. Identify short, medium and long-term priorities together with community members. Plan exactly how money will be used with the community. Be aware that this may throw up difficulties: for instance, at times the community-members may well prefer to use money available for other, more immediate concerns, such as

---

15 Practitioners interviewed as part of the study generally had limited experience in this area; see the table of case studies contained in Annex 1 for more detailed information.

16 For instance, see the Raja Ampat Homestay Association case study contained in Annex 1.
festivals etc.
- Specific methodologies for supporting indigenous peoples’ sustainable livelihoods and self-determined development highlighted by interviewees include:

- Community livelihood appraisal & product scanning (COLAPPS), as developed by NTFP EP Asia and shared through the Expanding Community Enterprise and Economic Development (EXCEED) trainings they facilitate across South Asia.¹⁷
- ValueLinks, a methodology for promoting value chains, developed by GIZ.¹⁸
- Plan de Vida, an approach to autonomous, self-determined development pioneered by the Misak people in Cauca, Colombia, which is being used by hundreds of indigenous communities across Latin America, and now Indonesia, to determine their futures (see below).¹⁹
- Training for Transformation, an approach to empowerment through grassroots community education, developed by Anne Hope and Sally Timmel in Africa.²⁰
- The Nature, Wealth and Power Framework, used by USAID.²¹

Additional methodologies which deserve special emphasis include:

- indigenous action research to carry out baseline livelihoods assessments.²²
- insider research methods.
- decolonising methodologies.²³

¹⁸ International ValueLinks Association e.V. website available at: http://valuellinks.org/manual/. (Accessed: 26/02/17). For examples of where this approach has been used, see case studies of Fundación Chankuap and Kallari in Annex 1.
¹⁹ See Marti (forthcoming). See also the LifeMosaic case study.
²⁰ See the Raja Ampat Homestay Association case study.
²² See Reason & Bradbury (2008) for a far-ranging treatment of participatory action research approaches.
2.4 Table of Organisational Models

As is demonstrated throughout the study, multiple organisational models have been deployed in diverse contexts to support communities to self-determine their futures and enhance their livelihoods. The table below provides an overview of some of these models and their key characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Livelihood addition: Mainly rights-based NGO expands its work to include a focus on sustainable livelihoods, initially</td>
<td>Rainforest Foundation UK: cacao production and marketing with the Asháninka Kemito Ene cooperative in Peru.</td>
<td>Builds on well-established working relationships with people at the centre of the project.</td>
<td>Unfamiliar area of work can require a lot of trial and error and ongoing learning by all partners to become established.</td>
<td>RFUK chose not to recruit new staff but rather provided existing staff with training in new areas such as cooperativism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Pros</td>
<td>Cons</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| working closely with a local CBO.                                    | IFAD support for Unión de Cuatro Pinos agricultural co-op; GIZ support for Kallari; INHERE & Miserecor support for Inhere Aajivika Uthan Samiti (IAUS) Producer Group etc. | - Builds local organisational capacity.  
- Supports and strengthens ongoing efforts.  
- Occasional, strategic interventions can be effective in surmounting particular bottlenecks. | - Tendency to pay insufficient attention to markets and ongoing challenges of commercialisation.  
- Limited multiplier effects; doesn’t build capacity to provide similar assistance to other partners – i.e. requires multiple reinventions of wheel.  
- Specialist expertise needed may not be available locally. | Most common model. Also probably the closest to the way in which FPP already works with partners. |
| 2. Building technical capacities of local partners: External NGO provides bilateral support to a CBO, i.e. producer coop or local NGO, enabling it to access relevant training, technical assistance & funds/other resources. | ILO-INDISCO Philippines, supported by DANIDA, the Netherlands, UNDP, AGFUND, UNV, CIDA, Rabobank Foundation & International Philippine Association. | - Participatory approach builds local capacity and self-reliance.  
- Projects, which are designed and implemented by local groups, tend to be more resilient and likely to continue once funding ends. | - Where projects involve commercialisation, marketing remains a key difficulty. In the case of INDISCO, occasionally hiring a marketing consultant wasn’t in itself sufficient to overcoming this barrier. Indicates the need for capacity-building sensitive to local needs. | |
<p>| 3. Livelihood small grants/loans programme catalyses grassroots development by making training &amp; a revolving loan fund available to community groups. | Rhizomatica (telecommunications); IBEKA (community hydropower) etc. | - Develop expertise in a particular area – often in addressing a common problem faced by many communities – which can be scaled up to meet the needs of many communities. | - Such solutions are likely to be more effective in generating positive impacts where they strengthen local institutions, i.e. supporting people to establish a community energy coop, and form part of broader strategies for change, rather than acting as stand-alone interventions. They may therefore require long-term commitment to partners and the funding streams that this requires. An exception to this would | Instances where organisations have developed a more comprehensive series of programmes after beginning by focusing on a single, concrete issue, i.e. Alianza Arkana and ecological sanitation; Ceibo Alliance, a grassroots indigenous organisation, has grown from ClearWater’s earlier work installing household rainwater harvesters. |
| 4. Targeted/ specialised livelihood NGO programme/social enterprise with a set of communities, focused on enhancing a particular livelihood priority identified by the community. | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Regional social enterprise hub provides technical, organisational &amp; marketing assistance to a number of communities.</td>
<td>NTFP EP Asia.</td>
<td>- This model is effective in counteracting common limitations of indigenous producers, especially in terms of access to markets, enabling them to rise up the value chain &amp; connect with markets. - Economically resilient, once established (initially using donor funds) as it uses a percentage of the funds from selling products to support its costs. - Effective in seeding further similar hubs and expanding the network by disseminating tested approaches through trainings, which also generate revenues to cover organisational costs.</td>
<td>- Location of hubs requires careful thought. - NTFP EP has found it a challenge to balance advocacy, community support work and securing funds, especially as large agencies persistently try to draw them into dialogue over policy issues, leaving less time for grassroots work. - Difficult to find ways to achieve scale, i.e. the entire NTFP EP network caters to around 600 communities in total. - Despite considerable achievements and a lot of struggle, it is still hard to obtain resources, despite NTFP EP having very effective fundraisers.</td>
<td>- Success in carving out new commercial niches, rather than simply following the market’. - NTFP EP Asia has been successful in identifying product-specific experts, i.e. resin, rattan, bamboo, to oversee work, and also benefits from staff and board with background in business and management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Indigenous education/skills training programmes equips people with education and training in facilitation methods/technical skills, as well as ongoing support, to catalyse self-determined development processes and livelihoods initiatives within their own territories.</td>
<td>Pamulaan Center for Indigenous Peoples Education; LifeMosaic’s Next Generation Leadership trainings; the Raja Ampat Homestay Association; Barefoot College.</td>
<td>- Particularly strong engagement with groups which typical development projects overlook or struggle to involve, i.e. youth, elders, women. - Trains people so that they can return to their territory and train others. - Focus on education for empowerment is effective at strengthening social organisation, often an impediment to livelihood gains.</td>
<td>- Hard to secure funding for this sort of work. - No guarantee that trainees will have opportunities to deploy their new knowledge.</td>
<td>- Education and training initiatives range from established learning centres and colleges, such as Pamulaan, to infrequent but long-term, externally-facilitated trainings. - Many of the successful Latin American coops highlighted elsewhere in this study emerged in contexts where these forms of popular, participatory education were widespread.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART III: KEY FINDINGS

3. Conclusions

This rapid scoping study on specialist organisations and people working on indigenous peoples’ self-determined development and sustainable livelihoods has surveyed the views of close to 30 practitioners within this field, drawing upon their diverse range of experiences, and has profiled over 30 initiatives which demonstrate the multiple ways in which indigenous peoples are self-determining their own autonomous development, in accordance with their own cultures, values and visions.

This study has found that successful initiatives to develop sustainable livelihoods do exist but are patchy rather than widespread and share the following properties:

- are built on foundations of strong social organisation, territorial governance and community vision;
- value holistic, territorial and culture-based participatory approaches, which start with community priorities and aim to bring about the solutions that community-members identify for themselves;
- a strong emphasis upon ongoing culture-based learning, skills training and local capacity-building;
- a recurrent pattern of small-scale solutions, which may be easily integrated with people’s existing livelihood strategies, that are most robust when they are built out and consolidated over time.

Furthermore, whilst recognising the considerable challenges confronting indigenous peoples, the intense pressures threatening their territories and, all too frequently, the relatively disadvantaged positions from which they engage with the monetary economy, the study highlights a range of community development initiatives and enterprises which are delivering a wide range of benefits: strengthening or revitalising customary governance institutions and laws, valuing traditional knowledge and practices, creating spaces for intergenerational dialogues and learning, reclaiming and protecting local food systems and seeds, building food and nutrition sovereignty, ensuring clean drinking water and adequate sanitation, generating electricity from renewable sources, making telecommunications available to remote communities and the creation of alternative income streams.

While the strongest examples underscore the effectiveness of holistic, territorial approaches, rather than stand-alone projects, they also point to an important role for visioning exercises, participatory action research on livelihoods and support for community governance initiatives, as well as providing rural indigenous communities with technical assistance and quality training in marketing, business-planning and book-keeping. Nevertheless, where possible, the study has also endeavoured to point out the idiosyncrasies of particularly successful case studies, as a reminder that often this success is intimately linked to a specific set of prevailing circumstances which cannot be repeated.
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The Union of Indigenous Communities in the Lowlands Region / Unión de Comunidades Indígenas de los Bajos Llanos (UCIRI) – a cooperative which has also developed initiatives to promote education, health, infrastructure and livelihood projects.

Annexes

Table of Case Studies of Sustainable Livelihood Initiatives & Self-Determined Development

Introductory Remarks to the Case Studies

- All of the thirty cases considered below have contributed in some way to enhancing indigenous peoples’ sustainable livelihoods and self-determined development.

- The initiatives are varied in their approaches, including those focused on supporting and strengthening food and nutrition security and sovereignty, and community health; the production, processing and marketing of timber, non-timber forest products; handicrafts and ecotourism enterprises; culture-based education and training, particularly those initiatives which are geared toward self-determined development and constructing alternative livelihoods; community finance and enterprise development; to options for community-controlled infrastructure, including renewable energy systems, appropriate water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) systems, housing and innovative community-based telecommunications networks.

- The highlighted initiatives have been developed by diverse community enterprises and producers associations, community-based organisations, non-governmental organisations and collaborative networks, along with supporting institutions such as financial donors, credit unions and local, regional and national authorities. Although the majority of initiatives identified are situated in indigenous territories across the South, many have made strategic use of transnational networks, working in partnership with organisations based in the North to advance their goals; these instances and the dynamics involved offer especially pertinent lessons for FPP and its partners.

- In attempting to evaluate the impacts of these initiatives (using available data, which is often scarce), a number of aspects have been considered:
  
  (i) community ownership over the initiative;
  
  (ii) positive community feedback on benefits and impacts;
  
  (iii) good governance and sustainability over time – ideally still active and effective;
  
  (iv) positive social and cultural spin-offs, including non-monetary benefits;
  
  (v) positive outcomes for rights, freedoms and land and food security;
  
  (vi) positive multiplier effects;

  (vii) significant challenges / obstacles to further development;
  
  (viii) resources, support from NGOs etc., whether it forms part of a particular project.

Notes

- Doubt as to replicability of UCIRI’s success, given that UCIRI’s particular history as a co-founder of Fair Trade and the entire Fair Trade labelling system confers a competitive advantage on it;

  - UCIRI’s role as an alternative development organisation and its access to financial resources from the Fair Trade system (derived from sales of Fair Trade coffee) makes this a unique case within the context of Fair Trade.

  - It is an open question whether the benefits of UCIRI’s success are replicable elsewhere.

  - The issue of replicability is not isolated to UCIRI, rather it is a much more generalised concern about fair trade as an alternative development strategy.

  - UCIRI has received significant support from various NGOs, including Max Havelaar, a leading Dutch-based body that provides technical assistance and support for fair trade initiatives.

  - The involvement of UCIRI in the ECUMED network has also been significant, providing a platform for networking and coordination.

  - UCIRI has been able to leverage its position to secure funding from various sources, including government grants and donations from international organisations.

  - UCIRI’s success is in part due to its ability to adapt to changing market conditions and to the support it has received from the local community.

  - UCIRI’s success is also due to its ability to build strong alliances with local communities and to develop effective communication strategies.

  - UCIRI’s success is an example of how alternative development strategies can be effective in improving the lives of small farmers and rural communities.
Cooperativa Productiva de Kallari, S.A. de C.V., a well-established firm with high levels of trust and respect, which produces foodstuffs and produces honey and other products.

**Location:** Guatemala

**Type:** Agricultural Food Products and Processing

**Overview:** Founded in 1979, CP, one of the most important cooperatives in the region, focuses on the production and marketing of high-quality agricultural products. CP has over 5,000 members, mainly Nahuat and Kichwa families in 21 communities around the country, using traditional techniques and the resource endowment of their territories. CP was founded in 1977 to improve the livelihoods of agricultural producers and has since taken on a range of economic and social projects.

**Community ownership:** The coops, cooperatives, and community initiatives have taken root in the region, using traditional techniques and the resource endowment of their territories. CP was founded in 1977 to improve the livelihoods of agricultural producers and has since taken on a range of economic and social projects.

**Positive community feedback and impacts:**
- **Economic:** By increasing the income of its members, CP is helping producers to obtain a stronger position in the market and improve their bargaining power.
- **Social:** Through initiatives such as its strong alliances with other cooperatives such as the Coopera Program (CP), CP is helping producers to improve their bargaining power and access to markets.
- **Environmental:** CP is supporting the revitalisation of indigenous ecosystems and ways of life, which are threatened by monoculture.

**Income generation:** The Coopera Program (CP) is helping producers to obtain a stronger position in the market and improve their bargaining power. By improving their bargaining power, producers are able to gain better prices from intermediaries and access to markets.

**Goverance and sustainability:**
- **Community:** The coops, cooperatives, and community initiatives have taken root in the region, using traditional techniques and the resource endowment of their territories. CP was founded in 1977 to improve the livelihoods of agricultural producers and has since taken on a range of economic and social projects.

**Positive social outcomes and cultural spin-offs:**
- **Economic:** By increasing the income of its members, CP is helping producers to obtain a stronger position in the market and improve their bargaining power.
- **Social:** Through initiatives such as its strong alliances with other cooperatives such as the Coopera Program (CP), CP is helping producers to improve their bargaining power and access to markets.
- **Environmental:** CP is supporting the revitalisation of indigenous ecosystems and ways of life, which are threatened by monoculture.

Challenges/obstacles to further development:
- **Economic:** Reduced length of the working day. By improving the working day, producers are able to gain better prices from intermediaries and access to markets.
- **Social:** Through initiatives such as its strong alliances with other cooperatives such as the Coopera Program (CP), CP is helping producers to improve their bargaining power and access to markets.
- **Environmental:** CP is supporting the revitalisation of indigenous ecosystems and ways of life, which are threatened by monoculture.

Ultimate beneficiaries:
- **Economic:** The ultimate beneficiaries of UCT's work are the various groups who have benefited from the organization's projects, including the coops, cooperatives, and community initiatives.
- **Social:** The ultimate beneficiaries of UCT's work are the various groups who have benefited from the organization's projects, including the coops, cooperatives, and community initiatives.
- **Environmental:** The ultimate beneficiaries of UCT's work are the various groups who have benefited from the organization's projects, including the coops, cooperatives, and community initiatives.

Notes:
- UCT's work in the region has been focused on improving the livelihoods of agricultural producers and has taken on a range of economic and social projects.
- By improving the working day, producers are able to gain better prices from intermediaries and access to markets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative / Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Community ownership?</th>
<th>Positive community feedback on benefits and impacts</th>
<th>Community empowerment?</th>
<th>Positive social and cultural spin-offs?</th>
<th>Positive social and political security?</th>
<th>Positive multiplier effects?</th>
<th>Challenges/obstacles to further development?</th>
<th>Resources and Support?</th>
<th>Website / Additional information</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Agribusiness in Rural Areas</strong></td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Agricultural Products and Processing</td>
<td>Improving on-farm productivity and increasing the integrity of ecosystem services by mainstreaming agroforestry, improving livelihoods of smallholder farmers by supporting farmers to adopt agroforestry, and reducing deforestation with cattle rearing.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In 2015, APASPE and 26 small producers, mainly from indigenous communities, reaped the benefits of increased productivity and greater market access.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Collaboration with local producers and leadership development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Visit APASPE's website for more information.</td>
<td>Odielca Solis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tropical Indigenous Producers (Evar) - Farmer-led Forestry and Livelihood Development</strong></td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Agricultural Products and Processing</td>
<td>A team of 20 paid staff — 9 women - works with communities in 60 villages in the autonomous indigenous region of the Amazonian, which consists of 49,000 people, mainly mestizo, and 21,000 people, mainly indigenous, including 9,000 in 4 villages, 1,000 in 43 villages, and 2,000 in 1 village.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Products are sold to local consumers, as well as to buyers, and have been used as a source of income for the community.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The community has developed a line of handicrafts, essential oils, spices and teas, and has managed to increase its income.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Visit the website for more information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Indigenous Producers (Jupaú)</strong></td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Agricultural Products and Processing</td>
<td>Oranges, food products, medicinal plants and forest products. The Jupaú producers, mainly from the tribal communities, have a rich tradition of using traditional knowledge for their livelihood.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Since its inception in 2012, the Jupaú producers have diversified their income by selling processed and packed products, including cassava flour, using traditional techniques and biodiverse production methods.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The community has been able to maintain its cultural identity and maintain social cohesion.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Visit the website for more information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fundación Chakchak (FC)</strong></td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Community Forestry and NTFPs</td>
<td>The FC supports and promotes the development of community forestry initiatives, with a focus on agroforestry, reforestation, and community-based conservation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The FC supports the development of community forestry initiatives, with a focus on agroforestry, reforestation, and community-based conservation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The FC has facilitated the establishment of community forestry initiatives, with a focus on agroforestry, reforestation, and community-based conservation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Visit the FC's website for more information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fundación Chakchak (FC)</strong></td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Community Forestry and NTFPs</td>
<td>The FC supports and promotes the development of community forestry initiatives, with a focus on agroforestry, reforestation, and community-based conservation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The FC supports the development of community forestry initiatives, with a focus on agroforestry, reforestation, and community-based conservation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The FC has facilitated the establishment of community forestry initiatives, with a focus on agroforestry, reforestation, and community-based conservation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Visit the FC's website for more information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community Agroforestry Network (CAAN) - XX
#### Overview
CAAN works with local partners to establish and strengthen local agroforestry organizations and projects, with a particular focus on smallholder farmers and indigenous peoples.

#### Community ownership and impacts
- **Positive community benefits and impacts:**
  - CAAN supports community-led initiatives to enhance local agroforestry knowledge and practices.
  - Many communities have increased their understanding of agroforestry benefits and practices.
  - **Community revitalisation:**
    - The programme has helped to re-establish traditional knowledge in some communities.
    - Communities have increased their resilience to environmental challenges.

#### Governance and sustainability
- **Governance and sustainability:**
  - CAAN is managed by a partnership of local and international organisations, including CAAN, the International Institute for Environment and Development, and the World Agroforestry Centre.
  - The programme is funded through a combination of grants and contract funding.

#### Positive social policy and economic spinoffs
- **Positive social policy and economic spinoffs:**
  - The programme has created jobs in agroforestry, particularly for women and youth.
  - Income generation opportunities have been developed.

#### Positive multiplier effects
- **Positive multiplier effects:**
  - The programme has had a positive impact on local economies, helping communities to become more self-reliant.

#### Challenges/obstacles to further development
- **Challenges/obstacles to further development:**
  - Funding constraints can limit the programme's capacity to scale up.
  - Technical challenges may arise in implementing agroforestry practices.

---

### International Labour Organization - Inter-Regional Programme To Support Self-Help Organisations Of Farm Workers And Indigenous Communities Through Cooperatives And Other Self-Help Organizations
#### Purpose
To support self-help organizations of farm workers and indigenous communities through cooperatives and other self-help organizations, and to promote action research and participatory approaches.

#### Community representation
- **Community representation:**
  - The programme represents the interests of farm workers and indigenous communities to promote their rights and well-being.
  - Communities have increased their participation in decision-making processes.

#### Governance and sustainability
- **Governance and sustainability:**
  - The programme is managed by a partnership of international and national organizations, including the International Labour Organization (ILO), FAO, and other stakeholders.
  - Funding is provided through a combination of grants and contracts.

#### Positive social policy and economic spinoffs
- **Positive social policy and economic spinoffs:**
  - The programme has created jobs in the self-help organizations.
  - Income generation opportunities have been developed.

#### Positive multiplier effects
- **Positive multiplier effects:**
  - The programme has had a positive impact on local economies, helping communities to become more self-reliant.

#### Challenges/obstacles to further development
- **Challenges/obstacles to further development:**
  - Funding constraints can limit the programme's capacity to scale up.
  - Technical challenges may arise in implementing self-help organization practices.

---

### INCOSE DOLOI

#### Overview
INCOSE DOLOI was established to support indigenous communities in Central America in 2014. The programme helps communities to establish their own self-sufficient economies.

#### Community representation
- **Community representation:**
  - The programme represents the interests of indigenous communities to promote their rights and well-being.
  - Communities have increased their participation in decision-making processes.

#### Governance and sustainability
- **Governance and sustainability:**
  - The programme is managed by a partnership of international and national organizations, including the International Labour Organization (ILO), FAO, and other stakeholders.
  - Funding is provided through a combination of grants and contracts.

#### Positive social policy and economic spinoffs
- **Positive social policy and economic spinoffs:**
  - The programme has created jobs in the self-help organizations.
  - Income generation opportunities have been developed.

#### Positive multiplier effects
- **Positive multiplier effects:**
  - The programme has had a positive impact on local economies, helping communities to become more self-reliant.

#### Challenges/obstacles to further development
- **Challenges/obstacles to further development:**
  - Funding constraints can limit the programme's capacity to scale up.
  - Technical challenges may arise in implementing self-help organization practices.
Living Farms (LF) - Forest food fests trigger and support action to regenerate forest, land and cultural diversity, replacing chemical agricultural inputs with locally-grown organic, nutrient-dense foods. LF works with Kondh communities in Odisha to improve food security, health and environmental sustainability. In 2017, LF plans to plant 1.5M trees.

In 1981 the Living Farms (LF) project was started in Odisha, India, by Hans Arquiza, an ecologist and anthropologist from Canada. The project was initiated by the Kondh communities themselves, with LF as an advisor and partner. The project is managed by Kondh women, who own and manage the land and forest. LF works with Kondh communities to maintain and develop their forest, land and cultural diversity, replacing chemical agricultural inputs with locally-grown organic, nutrient-dense foods. LF has received over US$6M in international funding, with the money going to support the Kondh communities in their efforts to maintain and develop their forest, land and cultural diversity.

The project has been successful in bringing communities together to protect and manage their forest lands, and has helped to improve food security and health. The project has also helped to improve local governance, education and income levels in the communities. The project has been successful in bringing communities together to protect and manage their forest lands, and has helped to improve food security and health. The project has also helped to improve local governance, education and income levels in the communities.

The project has been successful in bringing communities together to protect and manage their forest lands, and has helped to improve food security and health. The project has also helped to improve local governance, education and income levels in the communities. The project has been successful in bringing communities together to protect and manage their forest lands, and has helped to improve food security and health. The project has also helped to improve local governance, education and income levels in the communities.

The project has been successful in bringing communities together to protect and manage their forest lands, and has helped to improve food security and health. The project has also helped to improve local governance, education and income levels in the communities. The project has been successful in bringing communities together to protect and manage their forest lands, and has helped to improve food security and health. The project has also helped to improve local governance, education and income levels in the communities.

The project has been successful in bringing communities together to protect and manage their forest lands, and has helped to improve food security and health. The project has also helped to improve local governance, education and income levels in the communities. The project has been successful in bringing communities together to protect and manage their forest lands, and has helped to improve food security and health. The project has also helped to improve local governance, education and income levels in the communities.
The Network for World honey 
Production and 
Marketing (NFP) is a non-profit 
organization that focuses on 
sustainable honey production and 
marketing. Its main objectives are 
to promote the development and 
protection of honey bee 
communities, and to advocate 
for regulatory and legal frameworks 
that support honey bee 
protection and 
community development.

The NFP network consists of 
over 30 organizations from 
around the world, including NGOs, 
UN agencies, and 
governmental organizations.

In 2021, the NFP network 
launched a new initiative called 
"Honey for Change", which aims 
to support smallholder 
honey producers in developing 
countries to increase their 
income and improve their 
livelihoods.

The initiative focuses on 
providing technical 
assistance, training, and 
marketing support to honey 
producers in countries such as 
Indonesia, Brazil, and 
Philippines.

The NFP network also 
works to raise awareness about 
the importance of honey bee 
pollination and the role of 
honey bee products in 
sustainable development.

Notes:
- The NFP network is supported by 
various organizations, including 
the United Nations, the World 
Bank, and the European Union.
- The "Honey for Change" initiative 
is supported by the European 
Union and the European 
Development Fund.
- The NFP network has 
partnered with various 
organizations and 
governments to promote 
honey bee protection and 
community development.
- The NFP network is 
active in over 30 countries, 
including Brazil, Indonesia, 
and the Philippines.
Cooperative Management of Babassu Forests in Raja Ampat, Indonesia

**Overview**

The Cooperative Babassu Nut Breakers (Cooperativa Babassu Nut-Breakers) is a community-led initiative that promotes the sustainable use of babassu, a native palm, in Raja Ampat, Indonesia. The cooperative was established in 2009 with support from the Indigenous Community of Raja Ampat (ICRA) and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) as part of the Muskitia and Ratao Area Management Project (MARTAM Project). The cooperative aims to protect and restore the babassu palm forest, generate income for the community, and promote cultural revitalization.

**Community ownership**

The cooperative is owned and managed by the Babassu Nut Breakers from 30 producer households, with 53 households engaged in related activities. The cooperative is led by a management team comprising three women and a man, with the support of a facilitator and a community representative. The cooperative is registered as a non-profit organization under Indonesian law and is governed by a governing council.

**Positive community feedback on impacts**

The cooperative has received positive feedback from various stakeholders, including government agencies, NGOs, and local communities. The cooperative's efforts to protect and restore the babassu palm forest have been recognized at the local and national levels. The cooperative has also received support from international organizations, such as the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

**Positive social cultural spin-offs**

The cooperative has contributed to the revitalization of traditional practices, cultural identity, and social cohesion among the community. The cooperative has also generated economic opportunities, such as the sale of babassu products, which has improved livelihoods and reduced poverty among the community.

**Challenges/obstacles to further cultural sustainability**

The cooperative faces challenges in terms of sustainable management, economic sustainability, and social cohesion. The cooperative's ability to sustainably manage the babassu palm forest is crucial to the community's continued prosperity.

**Notes**

The information presented here is derived from the EID database (Study 181, 2016).

**Contact**

Serge Bertoni, serge@lifemosaic.net

**Website / Additional Information**

http://www.mastaphi.com

The training support the joint effort to deepen the understanding of the challenges indigenous peoples face in their territories and skills for the future in the form of training and assessment.

Aims

To develop an educational project for Indigenous youth, community leaders and elders.

Objectives

1. To foster learning communities that encourage the development of self-directed learning and self-esteem.
2. To strengthen capacity for decision-making and leadership.
3. To promote the cultural and economic development of Indigenous communities.
4. To support the right of Indigenous peoples to determine their own development and self-governance.

Methodology

The methodology is participatory and community-based. It involves the active participation of Indigenous youth, community leaders, and elders in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the project.

Expected Outcomes

1. Improved educational outcomes for Indigenous youth.
2. Increased self-confidence and leadership ability among Indigenous youth.
3. Strengthened capacity for decision-making and leadership among Indigenous youth, community leaders, and elders.
4. Improved economic and cultural development of Indigenous communities.

Challenges

1. Funding constraints.
2. Limited access to resources.
3. Resistance to change.
4. Lack of infrastructure.

Solution

1. Seek external funding.
2. Partner with local and international organizations.
3. Mobilize local resources.
4. Develop partnerships with educational institutions.

Notes

This project is supported by the Foundation for Indigenous Education (Pineapple), a non-profit organization working to improve educational opportunities for Indigenous youth and community leaders.
Shidhulai Swarajya Sangstha - Roots of Hope, Bangladesh

Shidhulai was founded by Mohammed Rezwan in 2001, with USD$150,000. Shidhulai’s core focus is to enhance the lives of people in rural Bangladesh through water-based solutions.

- Shidhulai partners with local communities to provide access to clean drinking water, help with fishing and agricultural activities, and support for women and children.
- Shidhulai offers vocational training, health education, and disaster preparedness.

Shidhulai’s main funders include the Blanket Garden Fund, Saving An Angel and the Leonardo DiCaprio Foundation. Shidhulai has adopted a triple bottom-line approach to its operations. CA’s wide-ranging impact has resulted in spin-offs that are currently running in the Philippines, India and Nigeria.

- Shidhulai has been successful in replication and innovation, and has established partnerships with other organizations.
- Shidhulai has partnered with the Global Partnership for Education, the World Bank, and the Nike Foundation.

Shidhulai was founded in 2001 and is a 501(c)(3) non-profit. Shidhulai’s main funders include the Blanket Garden Fund, Saving An Angel, and the Leonardo DiCaprio Foundation. Shidhulai has adopted a triple bottom-line approach to its operations.
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Rhizomatica is a telecommunications cooperative that seeks to improve community access to telecommunications services and is an example of a community-owned and operated telecommunications cooperative. Rhizomatica supports communications cooperatives who aim to build and maintain small and self-governed and external telecommunications networks on a non-commercial basis. It provides technical, financial, and regulatory assistance to community networks in the United States and around the world. Rhizomatica helps rural and remote communities build and maintain small and self-governed and external telecommunications networks on a non-commercial basis. It provides technical, financial, and regulatory assistance to community networks in the United States and around the world.

The telecommunication cooperatives in Latin America and the Caribbean have prioritised the implementation of community-owned and operated and multi-access networks. This is because they are based on the premise that the community’s access to telecommunication services can be improved through infrastructure investments that are designed and managed by the community itself. The cooperatives are based on the premise that the community’s access to telecommunication services can be improved through infrastructure investments that are designed and managed by the community itself. The cooperatives are designed to be community-owned, multi-access, and self-governed. They also provide technical and financial support to community networks in the United States and around the world.

In the United States, some members of the community have prioritised the implementation of community-owned and operated and multi-access networks. This is because they are based on the premise that the community’s access to telecommunication services can be improved through infrastructure investments that are designed and managed by the community itself. The cooperatives are based on the premise that the community’s access to telecommunication services can be improved through infrastructure investments that are designed and managed by the community itself. The cooperatives are designed to be community-owned, multi-access, and self-governed. They also provide technical and financial support to community networks in the United States and around the world.

Some examples of community-owned and operated telecommunications cooperatives in Latin America and the Caribbean include the Telecommunications Cooperative of the Quilombo community, a community-owned and operated and multi-access network in Brazil. The cooperative is based on the premise that the community’s access to telecommunication services can be improved through infrastructure investments that are designed and managed by the community itself. The cooperatives are designed to be community-owned, multi-access, and self-governed. They also provide technical and financial support to community networks in the United States and around the world.

There are also examples of community-owned and operated telecommunications cooperatives in the United States, such as the Telecommunications Cooperative of the Quilombo community, a community-owned and operated and multi-access network in Brazil. The cooperative is based on the premise that the community’s access to telecommunication services can be improved through infrastructure investments that are designed and managed by the community itself. The cooperatives are designed to be community-owned, multi-access, and self-governed. They also provide technical and financial support to community networks in the United States and around the world.

In the United States, some members of the community have prioritised the implementation of community-owned and operated and multi-access networks. This is because they are based on the premise that the community’s access to telecommunication services can be improved through infrastructure investments that are designed and managed by the community itself. The cooperatives are based on the premise that the community’s access to telecommunication services can be improved through infrastructure investments that are designed and managed by the community itself. The cooperatives are designed to be community-owned, multi-access, and self-governed. They also provide technical and financial support to community networks in the United States and around the world.

Some examples of community-owned and operated telecommunications cooperatives in Latin America and the Caribbean include the Telecommunications Cooperative of the Quilombo community, a community-owned and operated and multi-access network in Brazil. The cooperative is based on the premise that the community’s access to telecommunication services can be improved through infrastructure investments that are designed and managed by the community itself. The cooperatives are designed to be community-owned, multi-access, and self-governed. They also provide technical and financial support to community networks in the United States and around the world.

There are also examples of community-owned and operated telecommunications cooperatives in the United States, such as the Telecommunications Cooperative of the Quilombo community, a community-owned and operated and multi-access network in Brazil. The cooperative is based on the premise that the community’s access to telecommunication services can be improved through infrastructure investments that are designed and managed by the community itself. The cooperatives are designed to be community-owned, multi-access, and self-governed. They also provide technical and financial support to community networks in the United States and around the world.

In the United States, some members of the community have prioritised the implementation of community-owned and operated and multi-access networks. This is because they are based on the premise that the community’s access to telecommunication services can be improved through infrastructure investments that are designed and managed by the community itself. The cooperatives are based on the premise that the community’s access to telecommunication services can be improved through infrastructure investments that are designed and managed by the community itself. The cooperatives are designed to be community-owned, multi-access, and self-governed. They also provide technical and financial support to community networks in the United States and around the world.
Arkana, 2016). Challenges/obstacles to further development?

Notes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative / Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Community ownership?</th>
<th>Positive community feedback on benefits and impacts?</th>
<th>Governance and sustainability?</th>
<th>Positive social and cultural spin-offs?</th>
<th>Positive outcomes for rights, freedoms, land and food security?</th>
<th>Positive multiplier effects?</th>
<th>Challenges/obstacles to further development?</th>
<th>Resources and Support?</th>
<th>Website / Additional information</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Indigenous Development Foundation for Water and Sanitation</td>
<td>Philippines / Indonesia / Malaysia / Singapore / Peru / Costa Rica / Cambodia / Nepal / Colombia / Costa Rica / Cameroon</td>
<td>Water and Sanitation</td>
<td>AIDFI’s hydraulic ram pumps provide optimal and sustainable communities with a reliable water system. Additionally, the pump systems are carbon neutral (the pump runs on water power).</td>
<td>Training ensures that the communities themselves have the skills and knowledge to operate and maintain the pumps.</td>
<td>The pump systems are highly effective, providing clean water to rural and remote areas.</td>
<td>Positive feedback on benefits and impacts.</td>
<td>Positive feedback on benefits and impacts.</td>
<td>Positive feedback on benefits and impacts.</td>
<td>Positive social and cultural spin-offs.</td>
<td>Some communities have established pump associations to fund their operations.</td>
<td>Once installed, trained community members can maintain the pump for themselves.</td>
<td>AIDFI website</td>
<td>Auke Idzenga: <a href="mailto:auke_idzenga@yahoo.com">auke_idzenga@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:contactus@aidfi.org">contactus@aidfi.org</a></td>
<td>There exist a variety of effective, low-tech approaches to water purification, e.g. at the household level, see (Clearwater.org, 2016). These approaches have the advantage of being accessible, affordable and sustainable. Kreamer (2016) raises a number of important considerations to take into account when designing and implementing WASH initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>