



Peer-to-peer learning for enhancing capacities

An international indigenous knowledge exchange



INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR CONSERVATION OF NATURE



Organized by:

The IUCN Global Programme on Governance and Rights (GPGR) in collaboration with the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP) and IUCN Indigenous Peoples' Organisation Members.

With support from:

The Forest and Farm Facility

For further information:

Please contact governanceandrights@iucn.org or ceesp@iucn.org

Report prepared by Ameyali Ramos with inputs from Natalie Kurashima, Albert Chan Dzul, Daniel Rodriguez, Juan Cusanero Elias and Jenny Springer.

Table of contents

Table of contents.....	3
Participants – Tecpan Learning Exchange	4
IUCN Indigenous Peoples’ Organisations	4
IUCN Secretariat	5
IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy	5
Background on Tecpan Learning Exchange	6
Welcome and Ceremony	7
Global Policy Overview	8
United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change – Lola Cabnal and Juan Carlos Jintiach.....	8
Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) – Ramiro Batzin.....	9
Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species - John Cheecho	10
International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) - Kevin Chang	11
Strategic Discussion: Positioning IP’s in Global Policy Post-2020.....	12
Aim.....	12
Key Points Raised in the Discussion	12
Global Policy Workshop.....	14
Building Capacity to Engage in Global Policy – Kristen Walker and Adalberto Padilla	14
Institutional Strengthening	16
Overview of Funding Landscape – Jenny Springer	16
Global Environment Facility – Yeshing Upun	17
Green Climate Fund – Adalberto Padilla	17
Foundations – Ricky Archer.....	18
Key Points Raised in the Discussion	19
Financial Mechanisms.....	21
Overview	21
Sharing Experiences.....	21
Discussion.....	22
Capacity Building: Entrepreneurial Support.....	23
Overview	23
Fundalachua – Jimy Chub Leal.....	23
Tikonel – Maria Margarita Lool Sutuj.....	23
Asociacion Agro Artesanal Wiñak – Juan Carlos Jintiach.....	24
Land Rights and Sustainable Production.....	25
Overview	25
Discussion on Land Rights and Conservation	25
Discussion on Food Sovereignty.....	26
Closing Session	28
ANNEXES	29
ANNEX A: Meeting Agenda.....	29

Participants – Tecpan Learning Exchange

IUCN Indigenous Peoples' Organisations

Marco Antonio ALVARADO VASQUEZ, 48 Cantones Totonicapan, Guatemala

Ricky ARCHER, North Australia Land and Sea Management Alliance, Australia*

Pedro Benjamin BARRENO ZAPETA, 48 Cantones Totonicapan, Guatemala

Ramiro BATZIN CHOJOJ, Centro para la Investigacion y Planificacion del Desarrollo Maya SOTZ'IL, Guatemala*

Dolores CABNAL COC, Asociacion Ak'Tenamit, Guatemala*

Marvin CHIRIX SOTZ, Sotz'il, Guatemala

Ismael Gabriel CUTZAL, Alcadia Indigena y Cofradia Indigena de San Jose Poaquil, Guatemala

Albert Maurilio CHAN DZUL, U Yich Lu'um and ICCA Consortium, Mexico

Kevin CHANG, Kua`aina Ulu `Auamo, Hawaii (USA)*

John CHEECHOO, Inuit Issittormiut Siunnersuisoqatigiifiat (ICC), Canada*

Jimmy CHUB LEAL, Fundacion Laguna Lachua, Guatemala*

Alex CONNELLY, KUA E Alu Pū Coordinator, Hawaii (USA)*

Juan CUSANERO ELIAS, Sotz'il, Guatemala

Julio CUSURICHI PALACIOS, Federación Nativa del Río Madre de Dios y Afluentes (FENAMAD), Peru*

Rosario FERREIRA, Central Indigena de Mujeres Amazonicas del Pando, Boliva

Felipe GOMEZ, ICCA Consortium, Guatemala

Alejandro GOMEZ GUTIERREZ, Consejo Municipal de Chenalho, Mexico

Julio Leonardo GUINEA XURUC, 48 Cantones Totonicapan, Guatemala

Armando HERNANDEZ, IDESMAC, Mexico

Antonio HERNANDEZ SANTIS, Consejo Municipal de San Juan Cancuc, Mexico

Juan Carlos JINTIACH, Coordinadora de Organizaciones Indigenas de la Cuenca Amazonica (COICA), Ecuador*

Solomon KAHO'OHALAHALA, Island of Lanai' KUA and E Alu Pū, Hawaii (USA)*

Luka KANAHELE, Edith Kanaoale Foundation, Hawaii (USA)*

Natalie KURASHIMA, Kamehameha Schools, Hawaii (USA)*

Noelani LEE, Island of Molaka'I, KUA and E Alu Pū, Hawaii (USA)*

Maria Margarita LOOL SUTUJ, Tikonel, Guatemala*

Kaulupali kahauanu MAKANEOLE, E Alu Pū Youth Council Member, Hawaii (USA)*

Onel MASARDULE, Fundacion para la Promocion del Conocimiento Indigena, Panama*

Candido MEZUA, Alianza Mesoamericana de Pueblos y Bosques (AMPB), Panama

Carmen MIRANDA, ICCA Consortium, Bolivia

Osvaldo MUNGUI SIERRA, Agencia para el Desarrollo de la Mosquitia, Honduras*

Benito OVALLE, Alcaldia Indigena y Cofradia Indigena de San Jose Poaquil, Guatemala

Nely SHINGUANGO ALVARADO, Lider de la Comunidad "Runashito", Ecuador

Angelica SITAVI, Sotz'il, Guatemala

Daniel RODRIGUEZ FERNANDEZ, Federaci3n Nativa del R3o Madre de Dios y Afluentes (FENAMAD), Peru*

Luis TAYORI, Reserva Comunal Amarakaeri, Peru*¹

IUCN Secretariat

Adalberto PADILLA, Coordinador de Pais-Oficina Honduras y Oficial Senior Pueblos Indigenas, Oficina Regional para Mexico, America Central y el Caribe (ORMACC)

Jenny SPRINGER, Director, Global Programme on Governance and Rights

IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy

Ameyali RAMOS, Deputy Chair IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP)

Yeshing Juliana UPUN YOS, Co-Chair of the Joint CEL/CEESP Specialist Group on Indigenous Peoples, Customary & Environmental Laws & Human Rights (SPICEH)

Kristen WALKER, Chair of the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP)

¹ * IUCN IPO Member

Background on Tecpan Learning Exchange

In March 2018, IUCN's Member Indigenous Peoples Organisations developed a self-determined strategy with joint priorities and actions for how to advance indigenous issues in relation to IUCN's work on conservation, climate and natural resource management. These priorities focus particularly on leveraging IUCN's convening power, knowledge generation, standard setting and policy engagement to support and strengthen the roles of indigenous peoples in achieving rural development and climate goals. The strategy provides IPOs, in partnership with other constituencies of IUCN, with a basis to support and advance indigenous rights, needs and priorities in conservation, climate and natural resource management.

A key component of the IUCN IPO strategy focuses on strengthening indigenous institutions, peer to peer learning, and capacities to collectively act and effectively influence natural resource management and climate policy and practice. The strategy also highlights women's and youth engagement and actions to ensure that they are included in capacity building initiatives. These and other dimensions of the IPO strategy align closely with priorities for the Farm and Forest Facility's support to IPOs on climate adaptation, capacity building pathways for rural enterprise development, and climate resilience.

The concept for this learning exchange arose out of a request from both IUCN IPO Members and FFF members for capacity building and knowledge sharing activities.

The specific objectives of the Tecpan learning exchange were to:

- Understand and strategize on global policy: The learning exchange also explored barriers and urgent issues relevant to indigenous peoples and opportunities/modalities to engage, advocate and influence the CBD, UNFCCC, SDGs and other relevant global policies.
- Enhance institutional capacities: including sharing information on funding sources (multilateral, bilateral, foundations, etc.) and other financing mechanisms (enterprise development, entrepreneurial support services, entrepreneurial experiences).
- Share experiences on securing land rights and sustainable production. Participants discussed global frameworks for conserved and protected areas and how they relate to indigenous rights to lands, territories and resources. Participants also discussed sustainable production as an essential component of cultural identity, land management, climate resilience and human health.

Welcome and Ceremony



Ramiro BATZIN, the Global Focal Point for the IUCN Indigenous Peoples' Organisations, opened the 2019 Tecpan Learning Exchange by welcoming participants to Guatemala and to Tecpan. Juan CHIRIX, a Mayan spiritual elder, led participants in a Mayan ceremony to ensure fruitful conservation during the exchange. Pedro Benjamin BARRENO ZAPETA, Marco Antonio ALVARADO VASQUEZ, and Ismael Gabriel CUTZAL, representatives from the indigenous governments in the region, also welcomed participants and encouraged them to learn from the experiences of indigenous peoples in the region.

Jenny SPRINGER, Director of the IUCN Global Program on Governance and Rights, also welcomed participants. She shared IUCN's commitment to supporting indigenous peoples and thanked the Forest and Farm Facility for their support in making the Tecpan exchange possible. Jenny shared information about IUCN and the GPGR program, highlighting the important role that indigenous peoples play in biodiversity conservation. Kristen WALKER, Chair of the IUCN Commission on Environment, Economic and Social Policy, also welcomed participants and explained the Commission's mandate and commitment to supporting indigenous communities.

Participants then introduced themselves and shared their hopes and expectations about the learning exchange. The session closed with a blessing from Juan Chirix.

Global Policy Overview

Onel MASARDULE moderated a panel that provided a general overview on global policy. Onel highlighted the important role that indigenous peoples play in the global policy arena and shared some of the challenges with engaging in these processes.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change – Lola Cabnal and Juan Carlos Jintiach

Lola CABNAL gave a general overview on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). She explained that the UNFCCC is an intergovernmental treaty developed to address the problem of climate change. She explained that the signatories to the convention meet once a year in a Conference of the Parties (COP). These COPs are where countries negotiate agreements to anticipate, prevent and minimize the impact of climate change.

Lola shared that there are two permanent bodies of the UNFCCC: the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI). The SBSTA was established to support the work of the COP through the provision of timely information and advice on scientific and technological matters and how they relate to the Convention, the Kyoto Protocol (an international treaty which commits state parties to reduce greenhouse gas emissions) and the Paris Agreement (a landmark agreement to combat climate change and to accelerate and intensify the actions and investments needed for a sustainable low carbon future). SBSTA meets at least twice a year and looks at issues like impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, technologies, and guidelines for preparing and reviewing greenhouse gas emissions.

The SBI has been at the heart of all implementation issues under the convention, the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement. The agenda of the SBI is shaped around the key building blocks of implementation including transparency, mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology and capacity building.

She mentioned that indigenous peoples have been actively involved in the UNFCCC for several years, and most recently through the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform. This platform has been helpful in enhancing the engagement of local communities in the UNFCCC process, specifically the SBSTA and the SBI.

Lola also shared information on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+). REDD+ was first negotiated in 2005 with the objective of mitigating climate change through reducing net emissions of greenhouse gases through enhanced forest management in developing countries. She noted that while for some indigenous peoples REDD+ has offered a promising new policy and access to resources for others REDD+

has posed challenges related to violation of rights, marginalization, denial of the right to participate, corruption etc.

Juan Carlos JINTIACH then provided a historical summary of indigenous peoples' engagement in the UNFCCC. He explained more about the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform (LCIP Platform) and how it came into existence through the decision adopting the Paris Agreement in December 2015 at COP21. He noted how the creation of this platform in the Paris Agreement is a recognition of the unique role that indigenous peoples and local communities play in exchanging knowledge, technologies, practices and efforts related to addressing and responding to climate change.

Juan Carlos explained that currently the LCIP Platform is working to develop its work plan, adopting safeguards for protecting traditional knowledge and other priorities. He shared that COICA will be following these processes and is happy to help communities engage in the platform.

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) – Ramiro Batzin

Ramiro BATZIN provided background on the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). He explained that the CBD is an international legally binding treaty with three main goals: conservation of biodiversity, sustainable use of biodiversity and fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the use of the use of genetic resource.

Ramiro shared that recent research shows that indigenous peoples have tenure rights or manage almost a quarter of the earth's land and protect almost 80% of the planet's biodiversity – so the CBD has recognized that it is essential that the CBD work closely with indigenous peoples.

He shared a map that was jointly prepared by IUCN ORMACC and indigenous peoples in the Mesoamerican region, which shows the overlap between indigenous territories and key biodiversity areas in the region.

Ramiro then explained that the three main areas of the CBD for indigenous peoples are:

- Article 8j – subject to its national legislation, respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovation and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and promote their wider application with the approval and involvement of such knowledge, innovation and practices and encourage the equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge innovation and practices.
- Article 10c – Parties shall as far as possible and as appropriate protect and encourage customary use of biological resources in accordance with traditional cultural practices that are compatible with conservation or sustainable use requirements.
- Article 17 – The contracting parties shall facilitate the exchange of information from all publicly available sources, relevant to the

conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. Such exchange of information shall include exchange of results of technical, scientific and socio-economic research, as well as information on training and surveying programmes, specialized knowledge, indigenous and traditional knowledge as such and in combination with the technologies referred to in Article 16, paragraph 1. It shall also, where feasible, include repatriation of information.

In 1998, the Convention of the Parties established an Ad Hoc Working group specifically to address the implementation of Article 8j and related provisions of the Convention of which Indigenous Peoples are a part. The working group has met every year since then to report on advancements related to Article 8j.

Ramiro shared that this year the CBD is deciding ways to take Article 8j forward. At the moment there are three options – the working group becomes a Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA), the working group becomes a Group of Experts, or the working group stays as a working group. Ramiro shared the pros and cons of each option and encouraged all participants to consider the options and participate in the process.

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species - John Cheecho

John CHEECHO began by sharing his perspective on the structure of each of the conventions and some larger environmental organisations. He highlighted that in most conventions indigenous peoples can be observers or can be part of their government delegations. Only in IUCN are Indigenous Peoples Organisations members with full voting rights like governments and NGOs. He suggested that this was a very valuable platform for indigenous peoples.

John shared his experience with the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES). In CITES indigenous peoples can participate as observers or governments can nominate them as members of the government delegation. John shared the pros and cons of each and shared that the Inuit Circumpolar Council always tries to have an indigenous person on the government delegation and another as an observer. John explained that through their participation, the Inuit have defended the right to trade wildlife.

John mentioned that in the last CITES conference in South Africa a proposal was made for an indigenous peoples platform in CITES, citing that CITES was lagging behind in recognizing indigenous peoples' valuable contributions. At the moment, the CITES process is driven by western scientific knowledge but indigenous knowledge is also important and valuable in the discussions.

Currently, there are discussions on how an indigenous platform could work within the context of CITES. There are divided opinions among CITES members where some are supportive of the idea but others are concerned

because indigenous peoples are not government institutions. Unfortunately, there is no current platform where IPs can voice their views on the exercise of their right to wildlife trading.

International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) - Kevin Chang

Kevin CHANG provided a general introduction to IUCN. IUCN is a member organisation composed of government, non-government and indigenous organisations. Created in 1948, IUCN has evolved into the world's largest and most diverse environmental network. IUCN has three parts: members, commissions and secretariat. There are currently more than 13,00 member organisations and commissions gather the input of some 15,000 experts.

Kevin shared that he got involved in IUCN in 2015 when indigenous peoples' organisations in Hawaii were working with others to bring the IUCN World Conservation Congress to Hawaii. Kevin mentioned that he attended his first congress in 2016 and was impressed to see governments, non-governmental organisations and indigenous peoples in the same room discussing issues of importance.

During the Hawaii Congress, members adopted a decision to create a new separate category of membership for Indigenous Peoples' Organisations. Kevin shared that this was the first time he had seen how indigenous peoples through the resolutions and motions process could lobby governments and other stakeholders on issues of importance to IPs.

Kevin then shared his organisation's experience and the benefits they have received from being able to advocate for local issues at the global arena. He encouraged other indigenous organisations to join IUCN.

Strategic Discussion: Positioning IP's in Global Policy Post-2020

Aim

Various participants are actively engaged in the CBD, UNFCCC, CITES and other global policy processes. The aim of this discussion was to foster conversation and discussion between the different policy platforms so as to develop a common agenda for post 2020.

Key Points Raised in the Discussion

Although not exhaustive, some of the key points raised during the discussion were:

- Supporting communication is essential. Participants recommended the development of a virtual platform where indigenous peoples engaged in different global policy processes can share information about activities in each of the conventions. This would allow IPs to interlink and strategize. The platform could also support IPs in sharing information from the global to the local level.
- Creating a technical support team. This team could support IPs in effectively engaging at the global policy level. The team could also help build capacity in indigenous leadership especially since there is a turnover in leaders; the technical team could provide continuity.
- Working from a common agenda. For IPs to be effective at the global level it is necessary to agree on a set of common priorities; otherwise IP's risk losing power. It's important that engagement in the various policy processes is based on and promotes indigenous concepts and ideas. It is also important to partner and collaborate so as to avoid unnecessary competition.
- Several issues for a set of common priorities were identified, including:
 - Rights to Territories. This cuts across all three conventions, links into governance and resources, and is essential for IPs.
 - Implementing FPIC. There are many global instruments that support and protect FPIC but the implementation of FPIC has been very weak. Focusing on supporting the implementation of FPIC is critical.
 - Self-Determination and Governance – need to recognize the complexity of indigenous governance. Difficulties in trying to coordinate between different IP groups in different countries.

- Access to Funding. This is critical – without it we have very well-developed plans but not the means to implement them.
- Traditional knowledge. The importance of TK is widely recognized but how do we link the global discussion to local realities?
- Environmental and Rights Defenders. This is an urgent issue to address; our brothers and sisters are giving up their lives to protect the planet. We need to make sure that they are protected.
- An indigenous alternative economy – self-defined economy that respects Mother Nature.
- IUCN as platform for supporting IP's in Global Policy Engagement. Participants highlighted that IUCN creates a space from which to dialogue, coordinate and engage in the processes. Sometimes being an IUCN member also poses some challenges, which need to be reflected on.
- Creating an IP process. There are a number of international forums that were created at different times with different priorities – IPs end up fitting into these processes the way they allow it. It is time we create our own processes on our own terms.
- Connecting the local to the global. As representatives who participate in the global processes we need to prioritize finding ways to bring this information back to the local level. Without this global-local linkage, participation in these processes loses its meaning.

Global Policy Workshop

Building Capacity to Engage in Global Policy – Kristen Walker and Adalberto Padilla

The objective of this capacity building workshop was to learn about the mechanisms of participation in the global policy spaces.

In 1992, a world summit was held to save the earth. As a result of this event, three conventions were created: The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), which are collectively referred to as the Rio conventions.

In addition to these conventions, other fora were created to focus on specific issues, among them: RAMSAR, CITES, and the World Heritage Convention. They are tools for creating policies and establishing commitments. It is a way to influence States; indigenous peoples must take advantage of them to influence and ensure that commitments are fulfilled and applied.

There are different structures in each of the conventions that enable input and participation of indigenous peoples:

- In the UNFCCC, there is an Indigenous Peoples Platform. The platform is a mechanism to provide input on indigenous issues in the area of climate change. Indigenous peoples and civil society can participate in the UNFCCC as observers and/or as part of government delegations. As observers they can raise and defend proposals more publicly, while as part of delegations they have certain restrictions, but have the advantage of access to more information.
- Within the framework of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), a forum on indigenous peoples and biodiversity has been organized. The Forum meets before the official meetings, defining functions and preparing. In the CBD there is also a working group on Article 8j.

Governments from most countries are signatories to the CBD and UNFCCC and are required to adhere to certain safeguards, such as those regarding free prior informed consent, exchange of technology, respect of traditional policies. Indigenous peoples can play a role in helping States comply with these obligations. In several countries like Peru and Honduras, indigenous communities have pressured their governments to recognize these agreements and protocols to varying degrees of success.

Participants were encouraged to discuss and share perspectives. Although not exhaustive, the following are some points shared by participants:

- Mapping and Identity – scientific studies that document how indigenous people use territory would be a useful tool for informing the work of the CBD. It is important to respect indigenous governance and territories

- Representation and Communication – there is a lack of mechanisms for communicating the results of indigenous participation in these forums to communities. There are many outstanding indigenous representatives that are active in these forums but that do not have the support or the resources to then communicate the results to other communities/groups.
- Lack of proper implementation – laws or protocols exist but States often do not respect or comply with them. In the Organization of American States (OAS) there is the Inter-American Court of Human Rights and in this framework there have been rulings in favor of indigenous peoples.
- These conventions recognize the sovereignty of States often at the expense of the UNDRIP or rights of indigenous peoples; for instance when resources are in indigenous territories and States want to extract or develop them and indigenous peoples do not.

Institutional Strengthening

Overview of Funding Landscape – Jenny Springer

Jenny Springer provided a general overview of some sources and types of funding for indigenous peoples and environmental issues. She expressed that it is a very large and complex topic and this introduction would provide some examples of different categories of funding, while other speakers would provide further details.

Jenny spoke about multilateral agencies such as Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Green Climate Fund (GCF). She mentioned that these are public sources of funding because the funding comes from governments and multilateral because they involve multiple governments.

She provided some background to the GEF, which was founded in the 1990's specifically to fund environmental issues. Jenny also provided some historical background to the GCF, which was recently established. These financial institutions do not provide funding directly to organisations that are carrying out the work but rather it is administered through accredited "implementing agencies" (like UNDP and IUCN). The GEF provides grants of several sizes and the Small Grants Program of the GEF has been very active in working with indigenous peoples. Jenny mentioned some other funding arrangements that support the work of indigenous peoples – like the Forest and Farm Facility (FFF), which is a partnership between FAO and IIED and IUCN and the World Bank Forest Investment Program.

Jenny also explained about bilateral development agencies – which provide funding from a single government. Bilateral agencies often grant funds by putting out calls for proposals, and then organisations need to enter into a competitive selection processes. The agency selects projects or projects that they want to fund.

Another type of funding is private funding, which includes foundations and individuals. Some examples of large foundations are the Ford Foundation, the Christensen Fund, the Climate and Land Use Alliance – many of these have supported indigenous peoples and their work. Large foundations tend to be more formally structured and the grant levels tend to be larger. Small or family foundations tend to give smaller grants but may also have more flexible processes or areas of work. The group International Funders for Indigenous Peoples has membership from many foundations interested in indigenous issues. Jenny also mentioned organisations that specialize in providing small grants like the Global Green Grants funds which support grass roots led initiatives on environment and rights.

Jenny then shared some information on new institutions that have emerged as a response to the recognition that currently funding available for work in this area is not sufficient. Nia Tero for instance is a private foundation founded by individuals and is currently building its staff and strategy to secure indigenous guardianship of vital ecosystems.

Another unique institution is The Tenure Facility, which was set up in Sweden with a specific focus on providing funding for securing collective land rights.

Global Environment Facility – Yeshing Upun

Yeshing UPUN shared background on the Global Environment Facility. The GEF was founded in 1990 to help tackle the planet's most pressing environmental problems. The GEF unites 183 countries in partnership with international institutions, civil society organisations and the private sector to address global environmental issues while supporting national sustainable development initiatives.

The GEF funds different sized projects ranging from more than more than two million and less than 2 million. The funds reach indigenous peoples through implementing agencies. The process for applying for funds is through a government agency focal point that helps focus the project proposal into different areas of interest to the nation and the GEF.

Another way indigenous peoples have been involved in the GEF is through the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP). The SGP has funded over 25000 projects in different focal areas: 38% of its projects deal with biodiversity, 22% climate change, 21% soils, 6% capacity building, 4% climate change adaptation, 3% water, and 3% chemicals.

Yeshing explained that currently the GEF-7 has a strong focus on working with indigenous peoples and local communities, national governments, NGO's and others to strengthen the capacity of IPLC's to conserve biodiversity. Indigenous peoples are working with the GEF Indigenous Peoples' Advisory Group (IPAG) to ensure that indigenous people are included in the preparation of the proposals for the GEF 7 cycle.

Green Climate Fund – Adalberto Padilla

Adalberto PADILLA presented on the Green Climate Fund (GCF). The GCF is a new global fund created to support the efforts of developing countries to respond to the challenge of climate change. GCF helps developing countries limit or reduce their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and adapt to climate change.

The GCF was set up by the 194 countries that are parties to the UNFCCC. It aims to deliver funding to mitigation and adaptation, while being guided by the Convention's principles and provisions.

Adalberto explained that the work of the GCF is funneled through Accredited Agencies. Countries have a National Focal Point, which is the designated national authority. As with the GEF proposals, all proposals to the GCF must go through the national focal point. Adalberto shared that the process for developing a GCF proposal is time consuming and complicated and must be presented to the national focal point by an accredited implementing agency.

Adalberto presented on the different categories and scales of projects, most of them at a very large scale. Adalberto shared some of the challenges of administering large amounts of funds and of putting such a large proposal together.

Adalberto mentioned that there has been some internal discussions at the GCF about how to make this funding more accessible to indigenous peoples but that at the moment the process is still being funneled through and led by national governments.

Foundations – Ricky Archer

Ricky ARCHER shared the work the North Australia Land and Sea Management Alliance (NAILSMA) in Australia. NAILSMA is indigenous owned and led and works on land and sea management, research partnerships and policy in Australia.

Ricky also shared the experience NAILSMA has had with foundations. He mentioned that matching priorities with foundations is sometimes a challenge. NAILSMA has engaged with different foundations in a variety of ways. There is a consortium of groups in Australia – like the Australia Environmental Grant Network and the Tim Fairfax Foundation and the Peter Foundation. There are also some bigger organisations like the WWF, TNC and Greening Australia.

Ricky mentioned that sometimes foundations have their own agenda and ideas for what they want to achieve and IPs need to be strategic when approaching them. He shared the experience of a foundation that was buying huge tracks of land for conservation and fencing it in. NAILSMA had to convince them that management and real conservation needs people – which they needed to work with communities.

Ricky shared some of the challenges NAILSMA has had with foundations. The first is exposure (getting your foot in the door). A lot of communities are small and find it difficult to establish relationships with donors. Reporting is also a major challenge because sometimes foundations require a huge amount of paperwork that small organisations are unable to sustain. Ricky suggested that IPs should reflect on what framework works for you and the people you represent and then to clearly explain this to the donor from the onset. The other hurdle is the concept of ownership – a foundation may give funding to achieve a certain milestone that makes them look good but that isn't in the best interest of your organisation. Sometimes there are high level outputs that the foundation requires but that don't align with the on the ground priorities. It is important to make sure that as IPs our integrity and value is strong.

Ricky then mentioned that there are certain foundations that stand out and are willing to work with indigenous peoples. In terms of these challenges you do see the better foundations that do stand out. Those foundations are the ones that you will find are easier to work with. Ricky then shared that he has yet to see if being a member of IUCN makes the organisation more attractive to donors.

Ricky concluded by saying that the key is finding a balance between what your community priorities and values are and which foundations they align with. He mentioned that in his experience foundations invest in people and not organisations. Individual and human-to-human connections are essential for a good working relationship with a foundation.

He then suggested that IPs should look at a cultural governance framework and apply it to how IPs deal with foundations and philanthropic donors.

Key Points Raised in the Discussion

Although not exhaustive, some of the key points raised during the discussion were:

- Importance of FPIC and participation of indigenous peoples. Dialogue with Foundations and Funding agencies should always be coordinated directly with communities.
- Access to funds for IP's a challenge. Funding processes need to be more flexible and less bureaucratic to facilitate IP's access. Communication between indigenous organisations is imperative. Multilateral and bilateral agencies may be interested in consolidated proposals that come from a group of IPO's, which is something IUCN IPO's could consider.
- Even though indigenous peoples protect 80% of world's biodiversity they receive less than 15% of the funds for conservation – how can indigenous peoples gain more access to these resources?
- IUCN as a platform – how can IUCN IPO's leverage IUCN as a platform to access funds and participate more actively in the funding landscape?
- Safeguards and conditions – large funding bodies such as the GEF, NORAD and GCF are often difficult to access because of the financial capacity they require organisations to have to meet certain conditions and safeguards.
- Perhaps a network of organisations with financial capacity could help access and manage funds on behalf of the smaller organisations
- Sharing lessons and experiences – some indigenous organisations have already gone through a learning phase for enhancing their financial capacity and they can perhaps share this with other organisations. It would also be useful for IPO's to share their experiences on how to engage with western funders and maybe develop a strategy for how larger IPO's can better facilitate access for smaller organisations.
- Justifying funds and reporting – Collecting invoices and confirming expenses is often difficult in community situations.

Perhaps a more creative approach to justifying funds is needed for work with indigenous communities.

- Indicators and requirements – sometimes donors require us to report on certain indicators, IPO's spend so much time in achieving those indicators that we end up doing something entirely different from what we originally set out to do.
- Resources reaching communities. In many situations, resources haven't reached the communities as they were intended to do. We need to design projects in such a way that funds reach the communities they are intended to reach.

Financial Mechanisms

Overview

Yeshing UPUN and Adalberto PADILLA provided a summary of discussions from the previous day plenary focusing on the different funding sources available both from within states, between states and from non-governmental organisations including private donors.

Adalberto mentioned a couple of non-governmental organisations that are working to support IPOs in the region including Pan para el Mundo, Ibis and other organisations in Holland and Netherlands. Yeshing summarized some of the experiences participants shared in accessing different types of funds.

Both Yeshing and Adalberto then summarized discussions around the GEF and GCF. Yeshing shared that priorities for these projects are based on discussions with country governments and they very often do not include indigenous peoples' priorities and interests. For instance, Guatemala has already developed projects for the GCF but IPs are unaware of what is included in the portfolio.

Sharing Experiences

Ramiro BATZIN presented on Sotz'il's experience transitioning into an indigenous organisation that is able to manage large funds. Sotz'il started in 1994 as a small indigenous organisation. In 1996 the government of Denmark did a governance review and found Sotz'il was lacking institutional capacities. Sotz'il developed a plan to improve its governance and define its focus. The evaluation helped Sotz'il identify its strengths and focus and found that it was best suited to be an organisation that would support communities with technical support. Sotz'il has worked to professionalize its operations by hiring an administrative team that is able to respond to donors' requests for reporting, accounting, and transparency. These changes have made Sotz'il able to apply and manage large funds from many institutions and organisations. Ramiro also shared that Sotz'il has invested in community projects on orchids and honey to help make Sotz'il financially sustainable even without foreign funds and investment.

John CHEECHO presented the experience of Inuit Circumpolar Council. ICC is an international non-governmental organisation that represents approximately 160,000 Inuit of Alaska, Canada, Greenland and Chukotka (Russia). The goals of ICC are to strengthen unity among Inuit of the circumpolar region, promote Inuit rights and interests on an international level, develop and encourage long-term policies that safeguard the Arctic environment and seek full and active partnership in the political, economic and social development of the circumpolar region. The ICC is represented by a chair and an executive council and each country has a country office and a president. Depending on the country the level of funding varies. There are also different sources of funding; some of the funding that comes from the government (for instance Canada) is tied to projects in Canada. But ICC

also applies to grants for the wider circumpolar region. John shared that as a Canadian organisation, ICC is not able to access funds from the GEF or other bilateral/multilateral donors and so rely on private foundations and trusts. ICC has worked with the Pew Charitable Trust, the Moore Foundation and others on specific projects and specific themes. ICC has also worked with international organisations like WWF and others. But mostly the funding they have access to comes from the national and provincial governments. Some of the challenges they face are that funding is scarce and needs are wide especially since the cost of living in this region is high and one needs to fly everywhere. ICC is looking into alternative sources for building revenue.

Noelani LEE shared her organisation's experience. She mentioned that their work is targeted to indigenous peoples (about 60% each year). They have operated on a diversified grant system – a combination of large grants (foundations) and some smaller grants (local). In their experience, multi-year grants have worked the best because it allows them several years to implement projects. They have had some experience with Federal grants but face issues of reporting and strict spending guidelines. One of their biggest challenges is that native Hawaiians are not recognized as indigenous peoples in the United States and so are not eligible for any of the federal grants for Native Americans.

Discussion

Adalberto and Yeshing then opened the floor for a brief discussion.

Key Points Raised in the Discussions

- Using alliances to access large funds. Proposals that include collaborations and partnerships between several indigenous groups may improve opportunities of accessing larger funds. The Climate and Land Use Alliance (CLUA) was given as an example of funding organisation that would look favorably on a proposal by an alliance of indigenous peoples organisation.
- Impact of funding. Experiences were shared where indigenous organisations have received funding, which has caused problems within the organisation and divisions between communities. How can this impact be minimized?
- Challenges. There have been cases where organisations have applied for funding in the name of indigenous peoples but those funds never arrive at the community level.
- Importance of clear communication between IPO's around funding. Often competition occurs between indigenous organisations for funds; this is something that can be resolved with clear communication between IPO's.
- Creation of a communal indigenous fund. Created, managed and administered by indigenous peoples to fund indigenous projects that have common objectives.

Capacity Building: Entrepreneurial Support

Overview

Indigenous organisations requested assistance with capacity building, training and ideas for entrepreneurial development. In this session indigenous entrepreneurs shared their toolkits, business development and experience in developing their enterprises.

Fundalachua – Jimmy Chub Leal

Fundalachua is an indigenous organisation that was founded in 2007 with the aim of supporting local Q'eqchi Maya farmers around the Lachua eco-region. Fundalachua supported the local community in the development of two business plans – one for cacao and one for honey – and determined that they need at least 300 hectares to make the projects viable. Fundalachua also helped communities design a strategic plan to help improve capacities, production, and all aspects of commodity development.

Fundalachua has spent a great deal of time on the selection of genetic materials, best practices around harvesting and post-harvesting techniques, and soil fertility. Each step has required capacity development and business training. Quality control is very important and Fundalachua has had to develop clear quality control mechanisms. In the process they have developed strategies like the development of a delivery calendar so that producers know when they need to harvest and ferment cacao for delivery. Technical assistance throughout the process is also essential.

Jimmy mentioned that Fundalachua has also invested a lot of time in developing and copyrighting brands. Marketing is essential for enterprise success and accessing markets. Currently Fundalachua exports to South Korea and Hawaii.

Fundalachua also spends a great deal of time on building relationships with clients. They have found that signing long term contracts that guarantee volume and costs helps communities.

Currently, Fundalachua is working on improving the agroforestry system around cacao to improve productivity. They are engaging with forestry experts and others to try to improve farming methods, productivity, and sustainability and soil fertility.

Tikonel – Maria Margarita Lool Sutuj

[Tikonel](#) was founded in 2000 in San Martin Jilotepeque Chimaltenango, Guatemala by indigenous forests producers. These forests producers started nurseries to establish forest plantations that could contribute to the protection of the environment and adaptation to climate change. Tikonel emerged out of a need for producers to establish a model that would help improve community well being and quality of life.

Currently Tikonel support actions on value chains, management and conservation of natural resources in 152 communities (4453 men and 4000 women) and 11 organisations. Tikonel provides technical support and capacity building to communities that manage more than 3776 hectares of forests. Tikonel supports the entire production process including carpentry, plantations, tree growth, drying and cutting, and furniture making.

As part of their management strategy they work to support alternative livelihood strategies such as creole chickens and sustainable farm plots. They also support the development of value chains around fruit trees.

Tikonel has also helped communities develop a local honey brand and they work with women to support the production of traditional weaving

Tikonel has key alliances and partnerships and participates in expos and regional forums to give visibility to their products.

Asociacion Agro Artesanal Wiñak – Juan Carlos Jinitiach

The Asociacion Agro Artesanal [Wiñak](#) was founded in the 1980s with the aim of improving the living conditions and wellbeing of indigenous Kichwa people of the Napo region of Ecuador. The spirit of Wiñak was to regenerate the degraded soils while supporting local peoples through sustainable cacao production in a Chakra system.

Wiñak assists its partners and farmers with training, technical assistance and microcredit options. The aim of Wiñak is to develop an alternative indigenous economy that reduces deforestation and supports indigenous peoples.

Wiñak works with communities to support the Chakra system. A Chakra is a forest garden that a variety of plants and trees that supports the Kichwa people. Wiñak works with mostly women to sustainably harvest cacao, wayusa and plantains in these chakra systems for market production.

Some of the challenges Wiñak faces are maintaining organic certification, production (improving the quality of products and technical assistance and capacity development), and commercialization (how to position the brand in the national and international markets).

Wiñak is an example of how indigenous peoples can create and position their own value chains and commercialization structures.

Land Rights and Sustainable Production

Overview

Adalberto provided an overview of the global frameworks for conserved and protected areas. Protected areas are key for sustainable development of our countries and lands and are a fundamental tool to adapt and mitigate climate change. In 2016, a report documented the importance of protected areas but one of the biggest challenges is that these areas are being threatened and pressured.

In many countries, there is a clear and pressing need to articulate protected areas with national development plans. Development is occurring without considering protected areas yet these areas are critical for human and ecological wellbeing. Some countries are also still identifying protected areas without considering the broader economical and environmental context. IUCN is a good platform through which to encourage governments to include protected area planning in broader development plans.

In many cases, Indigenous governance systems for protected and conserved areas are still not being valued or considered by governments even though these are critical for biodiversity and, in some cases, service provision. This is something that needs support from indigenous peoples, IUCN and others.

A recent report by Vicky Tauli Corpus on Indigenous Peoples and Protected Areas highlights a number of cases where in the name of conservation; indigenous rights are not being respected. This too is unacceptable and needs to be further examined. We need to make sure that IP rights are respected and protected.

Discussion on Land Rights and Conservation

Although not exhaustive, the following are some of the key points that were raised during discussion:

- In Peru, there are clear lack of guarantees of territorial rights in the titling process. Communities have been using Convention ILO 169 to secure their territorial rights.
- Indigenous governance is a crucial for territorial rights but is constantly being threatened. In San Jose Puaquin in Guatemala, the communal organisation was forcibly evicted and legal action had to be taken. Sometimes mayors promise land to people who do not own land generating strong conflicts within the communities.
- Abuse of power is very common. Many decisions about land use are taken without consulting indigenous communities because they do not have recognized land tenure. But for some communities in Guatemala, for example, communities face many challenges in obtaining these rights and can, at times, take decades to process.

- In Peru there are communal reserves which are created by indigenous peoples but that operate under a contract/agreement with the government. Indigenous peoples have used this alternative to protect their lands.
- In Bolivia, the government recognizes communal territories but many of these overlap with protected areas. In these cases, indigenous peoples have sometimes been able to participate in the governance mechanisms. In recent years the recognition of these communal areas has become more challenging.
- Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCA's) – there is a global initiative to document and help protect ICCA's. There is a mapping project to try to document ICCA's globally. ICCA's are managed under local governance scheme in a sustainable manner. ICCA's started as an IUCN CEESP initiative but work is now coordinated by an independent organisation.
- The category of ICCA's is relevant for some communities but not for others. In cases where territorial rights have been recognized, the need to declare these areas as ICCAs may not be as relevant.
- Sometimes there is a disconnect between organisations that promote conservation and indigenous communities. Sometimes they have different ideas for how land should be conserved and/or managed.
- In Australia, Indigenous Protected Areas (IPA's) are legally recognized and are often well funded. There is a national rangers program that is supported by the government and where many indigenous peoples participate. There is growing support for IPAs.

Discussion on Food Sovereignty

Participants shared a problem or challenge faced by their community or organisation to achieve food sovereignty, food security or sustainable production.

Some of the main problems or challenges highlighted were:

- Accelerated advancement of the agricultural frontier and its impact on biodiversity and sustainable production
- Excessive use of agrochemicals
- Little availability of arable land, low productivity (thinking in terms of commercialization since there is evidence that the largest have a net productivity more efficient than monocultures) and therefore low incomes
- Transgenic seeds (corn and soybeans are the main ones)
- Lack of recognition of ancestral knowledge and practices of food production
- Soil degradation

- Diseases related to the excessive use of agrochemicals and more gradually due to the consumption of contaminated or highly processed foods
- Abandonment of the countryside by young people. Adults are no longer passing on knowledge to new generations
- Inconsistent global policies between the discourse of conservation and respect for human rights and effective investment in land privatization and infrastructure.
- In Australia, Native communities are not able to use native plants and animals on their ancestral lands commercially
- No incentive to cultivate local farmers, people moving from the land (Hawaii)
- Land availability and access, price of land increasing especially for development and tourism
- Farmers not allowed to live on farmlands (Hawaii)
- Pest management

Some of the solutions proposed were:

- Promote short consumer chains and local networks with direct relationships between the consumer and the producer
- Promote the recognition of ancestral wisdom and practices, for example the chacra system in Peru and the milpa in Mesoamerica
- Recognize cultural landscapes and territories. Sustainable production in ways that consolidate food sovereignty results in the maintenance of conservation of biodiversity
- Promote learning exchanges to share techniques and methodologies that are already being applied and validated in the field, for example agroforestry systems based on Inga sp. in Honduras
- Need for detailed studies of the real cost of food systems in countries that drive agro-industry and promote food imports
- Study of the economics of local farming vs. Imports/shipping
- Develop marketing strategies to encourage more to buy local (i.e. Certification, IPO sticker)
- Understand through trainings other models of local/indigenous food production systems (focus on distribution, marketing, economics)

Closing Session

Yeshing UPUN summarized the workshops and events of the last two days and highlighted some of the key issues. She highlighted the need to have clear follow-up activities including the drafting of a meeting report, the establishment of a communication platform and the follow up on key priorities.

Yeshing invited all participants to become IUCN members. As indigenous peoples we greatly contribute to conservation because it is so closely linked with our culture and identity. We, as indigenous peoples, have knowledge to share and IUCN is a good platform to do it. We are happy to help any interested organisation with the application process so that we can continue to work together.

She asked participants to please send feedback about any topics or priorities that were not covered so that they can be considered in the future.

Yeshing then invited participants to share their impressions about the learning exchange.

Jenny SPRINGER thanked Sotzil and Ramiro and all of the colleagues for hosting the exchange. She noted that the experience of the meeting demonstrated why we are here: because the connection of indigenous peoples to your lands and cultures is at the heart of the future of conservation. She expressed that for IUCN it has been a very significant development to have this membership of Indigenous Peoples' Organisations. The deep dedication and passion and knowledge that all of you bring to your roles as stewards of natural and cultural diversity is enriching for the entire conservation movement and the future of the planet.

Participants then gathered in a circle to reflect on achievements and upcoming work and to thank everyone for the fruitful and productive learning exchange.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A: Meeting Agenda

Day 1

09:00- 10:00	Welcome and Introductions Mayan Blessing Welcome by Ramiro Batzin Welcome by IUCN GPGR– Jenny Springer Welcome by IUCN Guatemala – Adalberto Padilla Welcome by IUCN CEESP – Kristen Walker
10:00-11:30	Introduction of Participants and Sharing Circle: Indigenous Knowledge, Land Management – Opportunities, Challenges and Interests
11:30-11:45	Coffee/Tea break
11:45-12:30	Panel of Indigenous Experts: General Overview of Global Policy and IPs Introduction and Overview – Onel Masardule UNFCCC – Lola Cabnal and Juan Carlos Jintiach CBD – Ramiro Batzin CITES and ICC - John Cheecho IUCN – Kevin Chang
12:30-13:30	Lunch
13:30-15:00	Global Policy – Two Streams Capacity Building Workshop – CBD, UNFCCC, IUCN WCC, SDG's Moderator: Kristen Walker Strategic Discussion – Positioning IP's in Global Policy Post 2020 Overview of Current Positioning
15:00-15:30	Summaries of Discussions
15:30-15:45	Coffee/Tea Break Institutional Strengthening
15:45-17:00	Overview of Funding Landscape – Global Financial Mechanisms (GEF / GCF), Bilateral Agencies and Foundations Overview – Jenny Springer Green Climate Fund – Adalberto Padilla GEF – Ramiro Batzin Foundations – Ricky Archer
17.00-17:30	Discussion
17:30	Close
19:30	Dinner and Sharing

Day 2

08:30	Reconvene Précis of Day 1 and overview of Day 2
09:00-11:30	Iximche Field Trip: Sharing Perspectives from Guatemala Institutional Strengthening Continued
11:30- 13:00	Financial Mechanisms Applying for Funds Moderator: Yeshing Upun and Adalberto Padilla
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:30-15:30	Entrepreneurial Support including Enterprise Plans and Networks Moderator: Jimmy Chub Leal, María Margarita Lool Sutuj, Juan Carlos Jintiach Securing Land Rights and Sustainable Production for Land Management, Conservation and Climate Resilience
15:00-15:15	Overview: Global Frameworks for Conserved and Protected Areas – Adalberto Padilla
15:30-17:00	Two Streams Strategic Discussion: Land Rights and Conservation Moderator: Felipe Gomez and Julio Cusirichi Sharing Experiences: Sustainable Production, Food Sovereignty, and Food Security Moderator: Natalie Kurashima, Albert Chan, y Osvaldo Munguia
17:00-17:30	Summary
17:30-18:00	Opportunities for Further Collaboration
18:00	Close



INTERNATIONAL UNION
FOR CONSERVATION OF NATURE

WORLD HEADQUARTERS

Rue Mauverney 28
1196 Gland, Switzerland
mail@iucn.org
Tel +41 22 999 0000
Fax +41 22 999 0002

www.iucn.org