



Indigenous Peoples

Partos Joint Evaluation

Synthesis Report

Colofon

Principals:

Partos, Ellermanstraat 18b, 1099 BX Amsterdam
Phone: +31 (0)20 3209901
www.partos.nl

Cordaid, P.O. Box 16440, 2500 BK Den Haag
Phone: +31 (0)70 3136300
www.cordaid.nl

ICCO, P.O. Box 8190, 3503 RD Utrecht
Phone: +31 (0)30 6927811
www.icco.nl

Hivos, P.O. Box 85565, 2508 CG Den Haag
Phone: +31 (0)70 3765500
www.hivos.nl

Executing Agency:

ETC International
Ann Waters-Bayer
Nicoliene Oudwater
Joris van de Sandt,
Madhusree Bannerjee
Rebecca Fries
Getachew Gebru,
Jacob Wanyama and
Graciela Zolezzi
www.etc-international.org

Table of contents

Acronyms	iv
Acknowledgements	vi
Executive summary	vii
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background to the study.....	1
1.2 The concept of indigenous peoples and their rights	4
2. Methodology	6
2.1 Process of carrying out the inception phase	6
2.2 Process of carrying out the country case studies.....	7
2.3 Process of synthesising the findings	10
2.4 Assessment of the methodology and implications for the findings	11
2.4.1 Strengths	11
2.4.2 Weaknesses and limitations.....	11
2.4.3 Differences that constrained comparison	12
2.4.4 Wider applicability of the findings	13
3. CFA policies and strategies to support indigenous peoples	14
3.1 Synopsis of CFA policies and strategies in the period 2003-08	14
3.1.1 Cordaid.....	14
3.1.2 Hivos.....	16
3.1.3 ICCO.....	17
3.2 Comparative analysis of explicit and implicit policies	20
3.2.1 Attention to individual and collective rights of IPs.....	20
3.2.2 Attention to issues of marginalisation.....	21
3.2.3 Attention to issues of self-determination	21
3.2.4 Attention to poverty alleviation among IPs	22
3.2.5 Attention to issues of indigenous women.....	22
3.3 Assessment of CFA policies.....	23
3.3.1 Relevance of CFA policies and their reflection of international debate on IPs	23
3.3.2 Alignment of partner selection and interventions with the CFA policies	25
4. Cordaid's contribution to change in the situation of pastoralists in Ethiopia and Kenya	28
4.1 Change in the situation of pastoralists	28
4.1.1 How the situation of pastoralists has changed over the last ten years	28
4.1.2 Overall assessment of change in the situation of pastoralists	34
4.2 How Cordaid and its partners have contributed to these changes	36
4.2.1 Direct poverty alleviation	36
4.2.2 Strengthening civil society	37
4.2.3 Influencing policy	38

4.3	Sustainability and unexpected outcomes of Cordaid-supported changes	39
4.3.1	Sustainability.....	40
4.3.2	Unexpected outcomes.....	41
4.4	Influence of Cordaid's mode of support	42
4.4.1	Choice of partners	42
4.4.2	Support to planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation	42
4.4.3	Communication and networking.....	43
4.5	Summarised assessment of Cordaid's contribution in eastern Africa	43
5.	Hivos' contribution to change in the situation of indigenous peoples in Bolivia and Guatemala.....	47
5.1	Change in the situation of indigenous peoples	47
5.1.1	How the situation of indigenous peoples has changed over the last ten years.....	47
5.1.2	Overall assessment of change in the situation of indigenous peoples..	53
5.2	How Hivos and its partners have contributed to these changes	55
5.2.1	Direct poverty alleviation	55
5.2.2	Strengthening civil society	56
5.2.3	Influencing policy	57
5.3	Sustainability and unexpected outcomes of Hivos-supported changes.....	58
5.3.1	Sustainability.....	58
5.3.2	Unexpected outcomes.....	60
5.4	Influence of Hivos' mode of support	61
5.4.1	Choice of partners	61
5.4.2	Support to planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluation	61
5.4.3	Communication and networking.....	62
5.5	Summarised assessment of Hivos' contribution in Latin America	62
6.	ICCO's contribution to change in the situation of Adivasi in India	64
6.1	Change in the situation of Adivasi	64
6.1.1	How the situation of Adivasi has changed over the last ten years	65
6.1.2	Overall assessment of change in the situation of Adivasi.....	68
6.2	How ICCO and its partners have contributed to these changes	71
6.2.1	Direct poverty alleviation	71
6.2.2	Strengthening civil society	73
6.2.3	Influencing policy	73
6.3	Sustainability and unexpected outcomes of ICCO-supported changes.....	74
6.3.1	Sustainability.....	74
6.3.2	Unexpected outcomes.....	75
6.4	Influence of ICCO's mode of support	75
6.4.1	Choice of partners	76
6.4.2	Support to planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation	76
6.4.3	Communication and networking.....	77
6.5	Summarised assessment of ICCO's contribution in India.....	77

7. Comparative analysis of change and of CFA contributions	79
7.1 Similarities and differences in change in the situation of indigenous peoples..	79
7.1.1 Worldviews, values and identity	79
7.1.2 Self-determination and inclusion in development	79
7.1.3 Representation and power	82
7.1.4 Position of indigenous women	84
7.1.5 Forced assimilation or integration	85
7.2 Similarities and differences in CFA contributions to these changes	85
7.2.1 Type and relative importance of CFA contributions	85
7.2.2 Sustainability of changes	93
7.2.3 Mode of support	94
8. Conclusions and lessons	96
8.1 Overall assessment of CFA contributions to change in the situation of IPs	96
8.2 Enhancing positive and diminishing negative outcomes of work with IPs	99
8.2.1 Lessons for enhancing positive outcomes	99
8.2.2 Lessons for diminishing negative outcomes	100
8.3 Lessons for effectively supporting the work of IPs' organisations	101
8.4 Main recommendations	102
Annexes	
Annex 1: Assessment of External Reference Group	107
Annex 2: Terms of Reference: Joint Programme Evaluation Indigenous Peoples	110
Annex 3: List of people consulted	122
Annex 4: List of documents consulted	131
Annex 5: Question matrix	150
Annex 6: Question checklists for fieldwork in country case studies	157
Annex 7: Differentiated approach to delivery of basic services to IPs	160
Annex 8: Members of the External Reference Group	162
Annex 9: Members of the Coordination Group	163
List of tables	
Table 1: Total number of IP-related projects, number of implementing partners and distribution of commitments according to continent by CFA, 2002-10	1
Table 2: Interviews during inception phase and fieldwork in the case-study countries..	9
Table 3: Types of partner organisations in period 2003-08 according to continent by CFA	16
Table 4: Type of intervention / approach taken by CFAs in IP-related projects in 2003-08 according to continent	17
Table 5: Comparison of major features of CFA policies and strategies in their work with IPs	19
Table 6: Distribution of actual expenditure by CFAs on IP-related projects according to continent in the period 2003-08	27

Acronyms¹

ACHPR	African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights
ACHR	Asian Commission for Human Rights
AITPN	Asian Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Network
ALRMP	Arid Lands Resource Management Project
AtBS	Access to Basic Services
C 169	(ILO) Convention 169
CAHW	community animal health worker
CALDH	Centro para Acción Legal en Derechos Humanos
CBO	community-based organisation
CECR	Committee of Experts on Constitutional Review
CELEP	Coalition of European Lobbies on Eastern-African Pastoralism
CEMIRIDE	Centre for Minority Rights Development
CFA	co-financing agency
CHW	community health worker
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CIDIN	Centre for International Development Issues Nijmegen
CMDRR	Community-Managed Disaster Risk Reduction
CNOC	National Coordination of Peasants' Organizations
CONADUR	Comisión Nacional para el Desarrollo Urbano y Rural
CONIC	Continental Commission of Indigenous Nations and Organizations
Cordaid	Catholic Organisation for Relief and Development Aid
CSO	civil-society organisation
D&P	Democratisation and Peacebuilding
DEMI	Office of the Ombudsman for Indigenous Women
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
DRIP	Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
ECG	Evaluation Coordination Group
ECOSOC	United Nations Economic and Social Council
EPD	Ethiopian Pastoralist Day
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FCRA	Foreign Contribution Regulation Act
FDRE	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
FPIC	free, prior and informed consent
FSED	Fair Sustainable and Economic Development
GoE	Government of Ethiopia
Gol	Government of India
GoK	Government of Kenya
HIV/AIDS	Human Immuno-deficiency Virus / Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
Hivos	Humanist Institute for Development Cooperation
IBG	identity-based group
ICCO	Interchurch Organisation for Development Cooperation
ICT	information and communication technology
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
IWIF	International Indigenous Women's Forum
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IPO	indigenous peoples' organisation
IP(s)	indigenous peoples
IWGIA	International Work Group on Indigenous Affairs

¹ Includes only those acronyms mentioned more than once in the text

KLA	Kenya Land Alliance
KLMC	Kenya Livestock Marketing Council
KPW	Kenya Pastoralists' Week
LMD	local market development
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MFS	<i>Medefinancieringsstelsel</i> (Co-Financing System)
MoFED	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development
MoL	Ministry of Lands
MoU	Memoranda of Understanding
MP	Member of Parliament
MRG	Minority Rights Group
NCIV	Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples
NGO	non-governmental organisation
NREG	National Rural Employment Guarantee
NTFP	non-timber forest product
NTP	National Tribal Policy
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
PASC	Pastoral Affairs Standing Committee
PASDEP	Plan for Accelerated and Sustainable Development to End Poverty
PDNK	Pastoralists Development Network of Kenya
PESA	Provisions of the Panchayats (Extension to the Scheduled Areas)
PLHA	people living with HIV/AIDS
PO	partner organisation
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PTG	Pastoralist Thematic Group
R&R	Rehabilitation and Resettlement
RECONCILE	Resource Conflict Institute
RQ	Research Question
SEZ	Special Economic Zone
SHG	self-help group
TBA	traditional birth attendant
TCO	<i>Tierra Comunitaria de Origen</i> (indigenous territory)
ToRs	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNPFII	United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues
WAMIP	World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples
WEF	World Economic Forum
WGIP	Working Group on Indigenous Populations
WISP	World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism

Acknowledgements

This synthesis report on change in the situation of indigenous peoples (IPs) and the contribution of the three co-financing agencies (CFAs) - Cordaid, Hivos and ICCO - to this change was written as part of the Joint Programme Evaluation on Indigenous Peoples commissioned by Partos. The synthesis report is based on the inception report and five case-study reports on Bolivia, Guatemala, Ethiopia, Kenya and India. The full references to literature consulted are given in the case-study reports.

Implementation of this joint evaluation would not have been possible without the support from staff from the CFAs and their partner organisations. In particular, we would like to thank Hilda van 't Riet, Inge Barmantlo, Mattijs Renden, Ton Haverkort, Annie Lefevre, Safia Abdi and Sophie Randall from Cordaid; Karel Chambille, Teyo van der Schoot, Dineke van den Oudenalder, Susanna Rochna, Erika Mendez, Julieta Hernandez and Corina Straatsma from Hivos; and Anouska Traast, Dineke de Groot and Lennard Roubos from ICCO for helping us gain access to relevant information and documents about the partner organisations and projects, advising about the approach to the study, suggesting appropriate contact persons and making the initial introduction to the partners that the case-study teams wanted to meet. Thanks to all CFA partners and external resource persons (listed in Annex 2) for sharing with us their perspectives and giving us valuable information and time. Special thanks go to Susmita Dasgupta for her support to the case-study team in India.

We particularly appreciate the time and thought that all members of indigenous communities devoted to the focus-group discussions during the field visits as well as the feedback given by some Western-educated members of these indigenous peoples on draft versions of our reports.

Finally, we would like to thank Partos, particularly Lisette Desain, for coordinating this programme evaluation.

*Ann Waters-Bayer, Getachew Gebru and Jacob Wanyama
Joris van de Sandt, Rebecca Fries and Graciela Zolezzi
Nicolienne Oudwater and Madhusree Bannerjee*

June 2010

Executive summary

Background and methodology

Three Dutch co-financing agencies (CFAs) – Cordaid, Hivos and ICCO – designed a joint evaluation of their support to indigenous peoples (IPs), focusing on political, land and women’s rights, livelihoods and the organisation of IPs. The core question was: *To what extent have CFA policies, strategies, procedures and programmes and those of their partner organisations contributed to reducing structural injustice toward IPs?*

The joint programme evaluation covered a total combined budget of almost €102 million spent on 588 projects with 302 partner organisations across four continents in the period 2003–08. The study consisted of three phases: inception phase, country case studies and synthesis phase, comparing and analysing findings from the two previous phases.

During the inception phase, the core study team (the three Netherlands-based members) reviewed CFA policies and strategies and the CFAs’ portfolio of partners and projects, interviewed CFA staff and resource persons, and compiled information from external and academic sources about concepts and definitions, international norms and developments, controversies and challenges regarding IP issues. The inception report served as the basis for planning the fieldwork in the five country case studies. The countries (Bolivia, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India and Kenya) were selected by the Evaluation Coordination Group (ECG) made up of representatives from the three CFAs.

For each country case-study, the study team (including the five national researchers) selected partner organisations to visit on the basis of information made available by the CFAs and in discussion with CFA staff. The selection criteria were defined to ensure a representative mix of partners in terms of their approaches, major intervention strategies, types of partner organisation, relative attention to gender issues and level of intervention. Primary data were collected through interviews and field studies. A desk review was made of secondary data such as the programme and partner documentation, literature by academics and other organisations working on IP-related issues, and government policy documents.

The fieldwork took place between November 2009 and January 2010. The case-study teams carried out semi-structured interviews and focus-group discussions using guideline questions for resource persons, partner organisations and IPs. In total, 35 partner organisations were visited (including the operational areas of selected partners), 85 individual interviews were conducted with partner organisation staff and resource persons, and 46 focus-group discussions were held with IPs in the communities visited.

The fieldwork sought to capture individuals’ and groups’ specific perspectives on changes in IPs’ livelihoods, indications of the sustainability of these changes, unexpected outcomes of CFA partners’ interventions, and how the CFA’s mode of supporting IPs and partners had contributed to or hindered the changes sought and achieved. Methodological triangulation in the country case studies involved: i) using different sources of data (interviews, discussions, CFA documents, partner organisations’ reports, other documents and own observations in the field); and ii) collecting data from different perspectives; the endogenous views held by IPs and the exogenous views held by people not of IP descent but working with IPs and/or well-informed about the situation of IPs (“resource persons”).

The country case studies formed the basis for the synthesis report. The Terms of Reference for the evaluation had already indicated the “general data limitations in CFA supported projects”. It had therefore been agreed with the ECG that the study team would not be able to look beyond outcomes. During the course of the study, the team indeed found that both the CFAs’ and their partners’ documentation contained little baseline data and information on impacts of CFA-supported interventions. Therefore, in the synthesis phase, the team focused on: i) comparing and contrasting the CFAs’ policies and approaches in supporting IPs; ii) ascertaining similarities and differences in the types of intervention they made; iii) identifying as much as possible the linkages between these interventions and observed changes as reported by IPs, CFA staff and external resource persons; and iv) assessing the direction of influence – positive or negative – of the CFA-supported interventions on the lives of the IPs. During the inception phase, the case studies and the synthesis, it proved difficult to make direct comparisons between the CFAs and their support to IPs, as the basis for comparison differs. This is due mainly to: i) differences in how the CFAs categorise “IPs”; ii) historical, sociopolitical and agro-ecological differences between the continents and countries; and iii) corresponding differences in CFA policy formulation and programme operationalisation related to IPs. Examining the work of 2–3 CFAs in one country or region might have allowed a more in-depth comparative analysis. Nevertheless, lessons can be learnt from one continent that are of interest to other continents.

It may not always be possible to generalise the conclusions regarding changes perceived by IPs in the individual case studies to apply beyond the CFA portfolio and/or to other IPs in the case-study countries, as there are large differences between indigenous groups. The recommendations, however, are based on comparison of findings not only from the IPs but also from resource persons with broader experience as well as from secondary data, and refer to commonalities found across several case studies. Therefore, in light of the CFA policies and the selection of case studies, the recommendations could probably be applied in or adapted to most other countries in the same region where the CFAs are working with IPs.

Concept of IPs and their rights

Current estimates for the global population of IPs range from 300 to 370 million (6–7% of the world’s population). The main international documents focused on IPs’ rights are the ILO Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples (ILO 1989) and the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (DRIP) adopted by the United Nations General Assembly (UN 2007). These set out the rights that countries should aspire to guarantee and provide a framework for dialogue between IPs and national states. The situation regarding the recognition and implementation of IP’s rights varies greatly between countries and continents. In Latin America, IPs in many countries have achieved recognition and many rights whereas, in Africa and Asia, most IPs are still struggling for recognition by national governments. The controversies in the debate on IPs’ rights centre on the following major points:

- Who is indigenous? Many countries still refuse to apply the term “indigenous people” to the historically marginalised and culturally distinct groups who are living within their borders and are not part of the mainstream society;
- National governments often hesitate to formally recognise the self-determination of IPs because, in international law, this right suggests independent statehood and threatens the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the nation-state; promoters of IPs’ rights deny having such aspirations and stress that IPs seek self-determination within the national state in which they live;
- IPs claim their internationally recognised collective rights to the land, territory and natural resources where they live. Many states claim indigenous territories as State land and are reluctant to grant collective rights to these territories, because this would prevent

privatisation of land and resources and hinder large-scale commercial development. Recognising IPs' rights would include their right to free, prior and informed consent for such development projects or commercial ventures.

CFA policies regarding IPs and related choice of partners

In the period 2003–08, two of the three CFAs did not have a formal policy regarding IPs, but the policies of all three did give specific attention to ethnic minorities and addressed issues relevant for IPs: decreasing marginalisation and discrimination and increasing self-determination and inclusion in development. Cordaid in eastern Africa and ICCO in India gave little attention to the issue of securing the collective rights of IPs according to the DRIP, e.g. collective territorial rights and self-determination as peoples. Hivos in Latin America gave more explicit attention to IPs' rights, particularly to their collective rights to land and other resources and to their representation and participation as IPs in decision-making processes. Cordaid and ICCO and their partners focused more on livelihoods and social empowerment through strengthening civil society in the form of community-based organisations (CBOs) and local non-governmental organisations (NGOs), but not specifically as part of an indigenous movement. They addressed policy influence mainly at the local level, focusing on basic human rights as citizens.

Hivos' choice of partners showed a greater emphasis on rights issues and policy work, whereas Cordaid and ICCO tended to choose partners working on poverty alleviation with an integrated rights component. In line with its strategic focus on political, cultural and collective rights and strengthening indigenous movements in Latin America, Hivos supported more grassroots and umbrella organisations of IPs than did Cordaid and ICCO. In their partner portfolio, the latter two had a larger share of intermediaries working more on direct poverty alleviation and strengthening civil society, including community governance structures. Recently, Cordaid and ICCO included new partners with a stronger focus on rights and policy work.

Greater support to grassroots and umbrella organisations of IPs would not necessarily have been more effective than working through intermediaries to empower IPs in social and political terms and to increase their representation at different levels. The political context and the capacity of the CFAs to provide close mentoring in-country determined whether it was possible or appropriate to work directly with membership organisations at local and/or national level. In some cases, the CFAs chose to support civil-society organisations (CSOs) and intermediaries working at national level to insert indigenous demands into policy and law proposals.

CFAs' and their partners' contribution to change in the situation of IPs

Cordaid's contribution related to pastoralists in Ethiopia and Kenya. Cordaid has addressed poverty alleviation and organisational development at local level while simultaneously influencing policy at national and international level. Such multi-level work is relevant and necessary to reduce structural injustice to pastoralists. Empowerment at the grassroots increased the self-confidence of pastoralists as citizens and led to greater acceptance by others at higher levels to listen to pastoralist men and women.

Cordaid has made a geographically limited but largely effective contribution to strengthening pastoralists' capacity in community-level decision-making. Together with partner NGOs, it has developed some promising models, e.g. community-managed development funds and ways to increase the livestock assets of women, which deserve to be better documented and scaled up. Cordaid stimulated some interest among state and non-state actors in Community-Managed Disaster Risk Reduction (CMDRR) as an alternative approach to disaster risk management.

Although “representation” of pastoralist men and women in modern government structures has improved at local and higher level, legitimacy of the representation was questioned by some pastoralists and resource persons. Cordaid and its partners may have given too little attention to indigenous power structures and how they relate to representation in the modern structures.

Through increasing women’s economic power and their involvement in managing community assets, Cordaid helped strengthen women’s position in their families and communities. However, rural pastoralist women still have little genuine voice at higher levels of decision-making. In addition, although women’s (not specifically pastoralist women’s) rights are enshrined in the Ethiopian and Kenyan Constitutions, violence against women remains a problem, according to resource persons.

Cordaid’s partners at national level in both Ethiopia and Kenya played an important role in raising the profile of pastoralists through mass and alternative media and through participation in major national and international meetings. Cordaid’s support strengthened capacities of intermediate NGOs – and, in the case of Kenya, a few pastoralist membership organisations – to engage directly in lobbying, where they brought pastoralists’ concerns into major policy documents. However, most Cordaid partners have not given enough attention to policy implementation and protecting pastoralists’ rights on the ground, especially with regard to access to land and water.

The current pastoralist development policy of Cordaid is very relevant for eastern Africa: increasing policymakers’ knowledge about the rationale behind pastoralism; helping pastoralists organise themselves to generate income and manage community assets; and increasing the participation and voice of pastoralist women and men in decision-making. In view of the ambivalent attitude toward the concept of “indigenous peoples” in both Ethiopia and Kenya, it has been wise of Cordaid not to put IPs’ rights in the foreground in its policy-influencing activities.

The contributions of Cordaid and its partners to change in the situation of pastoralists in Ethiopia and Kenya cannot be separated from the contributions of other donors and development actors working along similar lines. Moreover, in both countries, committed members of civil society have made efforts in the same direction, also without donor support. Cordaid has not been as visible as other foreign agencies in influencing national policies related to pastoralists. Cordaid is primarily a donor supporting institutional strengthening and capacity building among local organisations so that they can carry out development – including policy-influencing – activities themselves. What is important is that Cordaid has collaborated well with other donors and actors working in the same direction in support of pastoralist development.

Hivos’ contribution related to IPs in Bolivia and Guatemala. In Latin America, Hivos has followed a two-pronged strategy: increasing indigenous communities’ and organisations’ ability to gain access to material and financial resources, markets and knowledge to generate income, while at the same time improving their capacity to influence decision-making regarding policies and legislation on issues that are relevant to them.

In Guatemala, Hivos-funded interventions have been effective in increasing the legal awareness and the representation and participation of indigenous communities in local decision-making, and in improving the access of indigenous producer groups to markets and credit. They have, however, failed in substantially increasing IPs’ access to land or in mitigating

the growing number of resource conflicts between indigenous communities and large-scale development projects in the form of State-promoted agro-industrial and extractive industries. On the national level, indigenous organisations together with other CSOs have been quite successful in formulating proposals for policy and law reform on a wide range of issues, such as land rights, food security and integrated rural development. Unfortunately, opposition from powerful economic and political actors has prevented the adoption and implementation of these proposals by the government.

In the Bolivian lowlands, Hivos and its partners have been effective in securing indigenous land and resource rights and in helping communities formulate plans for the integrated management of their territories. However, they have been less successful in assuring indigenous communities' effective control over natural resources in their territories *vis-à-vis* external economic actors, or in helping the communities derive economic profit out of these resources through the sustainable exploitation of timber and non-timber forest resources.

Hivos' support to the participation of IPs in the elaboration of constitutional reform proposals has been very effective. Many of these proposals, also regarding women's rights, have been inserted in the revised constitutional text adopted in 2009. This broadly participatory process resulted in the political empowerment and increased rights-awareness of the participants; the recognition of indigenous autonomy has greatly enhanced IPs' prospects for achieving self-determination. Hivos' special attention to women as marginalised individuals and groups within indigenous societies contributed to the increased inclusion and participation of indigenous women, both in indigenous communities and membership organisations and on national level in official positions.

Hivos' decidedly rights-based approach in its work with IPs has proven very relevant in both Guatemala and Bolivia. However, in the new political and legal context of the latter country, Hivos' current policy toward IPs provides little orientation in finding answers to the many new challenges they face and is in need of being infused with new analysis, particularly on the issue of implementing institutional arrangements for indigenous autonomy.

ICCO's contribution related to Adivasi in India. The India country strategy 2006–10, which chose *Adivasi* as a specific target group, was highly relevant, as it recognised that rights to self-determination and inclusion were key to reducing structural injustice to *Adivasi*. It set out a coherent strategy with a strong rights focus, including direct poverty alleviation. Because of changes in organisational priorities in ICCO, the initial strategic choices guided by principles of rights to self-determination and inclusion were only partly operationalised. The focus of ICCO's policy and strategies became more pragmatic but remained relevant, given its emphasis on direct poverty alleviation and civil-society building through the themes of Fair Sustainable Economic Development and Access to Basic Services.

ICCO's work has focused mainly on the local level. The promotion of self-help groups (SHGs) and CBOs has proved to be an effective strategy that combines local civil-society building and direct poverty alleviation with an integrated rights approach. The SHGs and CBOs offer entry points for supporting and promoting sustainable livelihoods through improving agricultural productivity, diversification of income through local market development activities, savings mobilisation and access to credit. The work of ICCO partners on improving food security and livelihoods had a positive outcome in the communities concerned, but generally the levels of poverty among *Adivasi* have increased and continue to be worse than the national average. *Adivasi* continue to be marginalised, as they have not (yet) been able to benefit from the Government's efforts to improve their access to health, education and social-protection services.

Through ICCO's support to partners that are strong in social mobilisation, strengthening local CBOs and improving rights awareness, ICCO has contributed to the political and social empowerment of *Adivasi* at local level, in particular, of women. These CBOs give *Adivasi* a platform for articulating their demands and the opportunity to take action. They might help to prevent a further radicalisation in terms of growing support for extremist movements such as the Naxalites. The extent to which the *Adivasi* can successfully claim their rights depends on how the political situation will unfold and the extent to which economic vested interests outweigh the recognition of *Adivasi* rights to self-determination and inclusion. ICCO has given little support to policy-influencing activities at state and national level and has not strategically addressed this.

The current trend of industrialisation, increased pressure on natural resources and possible land alienation and displacement is a major threat to the livelihoods of *Adivasi*. These trends could undermine some of the outcomes ICCO's partners have achieved. ICCO and its partners will need to think more strategically about supporting *Adivasi* to defend and claim their rights and, at the same time, make them less vulnerable to the impact of displacement and better able to adapt and take on alternative livelihoods.

Main conclusions

The case studies made clear that, in all five countries, the situation of IPs has changed and is continuing to change in social, cultural, economic and political terms. Their world views and values have changed because of a multitude of external influences. They are more involved in "mainstream" development, although often not in a self-determined way. Government decentralisation has allowed more local-level influence on decision-making about development, often in ways that displace indigenous forms of governance. IPs' awareness of their social, cultural and political rights has increased. They have more opportunities for political representation, although the legitimacy of their representatives in higher-level political bodies is often questioned at the grassroots. Some indigenous women and groups have gained a better economic and sociopolitical position.

Some of these changes were depicted as positive by the IPs themselves, for example, the economic development of individuals, families and communities supported by the CFA partners, as well as the improved access to basic social services. However, none of the CFAs seem to have addressed IPs' aspirations for access to *culturally appropriate* services, which would be key for self-determined development. The income-generating activities usually took fairly conventional forms that were not driven by the visions of the IPs.

The study team was not able to assess the totality of numerous factors, besides the CFA-supported interventions, that have brought about or hindered change in the situation of IPs. There is insufficient evidence in the documents of the CFAs and their partners to be able to make a quantitative assessment of the extent to which the work of the CFAs contributed to reducing structural injustice toward IPs. This is doubtless linked to the fact that issues of IPs *per se* are not central to the policies of the CFAs, which regard IPs are part of a larger set of intended beneficiaries, namely marginalised and disadvantaged people (not distinct peoples). However, directions of influence could be identified.

In all five case-study countries, the CFA partners contributed to some extent to increasing IPs' awareness of their rights. However, they have not been so effective in helping IPs defend their rights (as citizens or as IPs) to land and natural resources. The efforts of all three CFAs in strengthening local organisation have contributed to gradually increasing IPs' capacity to claim and defend these rights, but this local capacity still needs to be nurtured and reinforced.

The CFAs' support to civil-society strengthening has contributed to increasing the voice of IPs in decision-making mainly at local level – a process favoured by government decentralisation. This local-level representation is a key step toward – in the longer term – increasing political representation at national level. Thus, the CFAs have contributed to increasing the *potential* for this.

In collaboration with other national and international organisations, partners of Hivos and Cordaid have – together with IPOs – made important contributions in influencing national policy and legislation, especially with respect to land rights and insertion of IPs' perspectives and concerns into major government papers. Influencing policy is a complicated and slow process in any case but was not helped by the fact that, during the period under study, the CFAs did not have deliberate strategies for policy influence. A better link between policy-related activities at local and national level could have strengthened the CFA partners' influence on policy processes. Moreover, relatively little attention was given – especially in eastern Africa and India – to pushing for and facilitating the implementation of existing favourable policies.

In their own policies and strategies, the CFAs have paid little explicit attention to some key issues that emerged in recent years in the international debate on the collective rights of IPs, such as prior consultation, development with culture, and indigenous knowledge and intellectual property. These issues are intimately related to IPs' strategies for achieving self-determination. In practice, some CFA partners did give attention to issues of culture and indigenous knowledge in their work, as well to consultation processes with IPs, but these examples were often of an *ad hoc* nature and not well informed by international debates. With respect to the position of indigenous women, work supported by Cordaid and ICCO in the case-study countries contributed to women's social empowerment, primarily through their economic empowerment. Hivos-supported work was more clearly aimed at women's political empowerment and, in Bolivia, was influential in inserting women's rights into new policies and the new Constitution and laws, as well as into the agendas of indigenous federations and regional organisations.

Even if more in-depth research and better monitoring systems had generated sufficient data to measure specific changes and their various factors contributing to them, it would have been difficult to give an overall rating of the extent to which the CFAs and their partners had contributed, in view of the complex and differing realities faced by IPs in different countries. Some of the interventions supported by the CFAs through their partners in the case-study countries – combined with the efforts of many other local and international NGOs working in the same area – did lead to positive results in terms of raised awareness of IPs' rights, enhanced organisational capacity of indigenous communities and groups, and formal recognition of IPs' rights in some countries. In many cases, however, these positive results did not contribute to reducing structural injustice in practice. Some of the CFA interventions led to positive results in terms of IPs' access to social services and economic development. In the limited geographic areas where the CFA partners were operating, However, the livelihoods of the majority of IPs in the case-study countries were not improved, their rights were not implemented and/or their aspirations for self-determined development were not fulfilled. Overall, poverty and socio-economic differentiation among IPs appears to have increased and their possibilities to pursue traditional forms of livelihoods have decreased. IPs are facing increased pressures on and alienation of their land and natural resources. Although new land policies favourable for IPs have been achieved in Bolivia and Kenya, their implementation is uncertain. A host of other factors not controlled by the CFAs and their partners often prevented widespread achievements in this regard.

In all case-study countries, improvements in natural resource-based livelihoods and in poverty alleviation will be sustainable only when IPs have secured access to land, water and other natural resources. Especially in Ethiopia, Guatemala, India and Kenya, the lack of security in access to and control over resources might threaten the results achieved thus far. Although formal representation of IPs has generally improved at regional and national level, many IPs at local level are not confident that this is sufficient for claiming and defending their rights. In light of this, strengthening IPs' ability to assert their rights becomes even more important. CFAs will have to continue supporting the mobilisation and strengthening of CSOs and indigenous peoples' organisations (IPOs) and investing in evidence-based policy dialogue, and also link with legal-aid support to strengthen IPs' ability to claim their rights, tailoring this work in keeping with the political context in each country.

The CFAs and their partners have helped gain small victories here and there – or have at least prevented the situation of IPs from worsening more than would otherwise have been the case. The interventions of some partners, highlighted in this report, show how incremental steps can be taken towards strengthening the position of identity-based minorities, including IPs. However, much more concerted and strategic action, together with like-minded organisations, will be needed to bring about widespread improvement. In each country and with each indigenous group selected for support within a country, specific strategies will need to be developed for the groups and for alliances of such groups. In each case, it will be necessary to start with the visions of the groups concerned on the ground, rather than with a broad-brush picture based on generalisations formulated at international level. In much of the work encountered in the case-study countries, it was not clear to what extent the CFAs and their partners were aware of the extent to which their visions of development coincide – or not – with those of the IPs. To create this awareness, a dedicated process of dialogue between CFA partners and beneficiaries is needed.

Moreover, in the policies and strategies formulated by Cordaid and ICCO during the period 2003–08, there is little evidence of awareness of the international legal instruments on IPs' rights, such as the ILO C169 and the DRIP. Although awareness of these standards is reflected in Hivos' 2002 policy on human rights, there is no reference in the policies and strategies of the three CFAs to IP-related issues that were further developed in international debates during the study period, e.g. IPs' rights to prior consent or to their indigenous knowledge and intellectual property.

Main lessons and recommendations

Recommendations specific to individual CFAs are given in the case-study reports. The following lessons and recommendations were derived by comparing those made for each of the case studies and assessing their wider applicability to the other countries, regions and CFAs:

- **Take IP-differentiated approach in development policy and service delivery.** The case studies revealed that non-differentiated development policies of governments and donors can unintentionally lead to indirect forced integration of IPs. It is important to help governments develop differentiated policies (e.g. insert IP-specific provisions in policy and law proposals) in order to address the specific needs of IPs.
- **Promote reflection in indigenous communities about visions and values.** Participatory planning with IPs has often been confined to identifying problems and planning activities to address them. CFAs should support their partners in stimulating reflection within the IP communities about their vision of their future, what values are central to their being, and what activities can lead to this vision and integrate these values. The IPs should assess to what extent past activities have brought them closer to

or taken them further from their vision, i.e. to self-determined development. Different IP groups and subgroups may have different visions and values; the reflection process should allow this diversity to emerge and be openly discussed.

- **Promote reflection by partners on experiences in working with IPs.** On a national or sub-national level, the CFAs should create opportunities for their partners to reflect on their experiences in working with IPs and best practices of supporting IPs in attaining their own visions. Consideration should be given to the relevance of international standards concerning IPs' rights, and whether and to what extent it would be possible – in view of the specific country context – to draw on these standards in their work with IPs. Intermediary partners should reflect critically on the extent to which they are accountable to the IPs with whom they are working, and ways in which this downward accountability could be strengthened.
- **Develop clear CFA vision, strategy and guidelines for work on IP issues.** The CFAs should reflect internally on their experiences in addressing structural injustice toward IPs, differentiating according to the political circumstances in each country and recognising the heterogeneity within IPs in terms of wealth and social status. CFAs taking a thematic approach need to be sensitive to the specific types of groups involved in their programmes and differentiate approaches accordingly. Otherwise, they run the risk of promoting development in a way that does not coincide with the visions of the intended beneficiaries. Moreover, as the Netherlands Government has ratified ILO C169 and approved the DRIP, the CFAs should assume the responsibility of putting this on their development agenda and improving their policies accordingly. The CFAs should follow closely the international debates related to IPs and adapt their policies and strategies when appropriate.
- **Improve monitoring systems.** The study team gained the impression that CFA partners had achieved considerable positive results in their areas of operation, but found little concrete evidence on which to base conclusions regarding contribution to change. All CFAs recognise the weakness of their partners in terms of monitoring the progress and impact of their work, but seem not to have addressed this gap through coherent capacity-building support. To be better able to enhance positive outcomes and diminish negative outcomes of work with IPs, the CFAs should give more emphasis to monitoring the outcomes and assessing the impacts of their IP-related interventions on a regular basis.
- **Involve indigenous authority structures.** In efforts to strengthen local organisation, CFA partners have sometimes bypassed indigenous governance and authority structures, thus marginalising them – especially where new structures to manage natural resources do not recognise indigenous forms of communal management. This can lead to internal opposition (parallel authorities), outright conflict or non-sustainable resource use. It is not necessary that all interventions go through indigenous structures, but it is advisable that these be involved, where they still exist. This can have a positive influence on development, as indigenous authority structures often have greater local legitimacy among IPs than do state-created (or NGO-created) structures.
- **Facilitate risk and vulnerability analysis.** Particularly the CMDRR work in eastern Africa has shown the potential of enhancing local capacities to analyse risks and vulnerabilities and to plan, taking these into account. Participatory risk and vulnerability analysis will make clearer to all concerned, including the intermediary NGOs and the CFAs, how serious is, e.g., the risk of land alienation, so that strategies can be generated

at all levels to address this. Good analysis of risk and vulnerability would also provide an important input for policy dialogue.

- **Link local and national level in policy work.** It has proved effective to work simultaneously with partners at grassroots level strengthening community organisation in poverty alleviation and at national level networking for mutual learning and influencing policy. Selecting partners working at different levels can bridge gaps in information and trust and bring a more genuine, grassroots voice to higher levels of decision-making. It is also important to stimulate relevant research to support IPs in influencing policy. Examples of good practice on the ground need to be well documented and brought to higher levels. At the same time, information about policies being discussed at national level needs to be brought down to IPs at local level, so that they can voice their views. CFAs should build the capacities of national-level IPOs to inform their constituencies about such policies and to facilitate participatory documentation to support communication from the ground up. CFAs should also support modern communication media as a way to provide information to IPs, amplify IPs' voices and create wider public awareness of and support for their concerns.
- **Support policy monitoring and legal paraprofessionals.** In countries like Bolivia, Ethiopia, Kenya and India, it is not so necessary to push for new policies but rather to ensure effective implementation or enforcement of existing policies and laws, and to push for harmonisation of legislation on IPs' rights with other policies and laws. IPOs need to be involved in monitoring the implementation of their rights. CFAs could support such IP-led monitoring bodies and provide local-level support in training legal paraprofessionals to become fully informed about existing rights and about channels and strategies through which they can defend these rights.
- **Enhance indigenous women's capacities for leadership and representation.** All three CFAs have, to a greater or lesser extent, given attention to economic and sociopolitical empowerment of indigenous women. However, much more needs to be done to strengthen their position within their communities (and in mixed-gender IPOs) and within the national women's movement which – although it may address many issues relevant for indigenous women – is still largely ignorant of their specific concerns. The CFAs should intensify their efforts to enhance the capacity of indigenous women in leadership and representation.
- **Address the situation of indigenous youth.** An issue that arose especially in eastern Africa and Latin America and to a lesser extent in India was the cultural alienation of educated youth and school dropouts. A much closer link is needed between modern and traditional education, i.e. between curriculum planners and indigenous cultural institutions. CFAs and their partners could influence policy to promote culturally appropriate education by developing ideas for locally relevant curricula and supporting capacity-development in youth groups at local level.
- **Scale up promising models and approaches.** The CFAs and their partners have designed and tested promising models and approaches for improving the situation of IPs. These need to be scaled up by convincing decision-makers at different levels in government and civil society about the merits of these models and approaches. To this end, the CFAs should support thorough evaluation and attractive documentation of the process and results.

1. Introduction

This introductory chapter gives the background to the current study on Dutch co-financing agencies' support to reducing structural injustice toward indigenous peoples (IPs), and explains some key concepts, international norms, developments and controversies regarding IP issues.

1.1 Background to the study

Three Dutch co-financing agencies (CFAs) - Cordaid, Hivos and ICCO - agreed to carry out a joint evaluation of their support to IPs worldwide. In many countries, IPs are among the poorest and most marginalised groups in society. All three CFAs have a long history of supporting initiatives and organisations of IPs. As can be seen in Table 1, during the period 2003-08, the three CFAs altogether committed almost €112 million to 588 projects working with over 300 partners in support of IPs in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and globally. These projects included interventions focused on political rights, land rights, livelihoods, indigenous women's rights and strengthening of indigenous peoples' organisations (IPOs).²

Table 1: Total number of IP-related projects, number of implementing partners and distribution of commitments according to continent by CFA, 2002-10

CFA	Cordaid			Hivos			ICCO		
	No. and % of total projects	No. of partners	Commitments (€) and % of total budget*	No. and % of total projects	No. of partners	Commitments (€) and % of total budget*	No. and % of total projects	No. of partners	Commitments (€) and % of total budget*
Africa	84 (46%)	49	17,284,791 (45%)	3 (2%)	3	808,351 (3%)	9 (3%)	4	1,872,029 (4%)
Asia	48 (27%)	39	9,808,124 (26%)	50 (34%)	23	7,431,157 (24%)	159 (62%)	62	32,557,055 (67%)
Europe	7 (4%)	7	1,273,183 (3%)	0	0	0	15 (6%)	10	2,069,601 (4%)
Latin America	39 (21%)	26	9,064,636 (23%)	89 (61%)	39	22,592,022 (72%)	71 (27%)	32	12,033,888 (24%)
Global	3 (2%)	3	1,230,000 (3%)	5 (3%)	2	464,000 (1%)	6 (2%)	3	574,000 (1%)
Total	181	124	38,660,734	147	67	31,295,530	260	111	49,316,219

Source: Project databases of Cordaid, Hivos and ICCO; the figures for the number of projects and commitments (both MFS and non-MFS funds) are higher than given in the Terms of Reference and the inception report, because the scope of the study changed to include also the year 2008 and because the CFAs, after making more detailed investigation, provided the study team with additional information. The Cordaid figures refer only to commitments made from 2003 onwards, including 2008 for the period up to 2010, whereas those for Hivos and ICCO include some commitments made already in 2002.

The CFAs intend to use the evaluation findings to show and account for the results of their activities in support of IPs, to critically review these activities, and to inspire future policy development and implementation.

² Table 6 in Chapter 3 gives an overview of actual expenditure in 2003–08 and the proportion of MFS (Medefinancieringsstelsel = Co-Financing System) funds.

The study was designed to focus on case studies in Africa (Cordaid-supported work in Ethiopia, Kenya and Tanzania), Latin America (Hivos-supported work in Bolivia and Guatemala) and Asia (ICCO-supported work in India). These countries were selected by the CFAs and, according to the Terms of Reference (ToRs, see Annex 2) cover a sizeable part of their overall IP portfolios (in terms of financial commitments: Cordaid 35%, Hivos 42% and ICCO 29%).

The core Evaluation Question is: To what extent have CFA policies, strategies, procedures and programmes and those of their partner organisations contributed to reducing structural injustice towards indigenous peoples?

The evaluation team was asked to respond to twelve ***Research Questions*** (RQs):

Regarding CFA policies

1. What explicit and implicit policies have the CFAs formulated regarding IPs?
2. How should the formulated policies be assessed in light of the current international debates, the incorporation of IP perspectives and the amount of attention given to the challenges of exclusion, marginalisation, discrimination, domination and achieving greater self-determination and inclusion?
3. Have the CFAs selected partner organisations and supported interventions in line with their policies?

Regarding change in the situation of IPs and the links to CFA-supported interventions

4. In what way did the position of the (selected) IPs change over the last ten years concerning political rights, land rights, livelihoods and the rights of indigenous women?
5. Can these changes be assessed - and to what extent - as:
 - a) a reduction of marginalisation of the IPs and a change in power, poverty, worldviews and values, an increase and strengthening of the political, economic, social and cultural self-determination and identity of the IPs?
 - b) a reduction in marginalisation and inclusion in development processes that is considered positive by them?
 - c) avoiding or mitigating forced assimilation or integration?
6. To what degree and in what way can the changes be explained by the CFA partners' interventions?
7. What is the relative importance of the CFA partner networks' contribution to these changes?
8. What can be said about the sustainability of the changes?
9. What unexpected (negative and positive) outcomes of CFA partners' interventions can be distinguished?

Regarding mode of supporting IP organisations

10. In what way has the CFA's mode of supporting IP organisations contributed to or undermined the (positive) outcomes (referring to criteria for selecting partners; accountability systems; planning, monitoring and evaluation models; and CFA-partner involvement/communication)?

As synthesis

11. What can be said overall about the change in structural injustice in the situation of IPs in the case studies and the contribution of the CFA partner organisations to this change?
12. What lessons can be drawn from the case studies to enhance the positive (diminish the negative) outcomes and to effectively support the IP organisations?

The evaluation was to address results at outcome level, and assess the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the work of the CFAs and their partners. Particular attention was to be paid to issues of indigenous women. The original ToRs specified that the evaluation should cover the period 2003-07. However, the evaluation team, Partos and the CFAs agreed that the historical scope could go further back than 2003 and that the period would be extended to include 2008.

The evaluation was carried out by three Netherlands-based researchers (“core team”) specialised in agricultural sociology, rural sociology and legal anthropology and, in each of the five case-study countries, with a national researcher experienced in working with the local IPs.

The evaluation process was in three phases from September 2009 to June 2010:

- 1) **Inception phase** (September-October 2009) focusing on the first three Research Questions about CFA policies regarding IPs, seen in the context of the current international discourse on IPs, and whether the CFAs selected partners and supported interventions in line with their policies. This phase involved a desk review of relevant documents provided by the CFAs (policy documents, overall IP project portfolio, reports on previous evaluations) and of relevant literature on IPs for the selected countries; and key-informant interviews with CFA programme and management staff and external resource persons (Waters-Bayer et al 2009);
- 2) **Case studies** (November 2009-March 2010) focused on the work supported by Cordaid’s Programme 1 (Identity and Diversity) in Africa, specifically with pastoralists in Ethiopia (Waters-Bayer & Getachew 2010) and Kenya (Waters-Bayer & Wanyama 2010); Hivos-supported work with IPs in Latin America, specifically in Bolivia (van de Sandt & Zolezzi 2010) and Guatemala (van de Sandt & Fries 2010); and ICCO-supported work in Asia, specifically with the *Adivasi* in India (Oudwater & Bannerjee 2010). These studies looked into how the CFAs operationalised their IP policies and supported their partner organisations, and assessed the relevance and outcomes of CFA policy and implementation in the selected areas;
- 3) **Synthesis** (April-June 2010), in which the findings from the review of CFA policies and the five case studies were compared and analysed. An assessment was made of the extent to which the situation of IPs in the selected areas had changed, and how the CFAs and their partners had contributed to these changes. Lessons were drawn from the experiences made in the CFAs’ programmes designed to support IPs, and recommendations were made for future CFA policies and programme development to provide effective support in improving the situation of IPs.

This synthesis report largely follows the order of the RQs. The relevant RQs are highlighted at the beginning of the appropriate chapters. Chapter 2 outlines the methodology of the study. Chapter 3 compares the CFAs’ policies to support IPs. Chapters 4-6 examine the CFAs’ contributions to change in the situation of IPs in Ethiopia and Kenya (Cordaid), Bolivia and Guatemala (Hivos) and India (ICCO), respectively. In Chapter 7, the changes in the different countries are compared, as are the contributions of the CFAs to these changes.

Chapter 8 brings conclusions and lessons about improving the way CFAs support IPs and their organisations.

1.2 The concept of indigenous peoples and their rights

The term “indigenous peoples” has no fixed definition. Over the past decades, several formulations have been offered by internationally recognised organisations such as the United Nations (UN), the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and the World Bank. The most widely accepted working definition is the formulation by UN Special Rapporteur José Martínez Cobo (1986) in his “Study of the problem of discrimination against indigenous populations”:

Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing in those territories, or parts of them. They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal systems.

UN Doc. E./CN.4/Sub.2/1986/7/Add. 4, para. 379 (1986)

Peoples (cultural groups or minorities) generally considered as “indigenous” usually meet all or most of the following criteria (WGIP 1996, UNDG 2008):

- They have historical association with a given area, and currently inhabit or have formerly inhabited the area before its colonisation, or alongside other cultural groups when a nation-state was formed;
- They have at least partly maintained their distinct linguistic, cultural or sociological characteristics and have remained separate from the dominant culture;
- They identify themselves as indigenous and are recognised by other groups or authorities as a distinct collectivity;
- They share an experience of subjugation, marginalisation, dispossession, exclusion or discrimination.

Using these criteria, current estimates for the total population of the world’s IPs range from 300 to 370 million (6-7% of the world’s population). They inhabit every region of the globe and speak three quarters of the world’s 6000 languages (WGIP 1996).

The main legally binding document focused on IPs’ rights is the ILO Convention 169 (C169) on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples (ILO 1989), which became part of domestic law in the countries that ratified it. More recently, the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (DRIP) adopted by the UN General Assembly (UN 2007) set out the rights that countries should aspire to guarantee and provided a framework for dialogue between IPs and national states. The UN also created two mechanisms on IP issues: the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) in 2002 and the Inter-agency Support Group on Indigenous Issues (IASG) in 2006.

The situation regarding the recognition and implementation of IPs’ rights varies greatly between countries and continents. In Latin America, IPs in many countries have achieved recognition and many rights whereas, in Africa and Asia, most IPs are still struggling for recognition by national governments. The controversies in the debate on IPs’ rights centre on the following major points:

- **Who is indigenous?** In the Americas and Australasia with a history of settler colonialism, the status of indigenous or first peoples is generally uncontested. In Asian and African countries, most of the inhabitants are regarded as indigenous in the sense that they originated from those countries. Many countries still refuse to apply the term “indigenous peoples” to the historically marginalised and culturally distinct groups living within their borders who are not part of the dominant political and economic structures of the nation.
- **Collective rights and self-determination.** IPs maintain that, because of their historically marginalised position, their members can exercise full citizenship only under a pluralist regime of law that recognises not only equal rights but also different and collective rights, i.e. as citizens of a country and as special citizens. The most important collective right is that of self-determination. State governments often hesitate to formally recognise the self-determination of IPs because, in international law, this right suggests independent statehood and threatens the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the nation-state. Promoters of IPs’ rights deny having such aspirations and stress that IPs seek “internal self-determination” (Stavenhagen 1992). They aspire to “a legally sanctioned and protected space within the state in which ethnic groups are able to maintain their distinct cultural identity and social organization” (De la Peña 1999). Self-determination includes IPs’ right to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) to all “legislative or administrative measures which may affect them directly” (ILO C169 Art. 6), e.g. related to poverty alleviation, agrarian reform, education, healthcare etc.
- **Access to land, territories and resources.** IPs claim and have an internationally recognised right to the land, territories and resources on which they live. Land and related resource rights protect their economic livelihood and are the source of their spiritual, cultural and social identity. Many states claim indigenous territories as State land and are reluctant to grant collective rights to these territories, because this would prevent privatisation of land and resources and hinder large-scale commercial development such as logging, infrastructure projects (e.g. dams), mineral exploration and large-scale agricultural projects. Recognising IPs’ rights includes their right to FPIC for such development projects or commercial ventures.

2. Methodology

The overall process for the evaluation consisted of three phases: the inception phase, followed by five case studies, which were then compared, analysed and synthesised in this final report. This chapter describes briefly the methodology and process followed in each of the three phases. Annex 3 gives a full overview of all persons consulted during the inception and case-study phase. A list of documents and resources consulted throughout the evaluation is given in Annex 4.

2.1 Process of carrying out the inception phase

During the inception phase, the core team compiled information from external and academic sources about concepts and definitions, international norms and developments, controversies and challenges regarding IP issues. It looked into the explicit and implicit policies of the three CFAs regarding IPs and the related interventions, and made preliminary assessments of:

- the degree to which IP perspectives were incorporated into the policies and interventions;
- the amount of attention given to the challenges of marginalisation, discrimination and domination and helping IPs achieve greater self-determination and inclusion; and
- whether the CFAs selected partners and supported interventions in line with their policies.

To make this assessment possible, the process of the inception phase consisted of:

1. A review of policy, strategy and other documents (from projects, programmes, evaluations, workshops etc) made available to the team by the CFAs
2. A review of the portfolio of projects funded in the period 2003-08 related to IPs, as interpreted and selected by each CFA, which provided brief (up to two pages each) project descriptions (181 IP-related projects supported by Cordaid, 147 by Hivos and 260 by ICCO)
3. Drawing on other publications and interviews with resource persons that could provide background on the international discourse about and current situation of IPs
4. Interviewing CFA staff, both current and former (see Table 2 in Section 2.2 and Annex 3)
5. Developing and - on the basis of feedback from the Evaluation Coordination Group (ECG) and own insights that the core team gained during the inception phase - revising and streamlining a question matrix, which served as a basis for developing question checklists for the fieldwork (see Annex 5 for the question matrix and Annex 6 for the question checklists)
6. Planning case studies in the five pre-selected countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

For the portfolio review, the team classified the projects in a matrix according to location, funds committed or spent, start and end of funding, type of partner organisation, IP(s) concerned, attention to women's issues, type of intervention/support and type of approach. In the case of all three CFAs, it is possible that some projects that work with IPs were not included in the project descriptions provided. Queries regarding IPs in the project databases might have yielded an incomplete list, as it depended whether certain keywords related to IPs were included in the project descriptions. This, in turn, depended on the choice of words made by individual CFA staff members when entering information into the database. The CFAs defined what projects should be part of the project portfolio analysis. Throughout the evaluation assignment, further information and fine tuning was done with the portfolio analysis. The team is confident that the final portfolio analysis is more accurate than the initial list prepared for developing the ToRs, but differences between the CFAs in defining IPs remained.

2.2 Process of carrying out the country case studies

Toward the end of the inception phase, the core team - in close collaboration with the national researchers - developed plans for carrying out the case studies in Bolivia, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India and Kenya. These plans were discussed with the ECG during the inception phase. After the first round of case studies in Ethiopia and Guatemala in November 2009, the experiences made were documented by the two case-study teams and then shared and discussed within the core team and with the ECG, consisting of representatives from the three CFAs and Partos. No major changes were made to the overall approach and methodology, except a tighter focus of the fieldwork in subsequent case studies in terms of number of partners and communities visited.

As the Netherlands-based researcher responsible for the case study in India was not granted an entry visa, the fieldwork was done by two Indian researchers. The Netherlands-based researcher had regular contact with the main Indian researcher by email and telephone to support preparation and implementation of the fieldwork, and met with this researcher in Nepal for joint analysis of the findings from the inception report, desk review and fieldwork. They assessed the progress made in data collection and identified gaps for follow-up by the main Indian researcher.

Selection criteria. The selection of case-study countries had been decided by the ECG and specified in the ToRs. Cordaid had proposed three countries for case studies. The evaluation team focused on two of them and did the fieldwork in southern Ethiopia and northern Kenya because: i) this crossborder area is the major focal point of Cordaid's pastoralist programme; and ii) the largest portion of the CFA's funding for pastoralist development goes to partners in these areas. For each case-study country, the core team selected partner organisations to visit on the basis of information made available by the CFAs and in discussion with CFA staff.

The selection criteria and information for making the selection were derived from the portfolio analysis made for the inception report. The criteria were defined to ensure a representative mix of partners in terms of:

- Approaches (rights-focus, poverty alleviation, community development);
- Major intervention strategies to cover the scope in that particular country (e.g. local organisational development, land rights, agricultural production, local market development);
- Type of organisation (faith-based, intermediary, IP and network organisations); as almost all partner organisations were intermediaries, a larger proportion of intermediary organisations was selected but, to ensure that perspectives from other types of partner organisation were included, a particular effort was made to include IPOs and networks in the field visits;
- Attention to issues of indigenous women: some partner organisations seemed to have a more explicit focus on these issues than did others; the selection of partners included a mix of those with little and those with explicit focus on women's issues;
- Level of intervention (community, national): the selection of partner organisations included those working at each level and also included both larger organisations working in several areas of the country and smaller organisations working in only one or few areas in the country.

In the case of India, given its vastness, the selection of partners was combined with the selection of geographic regions: Jharkhand and Orissa, as they have the highest concentration of Adivasi, the largest number of partner organisations working on IP issues and covered major thematic areas of natural resource management/food security, local market development and rights issues.

As can be seen in Table 2, out of the total number of partners working with IPs in each country, the partner organisations selected and visited made up 57% of the total in Bolivia, 90% in Guatemala, 77% in Ethiopia, 40% in Kenya and 66% in the two selected states in India.

Data collection. The overall methodological approach for data collection consisted of a combination of primary data collection through interviews and community consultations and a desk review of available secondary data such as the CFA's programme documentation, partner organisations' documentation, secondary literature by academics and by other organisations working on IP issues, and government policy documents. The desk review helped put the findings from the community consultations and the information provided by the partner organisations and CFA staff into a wider context and allowed cross-verification. The case-study teams identified and interviewed other resource persons to ensure that perspectives from a wide range of stakeholders were included and that the information could be triangulated. These persons included (political) representatives of the IPs, government staff, academics and staff from other international non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and multilateral organisations working on IP-related issues.

Methodological triangulation in the case studies involved: i) using different sources of data (interviews, discussions, CFA's documents, partner organisations' reports, other documents and own observations in the field); and ii) collecting data from different perspectives; the endogenous views held by IPs and the exogenous views held by people not of IP descent but working with IPs and/or well-informed about the situation of IPs ("resource persons").

Feedback mechanisms were built into the data-collection process to elicit IPs' views on study findings as much as possible. In the field, initial findings from previous community consultations and from sessions with partner staff and resource persons were included in subsequent discussions for feedback and verification or contradiction from the indigenous communities.

Based on the ToRs, the question matrix (see Annex 5) and the specific context of the respective case-study country, the study teams developed and adapted checklists of questions for semi-structured interviews and focus-group discussions (see Annex 6). Different guideline questions were drawn up for: 1) resource persons, 2) partner organisations and 3) indigenous communities. The questions in the checklists sought to capture individuals' and groups' specific perspectives on changes in IPs' livelihoods, indications of the sustainability of these changes, unexpected outcomes of CFA partners' interventions, and how the CFA's mode of supporting IPs and intermediary organisations had contributed to or hindered the changes sought and achieved. Table 2 gives an overview of the number and types of interviews conducted in the case-study countries. More details about the persons consulted can be found in Annex 3.

Table 2: Interviews during inception phase and fieldwork in the case-study countries

Case-study countries	Bolivia	Ethiopia	Guatemala	India	Kenya
Time of field study	Nov 2009	Nov 2009	Jan 2010	Jan 2010	Jan 2010
Team members	Joris van de Sandt & Graciela Zolezzi	Ann Waters-Bayer & Getachew Gebru	Joris van de Sandt & Rebecca Fries	Nicoliene Oudwater & Madhusree Bannerjee	Ann Waters-Bayer & Jacob Wanyama
No. of interviews during inception phase (CFA staff, resource persons)	10	12	see Bolivia (same CFA staff/resource persons)	19	see Ethiopia (same CFA staff/resource persons)
No. of CFA partners in country working with IPs	14	13	10	12 (10 in the two selected states and 2 at national level)	25
No. of partners visited	8	10	9	8*	10
No. of individual interviews: PO staff & resource persons	10	29	11	14	11
No. of group interviews: PO staff & other stakeholders	7	16	9	9	14
No. of focus-group discussions with IPs	7	10	8	12	9
IP groups visited	Sirionó, Aymara, Chiquitanos	Arbore, Boran, Hamar, Tsamai	K'iche', Chortí, Kaqchikel, Mam	Gonds, Oraons	Boran, Rendille, Samburu, Turkana

* In the case of India, six partners were selected for field visits and in-depth discussions. Two partners work at the national level. In addition, one partner workshop was organised in each state, to which all 10 partners working on *Adivasi* issues were invited. Their presentations of their organisations and work were followed by facilitated group discussions around key questions.

In discussion among the teams for all case studies, an outline for the case-study report was agreed on before starting the fieldwork. This outline provided a structure for capturing the information collected in the field.

During the fieldwork, interviews and group discussions were held separately with partner organisation staff and indigenous groups in the communities visited. The community visits were crucial to find out how the IPs themselves perceived the changes in their lives and livelihoods. During these visits, the case-study teams met with both men and women members of the community to obtain their views through facilitated group discussions. In addition, interviews were conducted with other resource persons including government staff, staff of other organisations working with IPs and academics. After the fieldwork, additional follow-up was done by email and telephone on unanswered questions and issues arising. During the community visits and when meeting with the partner organisations, the team collected relevant documentation in hardcopy or electronic form on project activities. It also reviewed project evaluation reports, studies and other relevant publications on IPs provided by resource persons and found on the internet.

The full analysis of all data and writing of the case-study reports were done by the core team members in close collaboration with the national researchers, who did additional follow-up when required. The team followed the same overall outline for the case-study reports to allow for comparison of the findings crucial for the synthesis report. The case-study reports were peer-reviewed within the core team and by an ETC staff member not involved in the actual evaluation. The feedback proved useful for reflection on similarities and differences in the findings. The preliminary case studies were presented and discussed at a review meeting with the ECG. Feedback provided by this group during the meeting and by email was incorporated into the final case-study reports. Feedback given by two Western-educated members of pastoralist groups to the Ethiopia case-study report was integrated into the final version.

2.3 Process of synthesising the findings

Based on the research questions in the ToRs, the core team developed the overall outline and structure of the synthesis report in discussion with the ECG. The team divided the responsibilities for writing the chapters. One team meeting was held to discuss the similarities and differences between the case studies and in the CFA policies related to IPs. During subsequent discussions by Skype and email, the team followed the research questions raised in the ToRs and compared findings among the five country case studies related to each research question. It consulted with the national researchers for their feedback and input into the revision of the case-study reports and the parallel process of formulating the first draft of the synthesis report.

The ToRs for the study (see Annex 2) had already indicated the “general data limitations in CFA supported projects”. It had therefore been agreed with the ECG that the team would not be able to look beyond outcomes. During preparations for the fieldwork, the team indeed found that the CFA documentation contained little in the way of baseline data and information on impacts of CFA-supported interventions. In the case-study countries, it became evident that also the documents available from the partners contained little of this type of information. The time allocated for the fieldwork was much too short to be able to obtain such data, to say nothing of information on other factors that contributed to change in the situation of the IPs, such as the interventions of other state and non-state actors and the direct and indirect influence of political, demographic and economic factors. Therefore, the team focused in the synthesis phase on: i) comparing and contrasting the CFAs’ policies and approaches in supporting IPs; ii) ascertaining similarities and differences in the types of intervention they made; iii) identifying as much as possible the linkages between these interventions and observed changes as reported by IPs, CFA staff and external resource persons; and iv) assessing the direction of influence - positive or negative - of the CFA-supported interventions on the lives of the IPs.

The core team revised the first and second draft of the synthesis report on the basis of comments from an ETC staff member not involved in the assignment, the Evaluation Coordination Group, the External Reference Group and the national consultants.

2.4 Assessment of the methodology and implications for the findings

2.4.1 Strengths

In the self-assessment by the entire team, the major strengths in the methodology have been:

- **Thorough inception phase.** The different steps in the process for preparing the case studies proved effective. The inception phase gave the core team a chance to talk with a large number of staff at the head office and to obtain a broader overview of the each CFA's total IP-related portfolio, relevant policies and overall approach to working on IP issues. During preparation of the country case studies, this overview and the interaction, though limited, with the national team members helped in targeting the fieldwork and, during implementation of the case studies, helped in assessing and analysing the information. As the team worked closely together while preparing the inception report, each member gained some overall understanding of the policies and approaches of the other CFAs. This helped in discussing, comparing and understanding the different findings from the case studies.
- **Gaining the endogenous view.** During the field visits, focus-group discussions with the IPs and participatory observation were very useful in learning about changes in the lives of the IPs. It is also in line with international ethical standards on IPs' rights that members/groups of IPs represent and articulate their experiences and problems themselves, instead of partner organisations and external experts doing it on their behalf.
- **Triangulation through insiders'-outsiders' views and literature.** The collection and comparison of information on endogenous and exogenous views and secondary sources of information on general change in the situation of IPs were important in obtaining a broader view, beyond that of the limited number of IP groups that could be visited in the field. This helped triangulate findings and brought in experience from other areas than only those visited.
- **Representative sample of partners included.** In each country, the case-study team visited a representative part of the portfolio of partners working with IPs, which made it possible to draw well-founded conclusions about the CFA's contribution in relation to IPs within the partner portfolio of the particular case-study country.

2.4.2 Weaknesses and limitations

In the self-assessment by the entire team, the major weaknesses in the process have been:

- **Insufficient differentiation within the IP groups.** IPs are not homogeneous groups. As wealth stratification and internal power mapping could not be done in the short period available for actual research in the field, it is difficult to assess to which wealth and power categories of IPs the findings apply. Resource persons, particularly in eastern Africa and India, noted an increasing heterogeneity within IP communities in terms of socio-economic status and power. To some extent, the case-study teams managed to relativise the field findings by referring to documents from deeper-going research, which often revealed that the situation of the majority of IPs was less favourable than that of the IPs who were most vocal in the focus-group discussions. Moreover, it must be noted that most of the participants in these discussions had benefited directly from support through CFA partner organisations.
- **Insufficient allowance for time needed for travel to and in IP areas.** As IPs are often also geographically marginalised, the case-study teams needed considerable time to reach them, and the fieldwork could not always be carried out as scheduled because of unexpected logistical challenges (e.g. delays in transport). The numerous days spent

travelling in the larger countries (Ethiopia, Kenya, India, Bolivia) limited the time available for collecting data in interaction with CFA partners, resource persons and IPs. Although the team is confident that the data obtained provided sufficient basis for assessing change and its causes, some depth and details may be lacking.

- **Potential for bias through translation.** In Ethiopia, Kenya and India, language posed some limitations, as the language or dialect spoken by some IPs was difficult or impossible for the national researchers to understand. In these cases, the case-study teams relied primarily on partner organisation staff for translation or additional clarification. This obviously increased the risk of bias in the responses during the community discussions. On the other hand, it was crucial to work with local staff of partner organisations as intermediaries, as they know the communities. The team also had the impression that partner organisation staff had built up a good rapport with the communities visited. This allowed for easier entry into discussion with both male and female groups. In view of the main objectives of the programme evaluation, the team does not think that this led to a significant bias in information gained from the field, as the attention was on changes in the lives of the IPs and the CFA's contribution to these changes, rather than being a conventional project evaluation to assess the partners' work with the IPs.

2.4.3 Differences that constrained comparison

During the inception phase, the case studies and writing the synthesis report, it became clear that it was difficult to make direct comparisons between the CFAs and their support to IPs, as the basis for comparison differs. This is due mainly to:

- **Differences in categorisation of "IPs" in the three CFAs.** In its documents, Cordaid does not define "IPs"; it includes them in the larger category of "identity-based groups". In its informal policy guidelines on IPs, ICCO recognised that there is no generally accepted definition of IPs and adopted the description in the ILO C 169 as its working definition. Similarly, Hivos takes the ILO C 169 and DRIP as guides in its approach to IPs and uses the definition of IPs formulated by Martínez-Cobo in 1986 for the UN (then) draft Declaration (see Section 1.2 of this report). Notwithstanding similarities in definitions used, there are differences in interpretation by the CFAs in classifying ethnic groups. For example, ICCO seldom applies the concept of IPs to its projects in Africa and does not define pastoralists as IPs, whereas Cordaid regards pastoralists as a major group of IPs, even though the pastoralists may not see themselves in this way. According to the DRIP, "IPs" are those groups that identify themselves as indigenous; in this study, "IPs" are those that the CFA identified as such.
- **Historical and sociopolitical differences between the continents and countries.** The historical and sociopolitical contexts differ considerably between Latin America, Africa and Asia. This obviously influenced the approach chosen by the CFAs and the types of intervention they support in each of the five countries across the three continents. For example, in Latin America, the IP discourse is much more developed and part of the national policy contexts (to different degrees in Bolivia versus Guatemala). In Africa and India, the IP discourse is sociopolitically more sensitive. Governments in Africa and Asia generally seek to avoid accusations of ethnic favouritism, as they fear that ethnic mobilisation or "tribalism" could lead to political instability.
- **Differences in CFA policy formulation and programme operationalisation related to IPs.** In the period under study, the CFAs had pursued more thematic approaches, and their policies and strategies were less focused on specific target groups such as IPs. Moreover, they seldom formulated their policies explicitly in these terms. Therefore, the policy foundation for their work with IPs had to be reconstructed from more general references to cultural minorities or marginalised groups and from thematic policy

documents. Cordaid comes closest to a focus on target groups, with its attention to identity-based groups (IBGs), yet - for part of the period under study - work with pastoralists and other IBGs still had to be fitted into thematic programmes on “Access to Markets” and “Peace and Conflict”. Both Hivos and ICCO adopted a thematic programme approach, and IP-related projects fell under different themes, in Bolivia (Hivos) mainly under “Sustainable Production”, in Guatemala (Hivos) mainly under “Human Rights and Democratisation” and in India (ICCO) mainly under “Fair Sustainable Access to Markets”, “Access to Basic Services” and, to a limited extent, “Democratisation and Peacebuilding”. The team dealt with this challenge by looking mainly for commonalities in the CFA approaches and activities, while still recognising as much as possible the specific contexts of the countries and each CFA’s policies and programmes.

In sum, the approach to the evaluation was largely determined by the ToRs, in which specific countries had been selected for in-depth assessment of each CFA’s work. A comparative analysis was challenging because the political, historical, socio-economic and agro-ecological context differs greatly among the five case-study countries. Looking at the work of 2-3 CFAs in one country or region might have allowed a more in-depth comparative analysis (although still possibly complicated by differences in funding allocations made by each CFA in a given area). At the same time, lessons can be learnt from one continent that are of interest to other continents, such as how IPs’ rights are addressed in Latin America compared to Africa and Asia.

2.4.4 Wider applicability of the findings

It may not always be possible to generalise the conclusions regarding changes perceived by IPs in the individual case studies to apply beyond the CFA portfolio and/or to other areas in the case-study countries, as there are large differences between indigenous groups with respect to their relative exposure to other cultures, their distinct cultural forms of organisation (especially for resource use), the nature of the environment, their livelihoods opportunities and differences in pressures from outside, such as encroachment by non-IPs, infrastructure development, mining or commercial-farming development. The short time available for the fieldwork allowed focus-group discussions only with IPs living in areas relatively easy to reach. However, the emphasis on bringing in both insiders’ and outsiders’ views and drawing on secondary sources helped to triangulate the findings from the field and put them into a broader context. The recommendations in Chapter 8, being based on comparison across the experiences in the five country case studies, are fairly general in nature. Therefore, in light of the CFA policies and the selection of case studies, they could probably be applied in or adapted to most other countries in the same region where the CFAs are working with IPs.

3. CFA policies and strategies to support indigenous peoples

RQ1: What explicit and implicit policies have the CFAs formulated regarding IPs?

RQ2: How should these policies be assessed in light of the current international debates, the incorporation of the perspective of IPs, and the amount of attention given to the challenges of exclusion/inclusion, marginalisation, discrimination, domination, self-determination, gender issues and differences in worldviews?

RQ3: Have the CFAs selected partner organisations and have the CFAs supported interventions that are in line with their policies?

3.1 Synopsis of CFA policies and strategies in the period 2003-08

This section is a summary of the assessment of CFA policies and strategies made in the inception report (Waters-Bayer et al 2009). The major sources of information are documents provided by the CFAs (policy documents, overall IP project portfolio, evaluation reports, memos about partners and projects), secondary literature on IPs in general and in the selected countries (see Annex 4), and interviews with CFA staff and external resource persons (see Annex 3).

3.1.1 Cordaid

IP-related policies and policy changes. Cordaid initially tried to improve the socio-economic position of IBGs³ by addressing their basic needs. In 2003, it shifted from a geographical to a thematic approach to development, more explicitly trying to address issues of structural poverty, human rights and self-determination of IBGs. Thematically, these projects promoted Access to Market (group formation, income generation) and Peace and Conflict (natural resource management, conflict resolution). They included attention to institutional capacity building, gender equity and policy advocacy. With the 2007 shift to a programmatic approach, Cordaid made more deliberate efforts to link partners and other actors to facilitate dialogue and mutual learning and to create a critical mass for social change. The work in support of pastoralists and other IBGs came under Programme 1 "Identity and Diversity". For eastern Africa, a programme for "Increasing Participation and Voice of Pastoralists" was designed to combat pastoralists' marginalisation by addressing: i) the knowledge gap among policymakers and development practitioners about pastoralism, and ii) the power imbalance between pastoralists and the dominant society.

3) None of the Cordaid policy and strategy documents made available to the study team defined the term "IPs". The terminology used throughout the Programme 1 documents is "identity-based groups" (IBGs), sometimes also called "ethnic minorities".

Intervention strategies. In 2003, Cordaid began to shift from delivering services, such as healthcare and education, toward more direct alleviation of poverty by increasing production and income of IPs; strengthening civil society primarily by supporting the organisation of marginalised groups for their economic, social and political empowerment; and influencing policy. According to data provided by Cordaid, by 2008, there had been a slight reduction in expenditure on direct poverty alleviation and a slight increase in expenditure on the other two strategies.

In 2007, with the new programmatic approach, the strategy with respect to pastoralist development in eastern Africa (the focus of the Cordaid case studies in this evaluation) consisted of: i) building alliances; ii) strengthening pastoralists' voice to advocate on their own behalf; and iii) strengthening research and policy-influencing organisations. Having recognised that several pastoralist groups use areas crossing national borders and that constraints on

mobility in this respect were undermining pastoralists' livelihoods, Cordaid chose to work in a regional programme focused on two crossborder areas: Southern Ethiopia / Northern Kenya and Southern Kenya / Northern Tanzania. Within this programme, the thematic foci are: i) increasing pastoralist women's participation and voice; ii) increasing pastoralists' participation and voice in natural resource planning and management; and iii) improving marketing of livestock and their products.

In other continents, Cordaid has intervened in human rights issues and peacebuilding, e.g. in Indonesia and India (including training journalists for peace and reconciliation); in healing war trauma, e.g. in Guatemala; and in advocacy for the human rights of Roma in Europe. Almost half of its funding for projects related to IBGs has been spent in Africa. In its work in Africa, it gradually phased down its support to local development and rights of pygmies and the Ogoni in West Africa and increasingly focused on pastoralists. According to data provided by Cordaid, about 80% of the funds in the IBG portfolio for projects that started in 2003 concerned pastoralists; the other projects concerned pygmies and other hunter-gatherers. Of the IBG projects that started in 2008, about 95% of the funds was for projects related to pastoralists and the total funding for such projects had more than doubled. Over the entire period 2003-08, about 90% of total IBG-related funding in Africa was committed to pastoralist development in eastern Africa.

Levels of intervention and types of partner. In its efforts to address issues of structural injustice, Cordaid worked simultaneously on different levels with different types of organisations:

- 1) Grassroots: activities related to poverty alleviation, civil society self-organisation and local-level policy dialogue, working with local NGOs and with pastoralist and community-based organisations (CBOs) supported by intermediary NGOs (national and foreign);
- 2) Regional (sub-national) and national: activities related to networking, training, research and policy dialogue, working with national and international NGOs, women's organisations, and networks on pastoralism-related issues, including livestock marketing;
- 3) International: advocacy activities, working with international civil-society organisations (CSOs) and networks to develop policies and laws supportive of marginalised people, including IPs.

As can be seen in Table 3, in the entire Cordaid portfolio over the entire period 2003-08, 75% of the partners were intermediary organisations and only 7% were grassroots organisations. Table 4 shows that, out of the projects that Cordaid supported, 69% were designed to address poverty alleviation directly and less than half focused on rights issues. It also reveals that Cordaid gave less emphasis to working with networks or umbrella organisations than did ICCO or Hivos.

Table 3: Types of partner organisations in period 2003-08 according to continent by CFA

Area	Grassroots organisation			Intermediary organisation			Network / Umbrella organisation			Service organisation			Own project of CFA		
	Cordaid	Hivos	ICCO	Cordaid	Hivos	ICCO	Cordaid	Hivos	ICCO	Cordaid	Hivos	ICCO	Cordaid	Hivos	ICCO
CFA															
Africa	11%	0	0	67%	60%	100%	8%	0	0	6%	40%	0	8%	0	0
Asia	2%	20%	9%	75%	15.5%	78%	10%	29%	12%	13%	35.5%	1%	0	0	0
Europe	28.5%	0	0	43%	0	36%	28.5%	0	57%	0	0	7%	0	0	0
Latin America	2.5%	19.5%	5%	95%	46%	78%	0	22%	13%	2.5%	12.5%	2%	0	0	2%
Global	0	0	0	100%	0	67%	0	0	33%	0	90%	0	0	10%	0
Overall	7%	17.5%	6.5%	75%	34%	75%	8%	22%	16%	7%	26%	2%	3%	0.5%	0.5%

Source: Cordaid, Hivos and ICCO project databases; data include double counting of partners, as one partner may implement several projects. For example, ICCO supported a total of 111 partners implementing 262 projects.

3.1.2 Hivos

IP-related policies and policy changes. In line with its human rights policy (Collier 2002), Hivos supported IPOs directly or indirectly in their struggles to claim rights to land and natural resources (referred to as “territory”), to participate and be represented in public affairs and to access relevant information. In these support activities, Hivos explicitly used the ILO C 169 and DRIP, as well as national laws on IPs’ rights, as reference points. In an internal policy paper (van der Schoot & Rochna 2007), Hivos adopted a critical and pragmatic attitude toward directly supporting IPOs, because of problems regarding their compliance with the CFA’s accountability and reporting criteria. In the same document, Hivos reiterates its preference for working with modernising tendencies within the IP movement (as opposed to traditionalist currents) in striving for the emancipation of IPs in the wider society and, at the same time, for emancipation of marginalised groups within IPs (referring mainly to women’s rights)⁴. The overall goal in working with IPs has been to support them in reducing their marginalisation and in becoming an active part of civil society, so as to improve the functioning of democracy in multicultural societies.

Intervention strategies. Throughout the 2003-08 period, Hivos consistently focused on strengthening IPOs and their leadership (in Latin America, particularly around the issue of natural resource management in recognised indigenous territories) and on advocacy for better laws and policies toward IPs (in Bolivia, also advocacy for insertion of IPs’ rights into the new political Constitution) and for their implementation. Other important areas of intervention consisted of strengthening indigenous producer groups and increasing their access to markets and credit, and - specifically in the Amazon lowlands - improving the sustainable exploitation of timber and non-timber forest products. Attention was given to the rights of indigenous women by mainstreaming gender equality in the work of its mixed-gender partners, as well as through directly supporting both exclusively indigenous and not exclusively indigenous women’s organisations.

⁴ Already in the Hivos working paper on Adivasi (Surenda et al 2004), it is stated that “recognizing the importance of viewing community [i.e. collective] rights as part of human rights, Hivos realizes that in terms of indigenous peoples it is necessary to look at not only individual but also their collective rights” (p2) ... Hivos also recognises that, within movements of indigenous people, there is sometimes a tendency to romanticize both themselves and the issues relating to them. It is therefore important to take cognizance of the fact that hierarchical relations and relations of inequality, including relations based on gender, exist both within and between indigenous communities, and that these realities must be taken into consideration in supporting movements of indigenous people” (p3). Likewise, in its work with IPs in Latin America, Hivos has sought to link up with “modernizing tendencies ... from a feminist perspective” (Schoot & Rochna 2007).

Levels of intervention and types of partner. In order to reduce the marginalisation of IPs, Hivos' worked on different levels with different types of organisations:

- 1) Grassroots: activities related to civil society-building, poverty alleviation, forest use and management, and indigenous participation in local development planning; working mainly through intermediary NGOs and, in some countries, directly with IPOs (e.g. in Guatemala);
- 2) Regional and national: activities relating to indigenous participation in advocacy and policy dialogue (including constitutional reform in Bolivia), mentoring indigenous representatives in official positions and increasing the participation of indigenous women; working with national indigenous and non-indigenous platforms and CSOs, including women's organisations;
- 3) International: advocacy activities through the support of international service organisations and networks promoting human and IPs' rights, one of which - International Indigenous Women's Forum - is an internationally operating IPO.

In Bolivia, Hivos has long experience in collaborating with partners that work from the perspective of IPs' collective rights. More recently, it increased collaboration with such partners in Guatemala. As shown in Table 3, in its overall portfolio during the period 2003-08, Hivos has worked with a fairly balanced array of different types of partner organisations: 34% intermediary, 22% networks, 26% service and almost 18% grassroots. The partners take a much more pronounced lobbying approach (88% of all projects) than in the case of the partners and projects of Cordaid and ICCO.

Table 4: Type of intervention / approach taken by CFAs in IP-related projects in 2003-08 according to continent

Continent	Type of intervention / approach					
	Direct poverty alleviation			Rights focus (policy lobbying / dialogue)		
CFA	Cordaid	Hivos	ICCO	Cordaid	Hivos	ICCO
Africa	74%	80%	100%	35%	80%	40%
Asia	63%	69%	54%	60%	89%	56%
Europe	57%	0%	71%	71%	0%	71%
Latin America	72%	54%	60%	41%	86%	73%
Worldwide	0	0%	0%	66%	100%	100%
Overall	69%	56%	57%	45%	88%	53%

Source: Project descriptions in Cordaid, Hivos and ICCO databases; because some projects were described as combining both types of intervention / approach and are counted double in the percentages of the total number of projects, the percentages per continent add up to more than 100%.

3.1.3 ICCO

IP-related policies and policy changes. ICCO recognises that poverty alleviation can be sustainable only if the different dimensions and the root causes of poverty are addressed. In 2001, three major themes - Access to Basic Services (AtBS), Fair Sustainable Economic Development (FSED) and Democratisation and Peacebuilding (D&P) - were identified and gradually embedded in the organisational structure. Until 2006, ICCO was structured around regional programmes: Latin America, Asia, Africa and Worldwide. Multi-annual programme strategies were developed based on country context analysis, and strategic choices were aligned to the three major themes. By 2007, ICCO had a matrix structure along the major themes with sub-units responsible for specific geographic areas to allow for regional/country context-specific programmes within the overall themes.

In its policies developed around 2002, ICCO emphasised that certain highly marginalised groups, including IPs, deserve particular attention. Of the regional programmes, the ones in Asia-Oceania and Eastern Europe most explicitly focused on IPs. Of the thematic programmes, D&P had initially included IPs as a particular target group, more so than the other thematic programmes. D&P took a general stance on promoting and ensuring individual economic, social and cultural rights, without referring to IP-specific rights. After a restructuring process, ICCO became organised in thematic programmes and themes were reprioritised. As a consequence, the specific targets and objectives set in relation to IPs, e.g. in D&P and the India country policy, were not operationalised. From 2007 onwards, the thematic priorities overtook considerations of giving particular attention to certain groups, such as IPs.

Intervention strategies. During the period 2003-06, ICCO operationalised its focus on rights issues by allocating more resources to the themes of FSED and D&P and reducing resources for AtBS. AtBS became more focused on claiming and securing rights to basic services rather than supporting direct service delivery. It gave priority to programmes that combined basic services with strengthening local people's capacities to claim their economic, social and cultural rights as citizens. ICCO saw its main role in supporting direct poverty alleviation, capacity building of CSOs to work on rights issues, facilitating and supporting networks and knowledge exchange, and engaging in policy dialogue. Raising awareness of and empowering IPs to claim these rights and addressing conflict around access to and control over land and natural resources were important elements of the D&P programme. The FSED-Asia-Oceania and Eastern Europe programmes focused on local market development and international market access, including livelihoods issues in general and rights issues related to markets, in order to address the constraints to IPs' participation in markets. In Latin America, the emphasis was primarily on environmental rights, i.e. securing collective rights to natural resources and supporting local and national-level lobbying and networking activities around collective rights to natural resources and land.

Levels of intervention and types of partner. By adopting a rights-focus from 2003 onwards, ICCO aimed to work in a more process-oriented way, involving a wider range of actors from CSOs, academia, the public and the corporate sector. Networking, learning and lobbying at national, regional and international level were given a more prominent place. In addressing issues of structural injustice, ICCO worked on different levels with different types of organisations:

- 1) Grassroots: activities related to poverty alleviation, civil-society self-organisation and local-level policy dialogue, working with local NGOs and CBOs supported by intermediary NGOs (local and national, of which some faith-based)
- 2) Regional (sub-national) / national: activities related to networking, training, research and policy dialogue, working with national NGOs and IPO networks in Asia, Latin America and Europe
- 3) International: support to several international CSOs and networks seeking to influence policy on general IP-related issues at international level, including the UN.

In its overall portfolio in the period 2003-08, three quarters of ICCO's partners were intermediary organisations (see Table 3). About half of the projects supported had an explicit rights focus, with much more attention to this in Latin America than in Asia or Africa (see Table 4). In India, ICCO worked mainly with national and local intermediary NGOs operating at grassroots level, focusing on community development and poverty alleviation with an integrated rights component in the sense that they sought to develop and strengthen the capacity of grassroots organisations to claim their social, economic and cultural rights and to work toward their own development. Support to networking, research and policy dialogue at the national and international level - including one IPO network organisation - was less

prominent, but included some interesting international initiatives in lobbying for recognition of IPs' rights and developing legislation in support of marginalised people, including landless farmers and IPs.

Table 5: Comparison of major features of CFA policies and strategies in their work with IPs

CFA	Cordaid / Africa	Hivos / Latin America	ICCO / Asia
Policy:			
Focus on IPs	Not explicit; IPs as part of "identity-based groups", "marginalised minorities"	Explicit, "modernising tendencies in the indigenous movement"	Not explicit; IPs part of thematic programmes (FSED, AtBS and D&P)
References to international IPs' rights instruments (ILO C169, DRIP)	None	Yes, to both explicitly	In non-official policy document: 'Guidelines on Indigenous Peoples', reference to ILO C169 and draft DRIP
Types of rights promoted	Human, civic, women's, constitutional (e.g. rights to land use)	IPs' collective rights, individual economic, social and cultural rights	Human and constitutional (rights to land and forest resources, access to market)
Attention to indigenous women's issues	Explicit and, since 2007, central to its pastoralist development policy	Explicit, prominent crosscutting issue	Not explicit on indigenous women as such; more women's issues in general
Intervention strategies:			
Main thrusts	2003–06: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct alleviation of poverty • Strengthening civil society • Influencing policy 2007–10: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building alliances • Strengthening pastoralist voice to advocate on own behalf • Strengthening research and policy-influencing organisations 	2002–09 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening indigenous organisations • Advocacy for better laws and policies • Increasing access to markets and credit • Sustainable exploitation forest products • Supporting indigenous women's rights 	2003–08: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct alleviation of poverty • Strengthening civil society • Influencing policy through three major thematic themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair and Sustainable Economic Development (FSED) • Democratisation and Peacebuilding (D&P) • Access to Basic Services (AtBS)
Level(s) of intervention (in order of priority)	1) Local (alleviating poverty, strengthening civil society) 2) National (influencing policy) 3) International (influencing policy)	1) Local (strengthening civil society, alleviating poverty) 2) National (influencing policy) 3) International (advocacy for human and IPs' rights)	1) Local (alleviating poverty, strengthening civil society) 2) National (influencing policy, level of engagement varies across countries) 3) International (influencing policy)
Types of partners	Local CBOs and NGOs (grassroots) Intermediary NGOs, national and foreign Decreasing number Church-affiliated Networks of CSOs Research and training institutes International CSOs and networks	Indigenous CBOs National indigenous organisations Intermediary NGOs Networks of CSOs (Indigenous) women's organisations Research institutes (Bolivia)	Local NGOs (grassroots) Intermediary NGOs (national) Decreasing number Church-affiliated Networks of CSOs (national/international) Research and training institutes

Source: Assessment by evaluation team on basis of CFAs' policy and programme documents and project databases

3.2 Comparative analysis of explicit and implicit policies

This section is based on a comparison and assessment by the core team according to major IP-related issues highlighted in the ToRs. It examines the extent to which the CFAs' policies give attention to these issues. Sources of information are the CFA policy documents (see Annex 4), interviews with CFA staff, findings from the inception report and findings from the case studies, which revealed some of the implicit (i.e. practised) policies. An overview of the major features of CFA policies and intervention strategies in their work with IPs is presented in Table 5.

3.2.1 Attention to individual and collective rights of IPs

In comparison to Cordaid in Africa and ICCO in Asia, Hivos in Latin America has given more explicit attention to IPs' rights, particularly to their collective rights to land and other resources and to their representation and participation as IPs in decision-making processes. Hivos sought to strengthen capacities of IPOs to influence decision-making on policy and legislation and to realise implementation of their collective rights. This emphasis is largely due to the visibility and strength of the IP movement in Latin America where, in several countries, IPs make up a considerable part of the population yet have historically been marginalised and politically excluded by the dominant society. Also ICCO gives more explicit attention to IP issues on this continent than in Africa or Asia. According to headquarters staff, Cordaid started to do so with its new strategy in 2007, although for most of the period 2003-08 it gave much less attention to rights-based work in Latin America than did Hivos or ICCO (see Table 4). To some extent, the political context influences the way that CFAs work in the different continents.

It is more politically sensitive for CSOs to bring up the subject of IPs' rights in many countries of Africa and Asia. The particular peoples that were the focus of the case studies on these continents are minorities within the nation as a whole, alongside numerous other minorities, while the dominant majority groups regard themselves as being just as indigenous as the minorities. Some minorities may be more discriminated than others, mainly for their lifestyle, such as hunter-gatherers and pastoralists, but many African and Asian governments are reluctant to recognise this, possibly because granting certain groups special rights as IPs living among other, equally poor and marginalised groups could create inter-ethnic conflict but probably also because granting such rights would affect the power base of dominant groups and decrease their control over exploitation of resources. In some cases, partner NGOs have deliberately chosen not to stress the "IP" aspect in their policy-advocacy work, because their main aim is to reduce marginalisation and poverty, regardless of whether the groups regard themselves as IPs or not. In Africa and Asia, the CFAs have not pushed the "IP agenda" onto their partners but have been supportive if partners are interested in informing themselves about IP issues, e.g. through participation in international meetings on the topic. However, in some cases, it can be a strategic choice of a CFA not to be overly explicit in supporting IP-related work, because they do not want to jeopardise other programme activities in the same country by upsetting the government.

In Kenya, there is more openness to discuss IP issues than in Ethiopia, but these issues are not high on the agenda of most NGOs working on pastoralist development in both countries. Access to land and other natural resources as a means to secure their livelihoods is a major concern. This is argued primarily on the basis of constitutional or legal rights in Ethiopia and economic, social and cultural rights of minority groups in Kenya, rather than referring specifically to IPs' rights. For example, in the process of constitutional reform in Kenya, policy-influencing NGOs deliberately decided not to refer to "IPs" but rather to "marginalised people" in order to be more readily accepted by the other stakeholders and thus to have more effective influence on the outcomes of the policy dialogue.

In India as in Africa, the key issue is access to land and other resources to be able to secure a means of livelihood. To achieve this, ICCO's partners use arguments related to human rights and the legal instruments for (individual) citizens of the countries, rather than referring to the special, collective rights of indigenous and tribal peoples (groups) that are designed to safeguard the lifestyles, identities and cultures of identity-based groups within the larger society.

In line with the policies outlined above, interventions by Hivos in civil-society strengthening have explicitly involved working on indigenous identity politics (strengthening IPOs and indigenous CBOs, supporting IP movements), land rights and territorial management, and indigenous women's rights. In contrast, Cordaid and ICCO have focused more on livelihoods and social empowerment. Cordaid has supported the formation of CBOs and NGOs of local people and networks of CSO/NGOs. Likewise, ICCO has supported CBOs to organise themselves, but not specifically as part of an IP movement. Some of these CBOs may have joined IP campaigns to advocate for certain rights such as to land or forest use.

3.2.2 Attention to issues of marginalisation

Cordaid has long been working with groups that are marginalised by the dominant society. Throughout the period under study, it sought to improve the social, cultural and political situation of IBGs or "ethnic minorities", defined as groups that can be distinguished by their culture, ethnicity and/or religion and are discriminated and marginalised because of it. Cordaid identified marginalisation as the key challenge of pastoralists, whose recognition and development have been impeded by inappropriate policy and interventions by the State. Cordaid's policies are in the spirit of supporting marginalised and discriminated peoples, whether indigenous or not.

Since its early existence, Hivos has been working with IPs, particularly in Latin America and Asia. IPs are explicitly mentioned in its 2002 human rights policy, and are considered as part of the larger group of disadvantaged people to which Hivos gives particular attention: "women, minority groups and people marginalized on the basis of race, class, caste, sexual orientation, ethnicity, religion, or because they are stigmatized for having HIV/AIDS" (Hivos 2004b). Reducing marginalisation has always been central to Hivos' work.

Within its overall mandate of working toward a fair world for all, ICCO has a long history of working with and supporting indigenous and grassroots movements, especially in Latin America. Although ICCO never had a specific target group approach, its policies certainly emphasised that particular groups of people are highly marginalised because of cultural and political factors and therefore deserved particular attention.

3.2.3 Attention to issues of self-determination

Since 2003, Cordaid explicitly supported marginalised groups' self-determination and autonomy, but it is not clear whether it was using these terms with a full awareness of their specific meaning within the international debate on IPs. In Cordaid usage, they appear to be more closely related to securing marginalised groups' rights to make decisions about natural resource use and to have access to basic services (Cordaid 2006a). The emphasis is on helping them to gain political, social and legal recognition and to press for implementation of the rights due to them as citizens. In its pastoralist policy paper, the concept of "self-determination" is equated with pastoralists advocating on their own behalf (Espinoza Rocca & Barmantlo 2008).

In its internal *Guidelines on Indigenous Peoples* (ICCO 2002a), ICCO adopted the definition of IPs as formulated in ILO C 169. The India country strategy for 2006-10 states that *Adivasi* should be able to live on their own terms with their own indigenous authority structures. ICCO has a clear preference for the principle of collective self-determination above the concept of "autonomy", as the latter is often equated with separation movements.

Following humanist principles, Hivos strongly emphasises individual human rights, democratic decision-making and principles of individual self-determination. This creates potential tension in its relations with indigenous organisations and movements that seek collective rights to self-determination. Nevertheless, in its work in Latin America and less explicitly also in India and Indonesia, Hivos and its partner organisations have critically supported advocacy for the collective rights of IPs, more so than did Cordaid in eastern Africa or ICCO in India. In Latin America, also ICCO supported the assertion of IPs' collective rights, in particular to natural resources and land; and Cordaid did so, e.g. in Nigeria and Guatemala (collective right to prior consultation in the context of oil or mineral exploitation; van de Sandt 2009).

Globally, all three CFAs have given relatively little attention to advocating for IPs' rights⁵. During the period 2003-08, Cordaid and ICCO and their partners addressed policy influence mainly at the local level, focusing on basic human and citizens' rights, such as to education or employment, women's rights, *Adivasi* rights to forest resources for their livelihoods, and making local people aware about elections and their right to be represented. Hivos has had a more marked focus on advocacy for IPs' rights, not only in Latin America but also in other parts of the world, e.g. India.

3.2.4 Attention to poverty alleviation among IPs

In Ethiopia and Kenya, Cordaid takes a two-pronged approach, with some (local-level) partners focusing on direct poverty alleviation combined with local organisation development, and other (national-level) partners focusing on influencing policy to make the framework conditions more conducive for pastoralist development, thus contributing indirectly to poverty alleviation.

In India, ICCO's main focus is on poverty alleviation, with considerable attention to civil-society strengthening by working through self-help groups (SHGs) and helping them federate into CBOs and by raising their awareness of their economic and social rights.

In Guatemala and Bolivia, Hivos has given less attention to direct poverty alleviation than have Cordaid in eastern Africa and ICCO in India, and has focused this work on promoting self-organisation of producer groups and facilitating their access to market and to credit. In the Bolivian lowlands, promoting economic activities is not primarily a strategy to alleviate poverty but rather to defend the indigenous territories, so that the land will not be claimed by external economic actors or assigned to settlers from the highlands. In Guatemala, the poverty situation has become worse because of economic deregulation, land scarcity, environmental degradation and adverse climatic conditions. Here, Hivos has given greater attention to poverty alleviation both directly and indirectly through policy influencing on issues related to land reform, food sovereignty and integrated rural development (i.e. removing structural barriers to increasing IPs' living standards).

3.2.5 Attention to issues of indigenous women

In its policy related to IBGs, Cordaid has paid explicit attention to addressing the double discrimination of women who belong to a disadvantaged cultural group. The foremost component of its pastoralist development strategy in eastern Africa is "Increasing the

5) However, in the case of Cordaid, this is gaining in importance in the context of the recently started CELEP network of European organisations, outside of the time scope of the current study.

participation and voice of pastoralist women within their own pastoralist society and within larger society.” The attention to empowering women became more apparent in partners’ proposals and activities over the period 2003-08. From 2005 onwards, Cordaid gave attention to gender issues not only in development interventions but also within the partner NGOs. From 2007 onwards, it started giving direct support to pastoralist women’s organisations.

Hivos has the explicit goal of emancipation of indigenous women within the IP movement in both Bolivia and Guatemala. It seeks women’s empowerment in five interrelated dimensions: material wellbeing, access to resources and opportunities, self-esteem and equal rights, participation and decision-making, control over resources and benefits and (individual) self-determination.

ICCO’s gender policy paper states that specific attention should be paid to gender issues when trying to improve women’s (individual) self-determination about their livelihoods, including reproductive rights, income security and access to basic services and decision-making processes at household, community and government level. It also states that ICCO partners are to adopt a gender approach in their work to improve the rights and position of women, i.e. to make progress toward women’s self-reliance, empowerment and access to services. The focus on indigenous women as such is less explicit in ICCO’s policies and strategies, but the partners in the field often chose women and women’s groups as entry points for their work.

3.3 Assessment of CFA policies

3.3.1 Relevance of CFA policies and their reflection of international debate on IPs

Although Cordaid policy has not explicitly focused on IPs, in its policy for work with IBGs, it deals with many of the key issues facing IPs. Reducing marginalisation and discrimination has been central to its policy, regardless of whether the people concerned are indigenous or not. In its attention to issues of structural injustice, Cordaid has been concerned mainly with the human and constitutional rights of IBGs as individuals and - especially among pastoralists - as groups. Over the period 2003-08, its work in eastern Africa focused increasingly on addressing the root causes for the marginalisation of pastoralists by closing the knowledge gap about pastoralism and strengthening the organisational capacities and confidence of pastoralists - especially women - to speak on their own behalf. This corresponds well with progressive discourse on promising approaches to pastoralist development, in view of past experience by numerous national and international agencies (e.g. IIED & SOS-Sahel 2010, Davies *et al* 2010). In its policy and strategy documents, there is little mention of IP-related debates and international legal standards. In practice, however, Cordaid has made strategic use of international IP-related agreements and legislation where these could help to further the cause of the groups supported. Moreover, its support to community-based workers in human and animal healthcare is an attempt to integrate traditional and “modern” health systems and its continued attention to pastoralists’ indigenous knowledge and institutions is in line with current international debate on development and culture.

Hivos’ general policy and its sectoral policy on human rights (Collier 2002) are highly relevant for addressing structural injustice faced by IPs. Its ultimate goal is to contribute to a more democratic pluriform society in which all people can participate in decision-making processes that affect their lives; this coincides largely with the ambition of IPs to control development of their distinctive cultures, including their use of land and natural resources, while effectively

engaging with larger social and political structures (Anaya 1996). In its human rights policy, Hivos took account of ongoing debates around international legal standards on IPs' rights, specifically ILO C169 and the draft UN DRIP. In sectoral policies and internal policy memos, it articulated tentative guidelines for working with IPs, focused on work in Latin America and India. In Guatemala, where there is an urgent need for structural change, Hivos' strong focus on rights and policy influence was very appropriate. In the Bolivian lowlands, the focus in advocating for IPs' rights was primarily on land and natural resources, which are of high priority to local communities; nationally, the focus has also increasingly been on the rights of IPs and indigenous women, which is relevant in view of the prevailing discriminatory policies and political processes. However, after the recent constitutional recognition of IPs' right to autonomy in Bolivia, Hivos' policy may need re-analysis.

ICCO's explicit policy has a strong focus on ensuring economic, social and cultural rights of people as individuals, not on collective rights of IPs. In its documents, reference is rarely made to IPs' rights or to international conventions related to IPs. However, ICCO's internal *Guidelines on Indigenous Peoples* (ICCO 2002a) are well aligned with the international debate at the time the guidelines were formulated, recognising key issues such as self-determination, identity and worldviews. ICCO's emphasis on a thematic approach seems to have led to less explicit attention to IPs than would have been possible with an approach based on target groups or areas. With regard to India, ICCO's initial country strategy for 2006-10 and parts of the D&P thematic policy, as well as the above-mentioned guidelines, are highly relevant for addressing structural injustice to IPs. The guidelines, which focused specifically on IPs' rights, were not fully operationalised in the way originally intended, on account of ICCO's restructuring and change in thematic priorities to more general issues of poverty alleviation and civil-society strengthening. Nevertheless, in practice, attempts were made in some cases to integrate some key IP-related issues into the thematic approach, as is evident in some of the work with *Adivasi* in India in 2003-08.

In the CFAs' implicit and explicit policies and approaches towards IPs (Cordaid 2003, Hivos 2002, ICCO 2002a), there is little or no mention of several issues that emerged in subsequent years in the international debate on the collective rights of IPs. Most notably, these are: the right of IPs (and ethnic minorities) to free, prior and informed consent (prior consultation); development with culture and identity or self-determined development; and indigenous knowledge and intellectual property. These issues, which are intimately related to IPs' survival struggles and strategies for achieving self-determination as distinct peoples, were discussed by IPs' representatives and experts during international workshops and dialogues held under the auspices of UN agencies (e.g. UNPFII 2005) and were translated into toolkits and guidelines (e.g. UNDG 2008; UNPFII 2008; see also Tebtebba 2008). The CFA policies were formulated early in the 2000s, when these debates were still being developed. During the period 2003-08, several interventions supported by the CFAs, such as support to indigenous communities defending their interests in the face of large-scale mining operations (Hivos) or encouraging traditional cultural institutions that reinforce indigenous communities' sense of identity (Cordaid) do reflect a readiness to protect indigenous livelihoods and cultures and to seek culturally appropriate ways to support development "from within" (self-determined development). However, these experiences and their underlying principles and concepts were not translated into written policies and strategies for working with IPs. Had this been the case, these crucial issues for IPs might have more consistently informed the work of the CFAs and their partners. In the future, reflection within the CFAs, as well as with partners and beneficiaries, would bring their policies in line with the international debates on these issues and would clarify their paths towards reducing structural injustice of IPs in the countries where they operate⁶.

CFAs action not well-informed by the international debate on IPs

An example of CFAs dealing with important IP issues without being aware of or in tune with relevant international debates comes from Guatemala, where all three CFAs were involved in the Mam people's resistance to large-scale mining in the San Marcos Department in the western highlands. Cordaid supported a Diocese-affiliated organisation, ICCO supported a farmer organisation and Hivos supported an environmental NGO. All three organisations initially dealt with the issue as an environmental one - not as a problem of violation of collective land rights, let alone autonomy or self-determination, which was how the IPs involved saw it. The CFAs were willing to support partners in organising meetings where the Mam could publicly express their resistance to mining. These were called community consultations, confusing this with prior consultation. None of the CFAs knew exactly what prior consultation entails: what are the criteria, standards, minimal requirements etc. Among the IPs, high expectations were created through the consultations, but these were declared invalid by the Government. The IPs did not have alternative defence strategies. It did not occur to the CFAs or their partners to claim collective land rights and to make a case out of violation of such rights. The CFA-supported work could have been much more effective, making use of the political capital inherent in the international debates, had the CFAs had a more clearly defined strategy for working with IPs.

Source: van de Sandt 2009.

Thus, in summary, during the period 2003-08, two of the three CFAs did not have a formal policy regarding IPs, but the policies of all three did give specific attention to ethnic minorities and addressed issues relevant for IPs: decreasing marginalisation and discrimination and increasing self-determination and inclusion in development. Cordaid and ICCO gave little attention to the issue of securing the collective rights of these minorities according to the DRIP, e.g. collective rights to customary territory and collective self-determination as peoples. Hivos was more explicit in its policy regarding these rights. By the end of the period under study, additional issues had emerged in the international debate on IPs' rights, e.g. prior consultation, linking development with culture, and indigenous knowledge and intellectual property. These crucial issues for IPs were not reflected in the policies of the three CFAs up to and including 2008.

3.3.2 Alignment of partner selection and interventions with the CFA policies

Over the period 2003-08, Cordaid gradually adjusted its partnerships and interventions to align with its changed policy designed to address the root causes of poverty rather than only its symptoms. Especially with the start of the programmatic approach in 2007, Cordaid chose to work with more organisations involved in advocacy for the interests of marginalised groups. In the continued work related to direct poverty alleviation, it selected (or retained) partners that, at the same time, gave attention to building local organisational capacities. In eastern Africa, it identified new relevant partners for its pastoralist development programme and encouraged some of its existing partners to give more attention to advocating for pastoralists' rights and strengthening pastoralists' capacity to influence decision-making at grassroots, national and international level. The focus on the pastoralist women's strategic needs became stronger. Several partners working at grassroots level carried out activities to strengthen women's economic and sociopolitical status through self-organisation and income generation. Two pastoralist women's organisations in Kenya were funded directly. However, some partner organisations working on national and international policy issues did not give explicit attention to gender issues. Together with other development-support organisations, Cordaid has made considerable efforts on national and international level to lobby for policies and legislation favourable for marginalised people, particularly pastoralists. However, in its interventions, it gave insufficient weight to strengthening the capacities of pastoralists at local

6) For more information, see <http://www.nciv.net/our-issues/millennium-development-goals/more-info>

level to secure access to natural resources, i.e. to help make existing government policies and laws work on the ground.

Despite the potential tension between its humanistic principles and IPs' collective rights to self-determination, Hivos has selected several partners that support indigenous movements as collectivities in particular areas and has given special attention to the emancipation of women and minorities within indigenous groups and territories. In Bolivia, it chose to work through intermediary NGOs to promote civil-society strengthening and IPs' participation in local development planning. In contrast, in Guatemala, where Hivos has a regional office with staff that could provide closer mentoring support, it worked directly with IPOs. It selected national-level partners capable of engaging in policy dialogue, including formulation of policy and law proposals. In recent years, it worked increasingly with women's organisations to support efforts to enhance the participation and voice of indigenous women. Together with other international organisations, Hivos has invested greatly in capacity building and organisational development of IPOs to improve their socio-economic situation and rights position. It has given high priority to the internal strengthening of its partner organisations; in most cases, it does not finance thematic or specific activities but rather works with its partners on organisational development and strategy.

ICCO's commitment to working on IP-related issues is reflected in the considerable funding it has allocated to partners at local, national and international level working on such issues. The most recent partners included in its portfolio in India deal explicitly with *Adivasi* issues and take a rights-based approach: one partner working at local level on land rights issues and one at national and international level doing research and lobbying on IP issues in Asia, including India. Most of ICCO's partners gave more attention to livelihoods and socio-economic empowerment, working through SHGs, than to securing access to land and other natural resources, i.e. to removing a major structural barrier to poverty alleviation. The importance of gender is highlighted in most of ICCO's policies and programme strategies, but attention to specific issues of *Adivasi* women is less explicitly reflected in the choice of partners and projects supported and the issues addressed. Several partners at the grassroots work mainly with women, both *Adivasi* and non-*Adivasi*, and two partners have an explicit focus on *Adivasi* women.

The comparative overview of the total actual expenditures per continent by the CFAs shown in Table 6 indicates the choices they made with regard to geographic foci in applying their strategies to address issues of indigenous and marginalised peoples⁷. According to the data provided by the CFAs, in the period 2003-08, ICCO spent €42 million on such projects, primarily in Asia (68%) and Latin America (22%). Over the same period, it is estimated that Cordaid spent almost €35 million, of which 45% went to Africa, 26% to Asia and 23% to Latin America. Of the almost €25 million that Hivos spent on IP-related projects, most went to Latin America (71%) and Asia (25%). Neither Hivos nor ICCO is heavily engaged in IP-related work in Africa.

⁷) This table also indicates the amount and percentages of total expenditure that came from MFS funds.

Table 6: Distribution of actual expenditure by CFAs on IP-related projects according to continent in the period 2003-08

CFA	Cordaid			Hivos			ICCO		
	MFS (% of total expenditure)	Non-MFS	Total	MFS (% of total expenditure)	Non-MFS	Total	MFS (% of total expenditure)	Non-MFS	Total
Continent									
Africa	14,778,200 (ca 95%)	777,800 (ca 5%)	15,556,000	640,578 (100%)	0	640,578	1,632,029 (97%)	50,000 (3%)	1,682,029
Asia	n.a.	n.a.	8,827,000	5,642,528 (97%)	151,447 (3%)	5,793,975	23,351,182 (81%)	5,652,775 (19%)	29,003,957
Europe	n.a.	n.a.	1,146,000	0	0	0	1,782,601 (88%)	237,000 (12%)	2,019,601
Latin America	n.a.	n.a.	8,158,000	16,087,211 (89%)	1,932,090 (11%)	18,019,301	7,984,471 (87%)	1,189,687 (13%)	9,174,158
Worldwide	n.a.	n.a.	1,107,000	319,000 (100%)	0	319,000	534,000 (100%)	0	534,000
Total	33,054,300 (ca 95%)	1,739,700 (ca 5%)	34,794,000	22,689,317 (92%)	2,083,537 (8%)	24,772,854	35,284,283 (83%)	7,129,462 (17%)	42,413,745
Case-study countries									
Bolivia				7,752,794 (91%)	762,753 (9%)	8,515,547			
Guatemala				4,379,678 (90%)	482,583 (10%)	4,862,261			
Ethiopia	2,890,950 (97%)	99,000 (3%)	2,989,950						
Kenya	3,409,178 (87%)	490,289 (13%)	3,899,467						
India							14,014,995 (75%)	4,809,556 (25%)	18,824,551

Source: Data provided by the CFAs; in the case of Cordaid, the study team received figures for actual expenditure only in selected countries in eastern Africa; the figures for Africa and Total given in this table are estimated by the study team, calculated on the basis of ca 90% of committed funds actually spent in eastern Africa, of which ca 95% came from MFS funds; otherwise, n.a. = not available.

4. Cordaid's contribution to change in the situation of pastoralists in Ethiopia and Kenya

For the review of its work with IPs, Cordaid requested a focus on pastoralists in eastern Africa. This chapter compiles the findings from two case studies made in Ethiopia and Kenya; more detailed information and full references can be found in Waters-Bayer & Getachew (2010) and Waters-Bayer & Wanyama (2010), respectively. In the case studies, views on changes in the situation of pastoralists and the contribution of Cordaid to the changes were sought from the endogenous ("insider") perspective, i.e. practising pastoralists and people from pastoralist ethnic groups working in local CSOs; and the exogenous ("outsider") perspective, i.e. non-pastoralists working with intermediary NGO partners of Cordaid and other actors in government and civil society engaged in pastoralist research and development. In the following, unless otherwise specified, "CFA partners" or "partner staff" refers to staff in both the organisation's headquarters and the field offices at the sites visited in Borana and South Omo in Ethiopia and in the Borana, Rendille, Samburu and Turkana areas of Kenya. Further sources of information were: a) project documents provided by Cordaid and partner staff; and b) publications and reports on pastoralism in eastern Africa, which were referred to prior to, during and after the fieldwork.

To place the findings in the wider context of pastoralism in eastern Africa, some basic data are given here. In Ethiopia, pastoralists make up 12-15% (MoFED 2006) of the population (a total of ca 80 million). They belong to 29 ethnic groups and use 55-60% of the country's area (which totals ca 1.1 million km²), mainly in the lowlands (FDRE 2009a). Over 80% of Ethiopian pastoralists are found in Afar and Somali Regions (Sandford & Yohannes 2000), whereas Cordaid focuses on pastoralist groups in Oromia (Borana Zone) and Southern Region (South Omo Zone). In Kenya, pastoralists make up ca 12% of the population (a total of ca 39 million; CIA 2010). They are among the ca 50 minority (including non-pastoralist) ethnic groups in Kenya, where the three dominant ethnic groups are the Kamba, Kikuyu and Luo (Makoloo 2005). According to FAO (2009), pastoralists in Kenya use about 80% of the country's area (total ca 580,000 km²), mainly in the arid and semiarid lands. According to the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA 2009), there are about 1.5 million pastoralists in Tanzania belonging for five ethnic groups, with the Maasai being the largest. Here, pastoralists make up 2-3% of the population in the country.

4.1 Change in the situation of pastoralists

4.1.1 How the situation of pastoralists has changed over the last ten years

RQ4: In what way did the position of the selected IPs change over the last 10 years concerning: political rights, land rights, livelihoods and rights of indigenous women?

In the case-study reports (Waters-Bayer & Getachew 2010, Waters-Bayer & Wanyama 2010), the endogenous and exogenous perspectives on change are presented in detail. In this synthesis report, their perceptions summarised and combined, but indicating differences in emphases.

Political rights

Political and institutional change in Ethiopia. In the political changes after revolutionary forces overthrew the communist regime in 1991, the policy framework for pastoralists in Ethiopia became more favourable. The current Constitution (FDRE 1994) recognises each ethnic group as a “nationality” with rights to self-determination: to speak and develop its own language; to express and preserve its own identity, culture and history; to govern itself; and to secede from the federation. Special recognition is given to pastoralists, e.g., Article 40.5 states that “*Ethiopian pastoralists have the right to free land for grazing and cultivation as well as the right not to be displaced from their own lands.*” Administratively, the country is divided into states and districts defined primarily along ethnic lines, in a form of regional ethnic autonomy. Decentralisation of government administration is supposed to increase democratisation of decision-making and self-governance. Policy change laid down in the Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty (PASDEP; MoFED 2006) includes a chapter on pastoralists. It recognises their “unique lifestyle and needs” and proposes various livelihood-related and service-delivery interventions designed for pastoralists, with a long-term vision of voluntary settlement.

Several government institutional changes since 2003 gave opportunities for pastoralist development and voice: the creation of the Pastoral Affairs Standing Committee (PASC), the launching of the 15-year Pastoral Community Development Project (PCDP) co-funded by the World Bank, the setting up of Regional Pastoral Commissions and the establishment of the Institute of Pastoral and Agropastoral Studies (IPAS) at Haramaya University and of pastoral and agropastoral research centres in Oromia, Afar and Somali Regions. The Government of Ethiopia (GoE) started programmes to expand healthcare and education in pastoralist areas and positively discriminate pastoralist children for entry into institutions of higher learning (FDRE 2009a).

Political and institutional change in Kenya. Since the 1980s, several ethnic pastoralist individuals held leading positions in government but, according to both pastoralists and resource persons, little changed for practising pastoralists in rural areas. The 1990s brought an improved climate for policy advocacy through the re-establishment of the multiparty system. From the mid-90s onwards, growing interest in and support to pastoralist development was reflected in the creation of the Kenya Pastoralist Forum and Pastoralist Parliamentary Group and the launching of the Arid Lands Resource Management Project (ALRMP) co-funded by the World Bank. In 2000, the Institute of Development Studies, with funds from the UK Department for International Development (DFID), helped set up the Pastoralist Thematic Group (PTG), made up of national-level advocates for pastoralists. The PTG managed to integrate pastoralist issues into a revised version of Kenya’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP; Hughes 2005). However, this was watered down when the new government elected in 2002 introduced its Economic Recovery Strategy Paper for Wealth and Employment Creation 2003-2007 (Republic of Kenya 2004). In 2006, the National Rainbow Coalition ushered in renewed support for pastoralist development, including revival of the Kenya Meat Commission in that year and establishment of a Ministry for Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands, led by an ethnic pastoralist, in 2008. The process of reviewing the Constitution, started in 2001, gained momentum after the political violence in December 2007; the regionalisation proposed in the draft Constitution (CECR 2009) should lead to more self-determination by minorities.

Government stance regarding IPs. The attitude of the GoE and GoK to the rights of pastoralists as IPs has been ambivalent. The Ethiopian Constitution of 1994 recognises the rights of the numerous ethnic groups in the country - including pastoralists - for self-

government. Ethnically based administrative units were created, but there are no provisions to protect minorities that live outside their own designated ethnic areas. Neither Ethiopia nor Kenya ratified the ILO C169 of 1989, and both countries abstained in the vote on the DRIP in 2007. Although the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR & IWGIA 2006) classifies pastoralists as IPs, this term was deliberately avoided in the Draft Harmonized Constitution of Kenya (CECR 2009), which refers instead to "marginalized communities". It affirms their rights to be integrated into the social and economic life of Kenya. It does not grant them any special status as IPs.

Insiders' and outsiders' perceptions of change. In Ethiopia, both insiders and outsiders pointed to the improved image of pastoralists, who are now known in Amharic, the national language, as *arbetua ader* (livestock producers) instead of *zelan* (aimless wanderers). They noted that pastoralists have more opportunity to express their views about local development in the decentralised regions and districts, but still have little say about Government control over communal land. Resource persons and NGO staff stated that pastoralists now have a higher national profile through their Members of Parliament (MPs) and the PASC as well as the annual Ethiopian Pastoralist Day (EPD) celebrated since 1999. They discerned a stronger sense of identity, also among Western-educated pastoralists, who take pride in their traditions, music, dress and language. Pastoralists are also building up new forms of organisation, such as regional councils of elders, and have become more competent to negotiate with government and NGOs. However, resource persons and educated pastoralists were concerned that the majority of Ethiopian pastoralists still have relatively little awareness about their constitutional rights.

In Kenya, resource persons and NGO staff stated that the GoK has become more open to listen to pastoralists and is better informed about pastoralist issues, and that Kenyan pastoralists were more aware of their rights as citizens, more vocal about these than in the past and thus in a better position to negotiate with modern government authorities. Pastoralist men and women pointed to an increased degree of self-organisation and networking at community and regional level. Several ethnic pastoralists who were formerly employed by NGOs working in rural development are now in influential government positions. Also in Kenya, pastoralism has been well profiled through events such as the annual Kenya Pastoralists' Week (KPW) and other national meetings. However, the case-study team observed that national-level NGOs engaged in lobbying are poorly linked with practising pastoralists. Although there has been considerable success in bringing pastoralist issues into policy documents, including the National Land Policy, all interviewees reported a big gap between written policy and actual practice. On the other hand, the team observed that some local and regional initiatives by pastoralists and supporting NGOs had led to improvement in road infrastructure and to change in practised policy, e.g. in sharing local market taxes or in supporting community-based healthcare, even though this is not written policy or formalised in any other way.

According to both insiders and outsiders, most pastoralists in Ethiopia and Kenya do not regard themselves as IPs, nor do they see their political rights in these terms. However, there is greater awareness among pastoralist support organisations in Kenya about international IP instruments.

Natural resource rights

Policy change. According to pastoralists, CFA partners, resource persons and literature (e.g. Mohammed 2007, Eyasu 2008, Flintan 2009), the key problem for Ethiopian pastoralists is insecurity of land-use rights. Despite what is written in the Constitution, the national land policy does not recognise their rights to communal land: rights are vested in the State, which - according to the Land Use Proclamation of 2005 - can “convert communal rural land to private holdings”. In Oromia and Afar Regions, recently formulated land policies do refer to customary rights to communal land, but it is not clear how pastoralists can register them. In Kenya, the situation has become more promising. Originally, the Trust Land Act introduced by the colonial powers and retained after Independence had stipulated that local authorities held communal land in trust for pastoralists. With the Land Act of 1968, provisions were made for group registration of land for ranches; unfortunately, this was followed by further subdivision of pastoral land (KLA 2005, Lesorogol 2008, Lengoibonia et al 2009). However, in 2009, the National Land Policy (MoL 2007), which recognises the collective rights of minority groups to land, was passed by Parliament. Likewise, the Draft Harmonized Constitution released for public debate in November 2009 has proposed protection of collective rights to land (CECR 2009).

Insiders' and outsiders' perceptions of change. Both pastoralists and resource persons were concerned that pastoralists in Ethiopia cannot defend their constitutional collective rights to land and ensure recognition of customary land-use. The pasture and water available for pastoralism have been reduced as a result of expansion of commercial irrigated farming beside rivers flowing through the lowlands. Land has also been lost to bush encroachment, allocation of land to investors (e.g. for biofuel production) and establishment of national parks and wildlife reserves (see also Eyasu 2008 and Poole 2009). In addition, some richer pastoralists have enclosed grazing areas for exclusive use by their herds, reducing the amount of pasture available to poorer households. Pastoralists reported that the resulting restrictions in access to land and water obliged them to migrate longer distances into areas they had not used before and thus to come into conflict with other land users. A spark of hope was seen by both insiders and outsiders in a few cases of re-invigoration of customary institutions to regulate land-use, e.g. in Borana, in some cases upon local initiative (e.g. Homann et al 2008), in others with support of NGOs. Moreover, crossborder meetings of pastoralists facilitated by NGOs stimulated new ideas about managing natural resources, dealing with risk, accessing new markets and starting up ecotourism initiatives.

In Kenya, the recent change in land policy leading to recognition of common-property rights was described by resource persons and Cordaid's national-level NGO partners as an achievement of the pastoralist movement of committed advocates. However, many practising pastoralists in northern Kenya were not fully aware of the actual content of the new policies and laws related to land and water. Pastoralists in the Samburu area referred to an increase in the number of local grazing bylaws, leading to a greater necessity to negotiate with other pastoralist groups - even of the same clan - to gain temporary rights to access pasture and water. Both pastoralists and outsiders had noticed increasing encroachment on pastoralist areas by investors, conservancies, ranches, national parks, military camps and mining operations. The resulting reduction in pasture had led to impoverishment or forced migration. More firearms were used in livestock rustling, leading to more conflict and to higher animal and human losses. Resource persons also reported that increased insecurity led to concentration of people and herds in some areas and abandonment of other areas, which were then underutilised and reverted to bush. Also in Kenya, like in Ethiopia, resource persons mentioned some promising examples of local people reviving their land-management institutions (cf. Davies & Roba 2010); these initiatives could counteract the otherwise negative trends.

Although practising pastoralists generally showed little interest in stressing their distinctness as IPs, some of them and some intermediary NGOs - including Cordaid partners - have started to see the IP movement as a possible path for land-rights advocacy. In Ethiopia, it is to push for recognition of pastoralists' collective rights to land and water and to prevent land alienation and encroachment. In Kenya, it is to push for actual implementation of the new land policy that does recognise collective rights, but in practice the general trend in the country continues to go in the direction of privatisation. According to some national CFA partners, the political establishment is likely to thwart implementation of Kenya's new land policy.

Livelihoods

In Ethiopia, both pastoralist and non-pastoralist interviewees reported an improvement in delivery of basic social services and in infrastructure (healthcare, education, water supply, roads, markets, telecommunications), which had created better living conditions for pastoralists. They noted an increased involvement of pastoralist men and women in marketing livestock, livestock products and other commodities. Where conditions required or permitted it, pastoralist families had diversified their livestock holdings (more goats and camels) and were pursuing complementary sources of livelihood, such as rainfed cropping, small-scale irrigation, gardening, petty trading, producing honey and selling chat. Several resource persons reported that cattle production had declined; this was confirmed by research in Borana Zone (Kejela et al 2006, Ayana 2007). A problem mentioned by resource persons, NGOs and pastoralist men and women was the growing number of school dropouts (youth) who fitted into neither the pastoralist nor the "modern" society and often pursued illegal means of gaining a livelihood (e.g. making and selling charcoal).

Also in Kenya, pastoralist and non-pastoralist interviewees reported improved social services and infrastructure compared to 10-15 years ago, when only the Church offered some healthcare and education facilities. They stressed the great change brought about by mobile phones and mobile banking (M-Pesa). Pastoralists showed greater readiness to invest in foregoing their children's labour and sending them to school. This was reinforced by the GoK's re-introduction of free primary education. According to pastoralists and school authorities, enrolment of boys and especially girls has risen greatly in recent years. Pastoralists also showed more interest in adult education. The availability of decentralised development funds allowed local community members to influence decision-making about use of resources from the central government, and here the more literate - mainly men - had more influence. An increasing number of educated children of pastoralists were coming back to work in clinics, schools etc in their home area. However, both pastoralists and resource persons reported that youth who had dropped out of school were becoming a problem group. This was one reason why the most recent KPW focused on youth. Resource persons drew attention to the fact that development NGOs had contributed to building the capacities of young pastoralists after hiring them to work in local projects.

In Kenya like in Ethiopia, both pastoralists and non-pastoralists noted that families had started to keep more goats and camels, were more involved in markets than in the past and had diversified their sources of income (crops, vegetables, honey, petty trade). Nevertheless, external observers saw an overall decline in livestock production and in the natural resource base, and both pastoralists and non-pastoralists referred to an increase in human population and a decrease in the percentage and number of families practising pastoralism. Although the partners felt they had contributed to improving the livelihoods of the people with whom they worked directly, they and resource persons and pastoralists themselves felt that, on the whole, pastoralists had become less resilient to shocks and more dependent on food aid. Resource

persons pointed out that up-to-date data and analyses of the current situation of pastoralists are lacking. The same figures are repeated year after year by both Government and NGOs, but much must have changed that is not reflected in these “standard” statistics. There has been inadequate research into change and/or research findings have not been made readily available to policymakers and pastoralists.

Position of pastoralist women

In Ethiopia, both insiders and outsiders perceived marked changes in the situation of pastoralist women, who had gained a better economic position, primarily through more control over assets such as livestock and self-generated income. This gave them more influence in the family and community. Women now play a bigger role in managing community assets such as water-supply systems and grinding mills. However, some resource persons thought that women who had gained personal assets such as livestock could lose in terms of collective security: someone who attains individual wealth may be excluded from customary “safety nets”. Outsiders reported that pastoralist women, especially among the Boran, are more aware of women’s rights according to the Ethiopian Constitution and pointed out that - compared with Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda - Ethiopia has the highest number of pastoralist women elected as MPs (four).

Also in Kenya, insiders and outsiders perceived improvement in the economic and sociopolitical status of pastoralist women and attributed this to the same factors. Pastoralists themselves - both men and women - observed that women and girls had become more active in demanding their rights. This was linked with higher education and literacy rates among young women, some of whom had taken on work in the modern sector in towns and sent money and information back to their mothers. However, outsiders observed that pastoralist women had little influence in the women’s rights arena in Kenya to be able to bring in pastoralist-specific concerns, such as those associated with high mobility. At grassroots level, there are still few women in formal community decision-making bodies, and their influence is limited by weak leadership skills. According to resource persons, women in the traditional power structure often do not recognise the legitimacy of Western-educated (and often younger) women as their representatives. In urban areas, several ethnic pastoralist women have become government commissioners and MPs (usually nominated rather than elected), but they are generally not well linked with rural pastoralists.

In both countries, there is continued concern - mainly among outsiders - about changes that have not yet taken place to any appreciable extent: i) reducing violence committed by pastoralist men against pastoralist women; and ii) eradicating female genital cutting (see also Lolosoli & Kaunga 2009); here, it was felt that only the traditional leadership could bring about change.

4.1.2 Overall assessment of change in the situation of pastoralists

RQ5: Can these changes be assessed - and to what extent - as: a reduction of marginalisation of the IPs and a change in power, poverty, worldviews and values, an increase and strengthening of the political, economic, social and cultural self-determination and identity of the IPs? a reduction in marginalisation and inclusion in development processes considered positive by them? avoiding or mitigating of forced assimilation or integration?

In discussion with pastoralist groups in Ethiopia and Kenya, it became evident to the case-study teams that, when male and female pastoralists talked about “development”, they referred to change in their life style: having a fixed house instead of a temporary hut, using borehole water instead of surface water, going to a clinic instead of a traditional healer, using modern instead of traditional production technologies etc. During the brief field visits, it proved difficult to go beyond these conventional concepts they are accustomed to using when speaking with outsiders. Nevertheless, a few issues regarding other sides of development did arise later in some longer discussions with focus groups, such as their concern about culturally appropriate education and community-based healthcare. This section brings the assessment by the study team about change in lives and position of pastoralists, taking into consideration as much as possible their own assessment of positive and negative aspects of change.

Changing worldviews and values. In both countries, the worldviews and values of the pastoralists have changed through increased exposure to other cultures, above all through schooling, markets and improved telecommunication. The influence has been stronger in Kenya, where educational levels of pastoralists are higher and exposure to modern education has been longer than in Ethiopia. This has led to changes in pastoralists’ view of their own culture. The communities visited who were most concerned about the negative impacts of exposure to other cultures were the small ethnic groups in South Omo in southern Ethiopia. Nevertheless, among Western-educated pastoralists in both countries - also among people from these small groups - there is still a strong sense of identification with their ethnic groups and pride in belonging to them, as well as a conviction about the need for modern education.

Reduced marginalisation and somewhat greater inclusion but increased poverty. In both countries, the improvement in access to basic services has reduced the marginalisation experienced by the pastoralists with whom the case-study team met, compared with a low baseline 10-15 years ago. However, pastoralists further from roads, i.e. those not visited during this study, have probably not experienced the same reduction in marginalisation. Moreover, the level of basic services in pastoralist areas is still low compared to other, more densely populated areas in Ethiopia and Kenya. Pastoralists find it increasingly difficult to maintain their way of life and production. Growth in population and decrease in access to land and water has led to a general increase in poverty and vulnerability among large segments of the pastoralist population, exacerbated by increasing inequality (Lesorogol 2008). Both ethnic and practising pastoralists in Ethiopia see a future in mobile pastoralism, if supplemented by other livelihood activities. Most of the pastoralists met in Kenya were settled and had lost many animals in recent droughts. They had a largely pessimistic view on the future of pastoralism. Also elsewhere in Kenya, as in Ethiopia, there is a trend toward semi-permanent settlement of women and children, while (mostly young male) herders continue to move with the remaining animals.

Growing power and self-determination at local level. In both Ethiopia and Kenya, pastoralists have more opportunities for formal representation in modern government structures up to national level. In the past, the prevailing political systems did not allow them to use these positions to have a large positive impact on improving pastoralists' lives. Now, several committed ethnic pastoralists, whose knowledge and capacities were - in some cases - built through their work with international NGOs, are in influential positions at national level in Kenya. At lower levels, recent subdivision of administrative units has given pastoralists a better chance to deal directly with local officials and to exert influence on development decisions. There is more evidence of "modern" pastoralist organisation in Kenya than in Ethiopia, through formation of cooperatives, committees, NGOs etc - some building on indigenous structures, some formed by pastoralists in response to new opportunities. However, most of these organisations are still relatively weak, especially in the Southern Region of Ethiopia, and need capacity-building and empowerment to become able to deal effectively with the government administration.

It is a general problem in Ethiopia (not only in pastoral areas) that devolution of power has been implemented only very slowly. Both the government and NGOs - with a few notable exceptions - have given little attention to the civic education of pastoralists, to inform them about their constitutional rights. This is also the case in Kenya, but here pastoralists appear to be more aware of their rights, possibly because of their higher level of formal education. The better communication technologies in Kenya place the pastoralists in a better situation to obtain information and, thus, power than in Ethiopia.

In both countries, it is interesting to note that ethnic pastoralists have disproportionately high political representation: over 20% of MPs are from (agro)pastoralist areas and generally identify themselves as pastoralists, although these ethnic groups make up, at most, 15% of all people in Ethiopia and 12% in Kenya. However, this political representation does not seem to have led to much positive impact on the lives of practising pastoralists. This may be partly due to the differences in worldviews of formally educated pastoralists and their remote rural counterparts.

Continued struggle for rights to natural resources. The increasing individualism in resource use among some pastoral peoples, especially those living in better-endowed areas, has brought economic opportunities but also social risks. In Kenya, largely because of land policy in the past, there has been a trend toward group ownership of designated land areas with clear boundaries, moving away from the common-property tradition of land use among pastoralists (KLA 2005). This has often been followed by subdivision of the land into smaller units and subsequent selling or leasing out of these units, often to non-pastoralists, as in the case of Maasai lands in southern Kenya. In the Borana and Guji areas of Ethiopia, partly in response to the tendency of some pastoralists to enclose pasture for their own herds, elders - with and without the support of NGOs - have tried to re-invigorate customary sociopolitical institutions, especially but not only in land management, and to find ways of linking customary and modern institutions of governance and jurisdiction. These examples have raised interest also among pastoralists in northern Kenya.

Improved position of pastoralist women. In Ethiopia, greater ownership of individual assets has brought economic benefits to women and their families. Their increased involvement in local-level institutions, e.g. for water management, and their greater freedom to attend meetings and markets have broadened pastoralist women's horizons and made them more confident to express themselves in public. Among the settled pastoralist women in Kenya, the increased burden of responsibility they have assumed to ensure

family welfare after high livestock losses stimulated them to organise themselves for mutual social and economic support, also on their own initiative. Here, pastoralist women seem to have a stronger voice in community-level decision-making than in the past. However, the improvements in the position of pastoralist women relate to a low baseline. They are still marginalised in economic and political terms compared with men in their own society and with other women in Ethiopia and Kenya. Although there are now some pastoralist women “representatives” at national level in both countries, the rural pastoralist women met by the study team did not feel well represented.

Indirect “forced” integration. The Ethiopian Constitution allows each ethnic group to express its own culture, but some ethnic groups - especially in South Omo - felt that modern education had weakened their culture, e.g. by obliging them to wear Amharic (“highlander”) clothes. Pastoralists in South Omo claimed that tourism development by non-pastoralists had led to distortion of the local culture, which was being put on display for tourists. In Kenya, ever since Independence, there has been much greater emphasis on nation-building than in Ethiopia. “Western” education, which started earlier among pastoralists and is more widespread, encouraged urban values and strongly promoted Swahili and English, even to the extent that children were punished for speaking their own language⁸. In both countries, settlement of pastoralists in villages and rural towns was induced through fixed-point provision of education and healthcare. Dropouts from pastoralism and from schools have converged in these sites of local administration and services. Because of culturally inappropriate education, a growing number of young people have become alienated from their own ethnic groups yet are not well integrated into “modern” society - this negative trend was highlighted by pastoralists and non-pastoralists alike.

4.2 How Cordaid and its partners have contributed to these changes

RQ6: To what degree and in what way can the changes be explained by CFA partners’ interventions?
RQ7: What is the relative importance of the CFA partner network contribution to these changes?

8) This was the case for all ethnic groups in Kenya, not only for pastoralists.

9) As the pastoralists in the focus-group discussions referred to the contributions made by the partner organisations rather than by Cordaid per se, some interventions and outcomes they mentioned may not be directly linked to Cordaid support.

4.2.1 Direct poverty alleviation

In focus-group discussions, pastoralists who were directly supported by Cordaid partners referred to the following activities as having contributed to positive change in their lives⁹:

- **Livestock husbandry:** Pastoral families were assisted in diversifying their herds to include more goats and camels. Some people - mainly men - were trained as community animal health workers (CAHWs) to give basic treatment to livestock, thus reducing mortality rates. In some cases, Cordaid partners helped to improve availability of water and forage/feed and to develop grazing management agreements, building partly on local institutions. Particularly in Kenya, pastoralists valued the achievements of grazing, stock-route and peacebuilding committees supported by Cordaid partners. Community-Managed Disaster Risk Reduction (CMDRR) activities leveraged internal and government resources to strengthen community resilience. In Ethiopia, some efforts have been made to strengthen the role of indigenous institutions in dispute settlement, natural resource management and redistribution of livestock assets after drought. These types of intervention have partly counteracted the numerous factors (e.g. population growth,

reduced access to land, increased use of guns in raiding) that have created huge pressures on livestock production.

- **Income diversification:** Cordaid partners gave considerable attention to helping pastoralists diversify their sources of income by providing seed money and training for savings and credit, petty trading, handicrafts, small-scale irrigation, gardening and beekeeping. Capacity building in small-enterprise development has benefited many women pastoralists and their families, especially in Kenya. Income diversification has also been promoted through support to marketing of livestock and livestock products, including the building of feeder roads in Ethiopia and support to establishment of marketplaces and market management committees in Kenya. Toward the end of the study period, some activities were started in Ethiopia to promote community-based tourism; both the elders in charge and the youth trained as guides were optimistic that this would generate income for the community. In the words of a Samburu pastoralist, diversification of income sources has given “two legs” to stand on.
- **Basic service provision:** Over many years or decades, Cordaid’s church-affiliated partners have provided health services through clinics and outreach posts, and through training of community health workers (CHWs) and traditional birth attendants (TBAs). In the sparsely populated pastoralist areas, these community-based workers are vital for basic healthcare. Church-affiliated and other NGO partners have provided facilities, staff and support for the education of pastoralist children, e.g. through boarding schools, stipends and mentoring, especially of girls, in Ethiopia; and through strengthening School Management Committees in Kenya. In Ethiopia, provision of water, primarily for humans, from shallow wells and cisterns has, according to pastoralists, eased the workload of women and girls and, according to project reports, improved hygiene and health. In the process of providing basic services, some partners have developed innovative approaches, particularly with respect to education, extension and resource mobilisation.

In summary, according to the pastoralists concerned in the operational areas of Cordaid partners, the main positive outcomes of Cordaid’s support to direct alleviation of poverty were:

- greater livelihood security through improved livestock production (above all, reduced risks to production) and diversification of income sources of pastoralist families and communities; and
- better access to basic services, mainly in healthcare, schooling and clean water supply, although availability was still far below local needs and, in some cases, the services were not designed to suit the life style and culture of the pastoralists.

4.2.2 Strengthening civil society

In both Ethiopia and Kenya, Cordaid partners contributed to strengthening local organisation of pastoralists, such as common-interest groups for income generation, cooperatives and CBOs. In southern Ethiopia, some partner NGOs hired local people with a few years’ schooling as community facilitators and helped build their capacities and confidence to represent their people in government at local and sometimes higher levels, even as MP. In both countries, partners provided training, mentoring and encouragement for pastoralist participation in local decision-making bodies such as Location Development Committees, Water Management Committees and CMDRR committees. A small but significant intervention in Borana Zone of Ethiopia succeeded in increasing budgeting capacities in the local administration and the budget literacy of pastoralists, giving them a sounder basis for influencing decisions about local development investments. Also in Ethiopia, in both Borana and South Omo Zones,

partner NGOs helped strengthen indigenous sociopolitical and cultural institutions and linked them with government institutions, e.g. for conflict resolution. An important aspect of strengthening civil society has been the empowering of pastoralist women by improving their access to micro-credit, livestock assets and self-generated income. In addition, in Ethiopia, one national-level partner successfully used community radio to stimulate community-level discussion about female genital cutting. In Kenya, partners supported pastoralist women's organisation and networking and, through seminars, informed both men and women about women's constitutional rights.

In summary, the main positive outcomes of Cordaid's support to strengthening civil society were:

- greater capacity and confidence of local pastoralists (men and women) to negotiate with state and non-stake organisations and to derive benefits from local-level development; and
- raised sociopolitical status of some pastoralist women (individuals and groups), primarily through their economic empowerment and better access to relevant information; however, this achievement is tenuous, especially in Ethiopia, where pastoralist men still have to be "reminded" about the importance of including women in community decision-making bodies.

4.2.3 Influencing policy

Cordaid partners have intervened to influence policy at both local and national level, in the latter case, often together with other organisations and supported also by other donors. In Ethiopia, partners have supported pastoralists in district-level lobbying to retain or regain rights to access land and water, and have helped gain at least temporary access or prevented greater loss of access than would otherwise have been the case. Cordaid supported the development of NGOs that lobby for pastoralists' rights at national level, e.g. by organising the annual EPD and thematic conferences that drew attention to pastoralist issues and by creating opportunities for pastoralists themselves to express their views: at the EPD, at workshops and other gatherings, in consultation meetings on policy issues, and through radio, television, newspapers and publications. National-level partners arranged visits by MPs in the PASC to lowland areas to hear directly the concerns of practising pastoralists. These partners made direct inputs into government policy formulation, such as a chapter on pastoralism in the PASDEP. They have also spoken on behalf of pastoralists in numerous international meetings, including ones on IPs issues.

10) A report from a meeting organised by the Ministry for Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands (2009) confirmed statements heard during the field study: "The concern of the pastoralists present was that PDNK is more closely associated with the organisations which support it (including ALRMP, Oxfam-GB, Cordaid) than with pastoralists and pastoralist institutions."

Also in Kenya, Cordaid supports an annual event to profile and celebrate pastoralism and to draw attention to key issues affecting pastoralists' lives: it has co-funded the KPW since its inception in 2003. An important lobbying activity linked to the KPW in 2004 was the Great Trek from Moyale to Isiolo to campaign for a tarmac road. Many interviewees saw the recent improvements in road infrastructure as a direct, although delayed, outcome of this. Cordaid and several other Western donors helped set up the Pastoralists Development Network of Kenya (PDNK), which exerted some influence on national policy, although many pastoralists and non-pastoralists regarded this network as externally driven¹⁰. Cordaid partners helped involve pastoralists in consultations on the National Land Policy in Kenya, which recognised collective rights to land. More so than in Ethiopia, the partners in Kenya created opportunities for pastoralists to speak at international meetings. They played a role in setting up the Regional Pastoral Elders Council in eastern Africa. Partners in Kenya and the UK developed an eastern African training course in pastoralist advocacy, held in Arusha, Tanzania. Participants in the one in early 2009 gave it a very favourable assessment. It opened the eyes

also of people in national policy-advocacy organisations about the rationale for pastoralism and provided them with well-founded arguments to lobby on behalf of pastoralists. Like in Ethiopia, NGO partners in Kenya have contributed to improving knowledge about pastoralism and widening awareness about pastoralist issues through dissemination of information via newsletters, radio and seminars for journalists.

In eastern Africa, Cordaid has financed studies and publications on pastoralism, e.g. on the situation of pastoralist women, the role of indigenous institutions, and climate-change adaptation by pastoralists. These increased the availability of information useful for influencing perceptions and policymaking. In addition, the clinic in Dadim - supported for many years by Cordaid - has provided long-term health data that have been useful to national and international bodies concerned with health planning in pastoralist areas.

For several years already, Cordaid has collaborated with the Minority Rights Group (MRG) to put issues of pastoralists and other minority groups on the international development agenda. These efforts were recently stepped up with the creation of CELEP (Coalition of European Lobbies on Eastern-African Pastoralism), involving MRG and various other lobbying organisations based in Europe. CELEP is coordinated by Cordaid.

In summary, the main positive outcomes of Cordaid's support to influencing policy related to pastoralists and pastoralism in Ethiopia and Kenya and more widely in eastern Africa were:

- Expanded opportunities for pastoralists to express their concerns and defend their social and economic rights;
- Increased availability of well-based information and greater awareness among policymakers about pastoralist issues, i.e. raised profile of pastoralism at national level; and
- Government policies more favourable for pastoralist development, especially regarding land issues in Kenya.

These outcomes have been achieved through cooperation by Cordaid and its partners with numerous other national and international agencies active in eastern Africa. However, across all countries in eastern Africa where Cordaid provides support, an outcome that has not been achieved is greater security of access to natural resources by practising pastoralists.

4.3 Sustainability and unexpected outcomes of Cordaid supported changes

RQ8: What can be said about the sustainability of the changes?

RQ9: Are there unexpected (negative and positive) outcomes of CFA partners' interventions?

This section is based on the judgement of the case-study teams in Ethiopia and Kenya, informed by observation of current trends, the forecasts made by interviewees and the team members' own experience in pastoralist development.

4.3.1 Sustainability

Political rights. To a limited extent, local awareness of rights as citizens has been raised but there is insufficient “local momentum” to increase Ethiopian pastoralists’ awareness of their rights, because of their low level of education and limited access to external information (especially among the women). Both men and women supported by Cordaid partners have gained more confidence to voice their concerns and influence decision-making at local level, but their motivation to continue engaging as members of civil society in the current political situation in Ethiopia is uncertain. As the new legislation for NGOs in Ethiopia does not allow foreign donors to provide direct support to rights-related work, the gains made thus far could be lost. It will be extremely important for Cordaid to provide support in ways that serve - at least indirectly - to strengthen local organisation and access to information. CMDRR and budget literacy are examples of promising approaches that have been successfully piloted by Cordaid partners in limited areas but are far from being mainstreamed within the activities of government and NGOs working with pastoralists in Ethiopia. These approaches could have wide positive impact in securing pastoralists’ social, economic and political rights.

In Kenya, because literacy levels, access to information and the strength of local organisations appear to be higher than in Ethiopia, there is greater likelihood that pastoralists’ awareness of their rights as citizens will continue to rise through the efforts of educated sons and daughters of pastoralists and through women’s associations. The recent positive changes in land policy, achieved partly through support of Cordaid partners, will probably encounter resistance in implementation and could be endangered by shifts in power at national level. Long-term support to advocacy for and monitoring of land-policy implementation will therefore be needed.

Natural resource rights and livelihoods. Pastoralists’ livelihoods depend on flexible access to natural resources. Activities to diversify sources of livelihood that likewise depend primarily on natural resources (e.g. small-scale irrigation) will have little future if the local people do not have secure access to land and water and cannot resist land alienation and encroachment. Also efforts to increase income from and reduce risk in livestock-keeping, e.g. through training community members as CAHWs and improving access to market, will have little future for the same reason.

In the long term, the GoE’s policy favours sedentarisation of pastoralists, and most of its current technical and administrative interventions go in this direction. Continuation of mobile pastoralism in Ethiopia will be endangered if Cordaid partners do not continue to question and influence government policies and interventions so that pastoralists’ interests are heeded. The GoE is open to recognising community-based workers: its proclamation (No. 267/2002) on the need for a statutory body for certifying veterinary professionals and para-professionals, including CAHWs, describes these workers as integral components in provision of animal health services. Government line agencies collaborate with NGOs in training CAHWs. In contrast, the GoK does not recognise the value of community-based health services (for livestock or for people); this puts the sustainability of the activities supported in Kenya by Cordaid in question, unless the partners and other stakeholders can manage to influence government policy in favour of these services.

Particularly in Kenya, integration of pastoralists within the larger national economy will probably continue to increase with the ongoing improvements in telecommunications and (mobile) financial services, which are attributable primarily to commercial ventures rather than development-aid interventions and are particularly suited to mobile groups.

Position of pastoralist women. The gains made in the position of pastoralist women in Kenya are likely to be maintained and increased, largely because also the GoK promotes this. In Ethiopia, with the new NGO legislation, it is less clear to what extent the gains can be maintained. Here, the situation will need to be closely observed and, in the meantime, efforts made to increase women's opportunities for non-formal education and access to information. In Ethiopia, there is particular concern with regard to maintaining pastoralist women's rights to natural resources (see also Flintan 2009). Customary institutions for resource allocation and access have afforded some degree of security to women's use rights but, if these institutions become weaker and government policy for land tenure in pastoral areas does not take women's concerns into account, the women are in danger of losing their traditional access to natural resources, as has already happened in parts of Kenya, e.g. where group ranches were set up (Mwangi 2005).

4.3.2 Unexpected outcomes

Some unexpected and unintended negative outcomes of Cordaid-supported activities were already mentioned in Section 4.1.2 with respect to indirect "forced" integration: the negative impact of Western education on culture and the settlement of pastoralists attracted by fixed-point development interventions (although this may not have been the major factor leading to sedentarisation). In addition, especially in Kenya, the provision of health services by the Church may be keeping pastoralists and the GoK dependent on the Church, rather than encouraging local people to demand what the State should be providing for them and encouraging recognition of the value of community-based health services to complement state services.

Especially in settled pastoralist communities in Kenya, the economic empowerment of women appears to have led to a greater burden of responsibility and work on women to sustain the family, leaving them less time to be involved in sociopolitical activities at community and higher levels, even though they now have greater self-confidence and ability to do so.

According to some resource persons, the greater involvement of young pastoral men and women in marketing activities may have the negative spinoff of a higher incidence of HIV/AIDS and increased use of alcohol and drugs. Further study would be needed to confirm or refute this. The partner NGOs involved in market development have started to raise these issues for discussion in the pastoralist communities and market committees, to consider how to minimise these risks.

The capacity-building of local people hired as staff of partner organisations has qualified and encouraged some of them to leave these organisations and to take on more responsible positions with other organisations or institutions, including political representation. Although partners may sometimes complain about this "turnover", it is not a loss to the pastoralist society as a whole if these former staff members apply their experience and skills in other positions to further the development of their people. This appears to be the case both in Kenya and, to a more limited extent, in Ethiopia and could be regarded as an unexpected positive outcome.

4.4 Influence of Cordaid's mode of support

RQ10: In what way has the mode of supporting IP organisations by the CFAs contributed to or undermined the (positive) outcomes?

4.4.1 Choice of partners

In both Ethiopia and Kenya, Cordaid chose a well-balanced portfolio of international, national and local-level partners, and used the experience of more established NGOs to build the capacities of emerging ones. In 2008, it carried out systematic consultations with stakeholders in pastoralist development and participatory institutional mapping with pastoralist men, women and traditional leaders in order to identify partner organisations that these pastoralists respect. It selected partners with different strengths: ones working on the ground with pastoralists, ones that could study and analyse pastoralist issues, and ones that could communicate with policymakers on behalf of pastoralists. In Kenya, it gave particularly strong support to policy research and lobbying organisations working at national and international level. It also partnered with a private-sector network to open up new possibilities to support pastoralist organisation around marketing. In Kenya, Cordaid supported a few pastoralist membership organisations directly, building their capacity to speak on their own behalf; in Ethiopia, it worked through intermediary organisations. In both countries, better linkages between partners working at different levels - grassroots, national and international - would have enhanced Cordaid's policy influence. On the whole, however, Cordaid's careful selection of in-country and international partners and allies who work on issues most relevant to addressing the structural injustice experienced by pastoralists have been and will continue to be crucial for its contribution to positive change.

4.4.2 Support to planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation

In building the partners' capacities, Cordaid supported both software (strategy development, planning, M&E, financial and human-resource management) and hardware (transport; office, meeting and lodging facilities). The partners appreciated the openness shown by Cordaid to accept and even encourage innovative, exploratory and flexible approaches to development. Through support from national and international advisors and Programme 1 staff, Cordaid helped stimulate and assess change in organisational capacity. However, there was little independent (external) technical assessment of the activities carried out in the name of pastoralist development. In most cases, project evaluation is difficult because baseline data are lacking. The monitoring reports describe mainly activities and outputs, but bring relatively little information on outcomes and impacts. In some cases, a next funding phase appears to have been approved without in-depth evaluation of the outcomes of the previous one. Many partners in the field were carrying out similar types of activities, as if there was a standard portfolio of interventions and many interventions supported a settled existence. Pastoralist groups had not been well differentiated with regard to their specific conditions, visions and realistic possibilities for development. As these possibilities may not always be immediately obvious, there is a need for more piloting and accompanying research to be able to assess the technical and economic feasibility of some activities intended to generate income, e.g. modern methods of beekeeping.

4.4.3 Communication and networking

Communication between Cordaid Programme 1 and its partners was described in both countries as satisfactory to good; it has been mainly by email. Most partners felt that Cordaid staff had a good understanding of their difficult and frequently changing circumstances. However, after the Regional Office in Nairobi closed, the presence of Cordaid staff on the ground was infrequent and, in the view of most partners, insufficient. Cordaid headquarters staff pointed out that there were more staff members handling the partner portfolios in the two countries when there was a Regional Office; now only one staff member must cover both countries. The partners expressed a need for a Cordaid “content person” for Programme 1 in the region or country, especially to understand the policy context and to strengthen the policy-dialogue activities of the partners.

With regard to communication about policy changes within Cordaid as an organisation and how this affects the work of the partners, many partners felt confused by the frequency of Cordaid’s policy changes and felt they had been insufficiently consulted. The feeling of confusion was stronger among the partners in Ethiopia than in Kenya. Indeed, here, one national-level partner felt it had played a major role in developing the new pastoralist programme.

In neither country is there a formal network of Cordaid partners working on pastoralist issues. In Ethiopia, the partners said there was little communication among them. In Kenya, other meetings organised by Cordaid Programme 4 (Disaster Prevention and Emergency Aid) or other events related to pastoralism gave partners some space to network informally and arrange collaboration on specific issues. The crossborder interactions supported by Cordaid (regional meetings for CMDRR partners and the pastoralist policy course in Arusha), although few in number, provided good opportunities for informal learning. It was on such an occasion in Kenya, for example, that some Ethiopian pastoralists and supporting NGOs saw the possibilities of ecotourism. Cordaid’s use of national-level NGOs to provide capacity-building support to regional and district-based NGOs also provided opportunities for networking on thematic issues.

4.5 Summarised assessment of Cordaid’s contribution in eastern Africa

Evaluation Question: To what extent have CFA policies, strategies, procedures and programmes and those of their partner organisations contributed to a reduction of structural injustice toward IPs?

Major positive contributions. Cordaid has addressed poverty alleviation and organisational development at local level while simultaneously influencing policy at national and international level. Such multi-level work is relevant and necessary to reduce structural injustice to pastoralists. Empowerment at the grassroots increased the self-confidence of pastoralists as citizens and led to greater acceptance by others at higher levels to listen to pastoralist men and women.

Cordaid has made a geographically limited but largely effective contribution to strengthening pastoralists’ capacity in community-level decision-making. Together with partner NGOs, it has developed some promising models, e.g. community-managed development funds and

ways to increase the livestock assets of women, which deserve to be better documented and scaled up. However, the legitimacy of pastoralist “representatives” in modern structures at local and higher levels is open to question. Cordaid and its partners may have given too little attention to indigenous power structures and how they relate to representation in the modern structures.

Through increasing women’s economic power and their involvement in managing community assets, Cordaid helped strengthen women’s sociopolitical position in their communities. However, rural pastoralist women have little genuine voice at higher decision-making levels. One reason may be their continued low rate of literacy. Writing and assessing proposals for development handled by higher-level institutions depend more greatly on these capacities than at community level. Most Cordaid partners have given little attention to helping women gain functional literacy. In addition, although women’s (not specifically pastoralist women’s) rights are enshrined in the constitutions of Ethiopia and Kenya, violence against women remains a problem.

Cordaid’s partners at national level in both countries played an important role in amplifying pastoralists’ voices through mass and alternative media and through participation in major national and international meetings. Cordaid has made a substantial contribution to raising the profile of pastoralism through its support to the EPD and the KPW, which also provided opportunities to celebrate and reinforce pastoralist identity. Cordaid support strengthened capacities of intermediate NGOs - and, in the case of Kenya, a few pastoralist membership organisations - to engage directly in lobbying, where they brought pastoralists’ concerns into major policy documents, e.g. the PASDEP in Ethiopia and the National Land Policy in Kenya. However, most Cordaid partners have not given enough attention to policy implementation and protecting pastoralists’ rights on the ground, especially with regard to access to land and water.

The contributions of Cordaid and its partners to change in the situation of pastoralists in Ethiopia and Kenya cannot be separated from the contributions of other donors and development actors working along similar lines. Moreover, in both countries, committed members of civil society have made efforts in the same direction, also without donor support. Especially in strengthening the position of women, also government agencies in both countries have been active. Many of the activities related to poverty alleviation and local organisational development carried out by Cordaid partners were in collaboration with government offices. In policy-influencing activities, Cordaid’s partners and Cordaid itself as an organisation have combined forces with like-minded non-state actors, thus increasing the impact.

Cordaid has not been as visible as other donors in influencing national policies related specifically to pastoralists, although it has stimulated some interest among state and non-state actors in CMDRR as an alternative approach to disaster risk management. Oxfam-GB has played a much more visible role; it is both a donor and an implementer, directly engaged in policy influence. In contrast, Cordaid is primarily a donor supporting institutional strengthening and capacity building among local organisations so that they can carry out development - including policy-influencing - activities themselves. Thus, Cordaid works “behind the scenes”. Cordaid’s contribution to change also cannot be measured indirectly in terms of the absolute or relative amounts of funds allocated directly to policy-influencing efforts. Equally important have been Cordaid’s contributions in strengthening the capacities of the eastern African organisations to carry out these activities, also with the funding support of other donors. What is important is that Cordaid has collaborated well with other donors and actors working in the same direction in support of pastoralist development.

Relevance of Cordaid policy. The current pastoralist development policy of Cordaid is very relevant for eastern Africa: increasing policymakers' knowledge about the rationale behind pastoralism; helping pastoralists organise themselves to generate income and manage community assets; and increasing the participation and voice of pastoralist women and men. This is being reinforced by Cordaid's closer collaboration with European-based organisations in CELEP to create a wider support base among donors and policymakers for pastoralist development in eastern Africa.

In view of the ambivalent attitude toward the concept of "indigenous peoples" in both Ethiopia and Kenya, it has been wise of Cordaid not to have put IPs' rights in the foreground in its policy-influencing activities. Much the same situation prevails in Tanzania: on paper, e.g. in the PRSP, the Tanzanian Government recognised pastoralism as a livelihood system that deserves to be supported, but were wary of the pastoralists - foremost the Maasai - who framed their grievances and demands against the state in terms of the indigenous rights movement. The pastoralists who "became indigenous" gained greater visibility and considerable resources from foreign donors, but faced hostility even from other citizens - including other Tanzanian pastoralists - with their claims to indigeneity. They are now giving more attention to drawing on their rights as citizens, rather than as IPs, to demand justice and change (Hodgson 2009). Cordaid and its partners, together with local pastoralists, will need to give careful consideration to whether and, if so, how IPs' issues should be addressed directly in Ethiopia and Kenya.

Wider validity of findings and recommendations. On the whole, the changes in the policy framework under which pastoralists in southern Ethiopia and northern Kenya operate apply also to other pastoralist groups in these countries. However, the situation with regard to other aspects such as worldviews, livelihoods, power and inclusion in development as experienced by the groups visited in the field may not be generalisable in all parts of these or neighbouring countries. Pastoralist groups in eastern Africa differ greatly in terms of their relative exposure to other cultures, their customary forms of organisation, their history (also with respect to trade), the topographical and agro-ecological conditions and - related to this - their degree of mobility and possibilities to combine livestock-keeping with other sources of livelihood. Variations in the speed of decentralisation in pastoralist areas in Ethiopia, Kenya and Tanzania will affect the degree to which local groups can influence development at district and sub-district level. There are also great differences between the pastoralist areas with respect to pressures from outside, such as encroachment of subsistence crop farmers, tourism, mining or commercial-farming development.

The short time for fieldwork allowed discussions only with pastoralists living closer to roads and - in most cases - benefiting directly from Cordaid-supported interventions. The areas visited were not categorised into pastoral and agropastoral settings and were probably dominated by the latter. As wealth stratification was not done, it is difficult to assess to what wealth categories of pastoralists the findings apply. Most pastoralist communities are also heterogeneous in terms of social status and power, and this could not be explored during the brief field visits.

The study-team in Kenya did not visit Maasai pastoralists in the field, although it did interview a leading Maasai rights campaigner based in Nairobi. The Maasai have been the most visible and vocal pastoralist group with regard to IPs' rights in both Kenya and Tanzania. There is probably not the same need to make them aware of their rights as IPs as there is among other pastoralist groups in eastern Africa. Because the study team could not include Tanzania as a third case in eastern Africa, it does not have sufficient insight into change in the situation of pastoralists there to be able to assess to what extent Cordaid may have contributed to reducing structural

injustice toward them. However, according to the team's own observations and comments of international resource persons, the situation of pastoralists in Tanzania is much worse than in Ethiopia or Kenya. The Tanzanian Government regards pastoralism as a backward system that needs to be replaced by settled farming. Pastoralists' lands are often arbitrarily annexed and put to private use. This has led to open confrontation between pastoralists and the State. Moreover, the Tanzanian policy of cultural and linguistic integration has been much more direct in forcing assimilation and eroding pastoralist identity. The situation and perspectives of pastoralists in Tanzania - and not only the Maasai which, although the largest ethnic group of pastoralists, are not the only ones - would need separate in-depth attention.

In general, the interviews that the case-study teams made with resource persons who have a broad overview of the situation in Ethiopia, Kenya and eastern Africa pointed to more critical aspects regarding the situation of pastoralists than did the focus-group discussions in the field. However, these resource persons also confirmed some of the major changes related to stronger pastoralist civil society and greater policy influence by pastoralists. Their views on contributions to these changes can be regarded as more widely valid than those of the pastoralists encountered in the field. The recommendations to Cordaid made in the case studies (Waters-Bayer & Getachew 2010, Waters-Bayer & Wanyama 2010) are based on an assessment and triangulation of the different sources of information, including literature, and are also informed by the experience of the team members, each of whom has worked for several years in pastoralist areas, primarily in eastern Africa. The team members therefore feel that their recommendations will be relevant for most areas of eastern Africa where pastoralism is practised, but that different emphases would be necessary depending on the prevailing political situation in each country.

5. Hivos' contribution to change in the situation of indigenous peoples in Guatemala and Bolivia

This chapter summarises the main findings from the case studies in Guatemala and Bolivia; more detailed information and full references can be found in van de Sandt & Fries (2010) and van de Sandt & Zolezzi (2010). The information contained in this chapter is based on the perceptions of a range of stakeholders, including resource persons, indigenous and non-indigenous intellectuals, staff of NGOs and CBOs working with or on behalf of indigenous communities, as well as members of indigenous beneficiary groups and communities that could be visited.

5.1 Change in the situation of indigenous peoples

Guatemala and Bolivia share the characteristic that they are the only two Latin American countries where the indigenous population constitutes the majority of the national population. However, also here - as elsewhere in Latin America - IPs have been historically marginalised and politically excluded by non-indigenous elites. In Guatemala, indigenous people make up 50-60% (depending on the census) of the approximately 11 million inhabitants and belong to 23 different ethnic groups of Mayan or other indigenous descent. Due to the legacy of the internal conflict (1960-96), the indigenous movement in Guatemala is - like the rest of civil society - still quite young and fragmented (Feiring et al 2003). In Bolivia, in the 2001 census, 62% of the 8.3 million inhabitants identified themselves with one of 33 indigenous peoples, the most numerous of which are the Quechua (31%) and Aymara (25%) highland peoples. In the Bolivian lowlands - the area that is the principal focus of Hivos' work with IPs and hence of this study - there are 31 indigenous peoples that constitute only 6% of the total indigenous population. These numerically small groups have, however, been very influential in the recent history of Bolivia's indigenous movement, which dates back to the agrarian reform of the 1950s (Molina 2005).

5.1.1 **How the situation of indigenous peoples has changed over the last ten years**

RQ4: In what way did the position of the selected IPs change over the last 10 years concerning: political rights, land rights, livelihoods and rights of indigenous women?

In both case studies, views on the change in the situation of IPs were sought from the endogenous ("insider") perspective, i.e. indigenous communities and indigenous people working in local CSOs (in Guatemala, some of these were indigenous membership organisations and partners of Hivos); and from the exogenous ("outsider") perspective, i.e. non-indigenous and indigenous resource persons engaged with the indigenous struggle.

Political rights

In Guatemala, since the Peace Agreements and Guatemala's ratification of ILO C 169 (1996), which held the promise of recognition of multiculturalism and IPs' rights, the development of a new State institutionality for applying indigenous rights has been slow. Several new institutions were created to address the situation of IPs, such as the Commission against Discrimination and Racism, the Office for the Ombudsman of Indigenous Women and a Fund

for the Development of Indigenous Peoples. Also a number of government departments were newly created or given to indigenous functionaries, such as the Ministry of Culture and Sports and the Vice-Ministries of Bilingual Education and Economy. These offices, however, have not yet been able to provide an adequate answer to the situation of IPs, according to various resource persons because of limited budgets, inefficiency and corruption. Also, there has not yet been a transformation of judicial practices in the sense that these take account of cultural differences. Many - if not most - crimes of discrimination or violation of indigenous rights still go unpunished. In the past decade, Congress has not enacted major laws concerning IPs' rights, on account of obstruction by opposing, conservative political forces.

Despite this disappointing situation in Guatemala, strengthened indigenous CBOs with the support of national and international NGOs have acquired increased capacities and skills that enable them to negotiate with official agencies and lobby or pressure the government to take account of IPs' particular interests and needs. Indigenous communities generally have become more aware of their political rights and are more assertive in monitoring government actions and reporting violations of their special rights. More communities have become politically involved in regional and national mobilisation and have participated in international events on IPs' rights. In part, this is due to a growing number of indigenous professionals - men and women - who act as knowledge brokers between indigenous politicians and elites, on the one hand, and communities at the grassroots level, on the other. This is also due to decentralisation laws and policies that have created new spaces for indigenous participation in local decision-making. However, in these processes, the role of indigenous traditional authority has been marginalised. Also problematic is the fact that communities are generally still very distrustful of the national government, including their own representatives, who they feel do not adequately represent or defend their interests.

In the past ten years in Bolivia, and particularly since the 2002 March for Constitutional Reform, the indigenous movement has considerably increased its visibility and dynamism, and has gained much political influence. This development, which started already in the 1990s, has resulted in increasing self-awareness and indigenous identification. The IPs in the sparsely populated Bolivian lowlands - and not from the highlands, where the indigenous population is predominant - have been the motor behind this process.

As a consequence of the Popular Participation Law (1994), IPs in the Andean region have been able to take control over municipal governments and, in this way, increased their local representation (Albó 2008). This generally is not the case in the Bolivian lowlands, where the indigenous population is much smaller and competes for power with non-indigenous sectors and powerful groups (large landowners, agro-industries and transnational oil and mining companies). Lowland IPs have remained underrepresented, and municipal governments do not take account of their particular interests and needs. In response, in recent years, local communities have strengthened their organisations and have become more active in local politics and in regional indigenous organisations. This has resulted in their increased political/ rights awareness and greater negotiating capacity *vis-à-vis* non-indigenous sectors of society. However, under the Popular Participation Law, indigenous communities have been subjected to the model of the municipality, and have been unable to represent themselves through their own forms of authority. In this sense, this law is contradicting ILO C 169 (ratified by Bolivia in 1991), which recognises indigenous institutions and forms of governance (Zolezzi 2005).

On a national level, highland and lowland indigenous organisations in search of autonomy strongly increased their political participation in electoral processes and the constitutional reform process after 2004. The adoption of UN DRIP as national legislation (in 2007) has been

an important resource in this process. The ascendance to power of Evo Morales (in 2006) has opened up many new opportunities for IPs to become actively involved in national and regional governments and representative bodies. Indigenous representatives are, however, being subjected to the structures and programmes of political parties, which limits possibilities for IPs' direct representation. Bolivia's new Constitution (2009) officially recognises IPs' rights to territorial autonomy and self-government. Proposals for autonomy arrangements that are currently in the making have not been subjected to consultation with the grassroots, however, and threaten to be imposed on local communities. This may jeopardise already existing indigenous governance structures (some IPs over the past years had already drafted their own proposals for autonomy).

Rights to land and natural resources

In Guatemala, the most important structural problem related to the poverty situation of IPs remains their lack of access to and ownership of land. In this respect, the market-assisted land reform programme of Guatemala's Land Fund in the past decade has had minimal impact: it has satisfied only 25% of the yearly increase in demand by landless families, most of which are indigenous. Moreover, bureaucratic procedures, land speculation, administrative irregularities and limited offer of high-quality land have complicated the actual redistribution of land through the Land Fund (CNOG 2007).

Indigenous forms of land tenure are hardly protected, and many indigenous communities cultivate communal lands over which they do not have formal ownership rights. High administrative costs and low accessibility of the Land Registry have de facto excluded poor indigenous families and communities from access to the legal systems that regulate land ownership. In consequence, many indigenous farming communities, and particularly tenant farmers, risk being or have effectively been displaced from their land by powerful economic actors. The resulting land disputes between indigenous communities and large landowners have led to an increasing number of land occupations and subsequent forced land evictions by State or private security forces, which often involve violence. Indigenous groups generally use land occupation as a tactic to pressure the government and judicial institutions to find solutions for their problems. The latter, however, are extremely slow and bureaucratic in dealing with communities' appeals against private actors that infringed their rights.

In the past five years, there has also been a notable increase in resource conflicts related to mining and other large-scale extractive development projects that are (planned to be) implemented on indigenous lands. In violation of IPs' collective rights according to ILO C169, the government has generally failed to adequately consult affected communities on these projects. In response to this, communities with the assistance of national and international NGOs have mobilised themselves and organised their own community consultations to express their opposition (van de Sandt 2009). Other communities have embraced the new Cadastral Information Registration Law for the demarcation of their communal lands in order to protect these against expropriation. In the process, they say they have recovered their (once lost) collective attachment to their ancestral territories. Among other IPs, community-based forest committees have begun to defend themselves against the environmental degradation that is caused by unlawful pillaging of their remaining ancestral forests and their conversion into commercial forest plantations by State agencies and private actors.

In the Bolivian lowlands, great strides have been made in the recognition of indigenous communal lands (TCO, Tierra Comunitaria de Origen) according to the Agrarian Reform Law (1996). Currently, 15 million ha have been titled, the largest part (ca 10 million ha) to lowland indigenous communities. In the first half of the decade, the land regularisation and titling

process took place at a very slow pace due to obstruction by powerful economic groups, lack of political will and corruption in government. The process has speeded up considerably with the adoption of the Renewal of the Agrarian Reform Law (2006), but the demand for TCO titling still is much greater than what has been titled so far (Urioste 2009). However, on account of the large size and sparse population of titled indigenous lands, the effective control of lowland IPs over the natural resources within their territories is limited. While local communities have preferential rights to natural resources in their TCOs, overlapping jurisdictions and contradictory laws often distort the application of these rights. Large parts of indigenous territories overlap with forest and mining concessions granted by government agencies to outside economic actors, and natural resources are moreover under pressure from infrastructural projects and the advancing agricultural frontier. Communities often are not adequately consulted on these developments. Some indigenous communities are involved in violent resource conflicts with timber companies and are effectively being displaced from their territories. The government and judicial institutions often fail to act in defence of indigenous resource rights (Zolezzi 2005).

In order to consolidate their territorial rights, internationally funded NGOs have assisted many indigenous communities in elaborating plans for the sustainable use and management of natural resources (Lehm et al 2004). As part of their territorial defence strategy, indigenous communities have also increasingly become involved in commercial timber exploitation. With the assistance of technicians in allied NGOs, they have gained first experiences with sustainable timber-harvesting techniques and elaborating annual operational forestry plans. In some areas, recently created indigenous forestry associations have negotiated commercial contracts with timber enterprises that buy the timber they communally harvest (Oud 2008). Resource conflicts have not disappeared, however, as indigenous communities in TCOs sometimes lack clear authority structures and internal regulations for resource use. This compromises their position *vis-à-vis* external economic actors that play communities out against each other.

Livelihoods

Generally, in the past ten years, poverty among IPs in Guatemala has increased, as a result of various factors: lack of access to land, environmental degradation, declining prices for cash crops (coffee) and adverse climatic events (storms and droughts). Malnutrition among indigenous children and pregnant women has increased (CONADUR 2009). Low wages earned during seasonal labour migration to the plantations on the coast do not cover the basic needs of indigenous families or compensate for their lacking market-oriented production. Many indigenous families see migration to the USA and to cities in Guatemala as the only way to escape poverty. During the period under study, remittances from migrant members became the most important source of income for rural families. The Government's social investment programmes, which are general poverty-reduction programmes that do not take account of the specific interests and needs of IPs (i.e. education and healthcare in a manner appropriate to their cultures), have had very limited impact because of chronically limited budgets, endemic corruption and domination by political party interests. IPs still lack access to basic services that should be provided by the government, particularly bilingual education and culturally appropriate healthcare.

In the meantime, deregulation of the economy in the context of free-trade agreements has further weakened rural economies, particularly among IPs in Guatemala, and affected their food sovereignty. Lack of economic opportunities in rural areas has contributed to growing migration flows of especially young indigenous people to the city, thus reinforcing ongoing processes of loss of cultural identity among large sectors of the indigenous population. In

some places, however, indigenous producer groups receiving assistance from international NGOs were able to acquire export licenses and certification for organic production and, in this way, secure access to international markets for their agricultural products; this contributed to increased stability for these groups during economic crises. In other places, indigenous groups have started to reflect and deliberate on what for them would constitute culturally appropriate development, as a first step in finding solutions to their economic problems. Indigenous organisations have had some recent success in negotiating with the Government on proposals for policy and legislation on Integrated Rural Development. This policy was adopted by the administration of President Colom (2008-), but the Government has not yet committed funds to particular programmes for its implementation.

In Bolivia, data concerning poverty among IPs are not readily available because statistics are undifferentiated and culturally biased, and also because of the informal nature of indigenous economies. What is certain is that poverty among IPs in the past ten years has remained higher than among the non-indigenous population (Hall & Patrinos 2005). Government programmes for development assistance to IPs¹¹ - except the land-titling programme - have not been adequately implemented due to political instability and resulting changes in staff in the Ministry of Indigenous Affairs and other government institutions. According to the Popular Participation Law (1994), municipalities receive 20% of the State budget to spend on development projects according to municipal development plans. However, the law has not recognised indigenous self-government and has subjected indigenous communities to the governance structures of the municipality.

Especially in the lowlands, indigenous participation in development planning has remained limited; most municipal governments do not invest proportionately in indigenous territories (TCOs) situated in their administrative jurisdictions, and indigenous communities' influence on or control over municipal governments - through newly-created "vigilance committees" - is furthermore complicated, as most TCOs fall within the borders of several municipalities at once. This makes it impossible to advance proposals for integrated development for their territories (Roper 2003). According to resource persons, culturally appropriate education and health programmes for IPs have remained underdeveloped and generally have low coverage. Lowland indigenous people from Chiquitanía, however, said they have greater access to technological developments, such as telephone lines, electricity and television, and - through their influence in the municipal government - have been able to develop bilingual curricula for primary schools in their area. They hope this will counteract the loss of language they are suffering. Although their economic situation has improved somewhat, the results of market-oriented production (forestry and cattle-raising) have been disappointing on account of lack of market access and limited commercial experience. Their production is still mainly subsistence oriented and, recently, the salaries of teachers and personnel of health centres have become an important source of income for their families. An indigenous women's association in a visited peri-urban area in the highlands has had more success in producing and selling organic vegetables on the market in La Paz-El Alto. Indigenous leaders in the northern Amazonian region claimed that the government is imposing Andean development models on the lowland IPs.

Position of indigenous women

The situation of poverty and oppression faced by Guatemalan indigenous women remains a great obstacle to their social, economic, political and cultural participation in society in general, and specifically in decision-making processes. Because of their lack of access to education, assets and resources, indigenous women are often dependant financially on men; this further impedes their participation and leads to low self-esteem. Women that

11) "National Plan for Indigenous Development with Identity" as part of the National Development Plan 2003–2007.

speak out face discrimination and oppression by men in the household and in public spaces. There has been a reported recent increase in violence against indigenous women (Hayes 2009). Notwithstanding these persistent problems, in the past years, there has been a clear increase in the number of women in official positions both in CSOs and in government, and a significant number of women have educated themselves and in this way gained relevant experience in public and administrative positions. Indigenous women in official positions have to deal with a traditionally sexist and patriarchal government system and have needed support from indigenous women's organisations. In mixed-gender organisations, indigenous women face resistance from the traditional male leadership, which argues that attention for women's rights undermines the strength of the indigenous movement. Nonetheless, a recently created indigenous women's platform has managed to insert an articulated agenda of demands and proposals into new official gender policy.

Despite positive changes, indigenous women are still underrepresented in politics. Indigenous Congress members have therefore formed an alliance with their *ladino* (mixed-race) colleagues in order to push for the inclusion of a 30% gender quota for women in Congress, to be divided equally between Maya and *ladino* women. They have also participated in the lobby for a Law against Femicide and other Forms of Violence against Women, which was adopted in 2008. Attention for the particular situation of indigenous women, within the government and in CSOs, has been important in providing social and political spaces from which indigenous women can speak out for themselves. In this regard, indigenous women's organisations have played an important role in Guatemalan society in contributing to indigenous women's increased capacity to critically perceive the effects of sexist behaviour and the role of indigenous women in Mayan cultures. These organisations have also taken a critical stance toward the government, including DEMI (Office of the Ombudsman for Indigenous Women), for the slow progress in finding justice and redress for the indigenous women who survived sexual violence during the internal conflict. They also maintained that DEMI has not effectively coordinated and mediated between women's organisations and other government agencies.

In Bolivia, until 2005, national and regional governments had no specific public policies or legal mechanisms that took account of the double discrimination of indigenous women. These still suffer disproportionately (compared to non-indigenous women) from illiteracy or monolingualism, as well as from problems of maternal mortality, lack of economic opportunities and physical violence (Sanabria 2005). Until recently, indigenous federations and regional organisations were reluctant to prioritise gender equality on their agendas because they found the issue complicated, arguing that the subject potentially divided the indigenous movement. In the past ten years, indigenous women in the lowlands have, however, increased their visibility and demands through the creation of regional indigenous women's organisations, mostly as a women's branch of the mixed indigenous organisations from which they emerged. Locally, they also created their own associations, both on community and intercommunity level.

In recent years, within indigenous CBOs, women have begun to fill leadership positions that were traditionally reserved for men, reportedly as a result of a crisis in male leadership (corruption scandals). Today, women also participate in the indigenous forestry committees of the TCO Monteverde; they have been trained in territorial planning and exert influence in administrative decision-making. They are especially valued for their prudent administration of financial resources (in which they perform better than men). Particularly among the younger generation, there is increased participation of indigenous women in local and regional public spaces, in TCOs as well as in municipal governments. Lately, regional indigenous organisations

have included gender equality (parity) criteria in their internal organisational statutes and mechanisms for representation and participation. In the community assembly that in 2006-09 drafted the Statute for Autonomy for the Lomerío TCO, men and women were equally represented.

Since 2004, indigenous women's groups through their collaboration with a national non-indigenous women's organisation (funded by Hivos) have been closely involved in the constitutional reform process, which increased their awareness on women's rights. Through this process, they have achieved the constitutional recognition of a number of important women's rights - among others, their right to land and natural resources - and they have managed to put the gender issue firmly on the agenda of the national indigenous movement (Uriona 2009).

5.1.2 Overall assessment of change in the situation of indigenous peoples

RQ5: Can these changes be assessed - and to what extent - as: a reduction of marginalisation of the IPs and a change in power, poverty, worldviews and values, an increase and strengthening of the political, economic, social and cultural self-determination and identity of the IPs? a reduction in marginalisation and inclusion in development processes considered positive by them? avoiding or mitigating of forced assimilation or integration?

This section brings the team's assessment of change in the overall situation of IPs in Bolivia and Guatemala. It is based on the foregoing findings, and is structured according to key concepts put forward in the ToRs for this evaluation.

Worldviews, values and identity

Although a sense of indigenous identity is still strong in Guatemala, generalised poverty has put increasing pressure on indigenous cultures and changed their values and worldviews. Migration and violence adversely affected social cohesion and authority structures in communities, and impeded the development of strong indigenous CBOs. The State has not promoted indigenous cultures through specific public policies. At the same time, however, a more open political climate has, in recent years, led to a recovery of indigenous spiritual and cultural practices, and the indigenous movement has recently embarked on a process of critical self-reflection and is increasingly applying a discourse of indigenous collective rights in political mobilisation.

In Bolivia, a matured indigenous movement has been mobilising around indigenous collective rights for more than two decades, and this has led to an increasing self-awareness and identification as IPs, also in the highlands where the indigenous population until recently negated its indigenous identity. On the other hand, non-implementation of specific public policies for IPs is indirectly putting pressure on their cultures, especially in the lowlands where IPs constitute small minorities. Also the growing influence of highland IPs in the current political context leads to the imposition of highland indigenous worldviews on lowland IPs.

Marginalisation and inclusion in development

In general, the poverty situation of IPs has worsened in Guatemala. This is due mainly to a growing lack of access to land among IPs (i.e. land concentration in the hands of the non-indigenous wealthy) and environmental degradation, which have affected subsistence and

market-oriented agricultural activities, as well as to economic crisis and deregulation, which have reduced other income opportunities and wage levels. IPs are in danger of becoming further marginalised by large-scale, investment-led development. The provision of basic services (education, healthcare, infrastructure) in rural areas has not significantly improved; social investment policies by the State have low coverage and do not offer a structural solution to poverty; moreover they do not take account of IPs' specific needs.

In the Amazon lowlands of Bolivia, with an abundance of natural resources, the poverty situation of IPs is not acute, although - like in the highlands - poverty levels among the indigenous groups are generally higher than among the non-indigenous population. As a result of decentralisation policies, municipalities can dispose of more resources than before for service provision but, in the lowlands, these resources do not proportionately reach indigenous communities. Since 2006, the State has invested more in pro-poor social policies (through cash-transfer programmes), but these State policies and programmes do not apply a differentiated approach to IPs that is sensitive to their cultures or responds to their being discriminated against in gaining access to State services (e.g. education and healthcare).

Self-determination and representation

In Guatemala, conservative political forces continue to block IPs' access to participation in national politics and lawmaking. Powerful economic forces, parallel power structures and a dysfunctional judicial system further limit indigenous representation and obstruct the adoption and/or implementation of pro-indigenous legislation and policies. Influence of indigenous communities on municipal governments through local development committees remains limited; these newly created institutions, moreover, tend to sidetrack existing indigenous authority structures. A fragmented indigenous movement until now has not proven capable of changing the prospects for IPs' self-determination.

In Bolivia, indigenous representation increased through decentralisation policies adopted in the 1990s. In contrast to the highlands, in the lowlands, effective indigenous participation in local government has remained limited, and has been further complicated by the creation of parallel authority structures. The adoption of the UN DRIP as national legislation and the recent promulgation of a new Constitution, which recognises indigenous autonomy, have greatly increased possibilities for IPs' self-determination. Direct indigenous representation (as peoples) has not been achieved, however, and the leadership of the indigenous movement threatens to be absorbed by the political party currently in power.

Rights to land and resources

Lack of access to and ownership of land is one of the central problems confronted by IPs in Guatemala, and a source of much conflict. Contrary to ILO C169, there still is no recognition of IPs' collective rights to land. Market-assisted land reform programmes have had minimal impact. Few indigenous families have formal ownership to land, and communities are in danger of being evicted without notice by their landlords or of being dispossessed by large-scale development projects (mining, hydroelectric dams, agro-industry) about which they have not been consulted. IPs' resistance and proposals for policy reform, as yet, have not been able to improve the situation to any significant extent.

In Bolivia, the land reform law has allowed for the titling of communal indigenous lands (TCOs); 13% of the national territory - the largest part situated in the eastern lowlands - is recognised as the inalienable collective property of indigenous communities. This process has not been without its problems, however, and a contradictory legal context has resulted in many overlapping forestry and mining concessions granted to outside economic actors.

Indigenous communities have advanced in elaborating territorial management plans, but effective control over natural resources remains a problem due to illegal resource extraction, advancing development projects and lack of law enforcement and clear internal regulations.

Position of indigenous women

In Guatemala, discrimination, oppression and violence against indigenous women continue to impede their participation and representation in public affairs. Women's empowerment is hindered by lack of access to education, high illiteracy rates and low self-esteem, which often results from these factors. Nevertheless, there has been progress in the situation of indigenous women, who have increased their participation in CBOs and CSOs. Moreover, an increasing number of indigenous women in official positions have been able to exert more influence on government decisions and policy. However, women's rights are still not high on the agenda of mixed-gender indigenous organisations, and indigenous women's organisations are still few.

Although still facing discrimination, indigenous women in the Bolivian lowlands over the past years have increased their participation in local decision-making, and there has been a proliferation of indigenous women's organisations. Recently, indigenous women have also assumed leadership roles in regional organisations as well as official positions. As a result of collaboration between indigenous and non-indigenous women's organisations during the constitutional reform process, indigenous women have managed to put gender issues firmly on the agenda of mixed-gender indigenous organisations. Currently in Bolivia, there is a strong legal framework for the recognition of women's rights, including those of indigenous women.

Forced assimilation/integration

In both countries, there is no longer an official integration policy toward IPs, but forced integration still takes place in subtle and indirect ways. In Guatemala, the government is reluctant to recognise IPs' economic and political rights and, in its social and economic policies, fails to take account of IPs' interests and needs (indigenous aspirations for development, bilingual education, culturally appropriate healthcare). Despite great political change in Bolivia, the government pays only lip service to IPs' special development needs. In the new political context, there is a danger that the Andean development model is imposed on the much smaller groups of lowland IPs.

5.2 How Hivos and its partners have contributed to these changes

RQ6: To what degree and in what way can the changes be explained by CFA partners' interventions?
RQ7: What is the relative importance of the CFA partner network contribution to these changes?

The information in this section is based on the case-study team's analysis of CFA project documentation, external project evaluations, and interviews with members of indigenous beneficiary groups and CBO staff.

5.2.1 Direct poverty alleviation

Agricultural/forestry production. Indigenous communities - generally local producer groups or community enterprises - received technical assistance so that they were able

to improve their market-oriented productive activities. In Guatemala, this involved coffee production and, in the Bolivian lowlands, mainly experimentation with sustainable forestry exploitation; another partner in the Bolivian highlands focused on the production of organic vegetables. In both countries, indigenous groups received training in applying new skills and techniques, with which they managed to increase the level of production, convert to organic agriculture or improve the sustainability of timber-exploitation methods. In the Bolivian lowlands, indigenous community enterprises received assistance in diversifying their economies with a variety of timber and non-timber (beekeeping, controlled hunting, cattle-raising) productive activities. Economically, the success of these activities has been disappointing, which can be explained by lack of experience with commercial production and difficult access to markets. In the northern Amazon region, a research and extension consortium has conducted participatory research with a view to strengthening the production chains of timber and non-timber forest products in order to increase the income opportunities and levels of indigenous/peasant communities.

Access to markets and credit. Hivos partners in both Guatemala and Bolivia directed attention to improving access to markets and credit. Agricultural producer groups received training in production standards and norms to gain accreditation and certification to be able to access niche markets. In Guatemala, a second-degree producer organisation funded by Hivos helped groups of coffee-producing families acquire an export license and accompanied them to international coffee fairs to gain access to American and European markets. This organisation also helped communities to access pre-harvest credit from international lending institutions, thus reducing their dependency on intermediary coffee buyers. In Bolivia, one partner assisted communities in accessing credit schemes for capitalising their production and another succeeded in setting up direct selling points for organic products of affiliated producer associations.

Basic service provision. In Guatemala, a partner coordinated with regional hospitals in improving access by discriminated groups, such as indigenous people living with HIV/AIDS (PLHA), to specialised medical care and in improving the registration of cases of infection with HIV/AIDS. Another partner in Bolivia facilitated relations between indigenous communities in TCOs with municipal governments and, in this way, improved delivery of basic services. In summary, the main positive outcomes of Hivos' support to direct poverty alleviation were:

- Increased production levels and sustainability in agriculture and commercial forestry through application of new skills and techniques;
- Greater access to national and international niche markets for organic agricultural products and timber and non-timber forest products; and
- Improved access to specialised medical care for PLHA (in Guatemala) and improved basic service provision.

5.2.2 Strengthening civil society

Strengthening indigenous organisations. In both countries, Hivos partners have been involved in strengthening IPOs on community and national and regional level. In Guatemala, one intervention focused on setting up regional indigenous councils, which have helped consolidate the organisational structure of a nationally operating indigenous membership organisation. Another project helped indigenous communities in setting up networks of Human Rights Observatories, as a result of which they are better able to monitor and defend themselves against human rights violations. Other, more locally focused projects helped in creating indigenous Youth Parliaments, which have promoted the rights of indigenous PLHA as well as reproductive health education, and in setting up community centres for information

and communication technology (ICT) training of women, which has served as a tool in achieving organisational goals. Hivos has also funded activities of partners that indirectly contributed to poverty alleviation, such as organising indigenous communities threatened by large-scale development projects or illegal timber logging to defend their rights to water and a clean environment; and offering assistance in negotiating with State agrarian institutions so that land-needy communities after many years of struggle could finally be adjudicated lands. In Bolivia, Hivos-supported interventions were mainly aimed at increasing the capacity of communities in territorial planning and forest management, through which they now have increased resource control. These activities have also served to enable communities to be more actively involved in municipal development planning. In one particularly large TCO, local indigenous communities were assisted in developing statutes and internal regulations for resource governance in their territory. In both countries, Hivos partners have undertaken efforts toward raising awareness among mixed-gender organisations and indigenous authorities about gender justice and equality; these efforts have been key in deconstructing sexism within the indigenous communities and movements.

Raising awareness and improving leadership. Other Hivos-funded activities focused on raising awareness about IPs' rights and indigenous leadership training. In Guatemala, community representatives were trained on the implications of ILO C169 with a view to constructing a pluricultural State. Other communities were accompanied in finding avenues for resolving agrarian conflicts and were trained in the demarcation of communal lands. Indigenous women in leadership or official positions received preparation training for their work and public duties. In Bolivia, indigenous leaders received training on legal and political issues related to the regularisation and titling of land. Community groups in TCOs were trained in collecting and analysing data on natural resource conflicts, and received specialised technical support in undertaking legal action against economic actors encroaching on their lands. People who took part in these activities said that, as a result, they felt better prepared for their work and more capable of defending the rights of their communities.

In summary, the main positive outcomes of Hivos' support to strengthening civil society were:

- Strengthened organisational capacity and improved leadership among IPs;
- Increased capacity of IPs to defend themselves against human rights violations and resource conflicts and (in Bolivia) to participate in territorial management and development planning;
- Raised awareness on indigenous women's rights and gender justice and equality within mixed-gender organisations, as well as the rights of indigenous PLHA.

5.2.3 Influencing policy

Advocacy for policy and legislation. Hivos has funded many interventions related to advocacy for better policies and laws. In Guatemala, a network of indigenous and non-indigenous agrarian organisations lobbied for reform of the Labour Code and new policy on Integrated Rural Development. It also organised civil-society debates around policy issues related to food sovereignty, agrarian reform and cadastral registration. Three of Hivos' partners have together promoted a proposal for a General Law on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Indigenous women's organisations lobbied for inclusion of indigenous women's rights in the official gender policy. While there has been some progress, many proposals that have high relevance for IPs continue to be blocked by conservative forces in Congress. In Bolivia, various partners have lobbied for better implementation of their rights to territory and natural resources (according to the Agrarian Reform Law and the Forestry Law). In recent years, this has resulted in law and policy reform and the effective regularisation and titling of many lowland TCOs, thus contributing to increased tenure security for IPs. Several staff

members of partner organisations involved in these lobbying activities have been appointed to government positions. Another organisation has successfully advocated for a new law to promote organic agriculture.

Indigenous participation in constitutional reform. In Bolivia, three of Hivos' partners have promoted indigenous participation in the constitutional reform process. They have helped indigenous (including women's) organisations in building consensus among their constituencies on proposals for indigenous members of the Constitutional Assembly. This has proven a very significant intervention, as the new Constitution recognises many indigenous rights, among others to indigenous autonomy, as well as rights of (indigenous) women.

Influencing policy through other means. In Guatemala, several partner interventions were aimed at generating policy dialogue and pressure on the government through the organisation of international meetings and seminars on specific issues. Representatives from various indigenous communities participated in the Third Continental Summit of Indigenous Peoples and a seminar on Mining and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples during the Social Forum of the Americas, which attracted considerable media attention and increased the rights awareness of the participants. In Bolivia, one partner produced documentary videos, radio programmes and an interactive website for the purpose of intercultural education among non-indigenous sectors of society. After positive tryouts, the Ministry of Education adopted these materials for use in schools.

In summary, the main positive outcomes of Hivos' support to influencing policy were:

- Increased engagement of indigenous CBOs and IPOs in policy dialogue on issues that have a bearing on IPs (in Guatemala);
- Secure collective rights to land and natural resources and generally a favourable legal (constitutional) framework for recognition of IPs rights (in Bolivia);
- Increased capacity and effectiveness of indigenous women to exert influence on government institutions and in legislative processes.

5.3 Sustainability and unexpected outcomes of Hivos-supported changes

RQ8: What can be said about the sustainability of the changes?

RQ9: Are there unexpected (negative and positive) outcomes of CFA partners' interventions?

This section brings the case-study team's analysis of information in Hivos project documentation, external project evaluations, and interviews with IPs and non-indigenous resource persons.

5.3.1 Sustainability

Political rights

In the stubborn political reality of Guatemala, an important gain is the increased rights awareness and strengthened capacity and participation of indigenous CBOs in voicing their concerns and influencing decision-making at local level. However, the strength and continuity of these organisations is compromised by the increasing criminalisation of indigenous

leaders and human rights defenders, as well as by the worsened poverty situation and ensuing migration of indigenous people to the USA and to cities in Guatemala. Coalitions of indigenous organisations and other CSOs have also been active in formulating proposals for law and policy reform, but their continued commitment in these processes is uncertain as long as the government shows no political will to seriously engage with civil society on these proposals, and to implement them. This obstruction to structural change is currently leading to growing frustration and radicalisation among CBOs and exacerbates existing divisions between CSOs.

In Bolivia, the political changes after 2005 have proven favourable for the recognition of IPs' collective rights in the new Constitution, but it is as yet uncertain to what extent and how these constitutional rights will be translated into secondary legislation and policies that effectively address indigenous concerns. Until now, however, the "indigenous" President Morales has shown little sensitivity in policy and practice to the cultural diversity among Bolivia's IPs. It is also worrisome that indigenous federations in the lowlands seem to have become weaker in their protagonist and questioning character, as their leadership has become absorbed in electoral processes and a scramble for official positions that recently opened up.

In the case of both countries, preparing indigenous women to participate in political life has been key in promoting the rights of IPs - often the focus of indigenous women's organisations (and of Hivos in funding such organisations in both countries) and increasingly emphasised in mixed-gender indigenous organisations.

Land and resource rights

The sustainability of the little progress made in Guatemala concerning the titling of indigenous (collective) land rights depends on whether communities are able to make productive use of this land without becoming indebted to the Land Fund. In the meantime, the capacity of other communities to defend their mostly untitled communal lands in the face of advancing large-scale development projects depends on their success in convincing the Government of its obligation to consult them on these projects and to find amenable solutions. Ultimately, however, it also depends on whether these communities manage to achieve tenure security (i.e. acquire property rights) over their communal lands and resources. In Bolivia, great advances have been made in securing land and resource rights of lowland indigenous communities, as well as in the elaboration of integral management plans for their TCOs. However, illegal resource-extraction, agro-industrial and mining projects and the migration of highland indigenous people to the lowlands jeopardise the exercise of these rights. To counteract this, law enforcement by government and judicial institutions needs to be improved, as well as the development of clear internal governance structures and regulations for resource use, in order to strengthen the position of communities *vis-à-vis* outside economic actors. Also the definition of responsibilities and procedures for their prior consultation will need to be further clarified, and applied.

Livelihoods

Although the poverty situation among IPs in Guatemala has worsened in general terms, it has improved in varying degrees in those areas where Hivos has funded partner interventions. The sustainability of specific projects for healthcare and health education for indigenous PLHA and youth or for access of indigenous women to ICT is uncertain as long as these projects depend on donor funds and uncertain government budgets. The continued access of producer groups to markets and credit depends to an important degree on fluctuations in international prices and markets, but also on the success of these groups to continue to find niche markets for their (organic) products.

The latter also goes for producer groups and community enterprises in Bolivia (even when success in Hivos-funded economic projects among lowland IPs has been less convincing than among highlands indigenous populations). In order to safeguard and improve the livelihoods of indigenous communities in lowland TCOs, it is important that communities continue their efforts - with the support of funding agencies and their partners - to further optimise methods of sustainable resource exploitation and to integrate themselves profitably into production chains and markets. Regarding provision of services, the livelihoods situation of indigenous families in TCOs might be helped once the national Autonomy Framework Law (2009) is implemented and indigenous communities can autonomously administer their share of State revenues.

Position of indigenous women

In Guatemala, improvements in the position of indigenous women in terms of their participation and representation are under pressure by the feminisation of poverty and remaining high levels of illiteracy among indigenous women, as well as by the increase in violence against women. The sustainability of the changes thus depends on whether indigenous women in public and official positions and recently created indigenous women's platforms succeed in further increasing their capacity to influence the government in adopting and implementing laws and policies that address the specific concerns of indigenous women. In Bolivia, the increase in visibility, representation and participation of indigenous women in decision-making in indigenous organisations (both women's and mixed-gender) as well as in public and representative institutions is considered by indigenous women and non-indigenous observers to be an irreversible change. The recognition and affirmation of women's rights in recent legislation and the new Constitution create a favourable context for increasing gender equality and eradicating the marginalisation and discrimination of indigenous women.

5.3.2 Unexpected outcomes

In Guatemala, indigenous community organisations are increasingly aware of their rights and are better able to participate in decision-making processes but, at the same time, are faced by a political and government system that offers them little space to do so, i.e. which has retained its exclusionary and discriminating characteristics. Increasingly pressing problems for IPs, mostly in the sphere of encroaching development projects and the violation of human rights, are not being addressed by the State, which has caused growing feelings of frustration and rejection, and is currently threatening to radicalise indigenous communities and other sectors of civil society. Maybe this is a necessary phase that preludes a phase of real political change in Guatemala.

Another unintended consequence of development interventions is the phenomenon that observers refer to as the "ngo-isation" of the indigenous and social movements in Guatemala. Large amounts of international support for the implementation of the 1996 Peace Agreements led to a proliferation of NGOs that entered into competition with each other for the limited development funds available. As a result, NGOs have tended to become self-centred and upwardly accountable instead of downwardly accountable and focused on the higher goal of strategic unification around fundamental issues. This ngo-isation has exacerbated existing cultural and political divisions between NGOs and CSOs, some of which clearly stem from the period of internal conflict.

In Guatemala, Hivos has supported the work of the indigenous membership organisation CONIC (Continental Commission of Indigenous Nations and Organizations), which has focused much of its attention on helping indigenous families obtain land through the Land

Fund. Working with a market-assisted model of land reform, the fund obliges indigenous groups to repay the cost of the land they are adjudicated. Because of unfavourable economic conditions, many of these communities enter into debts they will never be able to repay. For this reason, other organisations from the agrarian movement are expressly opposed to this market-assisted land reform and strive for an alternative, redistributive land reform. In their analysis of the situation, however, CONIC and Hivos are convinced that the first priority is to help landless communities gain access to land and both organisations have good hope that these communities later will be able to achieve cancellation of these debts through direct action and negotiation with the government.

In Bolivia, the recent political changes that organisations like Hivos have helped to bring about created many new opportunities for representation of IPs regionally and nationally. Among the leadership of indigenous organisations, this resulted in a scramble for these official positions, threatening to undermine the continuity of regional and local indigenous organisations. This would perhaps not be a problem if these people would directly represent the interests of their organisations and constituencies. However, in Bolivia, direct representation of IPs is not recognised and the IPs in official positions are constrained by the interests of political parties.

5.4 Influence of Hivos' mode of support

RQ10: In what way has the mode of supporting IP organisations by the CFAs contributed to or undermined the (positive) outcomes?

The information in this section is based on the case-study team's analysis of CFA project documentation and external project evaluations.

5.4.1 Choice of partners

In Guatemala, Hivos' partner portfolio has a good national coverage and thematic spread (across five of Hivos' seven sectoral areas), which is effective in strengthening Guatemala's relatively young civil society among IPs in various domains (e.g. poverty alleviation, organisational strengthening and defence of land and environmental rights). In Bolivia, Hivos' regional focus and strong thematic orientation responds well to the principal priority of the small indigenous groups in the Bolivian lowlands: the defence and sustainable management of natural resource in officially recognised indigenous territories. In both countries, Hivos also funds national platforms and networks for advocacy and policy dialogue on various issues (e.g. agrarian policy, women's rights, constitutional reform in Bolivia), which help transcend ethnic and regional boundaries. In Guatemala, more investment in building durable alliances between CSOs is needed so that policy-influencing efforts can become more effective. In Guatemala, only three organisations explicitly work from the perspective of the implementation of IPs' collective rights. In Bolivia, most organisations work from this perspective already for some time. In Guatemala, Hivos is working directly with indigenous membership organisations, while in Bolivia it has stopped doing so.

5.4.2 Support to planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation

Hivos has invested considerably in the institutional strengthening of its partners in order to raise the effectiveness of their activities. Hivos has avoided straightforwardly imposing

its policy criteria on its partners and has respected their autonomy. Criteria and indicators for planning and M&E are negotiated and made into tailor-made agreements. Hivos has offered its partners assistance in the definition and timely adjustment of expected results and indicators, in improving institutional planning or by offering courses in elaborating logical frameworks. This has usually been done through correspondence between partners and the Regional Office (Guatemala) or the Head Office (Bolivia). In the case of larger and more complex projects, Hivos - during country visits or through its liaison or country representative - offered more intensive and direct support. Generally, indigenous membership organisations need more intensive support because of their social-movement background and lack of experience with M&E and reporting processes. During the period under study, various partners were externally evaluated. Most partners said that they greatly valued Hivos' support and that Hivos had fulfilled a crucial role in the institutional development of their organisations.

5.4.3 Communication and networking

Hivos' emphasis on institutional strengthening of its partners has required a close follow-up and communication, which in large part took place through written correspondence concerning project proposals, annual reports and other periodic communications. Partner staff was generally positive about the communication with Hivos and valued the level of openness and mutual respect, as well as Hivos' flexibility and willingness to understand changes in context. Some partners also expressed implicit criticism regarding lack of clarity for phasing out their relationship or insufficient in-county presence to allow for effective coordination of projects.

Hivos does not have a formal partner network and has not actively stimulated contacts between partners - with one exception in Guatemala. Nevertheless, in both countries, various partners have been in contact with each other for occasional collaboration related to specific concerns. Generally, these contacts have provided opportunities for complementarily and mutual learning, both for partners and for their beneficiary populations.

5.5 Summarised assessment of Hivos' contribution in Latin America

Evaluation Question: To what extent have CFA policies, strategies, procedures and programmes and those of their partner organisations contributed to a reduction of structural injustice toward IPs?

In Latin America, Hivos has followed a two-pronged strategy: increasing indigenous communities' and organisations' ability to gain access to material and financial resources, markets and knowledge to generate income, while at the same time improving their capacity to influence decision-making regarding policies and legislation on issues that are relevant to them. In Guatemala, Hivos-funded interventions have been effective in increasing the legal awareness and representation and participation of indigenous communities in local decision-making, and in improving the access of indigenous producer groups to markets and credit. They have, however, failed in substantially increasing IPs' access to land or in mitigating the growing number of resource conflicts between indigenous communities and large-scale development projects in the form of State-promoted agro-industrial and extractive industries. A recent collaboration between two Hivos partners seems to constitute a promising approach,

because they combine innovative legal action on a national level with strengthening the capacities of local communities to defend themselves against resource-related violence. On the national level in Guatemala, indigenous organisations together with other CSOs have been quite successful in formulating proposals for policy and law reform on a wide range of issues, such as land rights, food security and integrated rural development. Unfortunately, opposition from powerful economic and political actors has prevented the adoption and implementation of these proposals by the government. This points to the need for stronger and more durable alliances among indigenous organisations, as well as between indigenous and non-indigenous CSOs. In order to generate political pressure from below, the involvement of local communities in national political and legislative processes needs to be increased by informing and consulting them at an early stage on proposals for implementing IPs' rights.

In the Bolivian lowlands, Hivos and its partners have been effective in securing indigenous land and resource rights and in helping communities formulate plans for the integrated management of their territories. However, they have been less successful in assuring communities' effective control over natural resources in their territories *vis-à-vis* external economic actors, or in helping them derive economic profit out of these resources through the sustainable exploitation of timber and non-timber forest resources. The first challenge requires the strengthening of both communities' internal governance structures and their capacities to pressure the government to enforce their rights. The second challenge is to find innovative and culturally appropriate ways to link indigenous economies to markets.

Hivos' funding of partners that supported the participation of IPs in the elaboration of proposals for constitutional reform has been very effective. Many of these proposals, also regarding women's rights, have been inserted in the revised constitutional text adopted in 2009. This broadly participatory process resulted in the political empowerment and increased rights-awareness of the participants; the recognition of indigenous autonomy has greatly enhanced IPs' prospects for achieving self-determination. In the new context, particular attention should be paid to the translation of constitutional rights into favourable legislation and policies, and care should be taken that the indigenous movement does not become absorbed by political party structures of the government currently in power.

In its work with IPs, Hivos has remained true to its policy to direct special attention to women as marginalised individuals and groups within indigenous societies. In both countries, Hivos' persistent pressure toward its partners to have them mainstream gender in their work as well as its direct support to (indigenous) women's organisations has contributed to the increased inclusion and participation of indigenous women, both in indigenous communities and membership organisations and on national level in official positions.

Hivos' decidedly rights-based approach in its work with IPs has proven very relevant in both Guatemala and Bolivia. However, in the new political and legal context of the latter country, Hivos' current policy toward IPs provides little orientation in finding answers to the many new challenges they face and is in need of being infused with new analysis, particularly on the issue of implementing institutional arrangements for indigenous autonomy.

6. ICCO's contribution to change in the situation of Adivasi in India

For the review of its work with IPs, ICCO requested a focus on *Adivasi* in India. This chapter summarises the main findings from the India country case study; more detailed information and full references can be found in Oudwater & Bannerjee (2010).

During the fieldwork for the case study, views on change in the situation of *Adivasi* were sought from the endogenous ("insider") perspective, the *Adivasi* communities and the exogenous ("outsider") perspective, such as staff of ICCO partner organisations, government staff, researchers and staff from other NGOs working on *Adivasi* issues. It must be noted that some staff of the partner organisations are of *Adivasi* origin, but their views have been presented as those of "outsiders", as they were not the beneficiaries. Further, there were only few *Adivasi* staff and they were often interviewed together with their non-*Adivasi* colleagues. Further sources of information were: a) project documents provided by the partner staff; and b) publications and reports on *Adivasi* in India, which were referred to prior to, during and after the fieldwork.

6.1 Change in the situation of Adivasi

In the 2001 census, *Adivasi* were estimated at 88.8 million, representing 8.2% of the total population. Although *Adivasi* live all over rural India, they are concentrated in a few states in central and north-east India. There are over 200 distinct groups of *Adivasi* that are highly diverse in terms of language, culture, extent of acculturation and livelihood strategies. What they do have in common is that they generally belong to the most marginalised sections of Indian society and are often regarded as backward and discriminated against. Many *Adivasi* live in areas rich in minerals; this has affected them negatively. About 70% of the total mineral, forest and water resources are found in areas where predominantly *Adivasi* live, which make up an estimated 20% of the total area of India. *Adivasi* have been disproportionately affected by displacement resulting from development projects such as mines, water dams and wildlife sanctuaries. Although *Adivasi* make up only 8.2% of the total population in India, about 40% of all displaced people belong to *Adivasi* communities (ActionAid 2008, Saha-Sinha 2009).

In both Orissa and Jharkhand States, the security situation is very tense because of the strong presence of Naxalites, a Maoist-inspired radical-left movement active since the late 1960s. Much of the social unrest is related to lack of access to basic services and limited access to and control over natural resources, upon which many *Adivasi* and other rural poor depend. The sense of deprivation and marginalisation is heightened by experiences and fears of land alienation and displacement (Gol 2008b). The Government of India (GoI) considers the Naxalites as a very serious threat to internal state security. According to human-rights watchdog organisations, atrocities against civilians are committed by both sides (AITPN 2009b).

6.1.1 How the situation of *Adivasi* has changed over the last ten years

RQ4: In what way did the position of the selected IPs change over the last 10 years concerning: political rights, land rights, livelihoods and rights of indigenous women?

Political rights and representation

The Constitution of India prohibits discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth, and it provides the right to equality, freedom of religion and culture, and education. Within the Constitution, specific Articles and the Special Schedules V and VI refer to the Scheduled Tribes, based on a policy of affirmative action and positive discrimination. The Special Schedules V and VI are constitutional provisions for tribal self-rule in geographic areas designated as Scheduled Areas, including Jharkhand and Orissa. It aims to protect the Scheduled Tribes from alienation of their lands; protect their livelihoods, social and cultural rights; and restrict the transfer of land from tribals to non-tribals (Jacobs 2009).

The overall legislative framework is rather complex, as some Acts protect *Adivasi* rights - Forest Rights Act of 2006 and the Provisions of the Panchayats (Extension to the Scheduled Areas) Act (PESA) of 1996 - whereas other policies seem to undermine their rights, e.g. the National Mineral Policy of 2008 and the proposed Amendment of the Land Acquisition Act of 2009. Several sectoral development programmes, e.g. health, education and employment, highlight the particularly vulnerable position of the *Adivasi* and try to address their lack of access to good-quality services (interviews, Gol 2007a, Gol 2008a, Surendra et al 2004).

Government stance regarding IPs. In relation to international conventions, the Gol ratified the ILO C 169 of 1989 and the DRIP of 2007, but has not granted any claimants special status as IPs. The Gol regards all citizens of India at the time of Independence and born afterwards as indigenous (Bagchi 2009). Although *Adivasi* do not have special status as IPs, the Gol has taken several steps to recognise, promote and protect their specific rights. In 1999, a Ministry of Tribal Affairs was created and developed the draft National Tribal Policy in 2004, which was revised after a consultation process in 2007. This not yet approved policy represents the first attempt to develop a holistic, integrated legislative framework addressing the protection of rights and promotion of socio-economic development of the Scheduled Areas. It addresses issues around regulatory protection, socio-economic development, granting social and cultural rights, improving distribution of benefits/schemes to the most vulnerable and ensuring intellectual property rights. For example, under this policy, it would become more difficult for companies to acquire land from the *Adivasi* and the companies would be liable to provide appropriate compensation (Jacob 2009, AITPN 2006a). According to resource persons, the fact that the policy has not yet been approved shows the lack of political will to promote and protect the rights of *Adivasi*.

Insiders' and outsiders' perceptions of change. Many CSOs saw the 73rd amendment to the Constitution of India as an important step to improve local representation through the introduction of a three-tiered governance system at local level (village, block and district). Despite this, both the *Adivasi* and outsiders felt that representation has not improved over the past years on account of weak implementation, the federal multiparty system and majority rules. Representation at district level is seen as quite weak for Jharkhand especially, where there have been no local elections for the past 30 years¹². Traditional local self-governance has been eroded over this period, compromised by several Acts and controversy about

12) In Orissa, the visited communities were more positive, as several *Adivasi* women had successfully contested local elections and won some seats.

the implementation of the PESA Act. Partners and resource persons saw the formation of Jharkhand as an independent state as an important step in asserting the identity and representation of the *Adivasi* in the political arena. However, they saw the federal multiparty system as giving little scope for actual representation of *Adivasi*. Local political party leaders' loyalty to national party interests compromised their commitment and opportunities for taking up pro-*Adivasi* positions.

The indigenous communities expressed their concern that their opportunities for raising their voice were undermined by the high levels of distrust on the part of local government and police toward *Adivasi*, due to the increasingly violent approach taken by the Naxalites movement. Police often suspect the local people of being sympathisers and threaten them.

Rights to natural resources

Policy change. Several policy changes have taken place, of which some protect *Adivasi* rights to natural resources. A positive change has been the Forest Rights Act of 2006, which aims to ensure *Adivasi* rights to forest resources. *Adivasi* used to cultivate land that belonged to the Forest Department. This was a constant source of conflict, as the Department saw the *Adivasi* as destroying the forests. The Gol has now realised that *Adivasi* depend on the forests for their livelihoods and have a stake in protecting and managing their resources sustainably. The enactment of the Forest Rights Act has given the *Adivasi* the right over the land they cultivate (AITPN 2006a, Gol 2008b).

On the other hand, the proposed Amendment to the Land Acquisition Act (2009) and the National Mineral Policy (2008) threaten to undermine *Adivasi* rights to natural resources. The Amendment to the Land Acquisition Act aims to do away with earlier clauses that put restrictions on alienation of tribal land to non-tribals or the government to provide land to companies (Bandyopadhyay 2009, AITPN 2009b). The National Mineral Policy aims to support the privatisation of the mining industry by providing a regulatory environment more conducive for investment and technology flows. It also advocates for frameworks of sustainable development and stipulates that special care should be taken to protect the interests of the affected people in line with the Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy of 2007 (Gol 2008a). However, the latter is seen by many CSOs and ICCO's partners as riddled with loopholes not in favour of the affected communities, which are often *Adivasi* (ACHR 2007, Saha-Sinha 2009, AITPN 2009a, Acharya 2008, interviews).

Insiders' and outsiders' perceptions of change. The *Adivasi* communities visited felt more threatened than before over loss of their rights to natural resources (land, water, forests). They were worried about forced evictions from their land, especially in Jharkhand. They stated that compensation for loss of land and livelihoods is often not given or is inadequate. In response to this, communities have become active in sensitising themselves about their rights to natural resources, including both land and forest, and are participating in several protest campaigns with support from ICCO partners and/or other CBOs and networks.

Both the *Adivasi* and the outsiders recognised the significance of the Forest Rights Act, which made it legal for them to have individual title over the land they cultivate. However, they had doubts about its implementation and effectiveness, and regarded bureaucracy as a major hurdle in applying for and obtaining titles to forest land. Partners reported various degrees of success in securing access to forest land.

Also most outsiders felt that *Adivasi* rights to land, previously protected by various Acts, have been compromised by new policies in favour of corporate companies. In both states, the

signing of Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) between the companies and the GoI have made *Adivasi* more vulnerable. These MoU stipulate land acquisition for corporate companies to set up a power plant, a steel plant and/or other heavy industries. However, senior government staff felt that there was no problem of land alienation and that this matter had become overly politicised for personal and political parties' interests. Outsiders were sceptical about several schemes of corporate social responsibility to compensate the people for the loss of land.

Livelihoods

Both insiders and outsiders confirmed that the work of ICCO partners on improving food security and livelihoods had a positive outcome in the communities concerned. The increase in income-generating activities, improved market linkages and uptake of improved agricultural production methods contributed to improving household food security. Through the introduction of low-cost irrigation facilities such as water tanks, treadle pumps, rehabilitated water ponds and rainwater-harvesting techniques, farmers can now grow several crops a year. This increased the availability of food for household consumption and opportunities for market-oriented vegetable production. Other improved agricultural production methods such as the use of low-cost external inputs had reduced production costs and increased household income. Communities where Gram Vikas was active said that improved availability of good water and sanitation facilities was a significant change and that women now spend less time fetching water.

Through self-help groups (SHGs), there has been an increase in savings mobilisation and improved access and links to banks and micro-finance institutions for micro-credit. Women's groups involved in poultry farming said that, although the income is small (Rs 24,000 annually¹³), it is an important complementary income which they did not have before. Both insiders and outsiders confirmed that, despite these efforts, seasonal labour migration continues. There are more opportunities to earn cash and the income earned in the cities is higher than in the villages. This has allowed women members of the SHGs to take up either individual or collective micro-enterprise activities. Outsiders stressed that SHGs have not only broadened the base of financial inclusion but also provided social capital at village level and a platform for women to come together and discuss issues of importance to them.

Despite these encouraging improvements, outsiders felt that levels of poverty have increased among *Adivasi*, generally because of globalisation and liberalisation. They perceived that the *Adivasi* economy is not well integrated into the market system and therefore left behind. In terms of access to government services, both insiders and outsiders said that this was limited and the services were often of poor quality. There have been no positive changes in access to social and public services such as health and education, despite the various national programmes such as the National Rural Health Mission and Universal Education for All. Primary health centres are understaffed and primary education is either poor or not available. Insiders felt that poor quality of education in the government schools is one of the reasons for their "backwardness", as they cannot compete with the mainstream society. They saw formal education as key to development, empowerment and political participation.

Although the National Rural Employment Guarantee (NREG) Act was aimed to give *Adivasi* the opportunity to take part in community-level planning processes, both insiders and outsiders saw it as being implemented from the top down, with villagers actually having little influence in planning to meet their development needs. Infrastructure improvement has also been generally poor. For example, government public works in Jharkhand were negatively affected by the frequent elections in recent years. Outsiders in Orissa mentioned that the total

¹³ Rs 24,000
= ca Euro 400
(exchange
rate April
2010)

amount of funds allocated for tribal welfare had gone down because earlier allocated funds had not been fully used.

Status and rights of women

Both insiders and outsiders felt that there has been an improvement in the position of *Adivasi* women in their society. In general, the position of women in tribal societies differs from that in the mainstream Hindu society. Among the *Adivasi*, there is less segregation between boys and girls, and girls have more freedom of movement. Some gender-biased superstitions exist, such as witch hunting and religious practices, and girls and women are denied the right to go to school, but both insiders and outsiders reported that this had become less prevalent. They stated that women have become politically and socially more empowered and have taken a pro-active role in their struggle over land and for livelihoods. Women are now actively involved in movements and rallies, e.g. against land acquisition and against introduction of genetically modified vegetables.

Women's involvement in income-generating activities has also contributed to their empowerment and, in some cases, they have taken full control over these activities. For example, the introduction of treadle pumps made it possible for women to become involved in vegetable production and women's SHGs have facilitated women to become engaged in several income-generating activities such as poultry farming and provided access to micro-finance.

However, negative changes were also mentioned by resource persons. With increased land alienation, women's labour migration to mines and to the cities has increased. This has made young *Adivasi* women vulnerable to exploitation by their employers. They become alienated from their culture and are not so respected by their communities; the number of unmarried *Adivasi* women might therefore rise in the near future.

6.1.2 Overall assessment of change in the situation of *Adivasi*

RQ5: Can these changes be assessed - and to what extent - as: a reduction of marginalisation of the IPs and a change in power, poverty, worldviews and values, an increase and strengthening of the political, economic, social and cultural self-determination and identity of the IPs? a reduction in marginalisation and inclusion in development processes that is considered positive by them? avoiding or mitigating of forced assimilation or integration?

Changing worldviews and values

Although the *Adivasi* are a very diverse, heterogeneous group of over 200 tribes speaking 100 different languages, over the years they seemed to have developed a sense of collective identity due to their increasing marginalisation and being labelled as different by the mainstream society and the government (interviews). The formation of the State of Jharkhand in 2000, based on ethnic considerations, can be seen as an important step toward giving self-determination to the *Adivasi*, although some argue that its level of self-determination is limited, as most state and market institutions are controlled by non-*Adivasi* (Ghosh 2006, interview).

Over the years, through increasing contact with mainstream society through media, incorporation into the market economy and access to education, the *Adivasi* have adapted certain cultural habits, such as their way of dressing and food habits, but continue to

celebrate their traditional festivals, at times actively promoted by the State. There have been gradual changes in social differentiation in terms of occupation, education, religion, social status and political orientation. In the discussions during the case study, it became clear that *Adivasi* do not want to be excluded from mainstream society. They value the importance of formal education and see this as a crucial step toward greater empowerment and livelihood improvement. Some insiders described “development” as preservation of their culture on one hand and upward social mobility on the other. They did not see development as a threat to their culture and identity. For them, social development also offers opportunities for self-determination and assertion of cultural rights.

However, the current trend of land alienation and displacement might have a more profound impact on their worldview and sense of identity. Land alienation and displacement lead not only to a loss of their livelihood base but also to an erosion of their culture and worldview, because they lose the spiritual connection to their land and ancestors (ActionAid 2008, interviews). Furthermore, the presence of Naxalites and the law-and-order response by the GoI has caused internal conflicts among and within *Adivasi* communities/tribes. These conflicts and possible levels of distrust may also affect their sense of identity and shared cultural values.

Marginalisation and continued high level of poverty

The communities visited benefited from the development interventions by ICCO partners, such as improved food security and income opportunities, better market linkages and increased social and political empowerment. Looking at the wider context, it becomes clear how encouraging these positive changes are. Article 46 of the Indian Constitution recognises that *Adivasi* are particularly marginalised and has made specific provisions in programmes and policies to address the structural injustice they face. Despite this, national data show limited progress so far, as *Adivasi* still make up a disproportionately large percentage of people living below the poverty line: 54% of the *Adivasi* in Jharkhand and 76% of *Adivasi* in Orissa, as compared with a national average of 39% (Saha-Sinha 2009). The decline in poverty ratio between 1993-94 and 2004-05 has been much slower for *Adivasi* compared to the national average decline or Scheduled Castes and Muslim minorities (Debroy & Bhandari 2007). Also the health and education indicators show that the *Adivasi* lag behind the national average, i.e. they have higher rates of infant mortality and primary school dropouts (Govinda & Bandyopadhyay 2008, GoI 2007b).

Affirmative action programmes by the Ministry of Tribal Affairs, which aimed to bridge the social, political and economic disparities between the *Adivasi* and the general population, have so far failed to achieve their desired results because of lack of proper implementation, underutilisation and misuse of funds and lack of awareness among *Adivasi* about this affirmative action (AITPN 2009b, GoI 2008b).

Representation, power and self-determination

There is a strong sense of empowerment and awareness of their political and civil rights and a greater degree of local political participation through an increased number of *Adivasi* women who successfully contested local elections. However, the overall level of formal political participation and representation is still low. Although the PESA Act, aimed at promoting village-level democracy, has been a step forward in recognising local community structures, their actual role is confined to implementation of government policies and is consultative in nature. Their real decision-making powers and control over resources are weak. In other words, full enactment of the Act has been limited. Within the formal political system, it is difficult for *Adivasi* representatives, as a minority, to really influence policies and plans in favour of *Adivasi*. Often, they are represented in major national political parties with their

own vested interests that do not necessarily match local priorities and interests (interviews, Surendra et al 2004, Gol 2008b).

In general, the level of self-determination by *Adivasi* has come increasingly under pressure because of their lack of access to and control over forest and land resources and the increasing levels of displacement resulting from land alienation. Although protective legislation is in place, there seems to be a gap between national policies and implementation at state level. Furthermore, the neo-liberal development paradigm has prioritised liberalisation, privatisation and industrial development rather than protecting and safeguarding the interests and rights of the marginalised and poor sections of society. The fact that the National Tribal Policy (draft 2006) is still in draft form after so many years clearly shows the lack of political will to address the structural injustice faced by *Adivasi*. The central state's response to the presence of Naxalites also indicates the relatively low level of meaningful political participation as perceived by *Adivasi*.

Struggle for rights to natural resources

Loss of access to and control over land is a major reason for current social unrest and marginalisation of *Adivasi* communities. In the past, *Adivasi* had already been marginalised from access to and control over forests on account of the timber industry and the establishment of forest reserves and wildlife sanctuaries. The passing of the Forest Rights Act was an important step forward in recognising *Adivasi* rights to forest land and resources, but there are concerns among *Adivasi* and CSOs about its implementation. For example, the responsibility for granting forest land titles lies with local government and not with the village council. *Adivasi* continue to be arrested for collecting and using minor forest products, evicted from their lands and harassed by forest officials (AITPN 2006a, Gol 2008b).

14) As per the Special Economic Zones Act 2005, SEZs are geographical regions that have different economic laws from the rest of the country, in order to facilitate increased investment and economic activity.

Concerns were raised by CSOs and researchers that the proposed Amendment to the Land Acquisition Act would open up land acquisition for industrial development on behalf of corporate companies and the establishment of Special Economic Zones (SEZs)¹⁴. As most of the mineral resources are found in the tribal areas, expansion of the mining industry could further marginalise the *Adivasi* through displacement, deforestation and environmental degradation. Mineral wealth has contributed significantly to the overall Gross Domestic Product, but the *Adivasi* tend not to benefit from the minerals found in their areas¹⁵ (Bandyopadhyay 2009, interviews). Although the Gol formulated the Rehabilitation and Resettlement Policy in 2007 to provide a legal framework for compensation and rehabilitation of displaced communities, *Adivasi* and many CSOs see it as failing to address the main causes of conflict around forcible land acquisition.

15) According to a study conducted in 2006 by the Centre for Science and Environment (CSE, India), Orissa and Jharkhand had one of the highest number of "backward" districts in the country: 27/30 and 19/22, respectively (Saha-Sinha 2008).

ICCO partners highlighted that *Adivasi* have become more vocal and organised in response to the increase in land alienation, as foreign and national corporate companies - encouraged by changes in government policy in support of industrialisation - try to establish new mining sites and other industries. In Jharkhand, there have been some successes in postponing the setting up of mines and power plants. Despite several incidents of land acquisition by companies, the movements in Orissa are less strong. *Adivasi* in Orissa are perceived by outsiders as less politically empowered and needing more support from NGOs/CSOs to raise their voice.

Position of *Adivasi* women

Generally, the status of *Adivasi* women appears to be better than that of most other women in Indian society, because they have greater freedom to move and interact with outsiders and with men in general. Several NGOs have chosen *Adivasi* women as their main entry points for community-development-based activities through mobilisation and strengthening of women's

SHGs. Both the partners and *Adivasi* women felt that these SHGs have been important for social and economic empowerment. Furthermore, the SHGs have also acted as platforms for taking up social development issues and claiming their rights. Several SHG members have successfully contested local elections, illustrating an increase in political empowerment. The 73rd Amendment to India's Constitution (1993, amended 2009) mandates local elections every five years and reserves one-third of all seats for women at local levels of government and the village assemblies (WEF 2009). Specific reservations are made to ensure that a minimum share of seats is allocated to women and Scheduled Tribes. No distinction has yet been made that the reservations for the Scheduled Tribes should be 50% for *Adivasi* men and 50% for *Adivasi* women (Chandra 2010).

In view of the current threat of increasing land alienation and reduced access to and control over forest resources, *Adivasi* women are clearly very vulnerable. Erosion of control over their productive resources, high levels of seasonal male labour migration, poor access to maternal health services and the threat of displacement put them and their children at risk.

Indirect "forced" integration

The Constitution and several related Acts, Bills and policies reflect articulation of *Adivasi* issues more from the perspective of integration rather than isolation or assimilation, without using the term "integration". Some policies and Acts are aimed at protecting the rights of the Scheduled Tribes and promoting their cultural, social and economic development. However, other policies, such as the proposed Amendment to the Land Acquisition Act (2009) and the National Mineral Policy (2008), seem to implicitly overrule and/or ignore some of these rights.

Over the years, *Adivasi* have become more integrated and thus also dependent on the wider market economy and wider society. They demand good education for their children to be able to benefit from this integration and take part in decision-making processes, but new challenges have arisen for communities threatened by land alienation and the establishment of extractive industries. The erosion of access to and control over resources has made them increasingly vulnerable, as most of them have not yet developed alternative livelihoods less dependent on land and natural resources. After losing their land and being forced to migrate to other places in search of work, i.e. at mining sites, steel plants or urban areas, they will have to give up their way of life, with possible consequences for their cultural identity, social cohesion and language. Incidences of *Adivasi* communities successfully opposing land alienation and the establishment of extractive industries on their land are examples where *Adivasi* try to protect their rights to self-determination in response to changes taking place in the political, social and economic sphere.

6.2 How ICCO and its partners have contributed to these changes

RQ6: To what degree and in what way can the changes be explained by CFA partners' interventions?

RQ7: What is the relative importance of the CFA partner network contribution to these changes?

6.2.1 Direction poverty alleviation

ICCO's partners contributed to poverty alleviation and improved food security through two major groups of interventions related to agriculture and income diversification:

- **Improved agricultural productivity.** Improving households' access to water for primarily productive purposes through low-cost small-scale irrigation facilities proved effective in raising agricultural productivity. Families are now able to grow more than one crop per year, whereas they used to depend mainly on rainfed farming. Partners also promoted improved access to seeds through seed banks and through the use of low-external-input and organic farming methods to improve soil fertility and to reduce the costs of farming. In addition, families were also assisted in poultry farming and in goat and cattle rearing. The resulting rise in agricultural productivity led to improved household food security and, through lower production costs and surplus sale of agricultural products, increased household income. The introduction of easy-to-use treadle pumps contributed to women's economic and social empowerment, as women can now be fully involved in vegetable production.
- **Diversified income sources.** The increase in agricultural productivity opened up opportunities for diversified income sources. Availability of low-cost irrigation facilities increased the crop and vegetable production for household consumption, leading to improved food security at household level. Any surplus is sold in the market. Through the mobilisation and strengthening of women's SHGs, savings were mobilised from the members, which were used as loans for both productive and consumptive purposes. These savings and/or loans enabled women to invest and set up income-generating activities such as poultry farming, goat rearing, small grocery shops and sal leaf plate-making. Women's active involvement in SHGs made them feel more empowered and gave them a greater sense of control over their livelihoods. Two partners actively promoted **local market development** through building on resources and strengthening skills already found in the *Adivasi* communities, such as tasar silk production and fruit-tree plantation and introducing new income sources such as dairy production. Key activities of ICCO partners have been skills training; facilitating access to support and business services such as animal healthcare, marketing boards and micro-finance services; and shortening the value chain by facilitating direct linkages between buyers and producers and minimising the role of middlemen.

Although improving health has not been a major area of work for ICCO-supported interventions, some partners have improved health and malnutrition status indirectly through improving access to water and sanitation facilities, training CHWs on preventive health measures and nutritional issues, training TBAs, and addressing malaria through herbal-based medicine production at community level and providing access to mosquito nets and blood-testing facilities.

In summary, the main positive outcomes of ICCO's support to direct poverty alleviation related to *Adivasi* in India were:

- Improved household food security and livelihood promotion through improved agricultural productivity contributing to improved food diversity at household level;
- Improved household income through sale of surpluses and diversification of income sources;
- Economic and social empowerment of women through their increased participation in agricultural production and linkages to local markets; women stated that they have a greater sense of control over their livelihoods.

6.2.2 Strengthening civil society

ICCO's support to strengthening civil society is mainly directed toward developing and strengthening community-level organisations and their federations. The choice of several ICCO partners to use *Adivasi* women as their main entry points for community-based development through mobilising and strengthening women's SHGs has clearly increased their political, social and economic empowerment. It has enabled both men and women to gain access to financial services and market linkages and to benefit from various training and capacity-building activities around income-generating activities, financial management and organisational development. Activities to empower women's SHGs have built on existing opportunities for political engagement at district and grassroots level. Most partners regard these groups as important entry points for strengthening local self-governance through awareness raising and through facilitating and supporting participatory planning processes. Local people have been able to gain more out of existing local government structures by having access to information and a better understanding of the dynamics and mechanisms through which decisions are made. In some cases, partners' beneficiaries were capacitated and elected in such local decision-making bodies. Through their focus on women's SHGs, most of ICCO's partners have contributed to the social, political and economic empowerment of women.

Strengthening the partner organisations is also an important way of indirectly engaging with the government, which has become more open for dialogue with NGOs. These are sometimes invited both at national and at state level to consultations in framing national policies, such as the NREG Act and the Forest Rights Act. In both Jharkhand and Orissa, the state also invited NGOs to take up responsibility for implementing some government schemes. In light of this, ICCO's support has been important to three partner organisations to access government development funds for livelihoods-related interventions in the communities. Thus, ICCO's support to partners served as catalyser for partners to link up with other donors that tend to fund more project-specific activities.

Thus, the main positive outcomes of ICCO's support to civil-society strengthening in India were:

- Political and social empowerment of women and men through increased awareness of their rights, improved access to information and better representation in local government bodies;
- Economic empowerment: expanded opportunities for people to take up income-generating activities through better access to financial services, savings mobilisation and improved linkages to markets;
- Strengthened local self-governance through capacitated SHGs taking part in economic development activities and local planning processes; and
- Increased possibilities for NGOs and CBOs to access government funds to support community development activities.

6.2.3 Influencing policy

ICCO's support was allocated primarily to direct poverty alleviation, but gradually a more rights-based focus was integrated into the partners' work. Most of ICCO's partners sought to build the capacity of CBOs to claim their rights primarily at local and district level. Some examples of influencing policy at local level include women's groups lobbying the Forest Department to grant them access to forest land; mobilising resources from the Tribal Welfare Commission to establish a poultry cooperative; and lobbying for subsidised sanitation for the very poor.

Only 4% of total project funding for *Adivasi* in India has a specific rights and advocacy focus. Each of the three partners involved in this work is quite different in terms of scale, focus and approach. On the whole, the impact of ICCO's support to advocacy for *Adivasi*-specific issues seems limited. There is no overall advocacy strategy in place, funds are relatively small and there is no clear connection between the activities supported. There are no established linkages among the advocacy partners and between the advocacy partners and other ICCO partners. ICCO's work on advocacy seems rather ad hoc and not very strategic, although the partners have interesting entry points, such as some partners' links to local land-rights movements and AITPN's research and lobbying work at international and national level. Missed opportunities are, for example, national partners not providing any training or advocacy support to any of ICCO's local partners in Jharkhand and Orissa. Furthermore, AITPN's work has a more regional focus and its India work focuses mainly on north-east India, whereas it would be good to link their work to ICCO-supported activities in Jharkhand for greater synergy and mutual learning.

In summary, the outcome of ICCO's support to influencing policy related to *Adivasi* in India has been limited. A positive outcome has been that CBOs and local communities are better informed and able to claim their rights and mobilise resources at local and district level. Given the limited focus of ICCO on influencing national-level policy in terms of number and types of partner organisations supported and amount of funding, there are no significant outcomes at that level.

6.3 Sustainability and unexpected outcomes of ICCO-supported changes

RQ8: What can be said about the sustainability of the changes?

RQ9: Are there unexpected (negative and positive) outcomes of CFA partners' interventions?

6.3.1 Sustainability

Poverty alleviation. Partners have contributed significantly to improving the livelihoods of *Adivasi* through their focus on direct poverty alleviation. Partners' work in local market development has greatly increased *Adivasi* access to and integration into local markets, diversified their income sources and developed their entrepreneurial skills. However, most of these market linkages depend on natural resources and land, e.g. vegetables and fruits, livestock rearing, sal leaf plate making. The current threat of land alienation, for some communities more than others, is likely to endanger some of these outcomes. It is clear that land displacement will have a far-reaching social, economic and environmental impact on *Adivasi* livelihoods. Part of the empowerment activities and developed skills such as leadership, record-keeping and entrepreneurial and business management skills might equip them to adjust to a new situation. For those communities where the threat is greater, ICCO partners will have to start giving more attention to ensuring the protection of forest/land rights of *Adivasi*. Further, they may also consider forms of support to make the *Adivasi* less vulnerable to the impact of land displacement and better able to adapt and take on alternative livelihoods.

Claiming rights and improved political representation. Many partners have successfully raised *Adivasi* awareness about their social, economic and political rights. Many of the women's groups appeared to be confident and empowered, and some members of these groups have been voted into local government bodies. However, it is not clear to what extent these groups and elected members know where to access relevant information and seek out support needed, nor to what extent they can deal with challenges and/or capitalise on opportunities. Most of the community groups seem to rely on partners' staff for information and giving them a platform to speak. The election of some members of women's groups into local government bodies should ensure access to information and provide opportunities to link up to government and other major development actors for advocacy and claiming their rights, provided these elected members feel accountable and keep close contacts to their constituency. Partners may need to continue to support these new leaders to enable them to work effectively in a competitive political environment with different vested interests. Given the complexity of the legislative framework and hierarchy of different Rights and Acts, community groups and these new elected leaders probably need continued support from resource persons/organisations with better access to information and a good legal understanding of the legislative framework and its implications for *Adivasi*.

Lobbying and influencing policy. Most partners are engaged in CSO building and lobbying activities at local level on a relatively small scale. These initiatives are not connected with each other, and no linkages have been established to movements or lobbying activities at the national and/or state level to address some of the crucial rights issues in a more coherent and concerted effort. Failing to connect to a larger network at higher levels will limit the scale, uptake, synergy and sustainability of these local activities. Failure to address the structural causes of poverty (lack of and/or inability to assert their rights) will also impact on the sustainability of some of the results achieved in terms of poverty alleviation.

Continuation of political and social engagement. The current social-political context with tensions between the Government and Naxalites and intertribal conflicts might hamper political and social engagement of local community leaders and CBOs. If they are too critical, community leaders might be singled out by either the Naxalites or the government. There is a danger that community groups and social movements become politicised and/or entangled with the Naxalites-related violence, in particular in the context of land alienation and development-induced displacement. Within this highly politically volatile environment, community-level groups and individuals may be wary to raise their voice in any state and/or national events.

6.3.2 Unexpected outcomes

Although all partners were asked whether there had been any unexpected outcomes, either positive or negative, as a consequence of their interventions, none could give any examples. In addition, partners' progress reports did not provide any examples of unexpected outcomes. However, resource persons mentioned that women's increased economic participation has had some negative consequences: gender-based violence among *Adivasi* has reportedly increased.

6.4 Influence of ICCO's mode of support

RQ10: In what way has the mode of supporting IP organisations by the CFAs contributed to or undermined the (positive) outcomes?

6.4.1 Choice of partners

ICCO worked mainly with intermediary organisations, both local and national NGOs differing in scale and focus. Three partners were large NGOs with a wide outreach over several states in India. The other partners were medium to small and more confined to working in selected districts in one or two states. Most of ICCO's partners worked with both *Adivasi* and non-*Adivasi* communities, with variations in proportion of *Adivasi* in the total portfolio of target beneficiaries. Most partners had integrated a rights component into their work, some more explicitly than others. ICCO's shift to more of a rights focus was noticeable in the changes in its partner portfolio. Three partner organisations with an explicit rights focus and working mainly on lobbying and advocacy were relatively new partners since 2002-03, compared to other partners which had been supported by ICCO since the early 1990s. ICCO chose to give indirect support to indigenous movements and IPOs through their partners, who facilitated the formation and strengthening of community-based groups. In some cases, this led to strong and relatively independent groups, movements and associations. Such capacity-building support to local CBOs and movements is important especially in the current political context of the presence of the Naxalites. These IP-based CBOs can become an important non-violent and alternative voice for representing *Adivasi* interests and concerns, in particular at local level.

6.4.2 Support to planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation

ICCO has a strong commitment to its partners and believes in long-term partnerships. Most of the partners in India have received funding and other support for over 15 years. Partners appreciated this long-term commitment and also the flexibility of ICCO's funding, as it covers overhead, organisational development and other institutional costs. This core funding allows partners to look for more project-oriented funds and, for example, mobilise funds from the State Government for specific project activities such as water and sanitation development.

In general, partners are free to identify their own priorities and develop their own proposals, as long as these fit within the overall framework and strategic priorities of ICCO. Implementation progress is monitored through annual reports, email contacts and field visits. The quality of programme monitoring by partners is an area of concern for ICCO and, in many cases, needs further improvement. Partners tend to monitor and report at activity level and seem less strong on monitoring and reporting at output, outcome and impact levels. Mechanisms for downward accountability are poorly developed. During organisational and proposal assessments, a major criterion for M&E is gender. If this is not well addressed, partners are requested to improve.

Next to flexible funding arrangements, ICCO also supports existing, well-established and new partners in learning and organisational development through funds for specific human-resource development and capacity-building activities and for organisational strategy development. Support to learning and exchange of experiences is provided through small travel funds for partner organisations to attend thematic meetings, international events and regional workshops. Although it was identified as a priority in the India country strategy plan for 2006-10, organisational learning around *Adivasi*-specific issues was not given much attention because of the restructuring processes in 2006 and 2009. There has been a considerable turnover of staff and changes in thematic priorities. In the work in India, learning on local market development became one of the priorities for organisational learning.

6.4.3 Communication and networking

The level of partners' involvement in ICCO's strategy development and prioritisation has varied. In the case of the India country strategy 2006-10, partners were involved only in the regional contextual analysis studies but not in the overall strategy development; they therefore had no influence on the decision-making process and the strategic priorities set. A few partners expressed their wish to be more involved in such processes and to be better informed about the strategic priorities.

Most of the communication between ICCO and partners takes place by email and is supported by regular country visits by desk officers. Satisfaction with the communication between ICCO and partners varied from positive to rather negative. Several partners said that the level and quality of communication had deteriorated considerably in the past years. As a result of high turnover of desk officers, some partners felt that there was a lack of understanding for their work and organisation. The partners saw the establishment of the regional office in India in 2009 as an opportunity for closer linkages and easier communication.¹⁶ So far, however, most of them were disappointed and stated that communication with the regional office was poor. Thus, the regional office has created expectations among the partners, at this early stage still unmet. Partners need to be clearly informed about the mandate of the regional office and ICCO's future strategies.

From time to time, ICCO has tried to stimulate more coordination and collaboration among partners and development agents, but not in a very active way. The networks of partners and other stakeholders are usually around a certain theme such as local market development, for example the Vikas Bazar network in India. In line with its organisational policy, ICCO does not actively coordinate the work of partners in the same district. As most partners work on poverty alleviation, albeit from different niches, there are opportunities for strengthening complementarities and synergies in their activities, especially if partners work in the same or neighbouring communities.

6.5 Summarised assessment of ICCO's contribution in India

Evaluation Question: To what extent have CFA policies, strategies, procedures and programmes and those of their partner organisations contributed to a reduction of structural injustice toward IPs?

During 2004-05, ICCO invested considerable resources in developing an India country strategy based on in-depth contextual analysis in which *Adivasi* were chosen as a specific target group. The India country strategy 2006-10 was highly relevant, as it recognised that rights to self-determination and inclusion were key to reducing structural injustice to *Adivasi*. It set out a coherent strategy with a strong rights focus, including direct poverty alleviation. Access to and control over land and natural resources was identified as one of the main challenges faced by *Adivasi*. Emphasis was put on the need to support *Adivasi* to claim their rights through supporting non-political *Adivasi* movements and partners providing legal aid and advocacy. Because of changes in organisational priorities within ICCO, the initial strategic choices guided by principles of rights to self-determination and inclusion were only partly operationalised. The focus of ICCO's policy and strategies became more pragmatic but remained relevant, given its emphasis on direct poverty alleviation and civil-society building through the themes of Fair Sustainable Economic Development and Access to Basic Services.

¹⁶ At the time of the field study, the Regional Office had been open only about six months, was still in the process of being set up and was busy with strategy development for the Asian region.

ICCO's work has focused mainly on the local level. The promotion of SHGs and CBOs has proved to be an effective strategy that combines local civil-society building and direct poverty alleviation with an integrated rights approach. The SHGs and CBOs offer entry points for supporting and promoting sustainable livelihoods through improving agricultural productivity, diversification of income through local market development activities, savings mobilisation and access to credit. ICCO has supported several interesting approaches to local market development and holistic community-development approaches around water and sanitation. None of these approaches is specific for *Adivasi*; they would be equally relevant elsewhere in resource-poor rural areas. Access to social services such as health, education and social protection programmes such as the NREG scheme seems not to have improved during the period under study. *Adivasi* continue to be more marginalised than non-*Adivasi*, as they have not been able to benefit from Government's efforts to improve access to these services in remote and deprived rural areas. In sum, the work of ICCO partners on improving food security and livelihoods had a positive outcome in the communities concerned but, generally, the levels of poverty among *Adivasi* have increased and continue to be worse than on a national average.

The CBOs composed of several SHGs provide a platform for articulating the demands of the *Adivasi* and raising their voice at local and district level. Through its support to partners that are strong in social mobilisation and improving rights awareness, ICCO has contributed to the political and social empowerment of *Adivasi*. Many of the women's groups seemed to be more confident in claiming their rights and in being involved in local-self governance processes, illustrated by examples of women in CBOs engaged in land and forest rights campaigns with other movements and women successfully contesting local elections. It shows that strengthening civil society is an effective way of influencing policy at local level and improving *Adivasi* awareness about their constitutional rights. These CBOs give them the opportunity to take action and might avoid a further radicalisation in terms of growing support for extremist movements such as the Naxalites. These CBOs and other SHGs might serve as an alternative, moderate counter-movement expressing the needs and priorities of the *Adivasi*. However, it is clear that the political context is rather volatile. The extent to which the *Adivasi* can successfully claim their rights depends on how the political situation will unfold and the extent to which economic vested interests outweigh the recognition of *Adivasi* rights to self-determination and inclusion. ICCO's contribution to policy influencing related to *Adivasi* issues has been mainly at local level through strengthening local CBOs and SHGs. ICCO has given little support to policy-influencing activities at state and national level and has not strategically addressed this.

The current trend of industrialisation and increased pressure on natural resources is a major threat to the livelihoods of *Adivasi*. Many *Adivasi* are very concerned about possible land alienation and displacement. This would have a major impact on their livelihoods and also undermine some of the outcomes ICCO's partners have achieved. So far, there seems to be little strategic thinking and/or coherent effort by ICCO and most of its partners to address and deal with this challenge. ICCO and its partners will need to think more strategically about supporting *Adivasi* to defend and claim their rights and, at the same time, make them less vulnerable to the impact of displacement and better able to adapt and take on alternative livelihoods.

7. Comparative analysis of change and of CFA contributions

7.1 Similarities and differences in change in the situation of indigenous peoples

RQ4: *In what way did the position of the selected IPs change over the last 10 years concerning: political rights, land rights, livelihoods and rights of indigenous women?*

RQ5: *Can these changes be assessed - and to what extent - as: a reduction of marginalisation of the IPs and a change in power, poverty, worldviews and values, an increase and strengthening of the political, economic, social and cultural self-determination and identity of the IPs? a reduction in marginalisation and inclusion in development processes considered positive by them? avoiding or mitigating of forced assimilation or integration?*

This section brings a comparative context analysis of the major changes in the situation of IPs based on the findings from the five case-study reports and Chapters 4, 5 and 6 in this synthesis report. The main issues discussed are related to the central concepts highlighted in the ToRs.

7.1.1 Worldviews, values and identity

All case studies reveal that the worldviews and values of IPs have changed over the years due to increased exposure to other cultures, integration into the market economy, formal education, poverty-induced migration and the increasing penetration of media and telecommunication into daily lives. Despite these changes, many IPs continue to have a strong sense of identity. Especially in India and Ethiopia, they have become more aware of their specific status as minorities and have managed to change the negative views of others concerning their identity and culture. In Latin America, the IP movement has matured and achieved some successes in advocating for indigenous collective rights. In all five case-study countries, there is a strong sense that - through self-mobilisation, economic development and formal education - IPs' opportunities to negotiate with the government and claim their collective rights will improve.

7.2.1 Self-determination and inclusion in development

Self-determination. Specific provisions to promote self-determination and IPs' rights have been included in laws and policies in the five countries, although to different degrees. When their collective rights are recognised, IPs have a firmer legal basis to defend their own priorities, promote their socio-economic development and gain access to and control over resources. The prospects for IPs' self-determination depend partly on the extent to which their specific collective rights are recognised but, in practice, are also greatly affected by the influence of mainstream capitalist market-led development on IPs' lifestyles and political room for manoeuvre.

In Guatemala, effective self-determination is still far away. A combination of incipient rights awareness and a fragmented indigenous movement, on the one hand, and an authoritarian,

exclusionary political system, on the other, has prevented the implementation of ILO C169 almost completely. A bill on IPs' rights is pending in Congress but is unlikely to be approved in the short term, because of opposition by conservative non-indigenous elites. In Kenya, although the GoK does not use the concept of IPs, it regards pastoralists as specifically marginalised people who have been left behind in the overall development of the country. Several policies recognise the rights of minorities, including pastoralists, to access land and participate in decision-making over land-based resources. The new Constitution (not yet finalised and approved) recognises the collective land rights of pastoralists. In Ethiopia, each pastoralist ethnic group - like all groups in the country - has the constitutional right to self-determination. Minority "nationalities" also have rights to special representation. Customary law and justice systems are recognised in the Constitution, to the extent that the disputing parties agree to this (FDRE 1994).

Of the five countries, only Bolivia and India have ratified both the ILO C169 and the DRIP. Both international instruments oblige states to implement certain arrangements for the autonomy of IPs and to promote their social, economic and cultural rights with respect for their indigenous identity and institutions. Bolivia has adopted the DRIP as national legislation, and its new Constitution recognises indigenous autonomy and makes room for IPs' self-determination.

The principles of ILO C169 are enshrined in the Indian Constitution (V and VI Schedule) and in various affirmative actions. The Gol has not granted any group special IP status, as it regards all people born in India and their descendents at Independence as IPs. The whole intention of the DRIP is undermined if no distinction is made regarding marginalised peoples within a country. However, even if a national government has not ratified the DRIP, this can still be used as a normative orientation point for identity-based groups in making claims toward the State.

The right to self-determination (whether formally recognised or not) should be distinguished from effective self-determination, which may exist even in a country that has not recognised any legal standard on IPs. Equally, even where it is written in the Constitution or other legal texts, the social reality may be very different. In Bolivia, Ethiopia, Kenya and India, there are problems in the implementation of laws and policies favourable to IPs, which are often contradicted by other policies or laws and/or are obstructed by politicians from dominant society/ethnic groups. In such a legal environment, economic actors with ill intentions can make use of the contradictions for their own interests in the areas inhabited by IPs.

Autonomy. The concept of autonomy always includes aspects of rights, most commonly rights to land and other natural resources. With reference to territorial autonomy, IPs are being granted rights in certain areas to govern themselves according to their own institutions. This allows groups to make decisions based on their own customs and traditions, and on their own visions of development. Self-government may be defined on a group basis or territorially, and may be exclusive or inclusive of other ethnic groups living within the same geographic boundaries.¹⁷ In the case of mobile groups such as pastoralists, territorial autonomy is difficult to secure and may not be desirable, because pastoralists depend on high mobility and flexibility in land use and because the territories they use are also used legitimately by people of other ethnic groups. A more flexible concept of "autonomy" is needed for pastoral peoples, which is more concerned with recognition of their traditional institutions and normative systems, i.e. their right to deal with their concerns according to their own institutions and governance structures.

17) Autonomy regimes can be defined in geographical and in ethnic terms. In geographically defined (inclusive) regimes, none of the different – indigenous and non-indigenous – ethnic groups has preferential rights, even though the borders of the autonomous regions have been set in such a way that the indigenous groups are in the majority. In ethnically defined (exclusive) regimes, the definition of an indigenous jurisdiction fully coincides with the formally recognised indigenous territories.

In Latin America, the right to autonomy has been the fundamental demand of indigenous movements for many years; in Africa and India (with the exception of north-east India), many IPs do not frame their demands in terms of autonomy (for diplomatic reasons or because they are unaware of the discussion or because they are not interested in territorial autonomy) but they have, in many instances, expressed the wish to have the ability and right to regulate and govern their own affairs through indigenous decision-making institutions, whether modern or adapted from tradition. In general, autonomy claims by IPs should not be interpreted as a rejection or disapproval of the societies around them. On the contrary, many IPs have expressed the wish to engage with, and integrate into, the national society on mutually agreed terms.

Decentralisation. Autonomy needs to be discussed in relation to decentralisation policies, whereby the Constitution or legislation grants a certain degree of self-rule to IPs. Policies for administrative decentralisation, which have been actively encouraged by international development agencies such as the World Bank, have sometimes dovetailed with the recognition of local-level forms of indigenous governance. In most cases, however, decentralisation has not involved the recognition of indigenous authorities as such, and these have often been displaced by new forms of organisation (usually State-imposed institutions). Moreover, management of resources transferred to the local level has remained conditional; local administration, in practice, has often involved only managing government-designed projects, with little scope for independent decision-making. Decentralisation therefore cannot be equated with full-fledged autonomy.

In Ethiopia, Kenya and India, decentralisation involves primarily subdivision of State authority into smaller units (districts, sub-districts). By virtue of their geographic location, these smaller units may include mainly certain pastoral ethnic groups or *Adivasi* (as in the case of Jharkhand), who thus gain greater influence through authorities that are located closer to them, but these are not indigenous structures. In India, the Constitution and laws have granted *Adivasi* the right to local self-rule through the Panchayat Raj system, which gives the appearance of granting autonomy. However, there have been no local elections in Jharkhand for the past 30 years and customary self-rule has become marginalised.

In Latin America, decentralisation policies helped IPs' claim for autonomy, which were seen by the Government as a way of decentralising in indigenous areas. Among the case-study countries, the most explicit recognition of IPs' right to autonomy is in Bolivia. Since 1996, indigenous territories were recognised, but communities were not given full administrative jurisdiction over these territories. Overlapping jurisdictions created legal uncertainty and disputes over local development planning and resource exploitation. The new Constitution in 2009 has tried to correct this by recognising indigenous self-government in the already recognised indigenous territories. In Guatemala, the Government implemented various decentralisation laws in 2002 but has remained very reluctant to grant indigenous communities rights to full-fledged autonomy. IPs have become involved in local governance through their participation in newly created local development councils which, however, have only a consultative status.

In practice, in Ethiopia, Kenya, India and Guatemala, decentralisation has meant subdivision of state authorities into smaller units without giving any real decision-making power over resources, and the role of local assemblies remains largely consultative.

Relationship between modern and traditional authorities. The countries differ with respect to the attention the Government gives to indigenous authority structures. In Bolivia

and Guatemala, there is a tendency to marginalise or replace indigenous structures with new state-imposed institutions. In Ethiopia, some efforts have been made to link modern and indigenous structures in ethnically based regions. In Kenya, modern authority structures have generally weakened traditional ones, although - in remote areas - traditional structures still prevail. In India, traditional resource-management structures seem to have lost their meaning over the years, partly because most natural resources are either government or privately owned; very few commonly managed land and forest resources remain. Furthermore, it is the local government and not the indigenous governance structures that grant forest-use rights to households, communities and companies.

Attention given by governments to poverty alleviation among IPs. In all case-study countries, the government recognises that IPs are particularly marginalised. Generally, these belong to the poorest groups within the countries: they lag far behind the average national indicators for human welfare in terms of health, education, nutritional status, food security and income. The extent to which governments have formulated policies and poverty-reduction programmes with a differentiated approach to the specific needs of IPs varies.

In both Ethiopia and Kenya, separate ministries have been set up to address the development of hitherto marginalised pastoralist areas and major pastoralist development projects have been co-financed and implemented by the State and international organisations (e.g. World Bank).

In Bolivia and Guatemala, there are several general policies related to poverty alleviation, but without a differentiated approach. Government institutions charged with attending to the concerns of IPs have relatively low budgets and are understaffed. In Bolivia, the implementation of poverty-alleviation programmes is poor and slow; some government plans have never been implemented because of insufficient funds as well as corruption and political instability. Other policies on health and education have attempted to incorporate a specific IP focus (e.g. bilingual, culturally appropriate) but have not been implemented. In Guatemala, the policy regarding poverty alleviation is not differentiated according to ethnic groups and does not take into account the specific needs or situation of IPs.

In India, there are draft policies/laws proposed specifically for IPs, but these have not yet been approved. For example, a National Tribal Policy, designed for the *Adivasi*, has been pending in Parliament for the last five years. Government policies on education, health and women's empowerment refer to *Adivasi* as an extremely poor and marginalised group, but do not clearly address their particular needs and situation. The Ministry of Tribal Affairs provides funds for development projects in the tribal areas. Some of these funds are channelled through NGOs and CSOs (including some ICCO partners) for implementing development projects such as water and sanitation and income-generating activities. However, the Ministry of Tribal Affairs is known for being seriously understaffed, and the available budget is not fully spent and is poorly monitored.

7.1.3 Representation and power

Awareness and assertion of rights. The case-study countries differ considerably in terms of IPs' awareness of and ability to claim their rights. The degree to which IPs are able to exert their rights has varied on account of the complexity of the legislative frameworks, the lack of clarity and/or difficulties in land-title registration, and barriers to accessing and securing legal justice (legal support structures are weak, slow and overburdened).

In Bolivia, IPs' rights have been high on the political agenda for almost 20 years. In

Guatemala, there has recently been a notable shift from a discourse on citizens' rights to a discourse on IPs' collective rights. In Ethiopia, Kenya and India, the rights awareness of the pastoralists and *Adivasi* is mainly related to their constitutional rights as citizens, such as their rights to basic services, but less to collective rights as defined in ILO C169 and DRIP. In these three countries, the governments have made no efforts to raise local communities' awareness of their rights as IPs. Furthermore, NGOs, CSOs and indigenous movements appear to have focused on what they consider to be the most immediate and essential needs: land, food, water, health, education, "livelihoods" (usually equated with income-generating activities). They may have regarded work on ensuring collective rights as a politically sensitive issue best to avoid, yet erosion of rights to natural resources and cases of displacement of pastoralists and *Adivasi* are obvious problems.

Political representation and distrust between communities and higher levels. In Ethiopia, Guatemala, India and Kenya, there has been improvement in IPs' awareness and possibilities for representation and voice at local level as citizens, but less so at higher levels. Members of local groups are involved in planning at that level, but cannot make decisions about money coming from higher levels of government. Their "representatives" at regional and national level are usually politically appointed and tend to follow vested party interests. In many cases, IPs at local level do not regard these "representatives" as willing or able to defend the interests. In Kenya, for example, practising pastoralists in rural areas often feel that the ethnic pastoralists who profess to speak at national level on their behalf have little knowledge of how they live. There is also little trust between the numerous pastoralist groups, so it is difficult for a person from one ethnic group to be accepted as speaking on behalf of all pastoralist groups in the country. Also in Bolivia, indigenous representatives, although they constitute a significant proportion of the parliament, are often bound by party and trade-union politics, especially since Morales came to power in 2006. Moreover, most are from the highlands; the much smaller lowland IPs remain underrepresented.

Generally, there is some degree of distrust between communities and government institutions. In Guatemala, many IPs feel that the government agencies dominated by non-IPs do not attend to the IPs' needs. In India, despite the gradual improvements in representation, the *Adivasi* feel increasingly marginalised, exploited and excluded from development processes. The strong hold of Naxalites in many *Adivasi*-dominated areas is both a reason for and consequence of distrust between communities and government (including police and security forces).

Control over natural resources. Issues related to IPs' rights to land and natural resources are extremely important in all case-study countries. In four of the five cases (Bolivia, Ethiopia, India and Kenya), the IPs / pastoralists have legal rights to natural resources, but there is weak or no government support to realise or defend these rights. Indeed, it is often the government that is undermining them, and the opportunities for IPs to appeal are few and difficult to pursue.

It is crucial whether the territory is defined as collective property and whether the land is inalienable (transfer of rights is prohibited). In the case-study countries, the situation differs with regard to IPs' interest in *owning* versus *having access* to land. For pastoralists in Ethiopia and Kenya, the key issue is the possibility to negotiate flexible access to resources to be able to maintain mobility. In Kenya, the GoK recognises pastoralists' territorial rights in principle, but infrastructure development (e.g. roads, tourist sites, dams and irrigation schemes) can overrule pastoralists' rights. In Ethiopia, all common-property resources used by pastoralists are under State sovereignty, and the GoE leases land to investors. This would be impossible

in the case of Bolivia, where 13% of the land surface is titled as designated indigenous territories (TCOs), inalienable collective property that cannot be sold or leased. Most of this land is in the Amazon lowlands, where only about 3% of the IPs live. In India, the concern is about both individual and collective access to and ownership of land. For example, the Forest Rights Act (2006), albeit weakly implemented, gives IPs individual ownership rights to forest that are inheritable but not alienable. However, with the proposed amendment to the Land Acquisition Act (2009, not yet approved), the Gol is backtracking on protecting *Adivasi* land rights. Thus far, land could not be transferred to non-*Adivasi*. If the inalienable character of ownership is erased from the legal text, companies will soon be able to obtain land from the State Governments.

In Guatemala, the Government has been very reluctant to recognise collective territories of IPs, most likely because of fear of having to deal with many indigenous land claims and because it wants to attract foreign investors interested in extracting resources from these lands.

Risk of displacement. In all five countries, to a greater or lesser extent, IPs are at risk of being displaced by large-scale “modern” development of land for cultivation, water resources/power and other infrastructure projects, mining, oil drilling, national parks and tourism. Displacement of IPs from their land is a threat to their culture, way of life, identity and self-determination. IPs and CSOs have become increasingly aware of the danger that IPs lose rights to the resources they have traditionally been using. In India, the *Adivasi* have been disproportionately affected by displacement, as they tend to live in mineral-rich areas (like IPs in Bolivia and Guatemala). In Ethiopia, displacement of pastoralists because of commercial developments and national parks has been most severe among the Karayu and Afar and several small groups in southern Ethiopia. Also in Bolivia, there has been displacement, although not in the regions where Hivos is working. In Guatemala, with no indigenous collective land rights recognised and a government that shows no political will to consult communities, but where mining investment has increased substantially in recent years, the risk of displacement of IPs is very high.

7.1.4 Position of indigenous women

In Ethiopia, Kenya and India, indigenous women have gained a better economic position through more opportunities to generate income. In all five countries, women’s empowerment had led to their greater awareness of their civic and human rights (and, in some cases, their rights as IPs). Local, national and international CSOs have played a key role in raising women’s concerns, including those of indigenous women. In Bolivia, Ethiopia, India and Kenya, an increased number of women have been appointed or elected as members of local development committees or councils and/or are involved in local development planning processes. They have also become more vocal in these capacities. In Guatemala and Kenya, the number of indigenous women in leadership roles and government positions has increased also at regional and national level.

In all five countries, there are no specific government stipulations regarding a minimum percentage of *indigenous* women in government bodies. In Bolivia, Ethiopia, Guatemala and India, there are reservations of seats for IPs (minority “nationalities” in Ethiopia), and all countries have allocated a certain percentage of parliament seats to women. In all, representation of IPs seems to be a more urgent problem than representation of indigenous women.

In all five countries, women (including some indigenous women) have been increasingly successful in raising their voice and exerting some influence on policies. However, overall the effects have not been very strong: women continue to face widespread marginalisation (illiteracy, feminisation of poverty) and violence against them. The recognition and enactment of women's rights in policies and laws, even less the rights of indigenous women, remain an area of concern.

7.1.5 Forced assimilation or integration

Although none of the five countries has formal integration policies, forced integration of IPs is happening in various ways. IPs are able to express their own culture through speaking their own languages and observing their cultural festivals but their ability to pursue their traditional livelihoods and maintain their cultural identity has become compromised. On account of pressure on land and resources, liberalisation policies and changes in aspirations of the youth, IPs have become more integrated into the mainstream society. They have taken up more market-oriented livelihoods and increasingly access modern healthcare and education services. Local government structures have become more widespread in the areas inhabited by IPs. Most of the indigenous communities visited expressed interest in access to good healthcare and education for their children, but also a need for more culturally appropriate forms of these social services. Most government policies and development programmes are "general" in nature and often do not take account of particular interests and needs of IPs, such as culturally specific and bilingual education and strengthening of indigenous governance structures.

7.2 Similarities and differences in CFA contributions to these changes

RQ6: To what degree and in what way can the changes be explained by CFA partners' interventions?

RQ8: What can be said about the sustainability of the changes?

7.2.1 Type and relative importance of CFA contributions

Following on the changes discussed above, this section discusses how the interventions of CFA partners have contributed to these changes. The findings are based on the case-study reports, the partner portfolios and earlier chapters of this report, in particular Chapters 3-6 and Section 7.1. The contributions are discussed along the three major intervention approaches of the CFAs - poverty alleviation, civil-society strengthening and policy influencing - with a specific section on change in the situation of indigenous women. Within these sub-sections, reference is made to the research questions in the ToRs and to changes discussed in Section 7.1.

Contribution to changes through direct poverty alleviation

Direct poverty alleviation is an important part of the portfolio of all CFAs in the five case-study countries and has focused mainly on improving production and income and, to a lesser extent, on improving access to services such as healthcare and education.

Improving production and income. The CFAs support similar interventions, which are generally based on use of natural resources, such as improving forestry and agricultural production (including animal husbandry). Improving production is seen as a strategy not only

for increasing food security at household/community level but also for raising an income through the sale of surplus and, in some cases, to secure land rights. All CFA partners therefore also support activities related to marketing, e.g. by linking the communities to markets (local and beyond), supporting producer groups, and facilitating linkages with business services. Mobilisation of savings and facilitating access to credit are important elements of supporting income-generating activities and market access.

Cordaid's support to direct poverty alleviation among pastoralists in eastern Africa has involved primarily improving livestock husbandry, facilitating access to credit (also in the form of livestock), helping pastoralists diversify their sources of income (including support to group formation for savings and credit, income generation and better access to markets) and improving their access to basic services such as education, water supply and healthcare, including training of community-based workers in human and animal health. The introduction of the camel by partners in southern Ethiopia has been a unique contribution that was not done by other actors in the area, and provides a good example of supporting pastoralist communities in their efforts to adapt to change in environmental conditions.

Hivos' support to poverty alleviation has been directly through improved agricultural and forestry production and facilitating access to markets and credit, such as through handcraft and organic coffee producer groups. In Guatemala, Hivos also funded several activities of partners that indirectly contributed to poverty alleviation, such as organising and supporting indigenous communities threatened by large-scale development projects or illegal timber logging to defend their rights to water and a clean environment, and negotiating with State institutions so that land-needy communities could obtain access to land. In Bolivia, Hivos supported indigenous communities in preparing integrated management plans for TCOs.

ICCO's support to poverty alleviation has been primarily through improving agricultural productivity through facilitating access to water (small-scale irrigation) and seed, and training in low-external-input and organic farming methods. It has also supported diversification of income sources, especially through mobilisation and strengthening of women's SHGs for savings and credit and income generation and through local market development (LMD).

With regard to market development, Hivos emphasised support to establishing international market linkages through organic and fair trade initiatives, whereas Cordaid and ICCO focused on local markets by strengthening existing marketing linkages, supporting establishment of pastoralist-managed markets (e.g. in Kenya) or introducing "new" forms of production (e.g. dairy production in India). ICCO has supported several interesting approaches to LMD (business services/ integrated approach) and a network to foster exchange of experiences and learning among other NGOs and intermediaries (including non-ICCO partners) working on LMD.

Improving access to healthcare. In Ethiopia, India and Kenya, IPs frequently referred to the importance of healthcare. Among the *Adivasi* in India and the pastoralists in Ethiopia and Kenya, Cordaid and ICCO partners have trained and, to a limited extent, equipped CHWs and raised awareness on preventive health measures. The communities visited in these countries felt that the current availability of formal health services did not meet their needs. In Kenya and Ethiopia, both IPs and resource persons appreciated the importance of the grassroots layer of healthcare in sparsely populated areas where there are few doctors or nurses. In Kenya, however, the government does not recognise the value of these community-based workers and no longer collaborates with NGOs to support them. This was raised by pastoralists as an issue about which they would like to exert influence in order to change the current government policy. In Bolivia, there is concern among IPs that, although the

government in previous years has stated its intention to devise a culturally appropriate health policy, they are not provided culturally-appropriate services (for more details about these, see Annex 7). In Guatemala, the issue of special healthcare for IPs does not seem to be high on the government agenda, as health services generally are lacking because of budgets cuts. In areas where transnational companies are operating, the government has delegated healthcare delivery (and also education) to these companies as a way to win communities over to these projects. Attention to HIV/AIDS seems limited; only Hivos appears to be supporting HIV/AIDS-related activities with IPs specifically, and it is a minor component of some Cordaid-supported projects with pastoralists.

By 2008, health was not a priority area for any of the CFAs in the five case-study countries; this is in line with the current CFA policies and strategies for these countries. A few ICCO partners did have some community health activities integrated in their overall community development work, but it was not the main emphasis of their work. During the period, Cordaid directly supported healthcare, including outreach to rural areas and gradually increased attention to building up community-based services attached to clinics and healthposts. The support directly to the clinics is now being phased out.

Expanding opportunities for youth. In all case-study countries, both IPs and resource persons saw “modern” education as the key to development, participation and political empowerment. However, there was concern about the situation of the many young people who experience this education but then no longer fit into the indigenous society. In Guatemala, migration to urban areas or to the USA is a big problem, as is the loss of indigenous culture among the youth. Culturally appropriate education might prevent this loss and make the educated youth feel more connected with their community of origin. During the case studies, some IPs mentioned the fear of losing their language and expressed a need for more attention to youth to make them more aware of their culture and history. Resource persons also saw a need to work with indigenous youth groups on issues such as “life skills”, leadership and awareness of their rights.

In general, all three CFAs regard education as the responsibility of government, which it is. However, if the government does not provide culturally appropriate education for IPs, there is still a role for CFA partners to promote this, working in collaboration with government agencies.

In summary, the main positive outcomes of the CFAs’ support to direct poverty alleviation in the operational areas of their partners were:

- Greater livelihood security and household food security through improved agricultural productivity and diversification of income sources through application of new skills, techniques, improved market linkages and access to financial services, and reduced risks to production;
- Economic and social empowerment of women through their increased participation in agricultural production and linkages to markets, as well as other income-generating activities;
- In some cases, improved access to basic services (healthcare, education and water supply), although availability remains far below local needs.

Contribution to changes through civil-society strengthening

Strengthening of CSOs and indigenous authority structures are key in supporting IPs in achieving self-determination, increasing their level of representation in political and government structures and empowering them in negotiating with government and other

major stakeholders. The CFAs also see civil-society strengthening as a major way to empower IPs to claim and assert their rights and to support poverty-alleviation strategies through better organised access to services and resources (i.e. markets, credits, extension and marketing services by government institutions) and management of forest and land resources. Cordaid and ICCO support civil-society strengthening as an entry point for direct poverty alleviation, whereas Hivos partners in Latin America place a stronger emphasis on strengthening civil society to assert rights. Common community-development approaches include setting up producer groups, savings groups and SHGs and developing local leadership capacities. For example, ICCO partners' work with *Adivasi* SHGs has proved to be an effective strategy that combines local civil-society building and direct poverty alleviation: the CBOs composed of several SHGs provide a platform for articulating the demands of the *Adivasi*. The SHGs and CBOs offer entry points for supporting and promoting sustainable livelihoods (income-generating activities, financial services, skill training).

Only few CFA partners deliberately work through and strengthen indigenous authority structures, and the opportunities for this differ greatly, depending on the local political realities and the extent to which these structures will exist. Some Cordaid partners have sought to integrate indigenous and modern authority structures in land-use management and conflict resolution, and to make assets available to poor women through indigenous structures. In Bolivia, there is more emphasis on indigenous structures (i.e. in the TCOs) and the support to territorial planning responds well to the indigenous communities' major concern: increasing control over natural resources, i.e. consolidating their rights in practice. In India, ICCO's partner Gram Vikas works with all existing community structures interested in and committed to local development activities around water and sanitation. Overall, the team's review of CFA partners' work in civil-society strengthening suggests that more attention could be given to indigenous authority structures, e.g. for communal land management. Working through and strengthening indigenous structures is an important mechanism to address issues around (forced) integration and strengthening self-determination.

Approaches to and impacts of strengthening civil society vary, given the historical and political context of the case-study countries. For example, although the civil war in Guatemala has ended, the Government still tends to categorise people voicing protest as undermining State authority. The situation is much the same in India, where platform-building can easily become criminalised: people who are vocal in demanding their rights are quickly accused of being sympathisers of the Naxalites. Also in Ethiopia, there are strong restrictions on NGOs, and justified protest is easily interpreted as opposition to the Government. There is a danger that the situation becomes politicised, although the people are merely demanding what is due to them by national and/or international law. CSOs and NGOs advocating for IPs' rights have to find a careful balance so as not to overly upset the government authorities. For example, in India, they run the risk of losing the FCRA registration needed to be allowed to receive foreign funds. In Ethiopia, the new CSO law does not allow NGOs with more than 10% of their budget from foreign sources to work on issues of human, civil, women's and children's rights. In Guatemala and India, the situation is potentially explosive; here, it is an urgent task for NGOs to help IPs defend their legal rights, in the manner most fitting in view of the political context.

These contextual differences are also reflected in the emphasis given by the CFAs to civil-society strengthening and IPs' collective identity. Cordaid in Ethiopia and ICCO in India have mainly supported civil-society strengthening at local and, to a lesser extent, national level. Community groups, e.g. SHGs, tend to focus more on direct livelihood issues but are also

strengthened and empowered to take part in local decision-making bodies. Local people are trained, e.g. in budget literacy to increase transparency in decision-making and accountability of district governments. At times, the community-level groups and platforms also raise local concerns, i.e. weak enforcement of government policies and programmes. Cordaid's work on Community-Managed Disaster Risk Reduction (CMDRR) revealed that this approach is highly relevant for pastoralists. Partners stressed the importance of scaling it up as an alternative to the conventional approach to disaster-risk management, as CMDRR starts with local people assessing their own situation and what they can do themselves, rather than starting with assessment by outsiders. None of these approaches (SHGs, budget literacy, CMDRR) is specific to IPs; they would be equally relevant elsewhere in rural areas.

Hivos' work in Guatemala has been centred more on building indigenous membership organisations at community and regional level and on strengthening the national integration of these organisations. The IPOs were also mobilised when communities were threatened by the introduction of large-scale development projects.

In Bolivia (since 2006) and Kenya, there are more open discussions about rights issues, and criticism of the government is not repressed to the same degree as in the other countries or previously. This provides a more conducive environment to support and strengthen CSOs to engage more directly with policy-influencing processes and decision-making. Hivos has contributed to increasing indigenous communities' capacities in territorial planning and forest management and understanding and working within the existing legal-political framework. Cordaid has supported national-level NGOs that openly campaign for pastoralists' political, economic and cultural rights. However, all governments have some repressive characteristics and can use their security forces to break resistance to what the government regards as being in the national interest, such as mineral extraction in indigenous territories.

In all five countries, CFA partners contributed to some extent to IPs' increased awareness about their rights and their ability to assert these rights, but there are differences between the countries in the emphases made in this respect. In Ethiopia, Kenya and India, both Cordaid and ICCO partners focused on the local people's constitutional rights as citizens, whereas Hivos partners related their work more to the discourse of indigenous collective rights, which is more "mainstream" in Latin America. Strengthening civil society is important for claiming and defending IPs' rights to natural resources and land, as illustrated by Hivos partners in Guatemala working with communities that had been displaced or were under threat of displacement through large-scale developments. Some of ICCO's partners also mobilised *Adivasi* community groups to claim their rights to forest resources. Generally, however, in the period 2003-08, partners of Cordaid and ICCO focused mainly on basic needs and gave relatively little attention to issues of individual and collective rights to land and natural resources. The livelihoods of the pastoralists and *Adivasi* are being threatened by competing claims on their land and natural resources. The efforts of CFA partners to support these people's livelihoods may have been in vain because they did not strategically address the main risks and vulnerability faced by IPs.

Through their support to civil-society strengthening, particularly at community level, all CFAs have contributed to the increased political representation of IPs at this level in Ethiopia, Guatemala, India and Kenya. This achievement should also be seen in the context of the decentralisation processes that have taken place in these countries. CFAs have provided less support to increasing political representation at national level - apart from Hivos' work in Bolivia, which has the most favourable political context regarding IP' rights of all five case-study countries.

In summary, the main positive outcomes of the CFAs' support to civil-society strengthening were:

- Strengthened organisational capacity and improved leadership among IPs at community level; IPs feel capacitated and more confident in negotiating with state and non-state organisations to benefit from local-level development;
- Political and social empowerment of women and men through increased awareness of their rights, improved access to information and improved representation in local government bodies; and
- Raised awareness on indigenous women's rights and gender justice and raised sociopolitical status of indigenous women through their economic empowerment and their active participation in community development activities and local decision-making structures.

Contribution to changes through policy influencing

Over the period 2003-08, policy-influencing activities became more important in the CFA-supported activities, albeit with differences in their focus. In all case-study countries, the national governments recognised that IPs are particularly marginalised and have developed programmes and policies for them. However, there is a clear gap between policies and practice on account of weak implementation, lack of enforcement and lack of political will, in particular to securing rights to resources (land, water, forest). There are several examples where CFAs have supported partners to respond to and influence certain policy-development processes by organising consultations with indigenous communities, attending key policy events, building capacities in policy advocacy and facilitating research and documentation to provide evidence for this work.

In collaboration with other national and international organisations, Cordaid partners at national level in Ethiopia and Kenya have made important contributions in influencing policy by providing evidence and facilitating consultation with pastoralists. In Ethiopia, this included formulating a chapter on pastoralism for Ethiopia's PRSP. In Kenya, partners brought pastoralist issues into land-policy formulation: a National Land Policy was approved in 2009 that recognises pastoralist peoples' collective rights to land. However, as it goes against some vested interests of commercial, industrial and tourist operations, it is likely to encounter resistance in implementation, which will now have to become the focus of the policy-related work in Kenya.

In Bolivia, Hivos partners have been effective in pushing for recognition and implementation of collective ownership rights to land and natural resources, and in inserting a broader range of IPs' rights into the new political Constitution. In Guatemala, Hivos partners have helped bring IPs' perspectives into the formulation of policy (reform) and law proposals, specifically, inserting IPs' rights into them. However, the proposals are unlikely to be approved in the short term because of strong opposition within the government. The proposals are related to poverty alleviation, food sovereignty, agrarian reform etc - not focused on IPs per se. Progress in getting pro-IP policy reform adopted is hindered by the particularly unfavourable constellation of power in Guatemala.

In the case of ICCO, one IPO network working in IP issues in Asia, including India, has brought IP perspectives into several of its position papers on (proposed) *Adivasi*-relevant policies developed by the GoI: the Forest Rights Act (2006), the Rehabilitation and Resettlement (R&R) Bill (2007) and the 2006 draft of the National Tribal Policy (NTP). One local-level partner has taken an activist approach on land rights. Some other partners have contributed to policy processes indirectly by supporting the development of CBOs that then protest locally against

certain policies. The R&R policy has been approved but not yet enacted. The NTP is still in draft form and faces considerable resistance in the Parliament. ICCO partners' influence on policy processes could have been stronger, had there been a better link between local and national-level policy-related activities, e.g. linking AITPN (Asian Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Network) with partners working specifically on *Adivasi* issues.

The limited progress made by ICCO partners in India and Hivos partners in Guatemala shows how challenging policy influencing is, as the political context is difficult and vested economic interests prevail. These examples show what is common when promoting IP concerns: progressive policies, if eventually achieved, encounter a backlash, and lobbying must continue.

Despite such successes as bringing pastoralist issues into the national land policy (Kenya), inserting collective rights for IPs into the new political Constitution (Bolivia) or facilitating a CSO response to the Draft National Tribal Policy (India), there is still a need for more networking and better linkages between policy-influencing activities at local, regional and national level. Well-grounded data are extremely important for effective evidence-based policy dialogue.

Cordaid made this an explicit part of its pastoralist development strategy, and supported some partners that could help generate information, make publications and organise events. These were designed to make national and regional policymakers more aware of pastoralists' situation and issues and how mobile pastoralism is the most productive way to use arid and semiarid lands to support people's livelihoods. Cordaid supported work on compiling and analysing information, such as studies on the exclusion of pastoralist women and on pastoralists and climate change. This aspect of its policy-influencing work is being complemented by the pastoralist policy course for NGOs, pastoralist organisations and policymakers, based on research evidence, and by the compilation of data on pastoralism to lobby international agencies in the framework of CELEP.

Hivos and ICCO have not invested as much as has Cordaid in research with the explicit aim to inform decision-makers. Hivos has given some attention to research since 2005 in northern Bolivia where, with EU funds, it supports a consortium of research institutions to influence the Agrarian Reform Law and Forestry Law. Recently, research results were published, with recommendations for improving the Forestry Law. In Guatemala, one partner did research on the incidence of HIV/AIDS among IPs; its Hivos-funded activities were focused on helping IPs with HIV/AIDS to influence regional and national governments to recognise their situation and promote reproductive health education for IPs.

ICCO started to support such research when it contracted The Other Media in 2004 to study the overall status of *Adivasi*, but this work was not completed; only some chapters are available. ICCO also supported the AITPN as a network for research and information dissemination, with a regional focus on IPs, e.g. providing information for lobbying with UN agencies to pressurise governments violating the human rights of IPs. The impact of AITPN is difficult to assess because of the nature of its work. It has prepared an impressive array of documentation, reports and policy briefs on IPs' status in several Asian countries, in particular recording human rights violations. It provides vital information to several UN bodies and has participated in several UN events. Given the complexities of international and national legislation and long timespan of such policy processes and diplomacy, the direct results and impacts are not directly visible to the intended beneficiaries. The immediate result is that AITPN has built up a track record as an organisation that is knowledgeable about IP-specific

human rights issues and can represent the interests of IPs. Its work has also shown the vulnerability of IPs to human rights violations.

All three CFAs have made good efforts to influence policy at national and international level by collaborating with and/or supporting like-minded organisations that deal specifically with issues of minorities or IPs. All three provided structural support to NCIV (Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples), and Cordaid and ICCO funded international NGOs such as IWGIA (International Work Group on Indigenous Affairs) and MRG to create a broader support base for IPOs' umbrella organisations in lobbying with UN agencies. As part of its pastoralist development programme, Cordaid has drawn several NGOs in Europe and eastern Africa into a coalition (CELEP) dedicated to lobbying donors in Europe to support pastoralist-led development. Hivos has worked closely with IBIS (a Danish NGO with a focus on IPs' rights) in Guatemala and Bolivia and provided support to the International Indigenous Women's Forum (IIWF).

During most of the period under study, the CFAs' work in the five case-study countries did not reveal a clear strategy for policy influence, which would involve identification of the key issues, the policies and policy processes in place, the stakeholders, the bottlenecks, what is currently being done in terms of policy influence and what could be done. For example, in India and Kenya, there were only weak links between policy work at local and national level; interesting initiatives were not linked in the form of effective networking to influence policy.

In summary, the main positive outcomes of the CFAs' support to influencing policy were:

- Expanded opportunities for and improved capacities of indigenous communities to express their concerns and claim their socio-economic rights, in particular at local level; national-level policy engagement was also taken up by Cordaid and Hivos;
- Collective/individual rights to land and natural resources were secured in Bolivia and, to a lesser extent, in Kenya but remained contentious in Ethiopia, Guatemala and India;
- Increased capacity and effectiveness of indigenous women to exert influence on government institutions and in legislative processes, in particular in Bolivia; in the case of the other countries, women's increased influence is noticeable mainly at community level.

Contribution to improving the situation of indigenous women

Cordaid's and ICCO's work in the case-study countries has clearly contributed to women's economic and social empowerment through support to poverty alleviation and civil-society strengthening. The women in the communities visited stated that they were economically stronger through their increased access to inputs, resources, markets, information and skills training. Being part of self-help or producer groups helped them in accessing loans from CBOs or banks. Through their greater role in economic activities, women also became more socially empowered and started to play a larger role in decision-making at community level. The economic activities of women, old and young, helped to expand their horizons and to increase their confidence and capacity to influence local-level decision-making. Many of Cordaid's and ICCO's partners working with women have also raised their awareness about their human and constitutional rights and stimulated community discussions about these. In general, Hivos' work had a stronger rights focus and gave more specific support to the political empowerment of indigenous women. Hivos has the explicit goal of emancipating indigenous women within the IP movement and works intensively with various indigenous women's groups at local and national level. In Bolivia, it was influential in inserting women's rights into new policies and the new political Constitution, as well as into the agendas of indigenous federations and regional organisations. Particularly in Guatemala, the feminisation of poverty and the increasing violence against women still limits participation of indigenous

women in the public sphere. Nevertheless, there have recently been promising developments in terms of the representation and participation of indigenous women - probably the result of a multiplying effect by various organisations working with IPs.

Compared to Hivos, the work of Cordaid in Africa and ICCO in India had a less explicit focus on promoting *indigenous* women's rights and addressing IP-specific gender issues. Especially in Guatemala and India, there is concern about increasing levels of gender-based violence. Hivos partners in Guatemala have lobbied successfully for a "Law against Femicide and Violence against Women". In India, some local *Adivasi* movements/CBOs (not necessarily those supported by ICCO) have taken up these concerns; ICCO could possibly pay more attention to this. Some Cordaid partners in eastern Africa have addressed these issues mainly in terms of combating "harmful traditional practices" such as female genital cutting; there is growing insight that this can be done only by working closely with indigenous authority structures.

Contribution to addressing forced integration

The extent to which CFAs addressed issues around (forced) integration varied across the countries. This tended to be done in a more implicit way. Integration is happening as a result of several processes, such as increased pressure on land and resources, universal government policies not addressing the specific needs of IPs (and/or weak implementation), liberalisation policies and - in some cases - changed aspirations of IPs. Opportunities to address issues around forced integration depend on the specific sociopolitical context of the countries in which the CFAs work. For example, the work supported by Cordaid, Hivos and ICCO in Latin America has a greater emphasis on securing political, cultural and collective rights to land and natural resources than in other continents¹⁸. Hivos clearly puts more emphasis on this than does ICCO and Cordaid, as illustrated, for example, by Hivos' partner portfolio in India: this included a significant number of projects focused on social and political rights and projects on reinforcing cultural identity through support to arts and culture projects¹⁹. None of the CFAs explicitly addressed IPs' aspirations for improved access to culturally appropriate education for their children, which IPs see as a key step toward self-determination in the long term.

7.2.2 Sustainability of changes

In all case-study countries, improvements in natural resource-based livelihoods and in poverty alleviation will be sustainable only when IPs have secure access to land, water and other natural resources. Especially in Ethiopia, Guatemala, India and Kenya, the lack of security in access to and control over resources might threaten the results achieved thus far. Although formal representation of IPs has generally improved at regional and national level, many IPs at local level are not confident that this is sufficient for claiming and defending their rights. In light of this, strengthening IPs' ability to assert their rights becomes even more important. The sustainability of changes also depends very much on the political context and governance in the respective countries. In Ethiopia, the new CSO law makes it more difficult to work on rights issues. In Guatemala and India, there is the risk of politicisation and radicalisation. In

¹⁸) However, ICCO's work in Guatemala focuses almost entirely on direct poverty alleviation with LMD as a key entry point. In other Latin American countries such as Argentina, Ecuador and Brazil, more support is given to securing environmental and collective rights to natural resources and land.

¹⁹) Hivos' support for arts and culture projects among IPs is limited to India. According to Hivos (2002), in Latin America it has proven difficult to identify activities undertaken by IPs that are aligned to Hivos' culture policy. Hivos does not want to support projects that aim to recover lost traditions "just for the sake of it", considering such projects to form part of traditional currents in the Latin American indigenous movements (interview). The 2002 study, however, states that Hivos may underestimate the importance of projects aimed at the recovery of indigenous knowledge and practices in relation to IPs' search for identity-based or self-determined development.

Bolivia, a sense of optimism prevails but there has been little actual improvement for IPs so far; this may led to disenchantment because expectations concerning the pro-IP government and policy changes were unduly high. In Ethiopia, India and Kenya, policy work at local and national level is only weakly linked; interesting local initiatives are not used for networking to influence policy. CFAs will have to continue supporting the mobilisation and strengthening of CSOs and IPOs and investing in evidence-based policy dialogue, and also link with legal-aid support to strengthen IPs' ability to claim their rights, tailoring this work in keeping with the political context in each country.

7.2.3 Mode of support

RQ10: In what way has the mode of supporting IP organisations by the CFAs contributed to or undermined the (positive) outcomes?

Choice of partners. In Bolivia and Ethiopia, the CFAs are working only through intermediary NGOs, not directly with IPOs. In Guatemala, Kenya, and India, there are some cases where the CFAs support IPOs and CBOs directly. For example, in Guatemala, Hivos works directly with indigenous membership organisations through the Regional Office in San José, Costa Rica. ICCO has chosen to give support indigenous movements and IPOs through intermediary NGOs, which facilitate the formation and strengthening of community-based groups. One exception is AITPN, which is a regional IPO network organisation in Asia, with highly educated indigenous staff and a well-functioning set-up.

Hivos' choice of partners revealed more emphasis on rights issues and policy work, whereas Cordaid and ICCO tended to choose partners working on poverty alleviation with an integrated rights component. In line with its strategic focus on political, cultural and collective rights and strengthening indigenous movements in Latin America, Hivos supported more grassroots and umbrella/network organisations than did Cordaid or ICCO. In their partner portfolios, these CFAs had a relatively larger share of intermediaries, usually working more on direct poverty alleviation and civil-society strengthening by supporting development of SHGs and community governance structures. Recently, Cordaid and ICCO included new partners with a stronger focus on rights and policy work. Especially Cordaid diversified and broadened its portfolio, including "unorthodox" partners such as the Kenya Livestock Marketing Council. Cordaid and ICCO traditionally worked more with faith-based partners, but reduced the number of such partners over the past years.

Greater support to grassroots and umbrella organisations of IPs would not necessarily have been more effective than working through intermediaries to empower IPs in social and political terms and to increase their representation at different levels. However, as IPOs ideally represent the IPs' interests and worldviews, support to such organisations could have been more seriously considered than appears to have been the case. There may have been some fear of politicisation and insufficient capacities of the CFAs to monitor possible vested interests of the leaders and to strengthen their downward accountability. In the late 1990s, Hivos had negative experiences in supporting indigenous movements in the lowlands of Bolivia and therefore shifted to indirect support to indigenous organisations through intermediary or service organisations in this country. It felt that continuous in-country support by the CFA or a partner organisation specialised in indigenous issues is needed to be able to give direct support to IPOs.

Support to planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. All three CFAs have given good attention to organisational development within their partner organisations, including support to strategy development, and have collaborated with their partners to prepare joint proposals to the European Commission. With respect to monitoring partners' progress, Hivos makes an elaborate assessment of the results achieved before making a new contract with a partner organisation. In several cases, ICCO phased out support to partners when results and impact were not convincing to justify continuous support. Cordaid gave close attention to organisational development and assessment, but the effectiveness and impact of the partners' activities were seldom subjected to an in-depth assessment. All CFAs recognised the weakness of their partners in terms of monitoring the progress and impact of their work, but did not seem to have addressed this gap through coherent capacity-building support - or only recently (after the period covered by this evaluation). Furthermore, the monitoring procedures did not pay specific attention to IPs and IP-related issues. Most coaching was focused on organisational-development aspects such as financial management, gender mainstreaming and strategy development, and some capacity-building in this respect took the form of exchange of experiences and lessons learnt.

Communication and networking. Most communication between partners and the CFAs has taken place through email, backed up with field visits and meetings/workshops at the regional/head office to which partners were invited. Generally, partners appreciated the presence of a regional office for easier communication and more interaction with the CFA and with each other. In the case of Cordaid and ICCO, partners were at times confused about the frequent policy and organisational changes of the CFA, which reportedly involved little consultation of the partners and appeared not to have been sufficiently well communicated to the partners.

In Ethiopia, India and Kenya, there has been no formal networking among the partners of Cordaid or ICCO on specific pastoralist/*Adivasi* issues; however, Cordaid has supported wider networking activities, i.e. involving more organisations than only its partners. Also Hivos has not actively promoted networking among its partners working on IP issues. In Bolivia and Kenya, there appears to be sufficient synergy and mutual learning that a formal network may not be needed. In India, there is an exchange between partners on LMD through the Vikas Bazar network, but not about issues specific to the *Adivasi*. A national network on pastoralism exists in Ethiopia (with some support from Cordaid), but not all Cordaid partners working with pastoralists are members of this network. A network of partners working on IP issues is lacking and is needed, however, in Guatemala, in order to help the CSOs overcome their differences. Hivos has already made an attempt in this direction by bringing together CONIC and CALDH (Centro para Acción Legal en Derechos Humanos), both human-rights organisations, into a joint EU-funded project. In such cases, the CFA can give the necessary stimulus to partnership and networking, but the local organisations must have the ownership. The CFA should link up initiatives rather than creating a network itself. Earlier experiences, e.g. in Kenya, show that networks that the participants regard as donor-driven are not sustainable.

8. Conclusions and lessons

8.1 Overall assessment of CFAs' contributions to change in the situation of IPs

RQ11: What can overall be said about the change in structural injustice in the situation of IPs in the case studies and the contribution of the CFAs' partner organisations in this change?

Evaluation Question: To what extent have CFA policies, strategies, procedures and programmes and those of their partner organisations contributed to a reduction of structural injustice towards IPs?

The conclusions and lessons highlighted here are those of the study team, based on its review of CFA policies, strategies, procedures and programmes; and on its analysis of interviews and discussions with CFA staff, partner organisation staff, IPs and other resource persons, of secondary literature and of direct observations in the field. Views of IPs were elicited, but the assessment is not that of IPs. A different set of ToRs and a different composition of the research team would have been necessary to produce an assessment "owned" by IPs.

Contributions of CFAs and their partners to change. The case studies made clear that, in all five countries, the situation of IPs has changed and is continuing to change in social, cultural, economic and political terms. Their world views and values have changed because of a multitude of external influences. They are more integrated into "mainstream" development, although often not in a self-determined way. Government decentralisation has allowed more local-level influence on decision-making about development, often in ways that displace indigenous forms of governance. IPs' awareness of their social, cultural and political rights has increased. They have more opportunities for political representation, although the legitimacy of their representatives in higher-level political bodies is often questioned at the grassroots. Some indigenous women and groups have gained a better economic and sociopolitical position. The IPs and resource persons in the case-study countries who described these changes also mentioned specific activities and interventions of CFA partners that made some contribution to these changes, as highlighted in the previous chapter.

Some of these changes were depicted as positive by the IPs themselves, for example, the economic development of individuals, families and communities supported by the CFA partners, as well as the improved access to basic social services. However, there is a flip side to the coin: none of the CFAs seem to have addressed IPs' aspirations for access to *culturally appropriate* services, which would be key for self-determined development. The income-generating activities usually took fairly conventional forms that were not driven by the visions of the IPs.

The study team was not able to assess the totality of factors, besides the CFA-supported interventions, that have brought about or hindered change in the situation of IPs. Such factors would include: a) the interventions of all other state and non-state actors, both local and foreign; b) endogenous initiatives by the IPs themselves; and c) external political and economic factors at national and international level than impinge directly or indirectly upon

the lives of the IPs, as well as demographic and natural factors such as population growth and adverse climatic events and trends. There is insufficient evidence in the documents of the CFAs and their partners to be able to make a quantitative assessment of the extent to which the work of a CFA contributed to reducing structural injustice toward IPs. However, directions and degrees of influence - strongly or weakly positive or negative - could be identified. The previous chapter highlighted the types of interventions and activities that IPs, CFA staff and resource persons observed as having made an important contribution to the reported changes, even if sometimes only on a small scale, and differences between the CFAs in their types of contribution and their approaches. Here, only a brief summary is made.

In all five case-study countries, the CFA partners contributed to some extent to increasing IPs' awareness of their rights. Hivos gave more attention to helping IPs secure their collective rights to land and natural resources as well as, in Bolivia, to self-government. Cordaid in Ethiopia and Kenya and ICCO in India placed more emphasis on strengthening the economic, social and political rights of IPs as citizens of these countries. However, they have not been effective in helping IPs defend their rights (as citizens or as IPs) to land and natural resources. To be sure, the efforts of all three CFAs in strengthening local organisations have contributed to gradually increasing IPs' capacity to claim and defend these rights, but this local capacity still needs to be nurtured and reinforced.

The CFAs' support to civil-society strengthening has contributed to increasing the voice of IPs in decision-making at local level - a process favoured by government decentralisation. This local-level representation is a key step toward - in the longer term - increasing political representation at national level. Thus, the CFAs have contributed to increasing the *potential* for this.

In collaboration with other national and international organisations, partners of Hivos and Cordaid have made important contributions in influencing national policy, especially with respect to land rights and insertion of IPs' perspectives and concerns into major government papers such as the PRSP and revised Constitution. Influencing policy is a complicated and slow process in any case but this process was not helped by the fact that, during the period under study, the CFAs did not have deliberate strategies for policy influence. A better link between policy-related activities at local and national level could have strengthened the CFA partners' influence on policy processes. Moreover, too little attention was given to pushing for and facilitating the implementation of - on paper - favourable policies.

In their own policies and strategies, the CFAs have paid little explicit attention to some key issues that emerged in recent years in the international debate on the collective rights of IPs, such as prior consultation, development with culture, and indigenous knowledge and intellectual property. These issues are intimately related to IPs' strategies for achieving self-determination. In practice, however, some CFA partners did give attention to issues of culture and indigenous knowledge.

With respect to the position of indigenous women, work supported by Cordaid and ICCO in the case-study countries contributed to social empowerment of women, primarily through their economic empowerment. Hivos-supported work was more clearly aimed toward the political empowerment of women and, in Bolivia, was influential in inserting women's rights into new policies and the new political Constitution and laws, as well as into the agendas of indigenous federations and regional organisations.

Especially with respect to social services and economic development, the improvements found in the case-study countries were achieved only in the limited geographic areas where the CFA

partners were operating. According to resource persons and secondary literature, the social and economic indicators in indigenous communities are still far below the national average. Overall, poverty and socio-economic differentiation among IPs appears to have increased and their possibilities to pursue traditional forms of livelihoods have decreased. In Bolivia and Kenya - partly as a result of the efforts of Hivos and Cordaid and their partners - decrease in structural injustice related to land rights has been more widely spread, as the rights gained theoretically apply to all IPs and other minority groups within these countries. On the whole, however, IPs are facing increased pressures on and alienation of their land and natural resources and, even in these two countries, implementation of the new policies is uncertain.

Extent of contribution to reducing structural injustice. Two reasons why it is difficult to assess the extent to which the work of the CFAs and its partners has contributed to reducing structural injustice toward IPs are: i) there is a lack of well-grounded and up-to-date information about what change has actually occurred in the situation of IPs; and ii) this has not been an issue about which the CFAs have systematically collected baseline information and monitored their contribution to change. The latter is doubtless linked to the fact that issues of IPs *per se* are not central to the policies of the three CFAs, which regard IPs are part of a larger set of intended beneficiaries, namely marginalised and disadvantaged people (not distinct peoples). Only Hivos gives more explicit attention to IP-related issues in its human rights policy and to monitoring change related to specific IP-related problems jointly defined with its partners.

However, even if more in-depth research and better monitoring systems had generated sufficient data to measure specific changes and their various factors contributing to them, it would have been difficult to give an overall rating of the extent to which the CFAs and their partners had contributed, in view of the complex and differing realities faced by IPs in different countries. To be sure, some of the interventions supported by the CFAs through their partners in the case-study countries - combined with the efforts of many other local and international NGOs working in the same area - did lead to positive results in terms of raised awareness of IPs' rights, enhanced organisational capacity of indigenous communities and groups, and formal recognition of IPs' rights in some countries. In many cases, however, these positive results did not contribute to reducing structural injustice in practice, seeing as the livelihoods of the majority of IPs in the country were not improved, their rights were not implemented and/or their aspirations for self-determined development were not fulfilled.

A host of other factors not controlled by the CFAs and their partners often prevented widespread achievements in this regard. For example, in Guatemala, Hivos contributed to the *potential* for reducing injustice faced by IPs but, because of the extremely difficult political and socio-economic situation in the country, injustice toward IPs has not actually been reduced. All that can be said is that, if Hivos had not made these efforts, the IPs in Guatemala would have fewer prospects for achieving justice in the future. Other bilateral and international development organisations do not seem to have been more successful than Hivos in Guatemala. Thus, even the CFA which - of the three - is most explicit in its attention to IP issues cannot register a victory here in terms of reducing structural injustice.

All the CFAs and their partners have helped to gain small victories here and there - or have at least prevented the situation of IPs from worsening more than would otherwise have been the case. The interventions of some partners, highlighted earlier in this report, have shown how incremental steps can be taken towards strengthening the position of identity-based minorities, including IPs. However, much more concerted and strategic action, together with like-minded organisations will be needed to bring about widespread improvement. In

each country and with each indigenous group selected for support within a country, specific strategies will need to be developed for the groups and for alliances of such groups. In each case, it will be necessary to start with the visions of the groups concerned on the ground, rather than with a broad-brush picture based on generalisations formulated at international level.

Thus far, in most of the work encountered in the case-study countries, there is little evidence of awareness among the CFAs and their partners of the extent to which their visions of development coincide - or not - with those of the IPs. To create this awareness, a dedicated process of dialogue between CFA partners and beneficiaries is needed.

Moreover, in the policies and strategies formulated by Cordaid and ICCO during the period 2003-08, there is little evidence of awareness of the international debates related to international legal instruments on IPs' rights, such as the ILO C169 and the DRIP. Although awareness of these standards is reflected in Hivos' 2002 policy on human rights, there is no reference in the policies and strategies of the three CFAs to IP-related issues that were further developed in international debates during the study period, e.g. IPs' rights to prior consent or to their indigenous knowledge and intellectual property.

8.2 Enhancing positive and diminishing negative outcomes of work with IPs

RQ12a: What lessons are there to be drawn from the case studies to enhance the positive outcomes (diminish the negative)?

In this and the following section (8.3), the team draws lessons from experiences made by the CFAs and their partners in the case-study countries, highlighting what appeared to work well and what did not appear to work so well. These lessons could be relevant not only for the CFAs but also for other organisations trying to improve the situation of IPs.

8.2.1 Lessons for enhancing positive outcomes

Looking at what worked well and could therefore be considered as good practices of the CFAs and their partners, the team drew the following lessons for enhancing positive outcomes of efforts to improve the situation of IPs:

- ***Working with partners at different levels creates synergy in influencing policy.***
Selecting partners that work at different levels can bridge gaps in information and trust and bring a more genuine, grassroots voice to higher levels of decision-making. The case studies revealed that, often, IPs at local level distrust others - including city-based people from their own ethnic group - who profess to speak on their behalf at higher levels. One alternative is that two organisations with expertise on different levels collaborate in one project, as in the EU-funded project in Guatemala which linked an IPO experienced in working with communities and a human-rights organisation experienced in national legal action and policy lobbying. The latter could thus build up a trust base with several indigenous communities. Another effective combination is to work simultaneously in different projects with partners at grassroots level strengthening community organisation in poverty alleviation and at national level networking for mutual learning and influencing policy. Good examples from the field provide evidence for higher-level policy dialogue, and local indigenous groups can use their increased knowledge of existing policy - in the country and beyond - to address local concerns. Grassroots IPOs need to take part directly

in policy work so that city-based CSOs working at national level become more aware of key policy issues from the perspective of rural peoples.

- **Changing interventions and partners as the IPs' situation changes.** Where interventions and new situations have led to change in the situation of IPs, such as the success in the constitutional reform process in Bolivia in securing collective rights to land and self-government in communal territories, shifts are needed in the type of intervention and partner supported. In this case, for example, more attention must then be given to strengthening internal governance structures for managing the communal territories, implementing coordination mechanisms between indigenous and State authorities and administrations, and developing new modalities of direct technical and financial assistance to indigenous governments operating as autonomous entities. This situation places new demands on CFAs and their partners, which - even more so than before - must consult and collaborate closely with indigenous authorities before intervening in a self-governing indigenous territory.
- **Addressing development of the entire partner organisation enhances its capacity for positive impact.** Instead of supporting only the partners' interventions, giving attention to strengthening the partner organisation as a whole - as is done by all three CFAs - can improve both the CFA-funded activities and the activities funded from other sources. It makes the partners better able to leverage additional support and helps them sharpen their focus on the essential activities needed to achieve their goals. Organisational development of the partners can be enhanced by external advisors; good experience has also been made - e.g. within the ICCO-supported Vikas Bazar network on local market development - in peer-to-peer mentoring of a younger partner organisation by a more experienced one.
- **Modern communication media offer ways to amplify IPs' voices.** Radio, television, newspapers, websites and other modern communication media can play an important role not only in providing information to IPs but also in amplifying their voices and creating wider public awareness of and support for their concerns. These media allow frequent communication that transcends distance - a major constraint for many marginalised peoples. For example, Cordaid partners used community radio to bring about change in women pastoralists' situation, and Hivos partners widened access to information about rights issues using alternative media, e.g. websites and community radio, not controlled by elites or the State.

8.2.2 Lessons for diminishing negative outcomes

Looking at what did not work so well and particularly the unintended outcomes of interventions supported by the CFAs (see Sections 4.3.2, 5.3.2 and 7.1.5 of this report), the team drew the following lessons for diminishing negative outcomes of efforts to improve the situation of IPs:

- **Intercultural education to prevent alienation of youth from their culture.** The discussions with IPs revealed the importance that most of them attach to formal education of good quality. However, sending their children to school often had unintended negative outcomes such as loss of language and culture among the youth. To ensure IPs' rights to good-quality education but to prevent cultural alienation of the youth, it will be important to find ways of blending "modern" education with indigenous forms of education.
- **IP-differentiated approaches in development policy and service delivery to avoid forced integration.** The case studies revealed that non-differentiated development policies of governments and donors can unintentionally lead to indirect forced integration

of IPs. It is important to help governments develop differentiated policies (e.g. insert IP-specific provisions in policy and law proposals) in order to address the specific needs of IPs. This includes offering positive examples of provision of basic services (healthcare, education etc.) to IPs in ways that take cognisance of their situation and culture, e.g. traditional healthcare, community-level workers and - in the case of mobile peoples such as pastoralists - also mobile services.

8.3 Lessons for effectively supporting the work of IPs' organisations

RQ12b: What lessons can be drawn from the case studies to effectively support IPs' organisations?

- ***Appropriate approach to working with IPOs is context-specific.*** The appropriate approach to working with IPOs differs according to the political context. For example, there are more possibilities to empower pastoralist membership organisations directly in Kenya than in Ethiopia, where this goal must be sought indirectly through strengthening capacities for local-level planning. In Guatemala, structural injustice is so pervading that it is logical to support CSOs working at national level to insert indigenous demands regarding land rights, food sovereignty and integrated development into policy and law proposals. In contrast, in Bolivia, this process happened years ago, so emphasis can be shifted to pressuring for implementing policy regionally and to strengthening grassroots IPOs to manage their territories in a sustainable and equitable way. In India, the IP movements are fragmented, acting mainly at district and state level. The Foreign Contribution Regulation Act makes it difficult for them to obtain direct foreign funding. Here, support needs to be in the form of building institutional capacity and partnership among IPOs, so that they can develop their own agenda for change.

In some cases, the policies that indigenous groups want to influence are relevant also for other marginalised groups that do not see themselves as IPs. It can be effective for IPs to link with such groups that have the same goal. Activities that bring together several ethnic groups to address a common concern (e.g. improving roads or health facilities, or advocating for rights to use land designated as a national park) can contribute to intercultural solidarity among the different groups and can reduce potential for inter-ethnic conflict. IPs in Latin America have learned that they cannot always use a strictly indigenous rights discourse and claim rights for themselves, and sometimes have to find common ground with other groups if they want to achieve changes. If indigenous movements want to generate positive public opinion for their cause, they have to build bridges between their own and other social movements on themes that are relevant to them all, such as attaining human rights, preventing conflicts and violence, and resisting adverse effects of large-scale development projects.

- ***Close mentoring is needed to empower IPs' organisations.*** The question whether to support IPOs directly or indirectly through intermediary NGOs needs to be constantly re-examined as the situation and local capacities change. An IPO needs some degree of maturity and professionalism to be a direct partner, particularly to be able to comply with the strict accountability and reporting requirements of Northern donors. Turning the argument around, IPOs' lack of maturity could be an argument in favour of working directly with them, but this requires good in-country mentoring. Experience of the CFAs

has shown that directly-funded IPOs can be empowered if they have advisors dedicated to coaching them in financial management and in participatory visioning, strategic planning and M&E. If this close mentorship cannot be provided by CFA staff, it is better to delegate the task of strengthening IPOs to external advisors or to capable intermediary NGOs in the country concerned.

8.4 Main recommendations

Recommendations specific to individual CFAs are given in the case-study reports. The following recommendations to the CFAs were derived by comparing the recommendations made in each of the case studies and assessing their wider applicability to the other countries, regions and CFAs:

- **Promote reflection within indigenous communities about their visions and values.** Participatory planning with IPs has often been confined to identifying problems and planning activities to address them. CFAs should support their partners in stimulating reflection within the IP groups or organisations about their vision of their future, what values are central to their being, and what activities can lead to this vision and integrate these values²⁰. The IPs should assess to what extent past activities have brought them closer to or taken them further from their vision, i.e. to self-determined development. Special attention should be given to the IPs' experiences with and perspectives on gender equality as well as development with culture and identity related to education, healthcare, production, economy and natural resource management, so that IPs can improve their living standards without having to renounce their culture. In the case of IPOs, attention should also be given to their perspectives on and practices for downward accountability. Different IP groups and subgroups may have different visions and values; the reflection process should allow this diversity to emerge and be openly discussed. To the extent possible, considering the political setting, information should be made available to the IPs about their human rights as citizens and their collective rights as peoples, and discussions stimulated about what rights they would prefer to pursue.
- **Promote reflection by partner organisations on experiences in working with IPs.** On a national or sub-national level, the CFAs should create opportunities for their partners to reflect on their experiences in working with IPs. This should go beyond exchange of information about activities and outputs. It should involve peer-to-peer learning and developing strategies to support IPs in attaining their own visions. Consideration should be given to the relevance of international standards concerning IPs' rights, and whether and to what extent it would be possible - in view of the specific country context - to draw on these standards in their work with IPs (even if the local beneficiaries do not regard themselves as IPs). In all case-study countries except Guatemala, in view of the great difference in context between areas where IPs live, regional (sub-national) exchange sessions would probably be most fruitful. In the process, the IPs and local partners could identify certain issues on which IPs in different regions should join efforts, including crossborder linkages. Intermediary partners should reflect critically on the extent to which they are accountable to the IPs with whom they are working, and ways in which this downward accountability could be strengthened.
- **Develop clear CFA vision, strategy and guidelines for work on IP issues.** The CFAs should reflect internally on their experiences in addressing structural injustice toward IPs, differentiating according to the specific political circumstances in the countries where they work and recognising the heterogeneity within IPs in terms of wealth and social status. CFAs taking a thematic approach need to be sensitive to the specific types of groups involved in their thematic programmes and to differentiate approaches accordingly. The

²⁰ As one example, SoS Sahel and IIED (2009) provide guidelines for facilitating such reflection at local level.

experience of Cordaid has shown that it is useful to have a specific policy on IPs (in this case, pastoralists), so that the group-specific concerns can be well integrated into the CFA's themes and approaches. Guidelines, like those for mainstreaming gender, should be developed to make CFA staff and partner organisations more sensitive to cultural aspects of working with specific groups while, e.g., supporting access to market. Both Hivos and ICCO do have informal guidelines for working with IPs; these should be further developed and made better known within the organisation and among partners. The guidelines should include a system of downward accountability to make sure that the IPs' views are taken into account throughout the project cycle and that dynamics in these views are recognised. Otherwise, the CFAs run the risk of promoting development in a way that does not coincide with the visions of the intended beneficiaries. Moreover, as the Netherlands Government has ratified ILO C 169 and approved the DRIP, the CFAs should assume the responsibility of putting this on their development agenda and improving their policies accordingly. The CFAs should therefore follow closely the international debates related to IPs and adapt their policies and strategies when appropriate.

- **Improve monitoring systems.** The study team gained the impression that considerable positive results had been achieved by CFA partners in their areas of operation, but found little concrete evidence on which to base conclusions regarding contributions to change. To be better able to enhance positive outcomes and diminish negative outcomes of work with IPs, the CFAs should give more emphasis to monitoring the outcomes and assessing the impacts of their IP-related interventions on a regular basis. This could include mandating other organisations, e.g. local universities, to carry out project-accompanying studies and supporting CFA partners in developing mechanisms for downward accountability.
- **Stimulate relevant research to support IPs in influencing policy.** Convincing arguments and supporting evidence are needed to influence not only policymakers but also civil society so that it can exert pressure on policymakers. Relevant research to provide data in support of policy dialogue should be defined together with IPOs and conducted in partnership with them. At the same time, independent studies will be needed to provide an "objective" assessment. The CFAs should select partners or allies that can carry out this research and can support IPs in generating their own evidence (participatory research). In addition, CFAs and their partners should be influencing the policy of research organisations in the countries concerned to conduct this kind of research and to provide findings in forms that can be used by policymakers and IPs.
- **Stimulate documentation and communication to link local and national policy dialogue.** This is closely linked to the above recommendation and to the lessons in the previous section about communication and working with partners operating at different levels. Two-way communication is needed between local and national level in policy-influencing activities. Examples of good practice on the ground need to be well documented and brought up to national or even international level. At the same time, information about policies being discussed at national level needs to be brought down to IPs at local level, so that they know what is being planned and can voice their views. In most countries, IPs do not have easy access to relevant information to allow them to engage in decision-making on an equal basis with other stakeholders. Grassroots IPOs need to have the chance to bring content into policy and law proposals, which - thus far - are often drawn up by commissions involving indigenous politicians and non-indigenous experts who may not be fully trusted by IPs at the grassroots. Improved documentation and communication would allow IPs - from an early stage - to take part in and be continually consulted on law proposals and policies concerning them that are being discussed and in the making. CFAs should build the capacities of IPOs at national level to inform their constituencies about such law proposals and policies and to facilitate participatory documentation to support communication from the ground up.

- ***Involve indigenous authority structures.*** In efforts to strengthen local organisation, CFAs and their partners have sometimes bypassed indigenous governance and authority structures, thus marginalising them. This is especially the case where new structures to manage natural resources have not recognised indigenous forms of communal management. This can lead to internal opposition (parallel authorities), outright conflict or non-sustainable resource use. It is not necessary or even advisable that all interventions go through indigenous structures, but it is necessary that these be recognised and involved, where they still exist. Promising examples, e.g. from Bolivia and southern Ethiopia, of working through indigenous institutions and linking these with modern authority structures should be shared with other partners and other CFAs as sources of inspiration and information about possible approaches. Involving indigenous authority structures can have a positive influence on development, as they often have greater local legitimacy among IPs than do state-created (or NGO-created) structures.
- ***Facilitate risk and vulnerability analysis.*** Particularly the CMDRR work in eastern Africa has shown the potential of enhancing local capacities to analyse risks and vulnerabilities and to plan, taking these into account. The CFAs should scale up such participatory approaches to risk analysis and should ensure that they include attention to gender, i.e. the ways in which men and women differ in terms of vulnerability to risks and how women's practical needs and strategic interests can be addressed in dealing with these risks. This kind of approach will make clearer to all concerned, including the intermediary NGOs and the CFAs, how serious is, e.g., the risk of land alienation, so that strategies can be generated at all levels to address this. Good analysis of risk and vulnerability would also provide an important input for policy dialogue.
- ***Support policy monitoring and legal paraprofessionals.*** In countries like Bolivia, Ethiopia, Kenya and India, it is not so necessary to push for new policies but rather to ensure effective implementation or enforcement of existing policies and laws, and to push for harmonisation of legislation on IPs' rights with other policies and laws. IPOs need to be involved in monitoring the implementation of their rights. This could take the form of a commission appointed by IPs and composed of IPs' representatives that observe and discuss progress made in policy implementation and make statements to the government. In cases where a representative IPO network exists at national level, it could take up this function. At the same time as supporting such IP-led monitoring bodies, CFAs should provide local-level support in training legal paraprofessionals to become fully informed about existing rights and about channels and strategies through which they can defend these rights.
- ***Enhance indigenous women's capacities for leadership and representation.*** All three CFAs have, to a greater or lesser extent, given attention to economic and sociopolitical empowerment of indigenous women. Cordaid is stepping up its efforts to enhance pastoralist women's leadership capacities in eastern Africa. With Hivos support, indigenous women in Guatemala and Bolivia appointed to government positions have been mentored and trained in leadership, rights, assertiveness and maintaining links with their constituencies. In India, ICCO is building women's leadership capacity primarily at community level. However, much more needs to be done to strengthen the position of indigenous women within their communities (and in mixed-gender IPOs) and within the national women's movement which - although it may address many issues relevant for indigenous women - is still largely ignorant of their specific concerns. Indigenous women need their own space to be able to discuss their concerns and ensure that these are taken up by mixed-gender IPOs, women's movements and non-indigenous CSOs working on indigenous women's issues. The CFAs should intensify their efforts to enhance the capacity of indigenous women in leadership and representation.
- ***Address specifically the situation of indigenous youth.*** An issue that arose

especially in eastern Africa and Latin America and to a lesser extent in India was the cultural alienation of educated youth and school dropouts. It was raised by all types of interviewees - men and women IPs, partner NGOs and resource persons - regardless whether the CFAs were directly supporting "modern" education. For example, the Asian regional council of representatives from different CSOs working with ICCO pointed to youth as a major group requiring attention. There needs to be a much closer link between modern and traditional education, i.e. between curriculum planners and indigenous cultural institutions. The study team is not recommending that the CFAs support service delivery, which should be a State responsibility, but rather that the CFAs and their partners influence policy to promote culturally appropriate education. For example, in partnership with IPs, they could develop ideas for locally relevant curricula and offer these to the State as proposals. This should be complemented by supporting youth groups at local level, providing them training in leadership and enterprise development - in close cooperation with indigenous institutions.

- **Scale up promising models and approaches.** The CFAs and their partners have designed and tested promising models and approaches to improving the situation of IPs. Examples are: promoting budget literacy among district government staff and local communities to increase government's transparency and accountability and to increase pastoralists' influence on the use of funds; the support by Hivos partners to the articulation and strengthening of production chains of timber and non-timber resources in a multistakeholder process; and the support by ICCO partners to local market development. These promising models and approaches should be scaled up - not just replicating the work in other areas (scaling out) but rather convincing decision-makers at different levels in government and civil society about the merits of these models and approaches. To this end, the CFAs should support thorough evaluation and attractive documentation of the process and results.

Finally, specific recommendations are made with regard to planning and coordinating programme evaluations of this kind:

- **Allow sufficient time and budget for complex evaluations.** When research teams are requested to bid for such a complex evaluation, they should have access to information that reveals how many projects are to be covered in the case studies and how dispersed these projects are. Only then can a team draw up a realistically feasible proposal. One alternative would be - rather than requesting a budget for the entire programme evaluation - to request initially a budget only for the inception phase. At the end of that phase, the study team could be asked to prepare a detailed plan and budget for implementing the case studies (including selection of countries and in-country sites) and for the synthesis phase. To allow for a thorough evaluation in an iterative process with the partners and beneficiaries, it would be better to plan from the outset for two field phases: some initial field work, possibly with follow-up by a local researcher, and an initial analysis, and then a second phase of fieldwork for deeper-going investigation of emerging key issues. This would lead to better-grounded results.
- **Integrate programme evaluation into continuing process of reflection and discussion.** In the case of a programme evaluation such as this, it is not realistic to plan feedback sessions with all the beneficiary groups involved in the study. This presents huge logistical challenges, especially in large countries where the beneficiaries live hundreds of kilometres from each other and from any central point where they could meet. Moreover, in the case of IPs, the various groups in any one country (e.g. Ethiopia) may speak several different languages and not have a language in common. Presentation and discussion of the findings would need to be done in languages and forms that the beneficiaries could easily understand. Considerable time and budget would be required for such a

process. It should also be considered what direct benefits the local communities would derive from devoting their time to additional feedback sessions. It would be a different matter in the case of a conventional mid-term or end-of-phase evaluation of a project, where the evaluation might be used for concrete planning of a follow-on project with the local people. A programme evaluation should be integrated into a continuing process of overall, thematic and/or country strategy development by the CFAs. The findings of this kind of study should form the basis for reflection and discussion with partners and beneficiaries to elicit feedback about issues that need more attention in future CFA policies and interventions.

Annex 1: Assessment of External Reference Group

Qualification
very good (4)
good (3)
poor (2)
very poor (1)

<p>1. Meeting needs</p> <p>The report adequately meets the information needs expressed in the terms of reference in a way that reflects the stated priorities. The demands which were made during the evaluation process are mentioned, and satisfied when possible.</p>	
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate as far as policy contexts of CFA and project mechanisms concerned. • Adequate to describe the processes of policy formulation and partner choice. • Adequate in overall assessment of CFA's contributions to change situation of IP and in identifying some weaknesses, but not fully convincing due to lack of baseline data and evaluation data and short field visits and lack of IP input in formulating conclusions and recommendations. • Meagre with respect to reflection on possible differences perspectives (worldview, values and notions of development) between CFA and IP, and the current international debates on IP. • Research questions are dealt with, elaborated in specific cases and in general. • The report adequately meets the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as defined in the TOR. • The recommendations suggest reasonable ways to overcome some of these limitations. 	
<p>2. Appropriate design</p> <p>Evaluation questions, key concepts and criteria are precisely defined. The method is described clearly. It is adequate for addressing the questions. Methodological limitations are explained, as well as their consequences on the strength of conclusions, and on the substance of recommendations.</p>	
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limitations clearly stated <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Concept of IP ambiguous and different per country/region. b. Social positions and injustice and marginalization IP and policy environments, vary per case. c. No clear and coherent CFA policies. d. No baseline data. e. No evaluation reports. f. Short time for field visits. g. No mechanisms for feedback of IP on conclusions/recommendations. h. Adequate on primary and secondary data, poor on getting the input from and feedback of IP. 2. Self assessment of methodology (2.4.1/2.) too positive: endogenous view not taken in the formulation of conclusions and recommendations. 3. Representativeness of partners included related to CFA's portfolio, does not guarantee representativeness for IP problems, perspectives and positions related to international debates. 4. And possible bias through sample selection due to short time for evaluation. 5. Within these limitations, the evaluation study has been implemented systematically, following research questions and research methodology of the TOR and drawing conclusions/ recommendations. The study is not a full fledged accountability of the programme results, but does offer valuable recommendations for the ongoing activities. 	

Qualification
very good (4)
good (3)
poor (2)
very poor (1)

<p>3. Reliable data</p> <p>Data are sufficiently reliable with respect to the conclusions that are derived from them. Data collection tools have been applied in accordance to standards. Sources are quoted and their reliability is assessed. Potential biases are discussed.</p>	
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Info from CFA and project files adequate.</i> • <i>Info from IP and resource persons seem relevant, but difficult to determine its reliability/representativity.</i> • <i>Outcomes mainly qualitative, based on soft info of stakeholders.</i> • <i>Field based info not quantitative, not cross checked and not fed back/endorsed by IP.</i> • <i>Hardly quantitative data available on project outcomes/impact.</i> • <i>Evidence of critical probing of outcomes absent.</i> 	
<p>4. Sound analysis</p> <p>Data are cross-checked, interpreted and analysed systematically and appropriately. Underlying assumptions are clarified. The main external factors are identified and their influence taken into account.</p>	
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Within the limitations the analyses seems reasonable, but not overall convincing as conclusions seem to be based on face value of informants/stakeholders and hardly on hard data or evaluation reports.</i> • <i>Policy choices of CFA's not considered critically: e.g. choice of Hivos to skew away from traditionalist currents and link up with for modernising tendencies not probed/tested and: "culturally adapted models for economic development" not substantiated.</i> • <i>Perspective from CFA, not from IP.</i> • <i>With exception of India, no analysis of IP Worldviews, values and notions of development IP, and no confrontation of these with current CFA policies.</i> 	
<p>5. Valid findings</p> <p>The findings are based on evidence through a clear chain of reasoning. The limitations to validity are clearly stated.</p>	
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Triangulation methods have brought some balance in the findings.</i> • <i>Findings are generally in terms of: "considerable attention", "greater livelihood security", "some people were trained" ...Indicators are often not mentioned.</i> • <i>Baseline data not available.</i> • <i>Limitations to validity should be expressed more clearly.</i> 	
<p>6. Impartial conclusions</p> <p>The conclusions are based on explicit criteria and benchmarks. They are free of personal and partisan considerations. Points of disagreement are reported truthfully. Lessons of wider interest are identified.</p>	
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>No reason to doubt impartiality, but clear benchmarks and hard data are very limited.</i> • <i>Conclusions are careful, tend to be positive on outcomes, without sufficient cross checking with IP and partners.</i> 	

Qualification
very good (4)
good (3)
poor (2)
very poor (1)

<p>7. Useful recommendations</p> <p>Recommendations stem from conclusions. They are applicable and detailed enough to be implemented by the addressees. The level of recommendations (political, strategic, managerial, ...) reflects that of the questions.</p>	
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Recommendations are a fair summary of recommendations of cases studies and provide partly adequate response to rather poor outcomes.</i> • <i>Recommendations are constructive, and fairly general in nature. They can be adapted to specific situations.</i> 	
<p>8. Clear report</p> <p>The style of the report is interesting for and accessible to the intended users. A short summary stresses the main findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations in a balanced and impartial way.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Report very well written, the similar formats of case studies are helpful.</i> • <i>Good summaries and introductions.</i> • <i>Logical structure of report.</i> 	
<p>Overall assessment</p> <p>Taking into account the contextual constraints on the evaluation, the report satisfies the above criteria.</p>	
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>In retrospect the evaluation was too ambitious. Too little funds and time was available for this study.</i> • <i>The evaluation questions and key concepts are precisely defined.</i> • <i>The methodology used is clearly stated and the limitations of the evaluation are explained.</i> • <i>The report adequately meets the purpose and objectives of the evaluation as defined in the TORs provided to the consultants.</i> • <i>Voice of IP not sufficiently incorporated; The review of the activities is not overtly critical, it mainly reports the answers of the stakeholders.</i> • <i>The limited data available with CFA_s on IP projects did not allow for an evaluation that could go beyond outcomes. This lends a degree of generality to the report that was perhaps unavoidable.</i> • <i>The conclusions of the report are fair, well formulated and the recommendations can be reflected upon and implemented by the CFAs.</i> • <i>Report is not a convincing for accountability of past experience, but can very well serve to improve the process of future work with IP.</i> 	

Annex 2: Terms of Reference: Joint Programme Evaluation Indigenous Peoples²¹

Participating organisations: Cordaid, Hivos, ICCO

May 2009

Table of contents

List of abbreviations	110
1. Joint programme evaluations Partos	111
2. CFAs & Indigenous People	111
3. Joint programme evaluation Indigenous Peoples	113
3.1. Purpose: what will this evaluation be used for	113
3.2. Objective - Evaluation Question (EQ).....	113
3.3. Research Questions (RQ).....	114
3.4. Methodology - implementing the evaluation	115
3.5. Scope.....	116
3.6. Result levels and evaluation criteria.....	116
4. Deliverables and timetable	117
5. Evaluation Team	118
6. Budget.....	119
7. Management and steering of the evaluation	119
8. Minimal requirements for proposals	120
Annex 1: Definitions IP	
Annex 2: Historical overview of CFAs' policy development IP	
Annex 3: Portfolio of projects	
Annex 4: Terminology used in the Result Chain	
Annex 5: The Intervention Strategies of the CFAs	
Annex 6: Quality Assessment List IOB (Beoordelingslijst Programma Evaluaties MFS)	

List of abbreviations

CFA	Co-Financing Agency
CBO	Community-based Organisation
CG	Co-ordination Group
ERG	External Reference Group
IOB	Inspectie Ontwikkelingssamenwerking en Beleidsevaluatie (Policy and Operations Evaluation Department)
IP	Indigenous People
MFP	Medefinancieringsprogramma (= CFP: Co-Financing Programme)
MFS	Medefinancieringsstelsel (= CFS: Co-Financing System)
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development / Development Assistance Committee
PME	Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
RBA	Rights Based Approach
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
ToR	Terms of Reference

²¹) Without the 13 pages of annexes; these are included in the annex to the inception report (11 December 2009).

1. Joint Programme Evaluation Partos

All recipient organisations from the Dutch Co Financing System (MFS) are required to establish a practice of regular “project evaluations” of their activities. In addition, the larger MFS recipients are also required to organise “programme evaluations”. In contrast with project evaluations (where the object of evaluation is an individual project/ organisation supported by an MFS organisation) the object of a programme evaluation is a particular programme and/ or policy area of the MFS organisation. The selection of programmes to be evaluated is made by the MFS organisations themselves. Programme evaluations are part of the accountability mechanisms of MFS organisations. Therefore they are required to be result oriented. The quality of these programme evaluations is assessed by IOB, the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Based on their previous collaboration²², the organisations Cordaid, Hivos, ICCO and Oxfam Novib have decided to implement part of their programme evaluation agenda jointly: in the period 2007-2010 they organise a series of five joint programme evaluations, focusing on subject areas common to and relevant for each of them. Each organisation has agreed to participate in at least three joint evaluations^{23,24,25}. The co-ordination of these joint programme evaluations is with Partos, the association of Dutch civil society organisations in the international development cooperation sector.

The present document provides the Terms of Reference for one of these five joint programme evaluations, focussing on the CFAs’ support for ‘indigenous peoples’. Participating organisations are Cordaid, Hivos and Icco. They will be referred to below as “the CFAs”.

2. CFAs and Indigenous Peoples (IP)

The CFAs have a long history of supporting initiatives and organisations of indigenous peoples²⁶, also referred to in this text as IP. This should be of no surprise given the overall mission of the CFAs to contribute to poverty eradication: in many countries indigenous peoples belong to the poorest and most marginalised social categories in society. During the period 2003-2007, the three CFAs committed roughly _60 million to more than 330 projects in support of indigenous peoples, in some 35 countries²⁷. The supported initiatives included interventions focusing on land rights, political rights, livelihood, the rights of indigenous women, and organisational strengthening.

The policy foundation for working with Indigenous Peoples differs between the CFAs²⁸. In

22) Reports from the 2003–2006 joint evaluations can be found at www.partos.nl, under ‘Kwaliteit’, ‘Kwaliteitshuis’, ‘Rapporten Programma Evaluaties’:

- Synthesis report of Dutch CFA Programme Evaluation HIV/AIDS 2001–2004 (no 5, Feb 2006)

- Synthesis Report - Assessing civil society participation as supported in-country by Cordaid, Hivos, Novib and Plan Netherlands (no 4, Dec 2005)

- Synthesis Report - Evaluation of health related programmes of three co-financing agencies 2002-2004 (no 3, Oct 2005)

- Synthesis Report - The Role of Women’s Organisations in Civil Society Building 1998-2003 (no 2, Nov 2004)

23) The other 4 programme evaluations in the period 2007-2010 focus on Conflict transformation, Microfinance, Capacity Development, and Gender-based violence respectively.

24) Gezamenlijke programma evaluaties 2007-2010, Herzien Plan van Aanpak Februari 2009

25) Oxfam Novib will not participate in this Programme Evaluation. Plan Nederland was also part of the agreement, but could only participate in the PE on Conflict Transformation

26) See Annex 1 for definitions of “indigenous peoples” and Annex 2 for a brief background of the respective CFA involvement with IP

27) See Annex 3 for details

28) The CFAs have described the policy foundation for their involvement with IP in different ways, which have also changed over time. Cordaid has a long history in supporting cultural minority groups. Most recently – in 2007 – it formulated its policy on ‘participation for identity based groups’. Hivos has anchored its support for IP – in general – in its policy on Human Rights. ICCO formulated its “Instruction for formulating country and regional policy Indigenous Peoples” in 2002. In addition policies have been formulated on specific groups, e.g. *adivasis*. A general trend in CFA policy formulation has been towards ‘sectoral’ policies, and away from policies for specific ‘target groups’. A consequence of this trend is that a CFA’s involvement with IP is not covered by one single policy document but covered by various mostly thematic policy documents.

spite of these differences it is possible to trace -in very general terms- a common framework of analysis of and approach to the position of IP namely structural injustice. In that framework a number of concepts are central: "Exclusion/marginalisation/discrimination", "Domination" "Self determination" and "Inclusion". In the following we briefly describe these central concepts.

Exclusion- Marginalisation- Discrimination- Domination

IP tend to be excluded from the -sources of- power in their societies. This is the case when they constitute a numerical minority in a country, but it also applies to situations where they are the majority population (as in some Latin American countries). Their exclusion is not a natural situation but the - ongoing - result of historical processes during which other groups have imposed their domination over them and by which IP were marginalized and discriminated according to the prevailing rules and culture in a society. IP's exclusion has various dimensions: political, economical and also socio-cultural. They are often considered and treated as second class citizens in the national political structures. Their historical and collective rights & claims on land and natural resources are not recognized and respected. Their cultural traditions and identity differ from, and are not respected by, the dominant culture and group(s) in society. Often IP live in remote, degraded areas and sometimes in (protected) areas rich of natural resources. Sometimes and in certain aspects IP's position in society can be characterised as "forced inclusion". Forced inclusion refers to forms of forced assimilation into systems, structures and values of the dominant group(s).

Self determination - Inclusion

Yet, the (recent) history of indigenous peoples is not only a history of exclusion. It is also a history of struggle for self-determination and inclusion, and of positive assertion of one's own culture and identity. In the last decades in many countries land rights were obtained as well as possibilities for bilingual education created. On the international level there were several successes; in 2007 the United Nations adopted the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Furthermore in several countries in Latin America (Bolivia, Ecuador, Colombia, Mexico) indigenous people made important progress in participation in national politics and legislation.

Improvement in the position of Indigenous Peoples requires changes at two - interrelated - levels:

- (1) at the level of the IP themselves (organisation building, self-esteem, cultural assertion, economic development, basic needs)
- (2) at the level of state and society (legal, economic and political structures and arrangements).

The outcome (or impact) of such changes can be described as "self determination" and "inclusion". Self determination points to the 'rights of peoples to freely determine their political status and to freely pursue their economic, social and cultural rights'. Inclusion refers to the inclusive society. This means a society which 'values the perspectives and contributions of all population groups and subgroups and a society which incorporates the needs and viewpoints of constituent communities. This implies respect for IPs' notion of what constitutes desirable development and poverty eradication.

CFAs' interventions consist of support to a wide range of 'actors' pushing for the above mentioned changes. These actors are -organisations of - the Indigenous Peoples themselves as well as non-IP civil society organisations supporting the IP (organisations). Both types of actors are among the partner organisations of the CFAs. These partner organisations can be active at local, regional, national and international level and in different thematic fields.

Although the accepted international definitions and this framework do suggest that it is possible to speak about the situation of indigenous peoples in general terms, it should be clear that behind these - relevant- general notions there is a diversity of contexts, which can only be addressed appropriately at a more 'local or national context' level.

Additional challenges

In principle CFAs' interventions with IP are not different from CFA interventions in general. They always involve relationships with partner organisations and with target group (organisations). However, supporting IP does imply some additional challenges for CFAs, which are related to -real/potential- differences in outlook and worldview between CFAs and IP. Such differences include views on 'development' and 'poverty' and the balance between individual and collective rights. Differences such as these find their expression around issues actively promoted by CFAs such as 'gender equality' and 'accountability'.

The promotion of women's rights and gender equality is a core concern of the CFAs. Apart from the fact that for most participating organisations it is one of their specific policy areas, they also have committed themselves to "mainstreaming gender" in all their work. This implies that the CFAs seek to ensure that all supported development activities and projects are gender sensitive and contribute to enhancing gender equality. Sometimes this CFA commitment meets with resistance from the IP organisations, invoking arguments of cultural difference. The CFAs therefore face the challenge of addressing the (potential) tension between (i) supporting the collective right to a specific, ethnic identity and self-esteem and (ii) enhancing individual indigenous women's rights and gender equality.

Another challenge faced by the CFAs is the "how" of their support for IP. IP membership-based organisations (local CBOs or higher level federations) are often organisationally weak and unstable. When providing direct support to such organisations the CFAs find themselves in major difficulties to meet the increasing accountability requirements of their back-donors. On one hand CFAs are supporting the IP organisations' own identity and organisational needs, on the other hand the requirements ask for a strong - or linear - PME-system. These difficulties appear less when providing indirect support to IP, via more established intermediary NGOs. However, the problem with such NGOs however may be their distance from the IP.

3. Joint Programme Evaluation Indigenous Peoples

3.1. Purpose: what will this evaluation be used for?

The CFAs will use the findings of this programme evaluation:

- To show and account for the results of their activities in support of Indigenous Peoples,
- To critically review these activities,
- To inspire future policy development & implementation.

3.2. Objective - Evaluation Question (EQ)

The objective of this evaluation is to answer the following Evaluation Question:

To what extent have CFA policies, strategies, procedures and programmes and those of their partner organisations contributed to a reduction of structural injustice towards indigenous peoples?

Specifically, to what extent have CFA policies and programmes contributed to:

- A reduction of marginalisation of certain population categories and a change in power, poverty, the worldviews and values, an increase and strengthening of the political, economic, social and cultural self-determination and identity of marginalised peoples;
- A reduction of marginalisation and inclusion in development processes that is considered positive by them, and
- Avoiding or mitigating of forced assimilation or integration?

3.3. Research Questions (RQ)

Answering the Evaluation Question means that the evaluation must address and answer the following research questions:

A. CFA Policies

1. What policies have the CFAs formulated regarding Indigenous Peoples? (explicit as well as implicit policies) ?
2. How should the formulated policies be assessed in light of
 - the current international debates,
 - the incorporation of the perspective of IP, and
 - the amount of attention given to the challenges mentioned in par 2?
3. Have the CFAs selected partner organisations and have the CFAs supported interventions that are in line with the policies described?

B. Changes in the situation of IP and the relation with CFA supported interventions

4. In what way did the position of the (selected) IPs change over the last 10 years concerning:
 - political rights
 - land rights
 - livelihoods
 - rights of indigenous women
5. Can these changes be assessed - and to what extent - as:
 - a reduction of marginalisation of the IP and a change in power, poverty, the worldviews and values, an increase and strengthening of the political, economic, social and cultural selfdetermination and identity of the IP?
 - a reduction of marginalisation and inclusion in development processes that is considered positive by them and
 - avoiding or mitigating of forced assimilation or integration?
6. To what degree and in what way can the changes under 4) be explained by the interventions of the CFA's partners ?
7. What is the relative importance of the CFAs' partner network contribution to these changes?
8. What can be said about the sustainability of the changes (see par. 3.6 definition sustainability)?
9. Are there unexpected (negative as well as positive) outcomes of CFA's partners interventions be distinguished?

C. Mode of supporting

10. In what way has the mode of supporting IP-organisations by the CFA's contributed to or undermined the (positive) outcomes. Include topics like:
 - Selection criteria of partners (different levels, intermediary organisations or indigenous organisations)
 - Accountability systems, PME-models
 - CFA-partner involvement/communication

D. Synthesis

11. What can overall be said about the change in structural injustice in the situation of IP in the case studies and the contribution of the CFAs' partner organisations in this change?
12. What lessons are there to be drawn from the case studies to enhance the positive outcomes (diminish the negative) and to effectively support the IP-organisations?

3.4. Methodology - Implementing the evaluation

General approach

These Terms of Reference will guide three separate studies, one for each CFA. Each study will start - inception phase - with an analysis/ reconstruction of the CFA' s policies & strategies in working with IP (RQ under A)

Phase 2 will cover research questions under B and C, and consist of a small number of case studies. The Cordaid study will focus on Africa (pastoralists in Kenya, Tanzania and Ethiopia), the Hivos study will focus on Latin America (Bolivia and Guatemala) and the Icco study will focus on Asia (India).

Phase 3 will lead to a synthesis report in which the findings of the CFA studies will be compared, according to research questions under D.

The evaluation will be carried out by a team of three evaluators, one of which will act as team leader. Each evaluator will be responsible for one CFA study. The teamleader will coordinate the whole process and be responsible for writing the synthesis report. Partos will sign up a contract with only the teamleader. The two other evaluators will work under responsibility - read under contract - of the teamleader.

The evaluation needs to meet the standards set out by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB), an independent body of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (see annex 4, in Dutch).

Methodology in detail

Phase 1 - Inception

The inception phase covers 2 activities:

- Addressing research questions under A (1 - 4) concerning the CFA policies on IP.

Given what was said about these policies in paragraph 2, this will partly mean a 'reconstruction' of the policies/theory of change/intervention logic.

This phase should include:

- A review of the relevant literature.
 - A systematic review of relevant files, reports and other documents (e.g. existing (impact) studies, project and previous programme evaluations) available at Cordaid, Hivos, ICCO. A basic analysis should be done on the total portfolio of the participating CFAs.
 - Interviews with desk- and programme officers, and management at the CFAs: to get an insight in the relation between policy, knowledge and practice of desk and programme officers.
 - Interviews with other relevant informants (organisations or individuals) in the Netherlands.
- Preparation of phase 2

This includes:

- a general refining of the research questions and development of indicators and judgement criteria, based on 4.1.1.
- a country specific refining of research questions/indicators/judgement criteria. This includes a check on the most relevant of the project foci.
- identification of sources of information and techniques of data collection.

This phase will result in three inception reports, one for each CFA. Approval of inception reports is a condition for the start of the next phase. Apart from the approval of each individual inception report, which will be done by the Partos Evaluation Manager and the respective CFA, it is proposed that in a 1/2 day workshop the three inception reports will

be compared, as a first contribution to the synthesis report.

To sustain uniformity during the inception phase and later during the synthesis phase the inception reports should be written following the same table of contents and using the same concepts. Also the three case studies' report should be written following the same table of contents. The uniformity must be guarded by the teamleader.

Phase 2 - Case studies - data collection²⁹

The data collection will include

- desk study of IP context in case study countries
- desk study of CFA documents and partner files
- interviews with CFA staff
- field work case studies, including interviews with informants from IP and partner organisations

Each country case study will address the research questions 4-10 against a thorough context analysis of the (historical) changes in the position of the IP.

The aim of the country cases is to:

- a. Complete of information that did not show up during phase 1.
- b. Verify already collected data, and collect additional data on partner organisation and target population level (looking for intended as well as unintended, positive as well as negative effects).
- c. In addition to partner organisations, other reliable and appropriate data sources and informants should be consulted as well. Triangulation of data found in the desk study is needed.
- d. Share the information collected with at least the partner organisations, but preferably also other relevant stakeholders in the field, in order to create a common understanding and stimulate the learning process at relevant stakeholders.

This phase will be finalised with 3 reports answering the research questions 1-10 and the evaluation question for each CFA.

Phase 3 - Synthesis

Based on the three CFA reports a synthesis report will be written. This report will answer part D, RQ 11 and 12.

3.5. Scope

- Policy wise (Part A of the research questions) the evaluation will cover the totality of CFAs' involvement with indigenous peoples.
- Geographically the scope of the evaluation includes Africa (Kenya-Tanzania-Ethiopia), Latin America (Bolivia- Guatemala) and Asia (India)). The country fieldstudies will cover a sizeable part of the CFAs' overall IP portfolios (in terms of financial commitments - Cordaid 35%, Hivos 42%, Icco 29%).
- The historical scope of the evaluation is at least the period 2003-2007. However, it may differ per case study, sometimes a "deeper scope" may be preferred. The historical depth of each case study will be determined during the inception phase.

3.6. Result levels and Evaluation criteria

- The evaluation will address 'results' at the outcome level, and - where possible - at impact level
- The evaluation criteria applied by this evaluation are effectiveness, sustainability and relevance. For these concepts we follow the definitions formulated by DAC (Development Assistance Committee - see annex 5) The evaluation will not attempt to assess efficiency.

29) Evaluators must be aware of general data limitations in CFA supported projects. Baseline studies are generally not available. Data limitations occur in CFA files as well as in administrative systems of partner organizations.

4. Deliverables and deadlines

All final products need to be in English. Depending on the selected areas for field study, translations may need to take place to French or Spanish. The final synthesis report should be handed in **the 1st of april 2010**.

Expected products, delivered by the consultants, and deadlines

Time available for phase 1 is 8 weeks: mid august 2009 - mid oct 2009

During this phase, the consultants:

- a. will have a kick-off meeting with the co-ordination group (CG): *augustus 2009*
- b. will draft an inception report (*after 7 weeks*). This inception reports includes a reconstruction of the policies and intervention logic, and a further operationalisation of the evaluation framework, evaluation questions, judgement criteria and indicators, based on this ToR, the proposal of the evaluators, and what they have found so far. This inception report is also sent to the External Reference Group (ERG)⁷ for comments.
- c. will have a meeting on the inception report and the progress in the implementation of the work plan with the co-ordination group (after 9 weeks). The discussion includes:
 - comments of the ERG
 - problems faced so far and solutions found
 - reliability of data collected
 - more information on judgement criteria and provisional indicators
 - verification that all important sources of information have been/will be used
 - first outline second phase for the case studies, suggestions for fine-tuning of the evaluation questions and the methodology for data collection in the field phase
- d. should submit a final report end oct 2010, including any comments received from the co-ordination group. This final report includes at least:
 - an overview of the different policies (formal or informal), intervention or programme logic, judgement criteria plus indicators, practices and main activities during 2003 - 2007 of the four participating CFAs
 - an overview of expenditures by CFAs (total and MFP budget) and the number of partners involved (most of this is already available in the portfolio)
 - an analysis of the link between the work of CFAs within the changes of the geographical context, preliminary answers on the evaluations questions, and hypotheses to be further validated through field research

Number of pages for the final inception report: max 40 main text, excl. annexes

Format: draft report: electronic version (MS Word format)

final report: hardcopy (5 copies) plus electronic version (MS Word format)

Time available for phase 2 is 12 weeks: nov 2009 - end January 2010

At the end of the field study phase, the consultants will:

- a. submit three to three (of course the number depends on the number of countries visited) draft country reports and one thematic report (mid January 2010). These reports will also be shared with the partner organisations for comments. These reports should include at least:
 - reports of the field briefings and debriefings (meetings or workshops) in the countries/regions
 - context analysis, methodology, findings, conclusions and a maximum of four organisation specific recommendations regarding the evaluation questions

- b. give a presentation of the findings to the co-ordination group (*around Mid January 2010*)
- c. submit four final country reports (*no later than end January 2010*), including any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft reports.

Number of pages for each report: max 40 main text, excl. annexes

Format: Draft country reports: electronic version (MS Word format)

Final country reports: hardcopy (5 copies of each report) plus electronic version (MS Word format)

Time available for phase 3 is 8 weeks: February 2010 - April 2010

After the field study phase, the consultants will:

- a. submit a draft Synthesis Report (*around mid March 2010*) based on the desk and field studies: besides answering the evaluation questions, the draft final report should also synthesise all findings, conclusions and recommendations into an overall assessment of the programme. This draft Synthesis Report is also sent to the External Reference Group for their comments and concerned parties.
- b. give a presentation on the draft report to the co-ordination group (*Mid March 2009*), followed by a discussion on:
 - findings, conclusions
 - quality of the report
 - utilisation of the report, including transferable lessons and recommendations
- c. and if deemed necessary, this discussion can immediately be followed by a meeting with the External Reference Group and the coordination group.
- d. submit a final Synthesis Report (*no later than first week of April 2010*), including any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report. This report needs to match the standards set out by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB), an independent body of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (see annex 4, in Dutch).

Number of pages of synthesis report: max 60 main text, excl. annexes

Format: Draft Synthesis report: electronic version (MS Word format)

Final Synthesis report: hardcopy (5 copies) plus electronic version (MS Word format)

The final Synthesis Report will include an annex 1 with the formal assessment of the External Reference Group. It will be printed and distributed by Partos, and put on Partos' website.

5. Evaluation Team

The team leader should have expertise in managing complex evaluation processes. Experience with evaluations which go beyond policy level; knowledge of the working conditions and contexts of local partner organisations in the South is a must.

The evaluators will have to complement the specific 'indigenous peoples' - social science focus on - expertise, gender expertise, and have experience in quantitative and qualitative survey techniques. Language skills needed are Dutch, English and Spanish/Portuguese in order to be able to read and interpret the files available at the CFAs.

Although not the main focus - learning is an important part of the PE-process; therefore it is important to include participative learning experience and skills in the team. At least one team member should have an understanding of the Dutch co-financing system. Preferably, the team should be a mixture of northern and southern consultants. Working with local consultants during field studies in the South is a pre-condition.

Team members should not have had a working relationship with the involved CFAs during 2002-2007, the period just before and under evaluation. The co-ordination group follows the generally accepted principle that the evaluation of a programme must be carried out by independent bodies, organisations or individuals. In this particular case, this means that

consultants should not have been involved in setting up the policy or programmes relating indigenous people at the CFAs under evaluation, nor should they have worked as policy-, programme or desk officers on this specific topic at these CFAs. In short: someone should not evaluate his or her own work.

It is the responsibility of the team leader to assure:

- composition of the team
- a realistic time frame and budget for the evaluation
- the consistency of the deliverables with the ToR
- the quality of the content of the deliverables

The team leader is ultimately responsible for finalising the report and co-ordinating and guiding the evaluation process (including all logistic arrangements).

6. Budget

A budget should give a breakdown of the expected number of days per team member and their fees. Prices need to be calculated in Euro's, are maximum prices and cannot be changed during the contract. The maximum budget available for the complete evaluation (including all three case studies and synthesis phase) is €365,000. **(VAT Inclusief)**

We suggest a division of the budget over the three cases studies and the synthesis phase. Per case study (rq 1-10) the amount could be €110,000. **(VAT Inclusief)**. For writing up the synthesis report we estimate the budget at €35,000. **(VAT Inclusief)**

The payment procedures are as follows:

25% at acceptance by the evaluation team of the task

25% after approval by co-ordination group of the draft inception report (end phase 1)

25% after approval by co-ordination group of the final organisational or country reports
(end phase 2)

25% after approval by co-ordination group of final report and financial justification
(end phase 3)

7. Management and steering of the evaluation

Co-ordination Group (CG)

The evaluation is managed by the evaluation manager within Partos, with the assistance of a co-ordination group consisting of members of the four participating co-financing agencies. The co-ordination group members have prepared the current Terms of Reference. The main function of this group is:

- To select the evaluation team who actually implement this evaluation.
- To ensure that the consultants have access to and have consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the project/programme available at the agencies.
- To validate the evaluation questions.
- To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the consultants.
- To assist in feedback of the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation back into their organisations.

External Reference Group (ERG)

Partos, together with the Co-Financing Agencies have installed a Reference Group of external experts to advise the co-ordination group on the quality of process and results of the joint programme evaluations. The External Reference Group gives advice on the draft Terms of Reference, the draft inception report, the draft Synthesis report, and prepares a

final assessment on the quality of process and results. Their independent assessment will be included in the final synthesis report as an annex³⁰.

Policy and Operations Evaluation Department (IOB)

The CFAs are accountable to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Dutch public for the obtained results. The evaluation reports will be open for public use and are reviewed by the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department, an independent body of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, according to a Quality Assessment List (annex 4, in Dutch).

All contracting, payment and correspondence concerning the evaluation goes through Partos:
Ellermanstraat 15

Amsterdam

The Netherlands

Tel : 020 - 320 9901

Fax : 020 - 620 8049

Contact person: Lisette Desain, ld@partos.nl, Evaluatie Manager Partos

8. Minimal requirements for proposals

In case you are or your organisation is interested, we invite you to prepare a proposal for implementation (max. 15 pages, excluding annexes). We encourage you to team up with other organisations or individuals. The proposal should be written in English. We expect a plan of approach, with at least the following information:

Understanding context and evaluation questions:

- Fine tuning of the evaluation questions, including a first draft of 'judgement criteria'.

The evaluation questions need to be captured into different judgement criteria developed by the consultants. Each evaluation question should have at least 1 to 2 judgement criteria.

The achievement of these criteria during the period 2003 -2007 can be assessed or judged through indicators, which need to be developed by the consultants during the first phase of the evaluation.

Evaluation capacity:

- A proposal for a methodology, the way in which data will be collected and data sources needed, taking into account the expected methodological problems and data shortcomings.

- A proposal for how to analyse data in order to answer the evaluation questions.

Evaluation team:

- An overview of the roles, expertise and skills of the team members in the evaluation.

- Time table, including possible risks, and measures you may take in order to reduce those risks.

The proposal should include at least the following annexes:

- Composition of the evaluation team with cv's, showing their knowledge, skills and experiences

- List of relevant evaluations within the last 5 years

A separate document including a breakdown of the requested budget should be sent with the technical proposal, but in a separate envelope. You should give the reference number "Partos /09/LD/800, technical -or- financial proposal" for quotation on the envelopes.

30) An example of such an assessment can be found at http://www.partos.nl/index.php?page=5_2_3, Synthesis Report of Dutch CFA Programme Evaluation - MBN HIV/AIDS Evaluation, 2001-2004 on page 111-112.

Technical and financial proposals (3 hardcopies each, in two different envelopes) should be sent to the contact person at Partos (mentioned in chapter eight), and need to be in her receipt no later than 13 july 2009 at 17.00 o'clock Dutch time. We also ask you to send an email with the two documents.

Annex 3: List of people consulted

Cordaid / Ethiopia

Name	Organisation	Position
Europe		
Alba Espinoza Rocca (f)	Cordaid, Sector Participation	Programme Officer, Pastoralist Development
Ced Hesse	International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), UK	Programme Officer
Frédérique van Drumpt (f)	Cordaid, Sector Participation	Project Officer
Hilda van 't Riet (f)	Cordaid	Monitoring & Evaluation Officer
Inge Barmentlo (f)	Cordaid, Sector Participation	Programme Officer, Pastoralist Development
Margriet Nieuwenhuis (f)	Cordaid, Sector Participation	Manager
Piet Spaarman	Cordaid, Sector Emergency Aid & Reconstruction (EA&R)	Manager
Sasja Kamil (f)	Cordaid, Sector EA&R	Team Leader Eastern & Southern Africa
Stephanie Joubert (f)	Cordaid, Section Participation	Programme Officer Lobbying
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia		
Abdulkarim Guleid	Federal Parliament	Member of Parliament
Abebe Balcha	Cultural&Art Society of Ethiopia (CASE)	Board Chair
Adrian Cullis	Save the Children–USA	Programme Officer, Ethiopia Office
Boku Tache	World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples (WAMIP)	Board member
Daniel Temesgen	Pastoralist Forum Ethiopia (PFE)	Policy Research Officer
Girma Zenebe	CASE	Director
Honey Hassen (f)	PFE	Cordaid Project Coordinator
Ibrahim Abate	Oromia Pastoralists Association (OPA)	Executive Director
Jemjem Udessa	Development by Unity and Brotherly Action for Future (DUBAF)	Executive Director
Johnathan Napier	Food and Agriculture Research Management (FARM)–Africa	Country Director
Mattijs Renden	Cordaid	Financial Officer (from head office)
Mohammed Ali	Federal Parliament	Chair of Pastoral Affairs Standing Committee
Muluneh Mengistu	CASE	Program Manager
Nura Dida	OPA	Chair; General Secretary, East African Pastoralist Elders Council
Rahel Belete (f)	Action for Development (AFD)	Programme Officer
Rustico Biñas	Consultant to Cordaid	Disaster Risk Reduction Advisor
Solomon Desta	Pastoral Risk Management (PARIMA)	Researcher
Tafesse Mesfin	Ethiopian Pastoralist Research and Development Association (EPARDA)	Acting Director and Board Member
Tamre Teka	Panos–Ethiopia	Country Director
Tegegne Alemayehu	EPARDA	Programme Manager
Tezera Getahun	PFE	Executive Director
Ton Haverkort	Cordaid	Regional Disaster Risk Reduction Programme Coordinator
Wako Dubo	DUBAF	Programme Manager
Wondwossen Chanyalew	FARM–Africa	Project Manager, Ethiopian Integrated Pastoralist Project (EIPP)
Wondwossen Gulelat	PFE	Programme Manager
Yohannes GebreMichael	Addis Ababa University GeographyDept	Lecturer; specialist in pastoralism
Yosef Gebrehiwot	Save the Children–USA	M&E, Africa Area Office

Name	Organisation	Position
Yoseph Negassa	AFD	Director
South Omo Zone, Ethiopia		
Aregay GebreSellasie	EPaRDA	South Omo Risk Management Project Officer
Bazo Morfa Dalime	Hamar (linguist)	Youth League & Sport Office Jinka
Burtenesh (f)	EPaRDA	Luka Community Development Facilitator
Hora Galcha	CASE	Woito Field Programme Manager
Jonathan Said	EPaRDA	South Omo Project Officer
Meseret Negaya	Catholic Mission Dimeke	Deacon (Ethiopian Orthodox Church)
Paddy Moran (Father)	Gamo Gofa Catholic Church	Integrated Community Devt Project Director
Sultan Abdurahman	EPaRDA	South Omo Programme Coordinator
Wondifraw Baykeda	FARM–Africa EIPP	Community Development Officer
Yared Tesfaye	Network of Ethiopian Women’s Associations (NEWA)	Public Relations & Communications Officer
Zenabu Indris	FARM–Africa EIPP	Community Development Officer
Abore pastoralists (m, f)	Genderoba community	Members, various positions
Hamar pastoralists (m, f)	Assile community	Members, various positions
Tsamai pastoralists (m, f)	Luka community	Members, various positions
Borana Zone, Ethiopia		
Abebe Olkeba	Yabello Pastoral and Dryland Agriculture Research Centre	Researcher
Abera Abebe	AFD	Arero District Supervisor
Adi Boru	Arero District Administration	District Administrator
Ann Belete (f)	Private	Petty trader
Azeb Abate (f)	Arero District Women’s Affairs Office	Head
Bezunesh Ale (f)	Yabello Catholic Church	Matron, girls’ hostel
Boru Boneya	Yabello Catholic Church	General Manager, boarding school hostel
Diba Debosa	Arero District Administration	Finance Head
Emawayish Shibru (f)	Arero High School	Vice Director
Emerike Petersixtus (Father)	Yabello Catholic Church	Project Coordinator
Galma Guyo	CARE	Livelihoods Officer
Girma Getachew	GOAL Ireland	Borana Field Office Programme Director
Godana Jarso (f)	Fuldwaha Pastoral Association	Youth
Husseine Jarso	Arero District Education Bureau	Head
Lemessa Daba	Action for Development (AFD)	M&E Officer, Acting Field Office Coordinator
Other staff members	Arero District Administration	
Teshome Dahessa	CARE	Borana Field Office Programme Manager
Wako Erbole	AFD	Alona Community Development Facilitator
Wario Wachi	Arero High School	Student, member of Education Working Group
Boran pastoralists (m, f)	Alona community	Members, incl. Water Management Committee
Boran youth (m, f)	Arero Youth Association Metagefersa	Members
Hawassa, Ethiopia		
Sixtus Augustini (Father)	Vicariate of Awassa	Secretary General
Yibeltal Jemberu	Vicariate of Awassa	Health Coordinator

Cordaid / Kenya

Name	Organisation	Position
Europe		
Alba Espinoza Rocca (f)	Cordaid, Sector Participation	Programme Officer, Pastoralist Development
Brigitte Kaufmann (f)	German Institute for Tropical and Subtropical Agriculture (DITSL)	Researcher (pastoralism in north Kenya)
Ced Hesse	IIED, UK	Programme Officer
Frédérique van Drumpt (f)	Cordaid, Sector Participation	Project Officer
Hilda van 't Riet (f)	Cordaid	Monitoring & Evaluation Officer
Inge Barmantlo (f)	Cordaid, Sector Participation	Programme Officer, Pastoralist Development
Margriet Nieuwenhuis (f)	Cordaid, Sector Participation	Manager
Piet Spaarman	Cordaid, Sector EA&R	Manager
Sasja Kamil (f)	Cordaid, Sector EA&R	Team Leader Eastern & Southern Africa
Stephanie Joubert (f)	Cordaid, Section Participation	Programme Officer Lobbying
Nairobi, Kenya		
Abass Mohammed	Kenya Livestock Marketing Council (KLMC)	Chief Executive Director
Abdikadir Mohammed	KLMC	Programme Coordinator
Annie LeFevre (f)	Cordaid Liaison Office	Liaison Officer
Bilach Jimale (f)	League of Pastoralist Women of Kenya (LPWK)	Director
George Odhiambo	FARM-Africa	Regional Programme Manager
Halakhe Waqo	Commission for National Cohesion and Integration	Commissioner
Jonathan Davies	International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) / WISP	Regional Drylands Coordinator
Joseph Ole Simel	Mainyoito Pastoralist Integrated Development Organization (MPIDO)	Executive Director
Lawrence Ole Mbelati	MPIDO	Programme Officer
Mohamed Elmi	Ministry for Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands	Minister
Mohammed	KLMC	Programme Officer Advocacy
Qulichwa Wario	KLMC	Marketing Officer
The Honourable Safia Abdi (f)	House of Parliament	Nominated MP for Garissa
Sofia Abdi (f)	Cordaid Liaison Office	Programme 4 Officer
Willie Tuimising	Practical Action	Programme Leader
Yobo Rutin	Centre for Minority Rights Development (CEMIRIDE)	Executive Director
Wamba area, Kenya		
Assilie Mohamed (f)	Samburu Integrated Development Programme (SIDEP)	Administrative staff member
Boniface Nakori	School	Teacher, Special Education
Frances Lenkes	Security Committee	Chair
Ibrahim Abdalla	SIDEP	Programme Coordinator
Iphraim Kagwe	Wamba Agriculture Office	Agribusiness Development
Jacob Lizoro	SIDEP	Education Programme Manager
Jane Degadero (f)	Women's gardening group	Chair
John Nagunabe	Wamba resident	
Julius Lemalasia	SIDEP	CMDRR Programme Manager
Ngoroge	Wamba Education Office	Field Services Officer
Patrick Lambokita	Wamba Location	Assistant Chief

Name	Organisation	Position
Rebecca Elangubai (f)	SIDEP	Micro-enterprise and Water Project Officer
Rueben Legagero	Wamba resident	Retired project worker
Stephen Wakalepe	Gulei West Sub-Location	Assistant Chief
Samburu pastoralists (m)	Livestock Marketing Association	Executive and members
Samburu pastoralists (f)	Women's gardening group	Members
<i>Nakuru, Kenya</i>		
Bilha Wanjiku Mucheru (f)	Resource Conflict Institute (RECONCILE)	Programme Assistant
Irene Aloo Mukalo (f)	RECONCILE	Programme Assistant
John Gichana Ombwori	RECONCILE	Accountant
Margaret Kerubo Ogeto (f)	RECONCILE	Programme Assistant
Michael Ochieng Odhiambo	RECONCILE	Executive Director
Peter Ken Otieno	RECONCILE	Programme Associate
<i>Turkana area, Kenya</i>		
Adima Paul	Oropoi dispensary	Patient Attendant
Catherine Ethokon (f)	Lopeyei School Committee	Treasurer
Charles Lokaala	Oropoi community	Assistant Chief
Gilchrist Lokoel (Dr)	Turkana Central and Loyima Districts	Health Office Head
Harim	Kalamunyang Health Post	Nurse
Jocelyn Aita (f)	Diocese of Lodwar	Development Coordinator (incoming)
Lucy Imasaja (f)	Lorugumu Health Centre	Social worker
Margaret Nasambu (f)	Kalamunyang Health Post	Patient Attendant
Margaret Twomey (Sister) (f)	Diocese of Lodwar	Health Services Coordinator
Otieno Zachary	Diocese of Lodwar	Community-Based Healthcare Coordinator
Pascalia Chirea (Sister) (f)	Lorugumu Health Centre	Nurse
Robert Girayo	Lorugumu Health Centre	Nurse
Simon Munya Echakon	Lopeyei Sublocation	Assistant Chief (formerly Patient Attendant)
Tim Flynn	Diocese of Lodwar	Development Coordinator (outgoing)
Turkana pastoralists (f)	Kalamunyang community	TBAs, CHWs
Turkana pastoralists (m, f)	Lopeyei community	Members
Turkana pastoralists (m, f)	Lopeyei School Committee	Members
Turkana pastoralists (m, f)	Oropoi community	TBAs, CHWs, Development Committee, youth
<i>Moyale area, Kenya</i>		
Adan Waqo	FARM–Africa	Project Officer
Alex Mbandu	District Livestock Office	Drought Monitoring Officer
Amutete (Dr)	Moyale Agriculture Office	District Veterinary Officer
Galma Cabrikie	Community Initiative Facilitation and Assistance (CIFA)	Water & Environmental Officer
Ibrahim Yuso	Godoma Location Devt Committee	Chair
Molu Dika	ALRMP	Drought Management Officer
Ousman Owaqo	FARM–Africa	Logistics Officer
Boran pastoralists (m, f)	Godoma community	Members
<i>Marsabit, Kenya</i>		
Hilary Halkano Bukuno	Diocese of Marsabit	Justice & Peace Coordinator
Hubert Moessmer (Father)	North Horr	Priest
James Galgallo	Diocese of Marsabit	Development Coordinator
Joseph Mirgichan	Diocese of Marsabit	Health Services Coordinator
Nuria Gollo (f)	Marsabit Women Advocacy and Development Organisation(MWADO)	Director

Name	Organisation	Position
Umuru Roma	Pastoralist Integrated Support Programme (PISP)	Executive Director
Laisamis area, Kenya		
Adam Lengima	Dept of Agriculture and Livestock	Veterinary Officer
Dan Kopir	Laisamis school	Teacher
Rendille pastoralists (m, f)	Tirukoamo community	Members (incl. Chief, elders, students)
Nanyuki, Kenya		
Anthony King/Delphine Malleret (f)	Laikipia Wildlife Forum	Director/Research
Juliet King (f)	Northern Rangelands Trust	Researcher & Monitoring Manager

Hivos / Bolivia

Name	Organisation	Position
The Hague, Netherlands		
Karel Chambille	Hivos	Evaluation Manager, M&E
Ria Hulsman	Hivos	Former representative for Hivos Country Office Bolivia, La Paz; currently Coordinator of the Office for Donor Relations
Teyo van der Schoot	Hivos	Programme Manager, Human Rights & Democratisation
Chantal Verdonk	Hivos	Programme Manager, Gender, Women & Development
Amsterdam, Netherlands		
Leo van der Vlist	Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples (NCIV)	External Relations
La Paz, La Paz		
Staff members	Asociación de Organizaciones de Productores Ecológicos de Bolivia (AOPEB)	
Corina Straatsma	Hivos	Director Hivos Country Office
Staff members	IBIS-Sudamerica	
Staff members	Coordinadora de la Mujer	
Alfonso Aalem	Independent consultant (resource person)	Social investigator, specialist in indigenous affairs
Xavier Alvó	Independent consultant (resource person)	Social investigator, anthropologist, Jesuit priest
Ramiro Molina Barrios	Independent consultant (resource person)	Anthropologist, specialist in indigenous affairs
Maria Eugenia Choque	Independent consultant (resource person)	Social worker, academic researcher, Andean Oral History Workshop
Carlos Mamani	UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (resource person)	Member of UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues
Miguel Urioste	Fundación Tierra, La Paz (resource person)	Director of Fundación Tierra, national office (La Paz)
Trinidad, Beni		
Staff members	Centro de Investigación y Documentación para el Desarrollo del Beni (CIDDEBENI)	
Staff members	Central de Mujeres Indígenas del Beni (CMIB)	
William Cuellar	Consejo Sirionó (Indigenous Council of the Sirionó people)	President of the Indigenous Council of the Sirionó people

Name	Organisation	Position
Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz		
Staff members	Apoyo para el Campesino-Indígena del Oriente Boliviano (APCOB)	
Staff members	Centro de Estudios Jurídicos e Investigación Social (CEJIS)	
Carmen Chuvé	Chiquitanos of Lomerío	Chief (Cacica) of the Syndicate of Indigenous Organisations of Chiquitanía (OICH)
Miguel García	Chiquitanos of Lomerío	Member of the Council of Elders of Lomerío
Miguel Parapaino	Chiquitanos of Lomerío	Member of Political Territorial Committee of Lomerío
Alcides Vadillo	Fundación Tierra, Santa Cruz (resource person)	Director of Fundación Tierra, Santa Cruz office; ex-CEJIS member, ex-director National Institute of Agrarian Reform (during Carlos Meza administration)
Concepción, Santa Cruz		
Antonia Cuasace Suvirú	Chiquitanos of Lomerío	Chief (Cacica) of Autonomous Council of Lomerío
Miguel García	Chiquitanos of Lomerío	Vocal (spokesperson), member of Council of Elders of Lomerío
Ignacio Soqueré	Chiquitanos of Lomerío	Chief of organisation and documentation of the Autonomous Council of Lomerío
Board members	Forestry Committee of Palestina (Monte Verde territory)	
Ignacio Macoñó	Chiquitanos of San Javier	Secretary of lands and territory and ex president of the Indigenous Syndicate of Paiconeca de San Javier
Riberalta, Beni		
Board members of the Administrative Council and member of the Vigilance Committee	Cooperativa Agrícola Integral Campesina (CAIC)	
Staff members, advisor	Central Indígena de la Región Amazónica de Bolivia (CIRABO)	
Staff members	Instituto para el Hombre, Agricultura y Ecología (IPHAE) / Programa de Manejo de Bosques de la Amazonia Boliviana (PROMAB)	

Hivos / Guatemala

Name	Organisation	Position
San José, Costa Rica		
Pablo Alvarez	Hivos	PO Sustainable Economic Development
Susana Rochna	Hivos	PO Human Rights & Development
Ciudad de Guatemala		
Ginet Vargas	Hivos	PO Gender, Women & Development
Julieta Hernández	Contemporanea Consultora	Hivos liaison person, consultant
Mario Minera	Centre for Human Rights Legal Action (CALDH)	Executive Director
Staff members	CALDH-PRODEPI (Indigenous Peoples Rights Programme)	
Staff members	Kaq'la	
Members of directive council	National Peasant and Indigenous Coordination (CONIC)	
Carolina Morales	Molaj	Member of executive board

Name	Organisation	Position
Members of directive council	National Coordination of Peasants' Organizations (CNOO)	
Members of executive board	Moloj	
Staff member and adviser	Madre Selva	
Amílcar Pop	Guatemalan Association of Mayan Lawyers and Notaries (ANMG)	Lawyer and consultant
Demetrio Cojtí	EU Democratic Principles Programme	Consultant
Irmalicia Velásquez	Mecanismo Oxlajuj (Support Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples)	General coordinator
Jacobo Bolvito	Presidential Commission against Racism and Discrimination (CODISRA)	General coordinator
Juana Celestina Sotz	Indigenous Women's Ombudsmans' Office (DEMI)	Programme officer
Otilia Lux	National Congress	Congresswoman
Peter Marchetti	Association for the Advancement of the Social Sciences (AVANCSO)	Investigator
Quetzaltenango, Quetzaltenango		
Staff members	Research, Development and Integral Education Association (IDEI)	
Members	Youth Parliament & Intersectorial Committee on HIV/AIDS	
Carlos Reynoso	Manos Campesinas	Managing director
Margarita Chojolán	Porfín/Root Capital	National technical coordinator
Río Hondo, Zacapa		
Antonio García	Human Rights Observatory	Human rights observer
Carlos Ramírez	DEMACH (Chortí Ombudsman's Office)	Member of executive board DEMACH & Human Rights observer
Gregorio Pérez	Human Rights Observatory	Human rights observer
María Domitila López	DEMACH/COSACH (Chortí Social Convergence)	Member of executive board of DEMACH & representative of Chortí Social Convergence
María Lucinda Vásquez	Human Rights Observatory	Human rights observer
Pablo Ramos	DEMACH	Member of executive board DEMACH & Human rights observer
San Martín Jilotepeque, Chimaltenango		
Community members	Siete Parajes (Las Mercedes)	
Santa Cruz del Quiché		
Staff members	Enlace Quiché	
Members of executive board	Association of Quiché Women's Organisations	
San Marcos La Laguna, Sololá		
Team members	COPAE (Pastoral Commission Peace and Ecology), Diocese of San Marcos	

ICCO / India

Name	Organisation	Position
Utrecht, The Netherlands		
Annet Smits	ICCO Head Office	Former programme officer India
Elske van Gorkum	ICCO Head Office	Former programme officer India
Heleen Broekkamp	ICCO Head Office	Former programme officer India
Zwaantje van 't Veer	ICCO Head Office	Former programme officer India
Delhi, India		
Lennard Roubos	ICCO Regional Office, India	
Poonam Kaur	ICCO Regional Office, India	
Samir Battarcharjee	ICCO Regional Office, India	
Ajay Jha	Public Advocacy Initiative for Rights and Values (PAIRVI)	
Suhas Chakma	AIPTN	
District: Lohardaga, India Villages: Ghumareia & Naudihi		
Staff members	Church Auxiliary for Social Action (CASA)	
PAT leaders, office bearers and council members	CASA	
Community members		
District: Latehar, India Villages: Chatrapur, Chandel, Hempur & Naudihi		
Staff members	Bindrai Institute for Research and Action (BIRSA)	
Community members		
District: Gumla, India Villages: Seelam, Narutoli & Sahitoli		
Staff members	Professional Assistance for Development Action (PRADAN)	
Leaders of SHGs and Federations		
Women doing poultry farming		
Families using lift irrigation		
District: Berhampur, India Villages: Mohuda, Tamana Kankia, Batangpada & Rahillapada		
Joe Madiath	Gram Vikas	
Individual households		
Women groups		
District: Kandhamal, India Villages: Biraguda, Balampada & Sudhasahi		
Staff members	International Development Enterprises India	
Four families using treadle pumps		

Name	Organisation	Position
One village entrepreneur		
One agent at village level		
Women groups in the village		
District: Bolangir, India		
Village: Bhutungpara		
Staff members	Team for Human Resource Education and Development (THREAD)	
Women group		
Ranchi, Jharkhand, India		
Mr BC Nigam	Government / Jharkhand State Scheduled Caste Corporation Devt Ltd	Special Secretary Welfare Department cum Managing Director
Delhi, India		
Ms Ruchira Pant	Ministry of Tribal Affairs, Government of India	Jt. Secretary
Dr Virginus Xaxa	Delhi University	Resource person
Bhubaneshwar, India		
Ms Bratindi Jena	ActionAid	Resource person
Delhi, India		
Resmi Bhaskaran	Institute of Human Development	Resource person

Annex 4: List of documents consulted

General documents

- Anaya SJ. 1996. Indigenous peoples in international law. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Anaya SJ. 2008. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development. UN Human Rights Council, Special Rapporteur, document A/HRC/9/9.
- Castro DM. 2009. The protection of the rights of pastoralist people in the United Nations system.
- De la Peña G. 1999. Territorio y ciudadanía étnica en la nación globalizada. *Desacatos* 1(1): 13-27.
- Henke R & Mook M. 2007. Final report. Regional Brainstorm meeting: Cross-border aspects of corporate interests in natural resources in the Greater Mekong Subregion, 19-20 February 2007, Phnom Penh, Cambodia.
- Libunao S, Ramachandran V, Solomon C & Rugmini R. 2007. Synthesis report on the Core Country Programme Evaluation (CCPE) for India, 2007. Report to Oxfam Novib.
- Martínez Cobo J. 1986. Study of the problem of discrimination against indigenous populations. UN Publication E.86.XIV.3, Vol. V. New York: United Nations Working Group on Indigenous People.
- Mook M. 2005. Back to office report of Conference on 'Sustainable use of natural resources and poverty dialogue in Mainland Montane South East Asia. 16-19 May 2005, Sa Pa, Vietnam.
- Mook M. 2007. Report Asia Regional Conference on Indigenous Peoples and Communal Land & Asia Regional Preparatory Meeting for the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, 12-18 February 2007, Cambodia.
- NCIV (Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples). 2010. Background paper - International Expert Dialogue on MDG7: achieving sustainable livelihoods for indigenous peoples. Amsterdam: NCIV.
- Parkipuny M. 1989. The human rights situation of indigenous peoples in Africa. Presentation to Sixth Session of the United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Populations, Geneva, 3 August 1989. <http://cwis.org/fwj/22/hra.htm>
- Stavenhagen R. 2007. Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development: report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous peoples. New York: UN Human Rights Council.
- Taylor M & Di Gessa S. 2006. Working at the boundaries: International Land Coalition's engagement with the land rights of indigenous peoples and their neighbours. Paper prepared for the Inter-Agency Support Group on Indigenous Issues 2006 Annual Meeting, Rome, 15-18 September.
- Tebtebba (Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research and Education). 2008. Indicators relevant for indigenous peoples: a resource book. Baguio City: Tebtebba Foundation.
- UNDG (United Nations Development Group). 2008. Guidelines on indigenous peoples' issues. Document HR/P/PT/16. New York: UNDG.
- UNPFII (United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues). 2004. The concept of indigenous peoples. Document PFII/2004/WS.1/3. New York: UNPFII.

- UNPFII. 2005. Report of the International Workshop on Methodologies regarding Free, Prior and Informed Consent and Indigenous Peoples (New York, 17-19 January 2005) (E/C.19/2005/3). Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, Fourth session, New York, 16-27 May 2005, United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).
- UNPFII. 2008. Resource kit on indigenous peoples' issues. New York: UNPFII.
- UNPFII & Corpuz J. 2008. Consultation Workshop and Dialogue on Indigenous Peoples' Self-determined Development or Development with Identity (14-17 March 2008, Tivoli, Italy) (E/C.19/2008/CRP.11). Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, Seventh session, New York, 21 April - 2 May 2008, Tebtebba / The Christensen Fund (TCF) / International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) / United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).
- UNPFII. 2010. Indigenous peoples: development with culture and identity: Articles 3 and 32 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples - Report of the international expert group meeting (E/C.19/2010/14). Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, Ninth session, New York, 19-30 April 2010, ECOSOC.WGIP. 1996. Working Paper on the Concept of Indigenous People. UN Sub-Commission on Prevention and Protection of Minorities, document E/CN.4/Sub.2/AC.4/1996/2. UN Sub-Commission on Prevention and Protection of Minorities.

Cordaid / Eastern Africa

A. Documents from Cordaid and partners

Various project descriptions, proposals, progress reports, internal communications etc, plus:

- Abdi S. 2005. Ilkerin Loita Integral Development Programme: Reaching the unreachable – some lessons from Cordaid's partnership with the Loita Maasai pastoralists in Kenya. Annex iv in Rijnierse *et al.*
- About P & Kiyonga F. 2007. Diocese of Marsabit: evaluation of the CMHC, PHC, HIV and AIDS programme: final report. Nairobi: IIRR Africa Regional Centre.
- AFD. 2007. Arero Pastoral Livelihoods Enhancement Project progress report September 2006–August 2007.
- Aklilu Amsalu & Alebachew Adem. 2009. Assessment of climate change-induced hazards, impacts and responses in the southern lowlands of Ethiopia. FSS Research Report 4. Addis Ababa: Cordaid & Forum for Social Studies (<http://www.cordaidpartners.com/uploads/documents/647/original/2008.pdf>).
- Bayer W & Sumbash Tolla. Final evaluation of FARM-Africa's Ethiopian Pastoralist Programme (EPP).
- Benschop Jansen M. 2000. Introductory paper on Cordaid pastoralists policy for discussion during the workshop. Draft.
- CASE (Cultural and Art Society of Ethiopia). 2009. Second Year First Quarter report "Promotion of traditional institutions and community participation".
- CCGG (Catholic Church Gamo Gofa). 2008a. Development work 1979–1996 and Integrated Community Development Program 1997–2007: impact assessment.
- CCGG. 2008b. South Omo Catholic Church ICDP bi-annual progress report January–June 2008.
- CIFA (Community Initiative Facilitation and Assistance). 2008. Pastoralists' Cross-border Community Development Project Kenya–Ethiopia Programme Annual Report 2007.
- Cordaid. 2003a. Access to markets in Africa. Draft policy paper, 17.06.03.
- Cordaid. 2003b. Peace and conflict policy paper 2003–2006. The Hague: Cordaid.

- Cordaid. 2004. Considerations PN 118/1261F Medical Missionaries of Mary Health Care Programme.
- Cordaid. 2006a. Programme 1: Identity and diversity in multiform societies. Translation Cordaid Strategic Plan [2007–2010], for BuZa. The Hague: Cordaid.
- Cordaid. 2006b. Cordaid strategy 2007–2010: Walk that extra mile. The Hague: Cordaid.
- Cordaid. 2008a. Cordaid annual report 2007. The Hague: Cordaid.
- Cordaid. 2008b. Programme 1 in words: explanation of the framework of objectives for Programme 1 (Participation for identity based groups). The Hague: Cordaid (memo).
- Cordaid. 2008c. Terms of reference: design and implementation of a tailor-made training for Cordaid on pastoralism and policy options in East Africa and Ethiopia. The Hague: Cordaid.
- Cordaid. 2009a. CELEP: Coalition for European Lobbies on Eastern African Pastoralism. The Hague: Cordaid.
- Cordaid. 2009b. Cordaid Jaarverslag 2008. The Hague: Cordaid.
- Cordaid. 2009c. Position paper and mapping: policy influencing in Europe for pastoralists in East-Africa. The Hague: Cordaid.
- Cordaid. 2009d. Disaster risk reduction and climate adaptation (brochure). The Hague: Cordaid.
- Cordaid. 2009e. Linking & Learning Identiteit en Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen Jaarplan 2009 + monitoring. The Hague: Cordaid.
- Cordaid. 2009f. Study conference on pastoralism in East-Africa and policy influencing in Europe, 17–19 June 2009. The Hague: Cordaid.
- Cosgrave J. 2009. Programme Evaluation of Disaster Risk Reduction commissioned by Cordaid: overall report. The Hague: Cordaid.
- Cosgrave J & Wata H. 2009. Programme Evaluation of Disaster Risk Reduction: Ethiopia Country Study. Draft version 0.95, 21.09.09.
- Dagnev Eshete. 2009. Evaluation findings of Drought Risk Reduction Program implemented in southern Ethiopia and northern Kenya (2008/09). Grant Agreement Number ECHO/HF/BUD/2008/01013.
- Damen P & Haagsma B. 2000. SNV-Bilance agreement on pastoral development: joint review. The Hague: I/C Consult.
- Dietz AJ & Mohamed Salih MA. 1997. Pastoral development in eastern Africa: policy review, options and alternatives. Report for I/C Consult, Zeist (for Bilance).
- DUBAF (Development by Unity and Brotherly Action for Futures). 2008. Liben Pastoral Economic Diversification Project (LPEDP) Terminal Report [Oct05–Dec07].
- DUBAF. 2009. Bi-annual report for Integrated Rights-Based Needs Responses and Economic Empowerment (RBN/EE) Project. Report submitted to Cordaid Netherlands.
- Entrée. 2009. Building out the coalition for European lobby for pastoralism/ists. The Hague: Cordaid.
- EPaRDA (Ethiopian Pastoralist Research and Development Association). 2009a. A terminal presentation of South Omo Risk Management Project achievements. PPT.
- EPaRDA. 2009b. Dassenech Woreda Flood Victims Rehabilitation Project. PPT.
- EPaRDA. 2009c. Ethiopian Pastoralist Research and Development Association (EPaRDA), Bulletin 1 (1).
- EPaRDA. 2009d. Ethiopian Pastoralist Research and Development Association (EPaRDA) to Enhancing Pastoralist Research and Development Alternatives (EPaRDA). PPT.
- EPaRDA. 2009e. Progress of South Omo Pastoralist Empowerment Project achievements. PPT.
- Espinoza Rocca A & Barmantlo I. 2008. Cordaid Program 1: A regional approach for improving the participation + the voice of pastoralist communities in the Horn of Africa. The Hague: Cordaid.

- FARM–Africa. 2007. Woreda Capacity Building Project 118/1299B Year II Report 22 July 2005–21 July 2006
- FARM–Africa. 2008. CSCF project completion report: Ethiopian Pastoralist Project.
- FARM–Africa. 2009a. Woreda Capacity Building Programme: final implementation report covering the period from July 2004 to July 2009.
- FARM–Africa. 2009b. Woreda Capacity Building Project Community Development Fund implementation guidelines.
- FSS (Forum for Social Studies). 2009. Community perspectives of climate change impacts and responses in the southern lowlands of Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: FSS / Cordaid.
- Haagsma B & Hardeman J. 1998. Pastoral development in East Africa: facts and findings. Zeist: I/C Consult. Report to Bilance (unpublished).
- Haagsma B. 2000. Proceedings of the expert consultation on pastoral development: “Pastoralists will survive”. The Hague: I/C Consult.
- Halderman M. 2007. Report of mission to northern Tanzania, November 7–23, 2007 (unpublished).
- Hill J. 2009. The development of small-scale irrigation and potable water systems in Hamer Woreda, South Omo, Ethiopia. FARM–Africa, London.
- Hoebink P & Badohini V. 2009. Programmatic Approach Cordaid. Appendix 11. Country report Tanzania. Nijmegen: Centre for International Development Issues Nijmegen (CIDIN).
- Jackson E. 2009. The key steps in establishing Community-Managed Disaster Risk Reduction in South Omo pastoralist areas: FARM–Africa’s field manual to guide practitioners in Ethiopia. Draft.
- Kodhek E, Espinoza Rocca A & Barmantlo I. 2008. Stimulating female leadership within pastoralist societies (via a small initiatives fund for Ethiopia, Kenya and Northern Tanzania).
- Lauwerysen H. 2008. Culturele minderheden: historische paragraaf Cordaid. Memo to Erica Wortel, Partos, 19 December 2008.
- Mohammed Rashid. 2009. Government budget assessment report on Arero Woreda, Borena Zone. Coordinated by Action for Development. Draft.
- Niger Delta Civil Society Forum. 2009. Oils of injustice: Nigeria, UPR and the Niger Delta (manuscript).
- PFE (Pastoralist Forum Ethiopia). 2005. Inclusion of a chapter on pastoralism in the PASDEP.
- PFE. 2006. Proceedings on GOs–NGOs Drought Management Consultation meeting, Awash, Afar Region, 15 June 2006.
- PFE. 2008a. Promoting gender mainstreaming within pastoral programs and organizations: a generic guideline, prepared by PFE in partnership with Oxfam Great Britain.
- PFE. 2008b. Terminal report on Cordaid support project “Pastoral Advocacy for Sustainable Development in Ethiopia”. Panos, Addis Ababa.
- PFE. 2009. Six months physical and financial performance report (January 1st through June 30th 2009).
- Practical Action. 2009. Building Sustainable ASAL Economies (BASE) annual progress report Jan–Dec 2008.
- Practical Action. 2009. The Karamoja Cluster Network for Peace and Development project report April 2008–February 2009.
- Rijnierse E, Joubert S & Watson R. 2005. Ethnic/cultural diversity and social cohesion: results and lessons learnt. Internal Cordaid workshop, June 7th 2005, Museum of Communication, Zeestraat 82, The Hague. The Hague: Cordaid.
- Schilderincx G. 2009. Drought Cycle Management in arid and semi-arid Kenya: a relevant disaster risk reduction model? an empirical study of Garissa, Marsabit, Samburu and Wajir. The Hague: Cordaid.

- SIDEP (Samburu Integrated Development Project). 2007. Participatory Community Disaster Risk Assessment for Koiting Community, November 2007.
- Solomon Gebre-Tsadik & Berhanu Worku. 2009. Woreda Capacity Building Programme in five special woredas in the SNNPR: final evaluation report.
- Tesfaye Weldemichael *et al.* 2008. Enhancing traditional conflict management institutions of pastoral communities in Southern Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: CASE.
- Waqo H. 2008. Stakeholder analysis and scoping study for northern Kenya and southern Ethiopia, October – November 2008: contribution to the formulation process of the proposed regional pastoralist development programme for Kenya, Tanzania and Ethiopia. Report prepared and submitted to Cordaid Netherlands.
- Wekesa M. 2008. Cordaid pastoralist programme in East Africa: Increasing the participation and voice of pastoralists – a stakeholder analysis and scoping for southern Kenya and northern Tanzania, November–December 2008. Report prepared and submitted to Cordaid.
- Yosef Gebrehiwot. 2007. Cordaid Ethiopia Program 1 general remark and observation.
- Zanen S, Alpenidze I & Bytyqi F. 2008. Final evaluation of Cordaid's Care programmes in Georgia and Moldova, and Cordaid's Empowerment of Roma programme in Albania over the period 2003–2006: synthesis desk-study and field-study.
- Zuidberg L with McFadden P & Nugteren M. 2004. The role of women's organisations in civil society building: a joint evaluation of the programmes of Cordaid, Hivos and ICCO in Kenya, South Africa and Zimbabwe in the period 1998–2003 – synthesis report.

B. Other documents consulted

- ACHPR. 2009. Final communiqué of the 46th ordinary session on the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights held in Banjul, Republic of Gambia, from 11th to 25th November 2009. Addis Ababa: African Union.
- ACHPR & IWGIA. 2006. *Indigenous peoples in Africa: the forgotten peoples?* Copenhagen: African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights / International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.
- Anis K. 2008. Education for pastoralists: flexible approaches, workable models. Addis Ababa: Pact Ethiopia.
- Ayana Angassa. 2007. The dynamics of savanna ecosystems and management in Borana, Southern Ethiopia. PhD thesis, Department of International Environment and Development Studies, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Ås, Norway.
- Ayana Angassa & Fekadu Beyene. 2003. Current range condition in southern Ethiopia in relation to traditional management strategies: the perceptions of Borana pastoralists. *Tropical Grasslands* 23: 53–59.
- Ba Boubacar. 2008. Paralegals as agents of legal empowerment in the Bankass area of Mali. In: Cotula L & Mathieu P (eds). 2008. *Legal empowerment in practice: using legal tools to secure land rights in Africa* (London: International Institute for Environment and Development), pp 45–60.
- Bekele G & Akumu J. 2008. Impact assessment of the community animal health system in Mandera West District, Kenya. Nairobi: Regional Enhanced Livelihoods in Pastoral Areas (RELPA).
- Behnke RH & Scoones I. 1993. Rethinking range ecology: implications for rangeland management in Africa. In: Behnke RH, Scoones I & Kerven C (eds). 1993. *Range ecology at disequilibrium: new models of natural variability and pastoral adaptation in African savannas* (London: Overseas Development Institute), pp 1–30.
- Biñas R. 2009. Resilient communities: navigating in the fast changing climate. Paper presented at World Conference of Humanitarian Studies, Groningen, Netherlands, 4–7 Feb 2009.

- Bushel H. 2009. Pastoralism and climate change in East Africa: enabling adaptive capacity. Paper presented at World Conference of Humanitarian Studies, Groningen, Netherlands, 4–7 February 2009.
- CEMIRIDE / IWGIA. 2007. Strategies for inclusion of minority and indigenous rights in Kenya's national human rights policy process: briefing note. Nairobi: CEMIRIDE, IWGIA.
- CECR (Committee of Experts on Constitutional Review). 2009. Harmonized Draft Constitution of Kenya. Nairobi, November 2009.
- CIA (Central Intelligence Agency). 2010. The world factbook. Washington DC: CIA (<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ke.html> accessed 26.02.10)
- COMESA (Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa). 2009. Policy framework for food security in pastoralist areas: consultative draft. Lusaka: COMESA.
- Crewett W, Ayalneh Bogale & Korf B. 2008. *Land tenure in Ethiopia: continuity and change, shifting rulers, and the quest for state control*. CAPRI Working Paper 91. Washington DC: International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2499/CAPRIWP91>
- Davies J, Niamir-Fuller M, Kerven C & Bauer K. 2010. Extensive livestock production in transition: the future of sustainable pastoralism, in: Steinfeld H, Mooney HA, Schneider F & Neville LA (eds), *Livestock in a changing landscape*, Vol. 1. Drivers, consequences, and responses (Washington / Covelo / London: Island Press), pp285–308)
- Davies J & Roba GM. 2010. Pastoralism: shifts in policymaking. *Farming Matters* 26 (1): 32–34.
- Devereux S. 2006. *Vulnerable livelihoods in Somali Region*. Research Report 57. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Eyasu Elias. 2008. *Pastoralists in southern Ethiopia: dispossession, access to resources and dialogue with policy makers*. Drylands Coordination Group Report 53. Oslo: Drylands Coordination Group.
- FAO. 2009. The FAO Component of the 2010 Consolidated Appeals. Rome: FAO (http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/tc/tce/pdf/CAP2010_KEN.pdf assessed 26.02.10)
- FDRE. 1994. Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.
- FDRE. 2002. Rural Development Policies and Strategies. Addis Ababa: Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.
- FDRE. 2009a. Combined report (initial and four periodic reports) to the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights: implementation of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights. Addis Ababa: Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.
- FDRE. 2009b. *Proclamation 621/2009 on Charities and Societies Administration and Regulation*. Addis Ababa: Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.
- Fekadu Beyene & Korf B. 2008. Unmaking the commons: collective action, property rights, and resource appropriation among (agro-)pastoralists in eastern Ethiopia. *CAPRI Working Paper* 88. Washington DC: CAPRI / IFPRI.
- Flintan F. 2008. *Women's empowerment in pastoral societies*. Nairobi: WISP / GEF / UNDP / IUCN.
- Flintan F. 2009. Sitting at the table: securing benefits for pastoral women from land tenure reform in Ethiopia. *Journal of East African Studies* 4(1): 153–178.
- Hesse C & Odhiambo M. 2002. In search of a vision for the future of pastoralism in East Africa: developing an alliance and strategy in support of pastoral self-determination. IIED Discussion Paper. London: IIED.
- Hesse C & MacGregor J. 2009. Arid waste? Reassessing the value of dryland pastoralism. IIED Briefing. London: IIED.
- Hobley M & Brocklesby MA. 2009. *Raising voice – securing a livelihood: the role of diverse voices in developing secure livelihoods in pastoralist areas of Ethiopia: a summary paper*. Addis Ababa: DFID Ethiopia / Pastoralist Communication Initiative (PCI).

- Hodgson D. 2002a. Introduction: comparative perspectives on the indigenous rights movements in Africa and the Americas. *American Anthropologist* 104 (4): 1037–49.
- Hodgson D. 2002b. Precarious alliances: the cultural politics and structural predicaments of the indigenous rights movement in Tanzania. *American Anthropologist* 104 (4):1086–97.
- Hodgson D. 2008. Cosmopolitics, neoliberalism, and the state: the indigenous rights movement in Africa. In: Wernber, Pnina (ed.), *Anthropology and the new cosmopolitanism: rooted, feminist and vernacular perspectives* (Oxford: Berg), pp 215–30.
- Hodgson D. 2009. Becoming indigenous in Africa. *African Studies Review* 52 (3): 23pp
- Homann S, Rischkowsky B, Steinbach J, Kirk M & Mathias E. 2008. Towards endogenous livestock development: Borana pastoralists' responses to environmental and institutional changes. *Human Ecology* 36 (4): 503–520.
- Hughes A. 2005. *PRSPs, minorities and indigenous peoples: an issues paper*. London: Minority Rights Group International.
- Igoe J. 2003. Scaling up civil society: donor money, NGOs and pastoralist land rights movement in Tanzania. *Development and Change* 34 (5): 863–85.
- Igoe J. 2006. Becoming indigenous peoples: difference, inequality, and the globalization of East African identity politics. *African Affairs* 105/420: 399–420 (doi:10.1093/afraf/adi127).
- IIED & SoS Sahel. 2010. *Modern and mobile: the future of livestock production in Africa's drylands*. London: IIED & SoS Sahel.
- ILO. 1989. C169 Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention. Geneva: International Labour Organisation (<http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/cgi-lex/convde.pl?C169>)
- Kejela Gemtessa, Bezabih Emana & Waktole Tiki. 2006. Livelihood diversification in Borana pastoralist communities of Ethiopia: prospects and challenges. Paper presented at ILRI Policy Research Conference on Pastoralism and Poverty Reduction in East Africa, 27–28 June 2006, Nairobi.
- Kipuri N & Ridgewell A. 2008. *A double bind: the exclusion of pastoralist women in the East and Horn of Africa*. London: MRG.
- KLA. 2004. The national land policy in Kenya: critical gender issues and policy statements. Issues Paper 2. Nairobi: Kenya Land Alliance.
- KLA. 2005. The national land policy in Kenya: addressing customary/communal land issues. Issues Paper 4. Nairobi: Kenya Land Alliance.
- KNCHR (Kenya National Commission on Human Rights). 2008. *Strategic plan 2009–2013*. Nairobi: KNCHR. (<http://www.knchr.org> accessed 26.02.10).
- Krätli S & Dyer C. 2009. *Mobile pastoralists and education: strategic options*. London: IIED & SoS Sahel.
- Lengoibonia M, Bregtb AK & van der Molena P. 2009. Pastoralism within land administration in Kenya: the missing link. *Land Use Policy* 26 (4): 10pp
- Lentz E & Barrett C. 2004. Food aid among East African pastoralists. Global Livestock Collaborative Research Support Program Research Brief 04-OI-PARIMA. Davis CA: GL-CRSP.
- Lesorogol CK. 2008. Land privatization and pastoralist well-being in Kenya. *Development and Change* 39 (2): 309–331.
- Little PD, McPeak J, Barrett CB & Kristjanson P. 2006. The multiple dimensions of poverty in pastoral areas of East Africa. Pastoralism and Poverty Reduction in East Africa: A Policy Research Conference, 27–28 June 2006, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Livingstone JK. 2005. A comparative study of pastoralist parliamentary groups: Kenya case study. For NRI/PENHA Research Project on Pastoralist Parliamentary Groups, funded by DFID's Livestock Production Programme and the CAPE Unit, African Union's Interafrican Bureau of Animal Resources.

- Lolosoli R & Kaunga JO. 2009. Human rights and development challenges faced by indigenous pastoralist women: experiences from Laikipia and Samburu, north central Kenya. *Indigenous Affairs* 3–4/09: 38–47.
- Looloitai L. 2008. Pastoralism and gender: the case of pastoralist women empowerment in Arusha and Manyara Regions in Tanzania, East Africa. CORDS.
- Lynch K & Judd A. 2010. *Dryland voices: the school of life – education for a pastoralist community*. Addis Ababa: Save the Children–Ethiopia USA.
- Makoloo MO. 2005. *Kenya: minorities, indigenous peoples and ethnic diversity*. London: MRG / CEMIRIDE.
- Meinzen-Dick R & Mwangi E. 2008. Cutting the web of interests: pitfalls of formalizing property rights. *Land Use Policy* 26: 36–43.
- Ministry for Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands. 2009. Building and sustaining effective communication with pastoralists, 9–10 March 2009. Nairobi.
- MoFA (Ministry of Federal Affairs). 2003. Pastoral Policy Direction. Addis Ababa: MoFA.
- MoFED (Ministry of Finance and Economic Development). 2006. Ethiopia: building on progress – a Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty (PASDEP) (2005/06–2009/10). Addis Ababa: MoFED.
- Mohammed Abdulahi. 2007. The legal status of the communal land holding system in Ethiopia: the case of pastoral communities. *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights* 14: 85–125.
- Mohammed Mussa. 2004. A comparative study of pastoralist parliamentary groups: case study on the Pastoral Affairs Standing Committee of Ethiopia. Study commissioned by NRI/PENHA Research Project on Pastoralist Parliamentary Groups, funded by DFID's Livestock Production Programme and the CAPE Unit, African Union's Interafrican Bureau of Animal Resources.
- MoL (Ministry of Lands). 2007. National land policy. Nairobi: National Land Policy Secretariat.
- Morton J & Meadows N. 2000. *Pastoralism and sustainable livelihoods: an emerging agenda*. Policy Series 11. Chatham: Natural Resources Institute.
- Mwangi EN. 2005. The transformation of property rights in Kenya's Maasailand: triggers and motivations. *CAPRI Working Paper* 35. Washington DC: IFPRI.
- Ngoitiko M. 2008. The Pastoral Women's Council: empowerment for Tanzania's Maasai. *IIED Gatekeeper* 137e. London: IIED.
- Nori M. 2007. *Mobile livelihoods, patchy resources and shifting rights: approaching pastoral territories*. Rome: ILC / WISP / CIDA.
- OCHA. 2009. *Pastoralist Voices* Vol. 1, Issue 13. Nairobi: Kenya.
- OPARC (Oromia Pastoral Area Development Commission). 2006. Drought situation in pastoral areas of Oromia. Addis Ababa: OPARC.
- Pantuliano S & Wekesa M. 2008. *Improving drought response in pastoral areas of Ethiopia: Somali and Afar Regions and Borena Zone of Oromiya Region*. London: Overseas Development Institute Humanitarian Policy Group.
- Poole P. 2008. A learning visit by Mursi pastoralists from Ethiopia to community conservancies in Kenya. Report to First Peoples Worldwide. n.p.: Local Earth Observation.
- Poole P. 2009. Paradigm-shifting in Ethiopia: communities, conservation and co-existence in South Omo. n.p.: Local Earth Observation.
- RECONCILE & IIED. 2003 *Pastoral Civil Society* Issue No. 4, October–December 2003. Nairobi: RECONCILE / IIED.
- Republic of Kenya. 2004. Revised 2005. Investment programme for the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation 2003–2007. (Original 2004: Kenya Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper.) Washington DC: International Monetary Fund.
- Rodriguez, Luis. 2008. *A global perspective on the total economic value of pastoralism*. Nairobi: WISP.

- Rowley J, Sangale L & Karani I. 2007. IIED RECONCILE Pastoral Civil Society Programme: a review of Phase 1. London: IIED.
- Rutten M. 2002. Parks beyond parks: genuine community-based wildlife eco-tourism or just another loss of land for Maasai pastoralists in Kenya? *IIED Issue Paper* 111. London: IIED.
- Ryans O. 2002. The school in Hamer, a no-go area for girls. MA thesis, Leeds University.
- Sandford S & Yohannes Habtu. 2000. Emergency response interventions in pastoral areas of Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: DFID.
- Scoones I & Anwera A. 2009. *Pastoral innovation systems: perspectives from Ethiopia and Kenya*. Science, Technology and Innovation Series: Occasional Paper No. STI01. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies / PCI / DFID.
- Solomon Desta & Coppock L. 2004. Pastoralism under pressure: tracking system change in southern Ethiopia. *Human Ecology* 32 (4): 465–486.
- SoS Sahel & IIED. 2009. *Planning with uncertainty: using scenario planning with African pastoralists*. London: SoS Sahel & IIED.
- TGE (Transitional Government of Ethiopia). 1993a. National Policy on Disaster Prevention and Management. Addis Ababa: TGE.
- TGE. 1993b. National Policy on Women. Addis Ababa: TGE.
- UN. 2007. United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. New York: United Nations (<http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/drip.html>).
- UNICEF. 2010. http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/ethiopia_statistics.html (accessed 20.02.10).
- Yakob Aklilu & Catley A. 2010. Livestock exports from pastoralist areas: an analysis of benefits by wealth group and policy implications. Inter-Governmental Authority on Development Livestock Policy Initiative Working Paper No. 01-10.

Hivos / Bolivia and Guatemala

A. Documents from Hivos and partners

- Anon. 1988. Hivos Tribal Belt Strategy (November 1988). The Hague: Hivos.
- Anon. 2000. Propuesta de Proyecto Tercer Encuentro Continental de Mujeres Indígenas (5–8 marzo 2000).
- Anon. 2003. Seminario: Género y Diversidad Cultural – MEMORIA (November 2003). The Hague: Hivos/Novib.
- Anon. 2008. Memoria: La explotación de los bienes naturales, otra forma de invasión a nuestras tierras y territorios – Encuentro Latinoamericano “Minería y Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas”. Guatemala.
- AOPEB (Asociación de Organizaciones de Productores Ecológicos de Bolivia). [n.d.]. Asociación de Organizaciones de Productores Ecológicos de Bolivia. La Paz: AOPEB.
- AOPEB. 2008a. Control de plagas en la producción de quinua ecológica – Cartilla No. 3. La Paz: AOPEB.
- AOPEB. 2008b. Gestión de territorio en el Altiplano Sur – Cartilla No. 2. La Paz: AOPEB.
- AOPEB. 2008c. Indicadores naturales en el Altiplano Sur – Cartilla No. 5. La Paz: AOPEB.
- AOPEB. 2008d. Manejo de suelos en la producción de quinua ecológica – Cartilla No. 1. La Paz: AOPEB.
- AOPEB. 2008e. Norma para la producción de la quinua ecológica – Cartilla No. 6. La Paz: AOPEB.
- AOPEB. 2008f. Ritos y costumbres en las comunidades del Altiplano Sur – Cartilla No. 4. La Paz: AOPEB.
- APCOB (Apoyo para el Campesino-Indígena del Oriente Boliviano). [n.d.]. Educación en la interculturalidad: serie de CDs interactivos. Santa Cruz de la Sierra: APCOB.

- Bebbington A & Biekart K. 2007. Northern NGOs and indigenous organisations in Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia: reflecting on the past to look to the future. [n.p.], Synthesis study of a joint research project initiated and supported by Ibis, Hivos, Oxfam America and SNV.
- Bebbington A & Biekart K. 2009. Encuentros y desencuentros: un estudio de las relaciones entre ONG del Norte y las organizaciones indígenas en el Perú, Ecuador y Bolivia. [n.p.], Hivos/SNV/Oxfam América/IBIS.
- CALDH. 2005. Memoria del Encuentro Centroamericano de Defensoras y Defensores de Derechos Humanos. Guatemala: CALDH.
- CALDH & CONIC. 2007a. Centro de Formación para Lideresas y Líderes Contra la Impunidad – Conflictividad de la tierra en Guatemala (Uro’ Wuj). Guatemala: CALDH/CONIC.
- CALDH & CONIC. 2007b. Centro de Formación para Lideresas y Líderes Contra la Impunidad – Defensores y defensoras de derechos humanos y lucha contra la impunidad (Uwaq Wuj). Guatemala, CALDH/CONIC.
- CALDH & CONIC. 2007c. Centro de Formación para Lideresas y Líderes Contra la Impunidad – Discriminación y exclusión (Urox Wuj). Guatemala: CALDH/CONIC.
- CALDH & CONIC. 2007d. Centro de Formación para Lideresas y Líderes Contra la Impunidad – Rostros de la represión y la desigualdad desde la historia (Nab’e Tanaj). Guatemala: CALDH/CONIC.
- CALDH & CONIC. 2007e. Centro de Formación para Lideresas y Líderes Contra la Impunidad – Violencia contra las mujeres (Ukaj Wuj). Guatemala: CALDH/CONIC.
- CALDH & CONIC. 2009. Conflictividad de la tierra: evidencias de violaciones a los Derechos Humanos en Guatemala. Guatemala: CALDH/CONIC.
- CEJIS (Centro de Estudios Jurídicos e Investigación Social). 2009. Balance de la política de Evo Morales en sus 4 años de gobierno (unpublished memo). Santa Cruz de la Sierra: CEJIS.
- CNOC (Coordinadora Nacional de Organizaciones Campesinas.). [n.d.]. La flexibilidad laboral ... Más empleo o más miseria y explotación para las y los trabajadores? Guatemala: CNOC.
- CNOC. [n.d.]. Por un trabajo digno y mejores condiciones para las trabajadoras y los trabajadores! – Reformas al Código de Trabajo. Guatemala: CNOC.
- CNOC. 2004a. Consiguiendo una vida mejor – Plan 2004–2008 CNOC. Guatemala: CNOC.
- CNOC. 2004b. Propuesta de Desarrollo Rural. Guatemala, Plataforma Política de la CNOC.
- CNOC. 2005. Ley del Registro de Información Catastral – RIC – Decreto 41-2005. Guatemala: CNOC.
- CNOC. 2006a. 1. Ley del Sistema Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional. 2. Reglamento de la Ley del Sistema Nacional de Seguridad Alimentaria y Nutricional. Guatemala: CNOC.
- CNOC. 2006b. Pocos tienen mucho, y muchos tienen poco – Ley del Registro de Información Catastral Decreto 41-2005. Guatemala: CNOC.
- CNOC. 2007. Propuesta de Reforma Agraria Integral. Guatemala: CNOC.
- Collier C. 2002. Hivos Human Rights Policy Document (December 2002). The Hague: Hivos.
- CONAMAQ (Consejo Nacional de Ayllus y Markas del Qullasuyu). 2007. Propuesta: Constitución Política del Estado Plurinacional Qullasuyu-Bolivia. Qullasuyu: Comisión Nacional para la Asamblea Constituyente.
- CONAMAQ & Cayo Arozamen F. 2009a. Construyendo nuestro nuevo Estado plurinacional: bases fundamentales del Estado – Cartilla No. 1. La Paz: IBIS/Hivos.
- CONAMAQ & Cayo Arozamen F. 2009b. La jurisdicción indígena originaria campesina en la Constitución Política del Estado – Cartilla 4. La Paz: IBIS/Hivos.
- CONAMAQ & Cayo Arozamen F. 2009c. Las autonomías en la Constitución Política del Estado – Cartilla No. 3. La Paz: IBIS/Hivos.
- CONAMAQ & Cayo Arozamen F. 2009d. Nuestros derechos en la Constitución Política del Estado – Cartilla No. 2. La Paz: IBIS/Hivos.

- CONAMAQ & Cayo Arozamen F. 2009e. Tierra, territorio y medio ambiente en la Constitución Política del Estado – Cartilla No. 5. La Paz: IBIS/Hivos.
- CONAMAQ, CIDOB *et al.* 2009. Ley Transitoria Electoral. La Paz: IBIS/Hivos.
- CONIC (Coordinadora Nacional Indígena y Campesina). 2006. El rescate de la cultura Maya, la lucha por la tierra y el territorio es lucha por la vida y la paz. Guatemala: CONIC.
- CONIC. 2007. Política de género desde la cosmovisión Maya. Guatemala: CONIC.
- CONIC. 2008. 15 años de organización y lucha – Decima Asamblea Nacional – de la resistencia Maya ... al poder. Guatemala: CONIC.
- CONIC. 2009a. Consejos departamentales. Guatemala: CONIC.
- CONIC. 2009b. Tierras entregadas 1991–2009. Guatemala: CONIC.
- CONIC & CALDH. 2008a. Centro de Formación para Lideresas y Líderes Contra la Impunidad – Manual para la aplicación de los mecanismos de defensa de los derechos humanos. Guatemala: CONIC/CALDH.
- CONIC & CALDH. 2008b. Centro de Formación para Lideresas y Líderes Contra la Impunidad – Naturaleza del centro de formación y evaluación del proceso de aprendizaje. Guatemala: CONIC/CALDH.
- CONIC, Defensoría Maya *et al.* 2009. Propuesta Ley General de Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas de Guatemala. Guatemala: CONIC/Defensoría Maya/CALDH/Moloj.
- Coordinadora de la Mujer. [n.d.]. “Dueñas de nuestra vida, dueñas de nuestra tierra” – Campaña por el acceso de las mujeres a la tierra. La Paz: Coordinadora de la Mujer.
- Coordinadora de la Mujer. [n.d.]. Agenda política de las mujeres en el proceso post Constituyente: para la equidad y respeto de las mujeres. La Paz: Coordinadora de la Mujer.
- Coordinadora de la Mujer. [n.d.]. La agenda de las mujeres en el proceso constituyente – Movimiento de Mujeres Presentes en la Historia. La Paz: Coordinadora de la Mujer.
- Coordinadora de la Mujer. [n.d.]. La tierra: un derecho irrenunciable – Agenda política de las mujeres: propuesta de marco normativo para garantizar el acceso, titulación, herencia y tenencia de las mujeres a la tierra. La Paz: Coordinadora de la Mujer.
- Coordinadora de la Mujer. [n.d.]. Movimiento de Mujeres Presentes en la Historia – DVD. La Paz: Coordinadora de la Mujer.
- Coordinadora de la Mujer. [n.d.]. Relación textual de los principales artículos sobre los derechos de las mujeres y género recogidos en la propuesta de la Nueva Constitución Política del Estado, aprobada en diciembre de 2007. La Paz: Coordinadora de la Mujer.
- Coordinadora de la Mujer. 2006. De la propuesta al mandato: una propuesta en construcción – Presentes en la Historia, Mujeres en la Asamblea Constituyente. La Paz: Coordinadora de la Mujer.
- Hivos. 1988. Volwaardige participatie, of: De toegang tot macht (een institutionale benadering) – Algemene Beleidsnotitie (November 1988). The Hague: Hivos.
- Hivos. 1999. Hivos en pastoralisten in Oost Afrika: een interne evaluatie. Den Haag: Hivos.
- Hivos. 2002a. Civil voices on a global stage – Hivos Policy Paper. The Hague: Hivos.
- Hivos. 2002b. Policy Document Arts & Culture: Towards cultural diversity and pluralism (December 2002). The Hague: Hivos.
- Hivos. 2004a. Annual Report 2003. The Hague: Hivos.
- Hivos. 2004b. Policy Document Sustainable Economic Development (January 2004). The Hague: Hivos.
- Hivos. 2005. Annual Report 2004. The Hague: Hivos.
- Hivos. 2006a. Annual Report 2005. The Hague: Hivos.
- Hivos. 2006b. Policy document Gender, Women & Development: women unlimited (November 2006). The Hague: Hivos.
- Hivos. 2008a. Annual Report 2007. The Hague: Hivos.
- Hivos. 2008b. Hivos vision paper on civil society building. The Hague: Hivos.
- Hivos. 2009. Annual Report 2008. The Hague: Hivos.

- IDEI (Research, Development and Integral Education Association). [n.d.]. Trifolar organizativo. Guatemala: IDEI.
- Kaq'la. 2004. *La Palabra y el Sentir de las Mujeres Myas de Kaqla*. Guatemala: Kaq'la.
- MadreSelva. 2007. *La Agenda Ecologista*. Guatemala: MadreSelva Colectivo Ecologista.
- MadreSelva. 2008. *Quién protege nuestros bosques?... INAB no!* Guatemala: MadreSelva Colectivo Ecologista.
- MadreSelva. 2009. *El camino del agua*. Guatemala: MadreSelva Colectivo Ecologista.
- Lempers M. 2001. *Hulp in vertechocratiserende ontwikkelingsamenwerking: een studie naar de invloed van technocratisering op de ondersteuning van inheemse ontwikkelingsorganisaties* (MSc thesis). Nijmegen/Den Haag: CIDIN/Hivos.
- Nostas M & Sanabria CE. 2009. *Detrás del cristal con que se mira: ordenes normativos e interlegalidad – Mujeres Quechuas, Aymaras, Sirionó, Trinitarias, Chimane, Chiquitanas, Ayoreas*. La Paz: Coordinadora de la Mujer.
- Oud P. 2008. *Aquí estamos para siempre: una serie de documentales sobre la autogestión en el territorio de Lomerío*. Bosch en Duin: Peter Oud Film & Photography.
- Rijke E. 2003. *Gender in a world of diversity: empowering indigenous women*. Nijmegen/Den Haag, CIDIN/Hivos (MSc thesis).
- Solval AR & IDEI [n.d.]. *Lo Humano del VIH*. Guatemala: IDEI.
- Surenda L, Narayan K *et al.* 2004. *Adivasis of India and development strategies* (September 2004). The Hague: Hivos.
- Uriona P. 2009. *Los caminos de la paridad: mujeres, participación y representación en el proceso post Constituyente*. La Paz: IDEA/Coordinadora de la Mujer.
- van der Schoot T & Rochna S. 2007. *Internal conclusions on basis of Synthesis Indigenous Study, third draft* (September 2007; unpublished internal memo). The Hague: Hivos.
- van der Schoot T & Rochna S. 2008. *Note on Hivos policy regarding Indigenous Peoples* (August 2008; unpublished internal memo). The Hague: Hivos.
- Waqib' Kej. 2007a. *Pueblos y Nacionalidades Indígenas de la Resistencia al Poder*. Guatemala: Coordinación y Convergencia Nacional Maya Wapib' Kej.
- Waqib' Kej. 2007b. *Sistematización – Cumbre Continental de Pueblos y Nacionalidades Indígenas de Abya Yala – Pueblos Indígenas y Nacionalidades Indígenas de la Resistencia al Poder*. Guatemala: Coordinación y Convergencia Nacional Maya Waqib' Kej.
- Waqib' Kej. 2008. *Aportes al Movimiento Continental de Niñez y Juventud Indígena de Abya Yala – "Germinamos, crecemos y damos frutos para el buen vivir"*. Guatemala: Waqib' Kej/Comité Organizador en Guatemala.
- Waqib' Kej & Comité Organizador en Guatemala. 2008. *Aportes al Movimiento Continental de Niñez y Juventud Indígena de Abya Yala – "Germinamos, crecemos y damos frutos para el buen vivir"*. Guatemala: Waqib' Kej/Comité Organizador en Guatemala.

B. Other documents consulted

- Albó X. 2002. Bolivia: from indian and campesino leaders to councillors and parliamentary deputies. In: Sieder R (ed.), *Multiculturalism in Latin America: indigenous rights, diversity and democracy* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), pp 74–102.
- Albó X. 2008. *Movimientos y poder indígena en Bolivia, Ecuador y Perú*. La Paz: CIPCA.
- Albó X & Romero C. 2009. *Autonomías Indígenas en la realidad boliviana y su nueva Constitución*. La Paz: Vicepresidencia del Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia (GTZ/PADEP).
- Anon. 2010. "Derechos indígenas en Bolivia: un balance de la situación." *Temas de Debate – Boletín del Programa de Investigación Estratégica en Bolivia (PIEB)* Vol. 13.
- Assies W. 2000. Indigenous peoples and reform of the State in Latin America. In: Assies W, Van der Haar G & Hoekema AJ (eds), *The challenge of diversity: indigenous peoples and reform of the State in Latin America*. Amsterdam, Thela Tesis: 3–21.

- Assies W. 2006. *Land tenure legalization, pluriculturalism and multiethnicity in Bolivia*. Leiden: Van Vollenhoven Institute, Leiden University.
- Bastos S & Camus M. 2003. CONIC – 11 Años de Lucha por el Rescate de la Cultura Maya y la Madre Tierra. Guatemala: CONIC/Hivos.
- Castillo I. 2009. En torno a especificidades observables en movimientos indígenas de lucha contra la acumulación global en el altiplano occidental guatemalteco. VIII Congreso de Estudios Mayas – Multiculturalismo e Interculturalismo: prácticas, efectos y desafíos (5, 6 y 7 de agosto), Universidad Rafael Landívar, Campus Central, Ciudad de Guatemala.
- CERIGUA (Centro de Reportes Informativos sobre Guatemala). 2009. Exigen reactivación de la economía campesina e indígena. www.cerigua.org
- CIDOB (Confederación de Pueblos Indígenas de Bolivia). 2009. Compendio sobre los derechos indígenas originarios – Constitución Política del Estado, Declaración de las Naciones Unidas sobre los Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas, Convenio OIT Nro. 169. La Paz: CIDOB.
- Cojtí D. 2005. La difícil transición al Estado multicultural – El caso del Estado monoétnico de Guatemala. Guatemala: Cholsamaj.
- Colque G. 2009. Autonomías indígenas en tierras altas – Breve mapeo para la implementación de la Autonomía Indígena Originaria Campesina. La Paz: Fundación TIERRA.
- Colque G. 2010. La propiedad colectiva o comunitaria: recientes enfoques y dilemas en la legislación agraria. Reconfigurando territorios reforma agraria, control territorial y gobiernos indígenas en Bolivia (Informe 2009). Fundación TIERRA. La Paz: Fundación TIERRA: 39–48.
- CONADUR (Comisión Nacional para el Desarrollo Urbano y Rural). 2009. Política Nacional de Desarrollo Rural Integral, PNDRI. Guatemala: CONADUR.
- Crabtree J, Molina GG *et al.* 2009. Tensiones irresueltas: Bolivia, pasado y presente. La Paz: PNUD Bolivia/Plural.
- Cultural Survival. 2008. Guatemala: observations on the state of indigenous human rights in light of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Universal Periodic Review). [n.p.]: Cultural Survival.
- Cumes A & Monzón AS (eds). 2006. *La Encrujiada de las identidades: Mujeres, Feminismo y Mayanismo en Diálogo*. Guatemala: Kaq'la.
- Feiring B & MRG partners. 2003. *Indigenous peoples and poverty: the cases of Bolivia, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua*. London: Minority Rights Group International.
- Fernández G. 2004. Salud e interculturalidad en América Latina: perspectivas antropológicas. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.
- Fundación TIERRA. 2009. Bolivia post Constituyente: tierra, territorio y autonomías indígenas – Memoria Seminario Internacional, 26–28 octubre 2009. La Paz: International Land Coalition/ Fundación TIERRA.
- Gustafson B. 2002. Paradoxes of liberal indigenism: indigenous movements, state processes and cultural reform in Bolivia. In: Maybury-Lewis D (ed.), *The politics of identity: indigenous peoples in Latin American states* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press), pp 267–306.
- Hale CR. 2004. Rethinking indigenous politics in the era of the “indio permitido”. *NACLA Report on the Americas* 38 (2).
- Hall G & Patrinos HA. 2005. *Indigenous peoples, poverty and human development in Latin America: 1994–2004*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hayes C. 2009. Guatemala's Femicide Law: progress against impunity? Washington DC: Guatemala Human Rights Commission (GHRC).
- IFAD. 2008. Guatemala: Country Strategic Opportunities Programme. Rome: IFAD.

- Isaacs A. 2006. Confronting the past? – The challenge of truth, justice and reparations in Guatemala. Madrid: Real Instituto Elcano de Estudios Internacionales y Estratégicos.
- Knuth L. 2009. The right to adequate food and indigenous peoples: how can the right to food benefit indigenous peoples? Rome: FAO.
- Köppen V. 2008. *Land regularization, land titling and cadastre in rural Bolivia with special regard to communal and indigenous lands*. Marburg: GTZ/ Institute for Cooperation in Developing Countries, University of Marburg.
- Lehm Z, Townsend W *et al.* 2004. Bolivia: estrategias, problemas y desafíos en la gestión del territorio indígena Sirionó. Copenhagen: IWGIA.
- Lema AM. 1997. Las políticas étnicas y las acciones emprendidas. Pueblos indígenas de la Amazonía Boliviana. A. M. Lema. La Paz: PNUD/UNOPS.
- Mayorga PE. 2007. Interorganisational collaboration: the National Cadastre of Guatemala. Eschede: ITC.
- Ministerio de Autonomía. 2009. Anteproyecto de Ley Marco de Autonomías y Descentralización – borrador Julio 2009. La Paz: Ministerio de Autonomía.
- Mizgata J. 2006. Land Conflict under the Berger Administration. [n.p.]: NISGUA.
- Molina R. 2005. Los pueblos indígenas de Bolivia: diagnóstico sociodemográfico a partir del censo del 2001. Santiago de Chile: CEPAL/BID.
- Molina R & Vadillo A. 2007. Los derechos de los pueblos indígenas en Bolivia: una introducción a las normas, contextos y procesos. La Paz: Centro Boliviano de Estudios Multidisciplinarios (CEBEM).
- Morales Escoffier N. 2010. Boom or a boomerang: social policy in Bolivia. *FOCAL Point* 8 (5): <http://www.focal.ca/>.
- Nickson A. 2006. Country profile Bolivia. [n.p.]: UCLG.
- OIM (International Organization for Migration). 2007. Encuesta sobre remesas familiares 2007. [n.p.]: Organización Internacional para las Migraciones.
- Oxlajuj Tz'ikin. 2008. Mecanismo de Apoyo a los Pueblos Indígenas. Guatemala: Oxlajuj Tz'ikin.
- Perreault T. 2008. Natural gas, indigenous mobilization and the Bolivian State. Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD).
- Roper JM. 2003. Bolivian legal reforms and local indigenous organizations: opportunities and obstacles in a lowland municipality. *Latin American Perspectives* 30 (1): 139–161.
- Sanabria CE. 2005. Diagnóstico situación de género en el departamento – Diagnóstico elaborado para el Plan de Desarrollo Económico y Social del Departamento de Santa Cruz (PDDES). Santa Cruz de la Sierra: Gobierno Departamental Prefectura Santa Cruz.
- Save the Children Norway. 2007. La primavera está aquí. Guatemala: Save the Children Norway.
- Sieder R. 2007. The judiciary and indigenous rights in Guatemala. *International Journal of Constitutional Law* 5 (2): 211–241.
- Stavenhagen R. 1992. Challenging the nation state in Latin America. *Journal of International Affairs* 45: 421–440.
- Taneja P. 2009. *State of the world's minorities and indigenous peoples (events of 2008 – education special)*. London: Minority Rights Group International.
- UNDP. 2007. MDGF-1660: Strengthening the institutional environment for the advancement of women in Guatemala. <http://sdnhq.undp.org/opas/en/proposals/suitable/156>
- UNHCHR. 2009. Preliminary Conclusions of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food Mission to Guatemala, 3–5 September 2009. Geneva: United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.
- UNICEF (United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund). 2006. Política Pública de Protección Interl y Plan de Acción Nacional a Favor de la Niñez y la Adolescencia 2004–2005. Comisión de la Niñez y Adolescencia. Guatemala: UNICEF.

- Urioste M. 2007. Reconducción Comunitaria de la Reforma Agraria en Bolivia: balance de un año y perspectivas. La Paz: Fundación TIERRA.
- Urioste M. 2009. Fetichismo jurídico: de la Ley INRA a la Ley de Reconducción Comunitaria de la Reforma Agraria. Bolivia post-Constituyente: tierra, territorio y autonomías indígenas – Memoria del Seminario Internacional La Paz 26, 27 y 28 de octubre 2009. Fundación TIERRA. La Paz: International Land Coalition / Fundación TIERRA: 55–58.
- Van Cott DL. 2000. *The friendly liquidation of the past: the politics of diversity in Latin America*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Van Cott DL. 2005. Bolivia. In: Repucci S & Walker C (eds), *Countries at the crossroads: a survey of democratic governance* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield), pp 107–126.
- van de Sandt J. 2009. *Mining conflicts and indigenous peoples in Guatemala*. The Hague: Cordaid / University of Amsterdam.
- Wittman H & Saldivar-Tanaka L. 2006. The agrarian question in Guatemala. In: Courville M, Patel R & Rosset P (eds), *Promised land: competing visions of agrarian reform* (Oakland: Food First), pp 23–39.
- World Bank. 1995. *Guatemala: an assessment of poverty*. Washington DC: World Bank, Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office.
- Zappacosta M. 2005. Guatemala: market profile for emergency food security assessments. Rome: World Food Programme (WFP), Emergency Needs Assessment Branch (ODAN).
- Zolezzi G. 2005. Conformación pluricultural del departamento de Santa Cruz – Diagnóstico elaborado para el Plan de Desarrollo Económico y Social del Departamento de Santa Cruz (PDDES). Santa Cruz de la Sierra: Gobierno Departamental Prefectura Santa Cruz.

ICCO / India

A. Documents from ICCO and partners

- ICCO. 2001a. Beleidsnota Vietnam 2002–2004.
- ICCO. 2001b. Gender in perspectief.
- ICCO. 2001c. On the road to justice: ICCO policy plan 2001–2005.
- ICCO. 2002a. Indigenous peoples: guidelines for formulating national and regional policy on indigenous peoples – lessons learnt from the ICCO practice. Internal document.
- ICCO. 2002b. Landenplan India 2002–2006. Policy paper.
- ICCO. 2003a. About needs and rights. Policy paper.
- ICCO. 2003b. Access to Basic Services: adopting a rights-based approach in basic services.
- ICCO. 2003c. Democratisation and Peacebuilding. Policy paper.
- ICCO. 2003d. Fair Economic Development 2003–2006. Policy paper.
- ICCO. 2003e. Human rights: a matter of decency and dignity – human rights principles in ICCO's development work. Policy paper.
- ICCO. 2003f. Jaarplan India 2003. Internal document.
- ICCO. 2003g. ICCO Partnership Policy.
- ICCO. 2004a. ICCO Jaarverslag 2003.
- ICCO. 2004b. Landenjaarplan India 2004.
- ICCO. 2004c. Meeting notes ICCO werkgroep Inheemse Volken 10 juni 2004.
- ICCO. 2005a. ICCO Jaarverslag 2004.
- ICCO. 2005b. Landen Jaarplan 2005 India.
- ICCO. 2005c. Regioplan 2005 AZEO. Policy paper.
- ICCO. 2005d. Thema Programma Plan 2007–2010 Democratisering en Vredesopbouw. Policy paper.
- ICCO. 2005e. Thema Programma Plan 2007–2010 DREO-AZEO. Policy paper.
- ICCO. 2005f. Thema Programma Plan 2007–2010 Gezondheid. ICCO Alliantie policy paper.

- ICCO. 2005g. Thema Programma Plan 2007–2010 Onderwijs op Maat. ICCO Alliantie policy paper.
- ICCO. 2005h. Thema Programma Plan 2007–2010 Voedselzekerheid. Policy paper.
- ICCO. 2005i. Thema Programma Plan 2007–2010 Water. Policy paper.
- ICCO. 2005j. Werkplan Inheemse Volken AZEO als onderdeel van het D&V plan 2005/6.
- ICCO. 2006a. Rights and dignity for all: country policy paper India 2006–2010.
- ICCO. 2006b. ICCO Jaarverslag 2005.
- ICCO. 2007a. Beleidsindicatoren 2003–2006: een terugblik.
- ICCO. 2007b. ICCO Jaarverslag 2006.
- ICCO. 2008. ICCO Jaarverslag 2007.
- ICCO. 2009a. ICCO Jaarverslag 2008.
- ICCO. 2009b. Monitoring protocol.
- ICCO. 2009c. Program Plan Private Sector Corporation and Corporate Social Responsibility India, 2008–2011.
- ICCO. 2009d. The Program Plan: Market Led Livelihoods Development program in India, 2007–2012.
- ICCO. n.d. IP projects inventory 2003–2008.
- ICCO & partners. 2005. Report from the Thematic Workshop in Indigenous Peoples, 5 April 2005, Manila, The Philippines.
- ICCO Alliance. 2007. Operational Plan 2007–2010. Partners of enterprising people.
- ICCO Alliantie. 2006. Subsidieaanvraag MFS 2007–2010.

Other ICCO internal and partners' documents:

- Quarterly progress reports 2004, 2005, 2006
- Trimester progress reports 2007, 2008
- Input D&V AZEO op D&V Thema Programma Plan 2007–2010
- Intake and progress memos for all selected partners during 2003–08
- Email correspondence
- Progress reports, proposals, evaluation and impact assessment studies

B. Other documents

- Acharya K. 2008. India: Mining boom affecting tribals, Environment. Inter Press Services. <http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=43654>
- ACHR. 2007. India's failed National Rehabilitation and Resettlement Policy 2007. Asian Commission for Human Rights Weekly, December 2007. <http://www.achrweb.org/Review/2007/198-07.html>
- ActionAid. 2008. Resource rich tribal poor: displacing people, destroying identity in India's indigenous heartland. New Delhi: ActionAid, Indian Social Institute and Laya.
- AITPN (Asian Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Network). 2006a. India's Forest Rights Act of 2006: illusion or solution? Occasional briefing paper. New Delhi: AITPN. www.aitpn.org
- AITPN, 2006b. Recommendation of the National Consultation on the revised draft National Tribal Policy 2006 Indigenous Issues. Occasional briefing paper. New Delhi: AITPN. www.aitpn.org
- AITPN. 2009a. A critique of India's Draft National Rehabilitation Policy 2006. Occasional briefing paper. New Delhi: AITPN. www.aitpn.org
- AITPN. 2009b. *The state of India's indigenous and tribal peoples 2009*. New Delhi: AITPN.
- Bagchi A. 2009. Explanation of position of India on the report of the 8th Session of the Permanent Forum of Indigenous Issues to the ECOSOC at the 2009 Substantive session of ECOSOC at Geneva, on 30 July 2009. New York: Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations.

- Bandyopadhyay D. 2009. Why we must oppose the Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill of 2009. *Mainstream Weekly* XLVII (35). <http://www.mainstreamweekly.net/article1586.html>
- Bhaduri A & Thapar R. 2009. Will the mindset from the past change? *The Hindu*, 09/11/2009. <http://www.thehindu.com/2009/11/09/stories/2009110955350800.htm>
- Bijoy CR. 2003. The Adivasis of India – a history of discrimination, conflict and resistance. *PUCL Bulletin*, February 2003. <http://www.pucl.org/Topics/Dalit-tribal/2003/adivasi.htm>
- Borooah VK. 2008. Deprivation, violence and conflict: an analysis of Naxalite activity in the districts of India. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 2 (2): 317–333.
- Burman JJR. 2009. Adivasi: a contentious term to denote tribes as indigenous peoples of India. *Mainstream* XLVII (32), 25 July 2009.
- Chandra S. 2010. The gap widens. *The Hindu*, 3 January 2010. <http://www.thehindu.com/mag/2010/01/03/stories/2010010350240400.htm>
- Debroy B & Bhandari L. 2007. *Exclusive growth – inclusive inequality*. New Delhi: Centre for Policy Research. <http://www.cprindia.org/morepapers.php?s=7>
- Drèze J & Oldiges C. 2009. How is NREGA doing? <http://www.docstoc.com/docs/14337497/How-is-NREGA-Doing>
- Ghosh K. 2006. Between global flows and local dams: indigenoussness, locality and the transnational sphere in Jharkhand, India. *Cultural Anthropology* 21 (4): 501–534.
- Gol (Government of India). 2001. National Policy for the Empowerment of Women. New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Women & Child Development.
- Gol. 2005. National Rural Health Mission (2005–2012). New Delhi: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare.
- Gol. 2006a. The National Tribal Policy. A policy for the Scheduled Tribes of India (Draft). New Delhi: Ministry of Tribal Affairs.
- Gol. 2006b. The Scheduled Tribes and other traditional forest dwellers (recognition of forest rights) Bill. New Delhi: Ministry of Environment and Forests.
- Gol. 2007a. The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill 2007. Bill 97 of 2007. New Delhi: Gol.
- Gol. 2007b. National Family Health Survey 2005–2006 (NFHS-3). New Delhi: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare.
- Gol. 2008a. National Mineral Policy. New Delhi: Ministry of Mines.
- Gol. 2008b. Development challenges in extremist affected areas: report of an expert group to Planning Commission. New Delhi: Gol.
- Govinda P & Bandyopadhyay M. 2008. Access to elementary education in India: country analytical review. New Delhi: National University of Education, Planning and Administration (NUEPA).
- GRAIN. 2005. Tribal rights (f)or wrongs in India. Genetic Resources Action International (GRAIN) *Seedling Newsletter* October 2005. <http://www.grain.org/seedling/?id=415>
- Indicus. 2008. Jharkhand in its eighth year: a study for Prabhat Khabar. New Delhi: Indicus Analytics.
- IWGIA. 2009. *The indigenous world 2009*. Copenhagen: IWGIA. <http://www.iwgia.org/sw18240.asp>
- Jacob S. 2009. The Adivasi unending wait for justice – National Tribal Policy 2006 (draft): a review. Pune: Adivasi Resource Centre, National Centre for Advocacy Study (NCAS). www.ncasindia.org
- Jhingran D & Sankar D. 2006. Elementary education in India: an analytical report. Part V. Unpublished. <http://pib.nic.in/archieve/others/2008/oct/r2008101004.pdf>
- Joshi S. 2006. Let the tribals speak for themselves. *The Hindu Business Line*, 2 Nov 2006. <http://www.blonnet.com/2006/11/02/stories/2006110200790900.htm>
- Lal N. 2009. India: Women's political empowerment, yes; better lives, no. Inter Press Agency (IPS). Nov 2009. <http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=49374>

- Govind K. 2009. Adivasi women: engaging with climate change. New York: United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM).
- MRG (Minority Rights Group International). 2008. World directory of minorities and indigenous peoples – India: Adivasi. <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/49749d14c.html>
- PACS (Poorest Areas Civil Society Programme). 2007. Implementation of the Rural Health Mission: an initial review. New Delhi: PACS-DFID.
- Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations. 2009. Statement on explanation of position of India on the report of the 8th Session of the Permanent Forum of Indigenous Issues to the ECOSOC at the 2009 Substantive Session of ECOSOC, at Geneva, on 30 July 2009. <http://www.un.int/india/2009/ind1585b.pdf>
- Saha-Sinha S. 2008. National Mineral Policy 2008: a review. Pune: Adivasi Resource Centre, National Centre for Advocacy Studies. www.ncasindia.org
- Saha-Sinha S. 2009. No respite for displaced Adivasi – the Rehabilitation and Resettlement Bill 2007: a review. Legislative brief. Pune: National Centre for Advocacy Studies. www.ncasindia.org
- Shariff A. 2009. Putting people to work: what can we learn from India's Mass Employment Scheme? New Delhi: IFPRI. <http://www.pide.org.pk/pdf/highlights/NREGS.pdf>
- Sogge D & Huong LN. 2008. Strong people, strong state: a report of an evaluation of the ICCO country programme in Vietnam 2002–2006. Utrecht: ICCO.
- Surendra L, Narayan, K & Hebbar R. 2004. Adivasi of India and development strategies: a policy working paper in progress. The Hague: Hivos.
- Swamy S. 2008. The only solution to NREGA-solution. <http://openspace.org.in/node/801>
- Thakur P. 2009. CAG review had found major gaps in NREGA functioning. *Times of India*, 26 March. <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/CAG-review-had-found-major-gaps-in-NREGA-functioning-/articleshow/4315928.cms>
- The Other Media [n.d.] Mining in Jharkhand: the present scenario. Internal paper.
- UNDP. 2008. Status report land rights and ownership in Orissa. http://www.indiaenvironmentportal.org.in/files/LandRights_OwnershipinOrissa.pdf
- WEF. 2009. The India Gender Gap Review 2009. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

Web articles:

- UN adopts declaration on rights of indigenous people. <http://www.indiaenvironmentportal.org.in/node/1896>
- Job scheme fails to attract workers: study. The Hindu Newspaper 1 April 2008 <http://www.hindu.com/2008/04/01/stories/2008040152300300.htm>

Previous reports forming part of this joint evaluation

- Oudwater N & Bannerjee M. 2010. Partos Joint Evaluation on Indigenous Peoples: Case study on development of *Adivasi* in India and ICCO's contribution. Leusden: ETC EcoCulture.
- van de Sandt J & Fries R. 2010. Partos Joint Evaluation on Indigenous Peoples: Case study on development of indigenous peoples in Guatemala and Hivos' contribution. Leusden: ETC EcoCulture.
- van de Sandt J & Zolezzi G. 2010. Partos Joint Evaluation on Indigenous Peoples: Case study on development of indigenous peoples in Bolivia and Hivos' contribution. Leusden: ETC EcoCulture.
- Waters-Bayer A & Getachew Gebru. 2010. Partos Joint Evaluation on Indigenous Peoples: Case study on pastoralist development in Ethiopia and Cordaid's contribution. Leusden: ETC EcoCulture.

Waters-Bayer A & Wanyama J. 2010. Partos Joint Evaluation on Indigenous Peoples: Case study on pastoralist development in Kenya and Cordaid's contribution. Leusden: ETC EcoCulture.

Waters-Bayer, A, Oudwater N & van de Sandt J. 2009. Partos Joint Evaluation on Indigenous Peoples: Inception report. Leusden: ETC EcoCulture.

Annex 5: Question matrix

Criterion	Category	Research Questions (ToR)	No.	Study Questions	Judgement criteria	Indicators	Sources of verification	Analysis & reported		
								Inception report	Country case study	Synthesis report
Relevance		1, 2	1	To what extent are CFA policies and strategies relevant for addressing structural injustice faced by indigenous peoples (IPs)?	CFAs have policies and strategies which give guidance to addressing structural injustice faced by IPs in line with international IP rights discourse. Country/programme strategies have operationalised the concept of IPs into their portfolio	Growing no. of references to IP issues in CFA policy documents during evaluation period. CFA policies are informed by the UN declaration and ILO Convention on IPs. Specific objectives and activities addressing IPs issues formulated	CFAs policy documents, annual programme reports, programme desk officers, midterm review and final evaluation reports of country/partner programmes, review of UN declaration, ILO convention and other key publications on IPs	X	X	X
Relevance		2,4	2	To what extent have CFAs contributed to the development of legislation/policies supportive of IPs?	CFAs have contributed to the development of IP rights legislation and policies both internationally and in the case-study countries	Types of support provided to international and country partners to advocate for policies and legislations supportive of IPs	CFA progress reports, key informants, CFA partners	X	X	X
Relevance		2,3	3	To what extent have CFAs supported partner organisations to develop and implement specific programmes addressing IP issues?	CFAs partners have incorporated IP issues into their programmes.	Growing no. of projects addressing IP issues implemented by CFA partners during evaluation period Specific objectives formulated dealing with IP issues such as social and cultural rights, collective rights, self-determination, marginalisation	CFA progress reports, CFA partner reports, interviews with relevant staff and key informants		X	

Criterion	Category	Research Questions (ToR)	No.	Study Questions	Judgement criteria	Indicators	Sources of verification	Analysis & reported		
								Inception report	Country case study	Synthesis report
Effectiveness		2,3,10	4	To what extent have CFAs given recognition to the different worldviews and understood the consequences for managing/supporting IP programmes and activities in the different countries	CFAs have a view on different IP perspectives and have translated these into their programmes and programme management support	Presence of CFA staff with specific responsibilities for supporting IP-related programmes and partners	CFA progress reports and documentation, interviews with relevant CFA staff and CFA partners	X	X	X
						Presence of specific references to IP worldviews and consequences for work in CFA documents and interviews				
Effectiveness	Gender and Equality	2,3	5	To what extent have CFAs dealt with tensions between collective/cultural rights and individual/gender rights within IP projects	CFAs have views on what rights are promoted above other rights	Types of non-funding support given to IP-related programmes and partners	CFA progress reports and documentation, interviews with relevant CFA staff and CFA partners			
						Incidences of such tensions in programme and project implementation are reported. CFA policy statements on rights issues and gender and how dealt with.				
Effectiveness	Gender and Equality	2,3,10	6	To what extent have gender and equality issues been mainstreamed in CFA's IP policies and supported programmes?	CFA partners have addressed gender and equality issues in their IP related interventions	Percentage of IP-related projects that have mainstreamed/incorporated gender issues	CFA progress reports and documentation, interviews with relevant CFA staff and CFA partners	X	X	X
						CFA partners have gender-specific monitoring systems in place				

Criterion	Category	Research Questions (ToR)	No.	Study Questions	Judgement criteria	Indicators	Sources of verification	Analysis & reported		
								Inception report	Country case study	Synthesis report
Effectiveness	Coherence	5,7,10	7	To what extent are the CFA partners programmes complementary to each other in reducing structural injustice of IPs	CFA partners programmes and activities are complementary and reinforcing each other in reducing structural injustice of IPs in the case study countries	<p>Joint activities and linkages exist between CFA partners</p> <p>Membership of CFA partners in relevant networks</p> <p>Types of formal and informal contacts/exchanges between CFA partners in the case study countries</p>	“Progress report and documentation, network/workshop reports; interviews with relevant CFA staff and CFA partners; interviews with representatives of networks”		X	X
Effectiveness	Partnership development & Capacity Building	10,7,3	8	To what extent have CFAs selected the appropriate partners to work on reducing structural injustice faced by IPs	<p>CFAs partners have the capacity and commitment to work on reducing structural injustice towards IPs in the case study countries</p> <p>CFAs partners are selected in line with IP policies and CFA partnership guidelines and procedures</p>	<p>Types of CFA partners and focus/level of their activities</p> <p>CFAs partners are representing the interests of IPs and respect their values and rights</p> <p>IPs confirm that CFA partners represent their interests and address their needs in the case study countries</p>	“CFA progress reports and documentation, interviews with relevant CFA staff, CFA partners, key informants and indigenous people/communities; organisation assessment reports; evaluation reports”		X	X

Criterion	Category	Research Questions (ToR)	No.	Study Questions	Judgement criteria	Indicators	Sources of verification	Analysis & reported				
								Inception report	Country case study	Synthesis report		
Effectiveness	Partnership development & Capacity Building	10	9	To what extent have CFAs supported organisational strengthening and capacity building of their country partners?	CFAs' partners have capacity to work on IP-related issues and expanded/consolidated their work	Organisational capacity assessments conducted by CFAs	"CFA progress reports and documentation, CFA partners annual report; interviews with relevant CFA staff, CFA partners, key informants; organisation assessment reports; evaluation reports"				X	X
						Type of capacity-building support given to partner CFAs						
Effectiveness	Accountability	10	10	To what extent are CFA partners able to account for their work done in terms of chosen intervention strategies and funding allocations?	CFA partners have accountability + M&E systems in place	Monitoring systems developed and implemented	"CFA partners project and financial documentation; M&E documents and progress reports"				X	X
						Regular progress reporting and financial reporting systems in place						
Effectiveness	Coherence	3	11	To what extent are CFA-supported interventions in line with their IP-related policies/strategies	CFA supported interventions are linked to and monitored in line with IP related policies and strategies	CFA staff confirm that programme supported interventions are clearly linked	"CFA policies and programmes, progress documentation; interviews with relevant CFA staff"				X	X
						CFA staff understand IP-relevant policies and strategies that are in place						

Criterion	Category	Research Questions (ToR)	No.	Study Questions	Judgement criteria	Indicators	Sources of verification	Analysis & reported		
								Inception report	Country case study	Synthesis report
"Outcome/Impact" (where possible)		4,6,7	12	To what extent have CFA partners and their networks contributed to improving the livelihoods of IPs?	Livelihoods of IPs in the case study countries have improved	Beneficiaries confirm that their livelihoods have improved in terms of access to and control over assets, differentiated by gender	"CFA progress reports and documentation, CFA partners annual report; interviews with relevant CFA staff, CFA partners, key informants and IP communities; organisation assessment reports; evaluation reports"		X	X
						CFA partners confirm that their work and links to a wider network have contributed to improving the livelihoods of IPs				
"Outcome/Impact" (where possible)		5,6,7	13	To what extent have CFA partners and their networks contributed to improving the rights position of IPs?	The IPs in the case-study countries are able to claim their social, cultural, economic and political rights	Examples of adoption of collective rights/claims to IPs and its implementation track record	"Government documents, news paper articles, CFA progress reports and documentation, CFA partners annual report; interviews with relevant CFA staff, CFA partners, key informants and IP communities; organisation assessment reports; evaluation reports"		X	X
					IPs in the case-study countries feel empowered and confident in claiming their rights.	IPs confirm that they feel confident and are able to claim their rights				

Criterion	Category	Research Questions (ToR)	No.	Study Questions	Judgement criteria	Indicators	Sources of verification	Analysis & reported		
								Inception report	Country case study	Synthesis report
"Outcome/Impact" (where possible)		5	14	To what extent have the CFA partners ensured that IPs are included and benefit from development processes?	IPs are included and benefit from development processes	IPs confirm that they feel empowered and are included in development processes	"Community development plans, interviews with IP communities and local government and other stakeholders; CFA partner documentation"		X	X
					IPs feel empowered & committed to actively take part in community development activities	Examples of community development plans developed by IPs and implemented				
"Outcome/Impact" (where possible)		9	15	To what extent have unexpected outcomes been identified and monitored by CFAs and CFA partners?	Unexpected outcomes have been minimised and/or capitalised on	Examples of unexpected outcomes reported Examples of actions undertaken to deal with unexpected outcomes	"Interviews with CFA and CFA partners staff; progress reports; monitoring reports and systems"		X	X
Sustainability		8	16	To what extent are the CFA-supported IP programmes sustainable from a institutional and financial perspective?	CFA partners have the organisational capacity to continue with IP-related activities	CFA and CFA partners confirm that latter have capacity to continue working on IP-related issues without direct support from the CFAs CFA partners have staff members who understand IP-related issues	"Interviews with CFA and CFA partners staff; progress reports; monitoring reports and systems; organisational assessment reports"		X	X
					CFA partners have developed institutional linkages with other organisations/institutions relevant for IP issues	Growing number of institutional linkages with other relevant organisations and institutions Growing number and types of non-CFA funding for IP-related activities				

Annex 6: Question checklists for fieldwork in country case studies

Resource persons

- Changes in national and regional **policies** and their **implementation** related to IPs in the case-study country in the last ten years?
- To what extent has the **CFA contributed** to developing legislation/policies supportive of IPs (internationally) and in the case-study country?
- Changes in **actual situation** of IPs? (*political rights, land rights, rights/control over natural resources (forests, minerals, other natural resources), livelihoods, rights of indigenous women, integration in development, other ...*).
- What are major issues for the IPs in relation to **claiming/securing their rights**? (political and/or socio-cultural rights, collective rights, self-determination/integration/forced assimilation, reduced marginalisation, legitimacy/representation). Are there differences how rights issues have been taken up between different IPs groups/representatives and among states/districts?
- Contributions of the CFA partners to **networking** and **learning** on IPs development and right status? (*added value to IPs development in the area?*)
- Other major stakeholders working on IPs development?

Partner organisations (POs)

- Changes in national and regional **policies** and their implementation related to IPs' development in the case-study country in the last ten years? (please note: also gender issues in relation to IPs)
- To what extent has the **PO contributed** to developing legislation/policies supportive of IPs regionally (internationally) and in the case-study country?
- Has the CFA **supported** PO to develop and implement specific programmes addressing IP issues? If so, how?
- Specific **objectives** of projects related to IPs? (*any mention of social & cultural rights, collective rights, self-determination, reducing marginalisation?*)
- What **other projects** (*not the CFA-supported*) implemented by the PO that are addressing IPs / IP issues? When and how developed? (*complementarity, synergy, relative impact, relative importance of IPs within overall PO project portfolio?*)
- Has the PO made **changes in number, type, focus and approach** in IPs related projects in the last ___ years? If so, why and how?
- What differences in **worldviews** of IPs as compared to those of PO (and the CFA) create challenges in development activities? How were these differences handled when planning activities?
- What kinds of tension have arisen during project implementation between **collective/** cultural rights and **individual** (incl. gender) **rights**? How have these been dealt with?
- How well does the PO think it has mainstreamed **gender**? How is this evident? Is there a gender-differentiated monitoring system in place?
- **Monitoring** system at PO level? (*project documentation, M&E documents, progress reports*)
- **Documentation** of learning and good practice? (*examples?*)
- Frequency and quality of **communication** between PO and the CFA?

- Changes in **actual situation** of IPs? (*livelihoods, rights of indigenous women, integration in development, other ...*) What brought these changes about? Contribution of the CFA-supported work to this?
- Change in **rights position** of IPs (*political rights, land rights, access to and control over resources (minerals, forests, NTFPs etc), rights of indigenous women*)? How evident? How did this change come about?
- Examples of **special laws/court rulings** supportive of IPs' rights?
- Change in **no. of IPs** over last __ years benefiting from the CFA projects? (*depending on how many years the PO has been working with the CFA*)
- Are IPs with whom they work now stronger or weaker in ability to deal with shocks and disasters (**resilience**)? How evident? How did this change come about?
- Are IPs with whom they work now more or less **empowered** to claim their rights? How evident? How did this change come about?
- **Unexpected** positive and negative outcomes of the CFA-supported PO's work? How were these or will these be dealt with?
- What **linkages** does the PO have with other the CFA partners in the network? What activities are carried out jointly? Frequency? Complementarities? Informal contacts?
- In which **other networks** is the PO involved that relate to IPs?
- What other **institutional linkages** with relevant organisations? (*e.g. research and educational institutes*)
- How has the CFA supported **organisational and capacity strengthening of PO**? How does PO assess change in its capacity to work on IP issues over past __ years? (*depending on how many years the PO has been working with the CFA*)
- No. and % of **staff with good understanding** of IP issues?
- How has the organisational-strengthening support (funding and otherwise) from the CFA helped PO to carry out its tasks in support of IPs in a different and more effective way? (**sustainability**)?
- How has PO been involved in developing the CFAs country and/or thematic programme strategies? How is PO involved now in developing future priorities?
- To what extent has the CFA supported learning and exchange of experiences between POs working on IPs related issues? (in case-study country and regionally/internationally).

Indigenous groups

- Does the PO **represent the interests** and **address the needs** of the IPs? If not, what needs to be changed so that this happens?
- What does **development mean** for these IPs (*different IPs groups, men, women, elders, youth*)?
- How are IPs (and who among them) involved in planning their own development process (**participation**)?
- No. and types of **community development plans** developed by IPs and state of implementation? (not only the POs, any other NGOs/Government funds also)
- Changes in their **lives** – positive and negative? How did these changes come about? (*gender-differentiated*)
- Changes in access to and **control over resources** – positive and negative? How did these changes come about? (*gender-differentiated*)
- Stronger or weaker in ability to deal with shocks and disasters (**resilience**)? How evident? How did this change come about?
- Examples of how IPs have tried to **claim** their social, cultural, economic and/or political rights and results obtained? Change in level of confidence to make such claims and, if so, together with whom?

- Examples of **special laws**/court rulings supportive of IPs' rights?
- Any **local organisations / institutions** built or strengthened with a view to claiming rights?
- **Unexpected** positive and negative outcomes of well-intended support from PO? How were or should these be these dealt with?
- Change in access to **markets** and **financial services**?
- Confident that they **can continue** to improve their economic situation as individuals and/ or as group? (gender-differentiated)

CFA staff (HO or at regional/national office in case-study country)

- Changes in national and regional **policies** and their **implementation** related to IPs in the case-study country in the last ten years?
- To what extent has the **CFA contributed** to developing legislation/policies supportive of IPs (internationally) and in the case-study country?
- Changes in **actual situation** of IPs? (*political rights, land rights, rights/control over natural resources (forests, minerals, other natural resources), livelihoods, rights of indigenous women, integration in development, other ...*).
- Contributions of the CFA partners to **networking** and **learning** on IPs development and right status? (*added value to IPs development in the area?*)
- To what extent is the CFA's support filling a relevant niche when specifically looking at IPs?
- To what extent are the selected geographic areas/project locations justified in terms of number of IPs, structural injustice and relative neglect by other donors and institutions working with IPs?
- How has the CFA selected its POs working on IPs? Total number of and types of POs working on IPs? Any changes in number and types of POs in the last 6–10 years? Does the case-study country partner portfolio sufficiently address the priorities of addressing structural injustice faced by IPs? (type of partners, their focus and approach).
- Any challenges in developing and maintaining the partner portfolio related to IPs?
- What are the main areas of the CFAs support for IP-related programmes? Why? Have there been any changes in focus of support and overall funding in the last 6–10 years? If so, how and why?
- To what extent have the CFA partners adjusted their IP-related programmes in response to changing needs and the socio-economic, legal and political context?
- To what extent has the CFA supported their partners to develop and implement specific programmes for IPs?
- How have the CFA partners been involved in developing the case-study country or other relevant thematic programme strategies?
- To what extent has the CFA supported their partners to build their capacity and improve their projects on IPs?
- How has the CFA supported gender issues in relation to IPs? How are gender issues been identified? How supported? What worked well? What has worked less? How could it be improved?
- To what extent has the CFA supported learning and exchange of experiences on working on IP-related issues?
- Do POs coordinate and link their work on IPs (within a specific geographic region, on themes etc)
- What is the CFA's long-term vision of their IP partner/project portfolio?
- Does the CFA have a clear exit strategy for support to IP programmes/partners?
- Other major stakeholders working on IP development?

Annex 7: Differentiated approach to delivery of basic services to IPs

Indigenous peoples worldwide claim that they are entitled to culturally appropriate policy regarding the provision of basic services (health and education) by the State. This relates to indigenous peoples' rights to be educated in their own languages, have recognition for their traditional health systems, and that policies in general take account of their distinct cultural values and conditions (these "conditions" are, in part, the result of historic injustices – discrimination and marginalisation – that prevented them from exercising their right to development in accordance with their own needs and interests). But this also refers to their rights to be involved in decision-making on planning and execution of such policies, which has the ultimate goal of bringing the delivery of such services (paid for by the State) under the control of indigenous peoples' own institutions. In most cases, however, States are criticised by indigenous peoples organisations that the social investment policies do not apply such a differentiated approach in service delivery to their peoples, i.e. that the provision of such services is inadequate, is not applied or has low coverage, or is altogether nonexistent. Below are listed the most important articles from ILO C169 and UN DRIP in relation to indigenous peoples' rights to a differentiated treatment in the provision of basic services by the State (emphasis is that of the authors of this study).

ILO C169

PART V. SOCIAL SECURITY AND HEALTH

Article 24

Social security schemes shall be extended progressively to cover the peoples concerned, and applied without discrimination against them.

Article 25

1. Governments shall ensure that adequate health services are made available to the peoples concerned, or shall provide them with resources to allow them to design and deliver such services under their own responsibility and control, so that they may enjoy the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.

2. Health services shall, to the extent possible, be community-based. These services shall be planned and administered in co-operation with the peoples concerned and take into account their economic, geographic, social and cultural conditions as well as their traditional preventive care, healing practices and medicines.

PART VI. EDUCATION AND MEANS OF COMMUNICATION

Article 26

Measures shall be taken to ensure that members of the peoples concerned have the opportunity to acquire education at all levels on at least an equal footing with the rest of the national community.

Article 27

1. Education programmes and services for the peoples concerned shall be developed and implemented in co-operation with them to address their special needs, and shall incorporate their histories, their knowledge and technologies, their value systems and their further social, economic and cultural aspirations.

Article 28

1. Children belonging to the peoples concerned shall, wherever practicable, be taught to read and write in their own indigenous language or in the language most commonly used by the group to which they belong. When this is not practicable, the competent authorities shall undertake consultations with these peoples with a view to the adoption of measures to achieve this objective.

Article 29

The imparting of general knowledge and skills that will help children belonging to the peoples concerned to participate fully and on an equal footing in their own community and in the national community shall be an aim of education for these peoples.

UN DRIP**Article 14**

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to establish and control their educational systems and institutions providing education in their own languages, in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning.

2. Indigenous individuals, particularly children, have the right to all levels and forms of education of the State without discrimination.

3. States shall, in conjunction with indigenous peoples, take effective measures, in order for indigenous individuals, particularly children, including those living outside their communities, to have access, when possible, to an education in their own culture and provided in their own language.

Article 15

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to the dignity and diversity of their cultures, traditions, histories and aspirations which shall be appropriately reflected in education and public information.

Article 23

Indigenous peoples have the right to determine and develop priorities and strategies for exercising their right to development. In particular, indigenous peoples have the right to be actively involved in developing and determining health, housing and other economic and social programmes affecting them and, as far as possible, to administer such programmes through their own institutions.

Article 24

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to their traditional medicines and to maintain their health practices, including the conservation of their vital medicinal plants, animals and minerals. Indigenous individuals also have the right to access, without any discrimination, to all social and health services.

Annex 8: Members of the External Reference Group

- President of ERG: Paul Engel, Director ECDPM
- Administrative assistant of ERG: Niels Keijzer, Programme Officer Centre Policy and Innovation, ECDPM
- Members of ERG:
 - Anita Hardon, Professor Medical Anthropology (UvA)
 - Rehka Wazir, Co-director International Child Development Initiative
 - Georg Frerks, Centre for Conflict Studies UU, Professor Rampenstudies WUR
 - Geske Dijkstra, Senior lecturer economics, EUR
 - Bert Helmsing, Professor ISS
 - Bertus Haverkort, freelance consultant

Annex 9: Members of the Coordination Group

Partos	Lisette Desain	Evaluation Manager
Cordaid	Inge Barmantlo	Programme Officer
	Hilda van 't Riet	Policy advisor PM&E
ICCO	Dieneke de Groot	Coordinator Research and Evaluation
	Anouska van Traast	Research and Development
Hivos	Karel Chambille	Evaluation Manager
	Teyo van der Schoot	Programme Officer