



# Darwin Initiative Annual Report

## Important note:

To be completed with reference to the Reporting Guidance Notes for Project Leaders: it is expected that this report will be about 10 pages in length, excluding annexes



**Submission Deadline: 30 April 2012**

**Note: as this is an extensive project which is carried out in 6 countries, the length needed to provide all information that was required exceeds 10 pages**

## 1. Darwin Project Information

Project Reference	18-003
Project Title	Supporting indigenous and local organisations to implement CBD article 10(c)
Host Country/ies	Bangladesh, Cameroon, Guyana, Indonesia, Suriname, Thailand, Panama
UK contract holder institution	Forest Peoples Programme (FPP)
Host country partner institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Unnayan Onneshan, Bangladesh</li> <li>○ South Central People's Development Association (SCPDA), Guyana</li> <li>○ Institut Dayakologi, Indonesia (West Kalimantan)</li> <li>○ Organisation of Kaliña and Lokono People in Marowijne (KLIM), Suriname (<u>Note</u>: formerly "Indigenous Land Rights Commission Lower Marowijne (CLIM)", the official name change was adopted in December 2009)</li> <li>○ Inter Mountain Peoples Education and Culture in Thailand Association (IMPECT), Thailand</li> <li>○ Fundación para la Promoción del Conocimiento Indígena (FPCI), Panama</li> </ul>
Other partner institutions	N/A
Darwin Grant Value	<p>£90,000 per annum</p> <p>As we have indicated in question 22 of our original application, various other sources of funding have been secured and put towards the costs of this project. During the last project period, the co-funders of this project have been Swedbio, the EC (Guyana component), Oxfam-Novib, the Christensen Fund and the Ecosystem Alliance. The budget for 2011 (January – December) was around €387,500.</p> <p>Achievements and results described in this annual report reflect progress made through the joint funding base.</p>
Start/end dates of project	1 April 2010 – 31 March 2013
Reporting period (eg Apr 2010 – Mar 2011) and number (eg Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	April 2011 – March 2012 Annual Report 2
Project Leader name	Dr. Maurizio Farhan Ferrari
Project website	<a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org">www.forestpeoples.org</a> (general FPP website, not project-specific)
Report authors, main contributors and date	<p>Maurizio Farhan Ferrari and Caroline de Jong, FPP, project coordinators, Sarah Roberts, FPP finance officer (financial report).</p> <p>In collaboration with the project teams from Unnayan Onneshan, IMPECT, KLIM, SCPDA, FPCI, and Institute Dayakologi.</p>

## 2. Project Background

### **Background & problem that the project seeks to address:**

In our application, we described that effective implementation of Article 10(c) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), which states that Parties shall protect and encourage indigenous and local communities' customary sustainable use of biological resources, is still a challenge. Some key issues are that:

- Many communities still broadly experience a lack of access to and control of lands and resources, and a lack of involvement in decision-making and management of natural resources, while secure rights to land, territories and resources represent a fundamental requirement for forest peoples to maintain and practise customary use and traditional knowledge.
- Despite the international acknowledgement of the importance of CSU, it is generally still disregarded and considered irrelevant at the national and sub-national levels. Top-down natural resource management and conservation approaches exclude customary practices, which can have severe negative consequences for the vitality of these systems. Often, biodiversity loss is even unjustly blamed on local communities' practices and therefore access to, and use of, resources are severely restricted. If customary sustainable management systems and customary laws and institutions, which are the backbone of customary sustainable use, are not respected and recognized by governments and national laws, such practices can become weakened.
- The establishment of protected areas without respect for indigenous peoples' rights and without adequate participation is posing challenges to communities in terms of both access and management of biological resources, and thus on the customary sustainable practices related to these areas.
- Customary sustainable use is also under threat from external pressures such as extractive industries (such as logging and mining) and top-down development interventions, which destroy customary territories, or restrict access. The application of free prior informed consent (FPIC) is important to protect customary use from such threats. However, FPIC is generally not institutionalised and not applied (and not fully understood).
- Many current education systems are aimed at assimilation and are enforcing non-indigenous languages, which cause loss of local knowledge and related practices. Education in the own language and on issues that relate to local environment and knowledge is vital to maintain customary sustainable use and traditional knowledge.

In this project, the host country partners (see below) – all organisations of indigenous peoples, local communities and local support organisations - with support from FPP, are aiming to implement Article 10(c) of the CBD more effectively, both by the communities themselves and in facilitating collaborative implementation with government and other relevant agencies.

The project is a follow-up of work that has been done since 2004 to clarify the meaning and implications of customary sustainable use and advocacy work to implement this article of the CBD at the national and international levels.

### **Location**

The project is carried out in the following locations with the following indigenous peoples and local communities:

- Bangladesh – Sundarbans – traditional resource users
- Guyana - South and South Central District – Wapichan people
- Indonesia – West Kalimantan – Dayak people
- Panama – Guna Yala – Guna people
- Suriname – Marowijne district – Kaliña and Lokono people
- Thailand – northern highlands – Hmong and Karen people

## 3. Project Partnerships

### **Project partnerships:**

As we explained in our application, we have a long-term field relationship with all the host-country partners (the organisations of indigenous peoples and local communities), with whom we worked on similar projects for many years. In that respect, our relation has not changed since last year and it continues to be strengthened.

In terms of management structure:

The host country partners carry out the local and (sub)national level field and advocacy work activities, and represent and voice the local level concerns and issues in the international arena (CBD) and also share the international outcomes with local level constituencies. They are responsible for their own administration, staff and office issues, and report regularly to FPP on project progress.

FPP takes care of the overall coordination and administration of the project. We manage the overall budget, raise additional funds, and put together the joint narrative and financial reports. We also facilitate regular exchanges and contact between the various partners and we support the production of joint publications or articles and play a role in media outreach. We usually coordinate the participation of the partners group in the CBD process at the international level, including international meetings and submissions of joint documents to the CBD Secretariat. FPP's staff are also involved in the local project activities as technical advisors or resource persons for our partners.

The relations with the partners are managed in different ways. First of all FPP's staff have a strong field presence in all partner countries; we visit the local offices at least once a year and we are very familiar with the project teams and activities on a personal level. From the UK we maintain regular contact through e-mail and skype. We meet with the entire project team to participate in CBD meetings, and we always use these opportunities to arrive 1-2 days in advance to spend time together to discuss project updates and possible problems. Every 2 years, we organise a partners' meeting (in one of the partner communities) where we reflect on progress and future steps together. A partners' meeting was held in Guna Yala (Panama) on 4-9 April 2011.

See also section 5 on monitoring and evaluation.

### **Other Collaboration**

The 10(c) team has continued to strengthen the link with the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB), the indigenous peoples' caucus in the CBD. At CBD meetings, we operate within the IIFB and track and engage in various CBD issues, particularly on customary sustainable use. Interventions and statements are made on behalf of the entire IIFB.

Prior to the official CBD meetings, there are IIFB preparatory meetings to discuss agenda issues and prepare positions. FPP and the 10(c) team usually present 10(c) and related issues. Each morning between 9 and 10 a.m., the IIFB meets to reflect on the previous days and look ahead and strategize for the coming sessions. Statements or interventions are shared with the entire caucus and are agreed on before they are read in plenary.

FPP and the 10(c) team are also directly and closely involved in the IIFB Working Group on Indicators, which is formally tasked to develop indicators related to indigenous well-being in relation to the CBD. Our team also continued to strengthen the links with the CBD Alliance, a network of NGOs that are working on CBD issues.

FPP was also one of the 51 founding organizations that created the International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative (IPSI) at COP10 in October 2010, and in January 2011 also became a member of the Steering Committee and in the second part of 2011 Maurizio Farhan Ferrari became a member of the IPSI's Sub-committee on Strategy Development. The Satoyama Initiative is a high-level partnership launched by the Japanese government that includes a mixture of agencies, from international (UNEP, UNDP, FAO, CIFOR, CI) to community-based organisations, to promote socio-ecological systems relevant to sustainable use of biodiversity. As such this initiative is very relevant to 10(c) and FPP and partners have used this platform to highlight the linkages between Satoyama and 10(c) and to promote 10(c).

### **Link with CBD focal point:**

The project partners maintain contact with the CBD focal points in their respective countries. These contacts are often strengthened 'in the corridors' of CBD meetings which we attend as observers and the focal points as Parties. Here there are good opportunities to exchange information and views. In particular the focal points from Bangladesh, Thailand and Suriname are open for collaboration and inputs from our partners and on several occasions they have discussed their positions with the partners. We provide them with the 10(c) team statements and interventions, and also invite them for our 10(c) side events (sometimes they attend), and give them copies of our 10(c) publications. In Suriname, the KLIM has been invited to CBD preparatory meetings by the Ministry of Environment (the focal point) and they maintain regular email contact with the KLIM. In Thailand, the CBD focal point has met a few times with our partner, IMPECT, and they are now developing a collaborative project together.

## 4. Project Progress

**NB:** this project is carried out mostly at the local level in six countries and in many villages and communities. We do not require our partners to send us full minutes, notes, (training) materials, or reports from every single village or community meeting, workshop, training, etc that they have held. Most of these are held in indigenous, local or non-English national languages and some are considered confidential or private by the communities. We don't think these would be necessary for LTS/Defra either - but we do require our partners to send us summary reports of all the meetings, the outcomes and results, or any obstacles or questions arising from these meetings. However, if there is a particular item that LTS/Defra would like to see, we can discuss this with the concerning partners (and translate it into English as needed and appropriate). Please let us know when that is the case.

### 4.1 Progress in carrying out project activities

**NB:** the project activities in the project application (in the logframe / workplan) all correspond to various outputs because of the cross-cutting nature of the work. The outputs are provided below and we will report on each of the activities and indicate to which of the outputs this activity relates. The activities have been carried out as planned and on time.

**Output 1.** The acknowledgement and recognition of (the role of) CSU and traditional knowledge (TK), indigenous languages (IL), customary laws and institutions has increased

**Output 2.** Significant progress has been made towards securing land and resource rights of partner communities, including access and control

**Output 3.** Local involvement in biodiversity decision-making and management (including in protected areas) has increased and community-based management plans play a significant role in it

**Output 4.** Threats and pressures on CSU have decreased, among others through enhanced application of FPIC in matters affecting indigenous peoples' lands and territories

***Activity 1: Capacity-building activities for local institutions to augment their capacity to interface with regional, national, and international agencies (governments, NGOs, private and other sectors) in asserting and maintaining their rights (including right to FPIC) ( outputs 2,3,4)***

This project element has focussed on facilitating meetings of traditional authorities and networks to discuss communal concerns and develop collaborative strategies to respond to these, and to improve awareness on issues that impact on the traditional territory and as such on the customary management of these areas through trainings and capacity-building sessions.

#### **Joint activities:**

FPP organised a Strategy and Training Workshop on Human Rights, Gender and Biodiversity Issues on the island of Usdup, Comarca Guna Yala, Panama, between 4-9 April 2011. This meeting brought together ± 30 FPBP project partners and indigenous women from the Latin American region, and was hosted by FPP's Environmental Governance Programme and the Legal and Human Rights Programme. The joint sessions focussed on the following topics:

- Indigenous peoples' rights and the Convention on Biological Diversity
- Key issues in implementing the CBD through a rights based approach at local/national level
- Making use of instruments and mechanism to defend indigenous peoples' rights
- Biodiversity and human rights from a gender perspective
- Indigenous women's rights under international law
- Biodiversity and Climate Change: impacts, vulnerability, and adaptation / resilience

The '10c team' worked on internal issues as well, such as:

- the submission to the CBD about the new Programme of Work on 8(j), with focus on 10(c)
- preparation for the international expert meeting on 10c in Montreal in May
- drafting of a new work plan for 2012-2013

During the last day, Jorge Andreve of FPCI made a presentation about the Guna Yala management plan. A field trip was also organised. The evaluation of the meeting was very positive. A meeting report is available on request.

**Suriname:**

The 3-year training programme for village leaders, women and youth organisations in Lower-Marowijne ended with the last session held on 6-14 October 2011, in which 35 people participated.

This capacity building programme started in 2008 at the request of the village councils, who felt their leadership and governance should first be strengthened to better prepare them to secure their rights and carry out effective self-governance and management of the collective territory. In total, 11 training sessions have been held (3-4 days average, 25 participants average), facilitated by Ellen-Rose Kambel (Surinamese indigenous rights expert), Caroline de Jong (FPP) and several guest trainers both from Suriname and abroad. The last training focused mostly on evaluating the past three years and planning ahead for the future. During the evaluation, the majority expressed that 'a lot of progress has been made but we are not completely there yet'. The capacity, awareness, and skills have improved and paid off, but sometimes are not fully applied yet. On the other hand, many villages are now governed more transparently, effectively, and recently the village regulation was used to replace a village leader who had been malfunctioning for a long time.

Among the most rated elements of the training were the leadership training, communication (internal in the board as well as with the villagers), meeting and lobby techniques. The external and internal situation in 2011 as compared to 2008 was also evaluated. In particular the external legal/political situation was a source of concern and frustration. Many indigenous peoples in Lower-Marowijne voted for president Bouterse, who promised during election time that he would solve the land rights issue during his term – it was one of his 'priorities'. However, after his installation it soon became clear that he had no intention to really do this (see national land rights conference in section 5).

***Regular meetings of the KLIM and KLIM board.***

There were two board meetings held between April and November 2011. The KLIM board discussed: the process of KLIM becoming independent, planning and budget for 2011, the activities on the land management plan, KLIM's participation in CBD meetings and a report of the FPP partners' meeting in Panama. The plan is that during 2012, KLIM will become the project holder for the FPBP – currently the mother organisation VIDS is managing the funds. FPP and VIDS are closely involved in supporting KLIM in the process and a specific MoU has been drafted with standard amended terms and conditions that are used in collaboration with newly established partner organisations (e.g. quarterly reporting). During the regular KLIM meeting (13 November 2011) project activities and updates were reviewed and discussed, such as the climate change research, the plans for next year related to the land management plan (a pilot area – Wane Kreek – has been identified for research and inventory). The national land rights conference was also evaluated internally, focusing on: 'What went wrong and how could the dialogue with the government be re-started?'

***Leadership training programme for youth (training-of-trainers)***

An introductory meeting was held with the trainers and the KLIM board. The training was held from 29 February – 4 March 2012 in Erowarte and Marijkedorp and was attended by 12 young people below 29 years of age from the communities. Topics discussed included: leadership, personal development, presentation, communication and conversation technique (by the trainers Ralph Schreinemachers, Daphina Misiedjan and Ufuk Hakya from the Netherlands, land rights (by Grace Watamaleo - KLIM assistant coordinator and land management plan of Marowijne (by KLIM coordinator George Awankaroe).

Output: capacity of community, in particular leaders and youth, has increased and collaboration and collective action has been supported.

Means of verification: documents and materials produced by participants during the trainings (in Dutch); evaluations & quotes from participants and from trainers that skills and level of knowledge and capacity have improved; reports of KLIM meetings and board meetings (in Dutch).

## **Guyana**

During this period the Wapichan people of the South Rupununi District of Guyana focused on preparations for the launching of their community map and territorial management plan. They held two assemblies in October 2011 to review, correct and confirm the contents of their community land use map and territorial plan, including the inter-community agreements on which they are based. This was the culmination of ten year's work by the Wapichan, who have digitally mapped their lands and made community-based agreements on sustainable land use and self-determined development. Both validation meetings were well attended, with between 100 and 150 elders, women, youths and Village Council members taking part in the villages of Karaodaz (South sub-district) and Shorinab (South Central sub-district). Activities involved discussions to ratify agreements on common land title boundaries as well as a careful review of the final draft of the Wapichan land use map, which was endorsed by all participants. Many community people expressed their satisfaction: *"Now I see the final draft of our map up on the wall, it brings tears of joy to my eyes. Our people have worked for years to come up with this map, which shows very well how we use and occupy our traditional land. Sometimes we thought we would never see the end result. Now we have it almost finished, we are proud with what we have achieved..."* (Kokoi, Wapichan elder, Deep South Validation Meeting, Karaodaz Village, October 2011).

Participants also went through their draft territorial plan, page-by-page over five days, with full oral translation into the Wapichan and Makushi languages. Parts of the draft document were approved without changes, while some photographs, quotes and maps were removed or amended based on consensus. Among numerous land use agreements, communities validated a proposal to establish a large Wapichan Conserved Forest covering about 1.4 million ha in the eastern and southern parts of the territory, as well as numerous plans to protect the sacred sites and local sites important for fish, game animals and wildlife. At the end of the meetings, community leaders and villagers voiced satisfaction with their final document and called on the Forest Peoples Programme and other allies to continue providing support to help them implement their plan for securing and sustainably managing Wapichan traditional lands, as one of the village chiefs expressed: *"We are pleased with this territorial document. It captures what we said and records the agreements we have made. It looks good too. Let us now work together to make this plan work for our people and the generations to come"* (Toshao Potarinao Village, South Central Validation meeting, October 2011). The launching of the map and territorial management plan is described in section 3.

Outputs: capacity of community, in particular leaders, has increased and collaboration and collective action has been supported. Community map and territorial management plan have been finalized.

Means of verification: community maps and territorial management plan; reports (including agreements reached) of DTC meetings; feedback from project coordinators.

## **Thailand**

An ongoing aspect of the project is to enable and facilitate the meetings of community networks and to support them to enhance collaboration and collective discussion and decision-making. As such, the project supported activities of the women's network and their meetings, meetings of watershed committees, meetings with partner organizations in the field, and provided continued support to the Highland Natural Conservation in Chomthong (HNCC) Group. The project also provided support to the Hmong network forum of 5 communities (Maeyanoi, Maesanga, Pakluay, Mae chon and Maesamai). In the first half of 2011, a training of trainers to hold training for indigenous peoples on the Convention on Biological Diversity was started and this training continued in the second half. A new activity since July was the training for community leaders on climate change issues.

Outputs: capacity for self-organisation has increased and collaboration and collective action of watershed networks have been supported.

Means of verification: network meeting notes (including agreements, points of action / steps to be taken); training reports (all in Thai); feedback and information provided by IMPECT staff.

## **Bangladesh:**

A highlight of the year 2011 was the operationalization of the resource users' cooperatives. During the first six months of the year, three community co-operatives were established and registered under the Social Welfare Department (see previous report). Since then, the cooperatives have been serving as a meeting place and common ground for sharing information, ideas, experience and enhancing cooperation among the cooperative members. Daily getting together has facilitated fostering brotherhood and cooperation among the cooperative members. Since July, Unnayan Onneshan has continued to support these cooperatives among others by organising regular group meetings to discuss communal natural resource management problems and to devise collaborative actions and solutions. Research was done in the second part of the year to document the collaborative resource management field experiences.

Each member contributes a monthly membership subscription fee, thus each of the cooperatives has raised a considerable fund over the year. In this way the cooperatives started stocking capital with the long term goal of buying a boat and net for each member. The poorest members can use cooperative funds at low interest.

Unnayan Onneshan facilitated community trainings in each of the 3 cooperatives on effective and efficient operation and management of co-operatives, so that community members are able to manage the cooperatives themselves and generate own capital to become self sufficient. After the successful completion of the trainings, the members of the cooperatives have increased knowledge about:

- Cooperative organizational structure
- Cooperative codes of conduct
- Fundraising and cost-effective investment of funds
- Intra-cooperative interactions
- Decision making systems
- The rights and responsibilities of the mangrove resources users
- Information gathering, storing and sharing
- Digitalization of the cooperative' information system

Outputs: Sundarbans resource users are better organised and equipped for collective work and action through the new cooperatives.

Means of verification: three cooperatives registration papers and photos and film of official openings, reports of meetings.

## **Panama**

FPCI has focused its work on training activities on climate change (REDD) and biodiversity and 10(c), aimed at strengthening community understanding about sustainable and equitable self-development and linking this to the Guna peoples' traditional knowledge. FPCI has set up a tour along several islands (communities), where they held meetings with local advisors and traditional authorities to share information about the project. With the help and suggestions of the advisory committees, the project team made changes to the methodology of sharing information and capacity building. It was decided to use participatory video as a tool for information transfer as this allows for a dynamic and comprehensive analysis of the issue but at the same time is a source of research data. The videos were done in the Guna language to make it more understandable to the people in the community. The experience has shown that the use of multimedia tools facilitate the explanation of difficult and abstract issues and increase community members' understanding of them. One video was made about climate change in Guna Yala. In this video, elders talk about the ancestors' legacy, the respect for Mother Earth, and the threats the territory is faced with and the changes they are observing, such as pollution of the sea, increasing heat, heavy winds, floods, and rain. The other video is on *Nabire Gudi Guede* (Kuna worldview and way of interacting with Mother Nature). This video addresses the importance of cultural knowledge in the management of the land and natural resources.

Two training workshops were held for Guna women, which addressed topics such as women's rights, article 10c, climate change, ICCAs and biodiversity in general. More workshops will be held with the Guna women in the first half of 2012, with the aim to cover as many Guna communities as possible. The FPCI has also succeeded in strengthening ties with the Guna General Congress through different types of activities, meetings, workshops and conferences. At present FPCI is advising the general congress to develop safeguards for Guna people using the ABS publication developed under the project.

Outputs: Guna people (leaders, youth, women) have increased knowledge and capacity, training materials, including videos, have been produced

Means of verification: Evaluations by participants, information from FPCI project staff, meeting reports, educational materials, videos.

## Indonesia

In 2011 the Institut Dayakologi based in Pontianak, in collaboration with *Tapangk Olupm Macatn Sangi Sanjan Association* (Tomas Association) continued a project in West-Kalimantan, called "Empowerment and advocacy of indigenous peoples (Dayak Kodatn) in natural resource management at Kampong Sanjan, (Sanggau district, West Kalimantan province)". Besides several community meetings on how to develop the process for the recognition of customary forests in the provincial and regional government's spatial planning, a specific Workshop on the Continuation of Advocacy on the Customary Forest in *Sanjan* was organised. This workshop was attended by approximately 20 participants consisting of community representatives, *Tomawangk Ompu'* customary forest's caretakers, the board of TOMAS, customary figures, and local villagers as well as the teachers of Sanjan Primary School. It was aimed at finalising the formulation of a request letter addressed to the Regional administration of Sanggau for the verification and recognition of the customary forest of *Tomawang Ompu'*. The workshop produced several outcomes, including an agreement on the formulation of a request letter for customary forest verification and the management history record of *Tomawangk Ompu'* customary forest and a timeline for the collection of the signatures of the community and delivering the letter to the Regional administration of *Sanggau*.

Capacity building started on community mapping as well. Encouraging activities include the socialisation of participatory mapping, a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with several community figures, lobbying the government for support, a number of special talks on the mapping process and even the facilitation of several special meetings of *Sanjan* Indigenous Peoples with the National Land Agency. The actual mapping of the customary forest has not started yet as not all community members are on board yet, but it is expected to happen in the second part of 2012

Outputs: community of Kampong Sanjan has increased collective decision making concerning the process to request government action for the recognition of their customary forest and have started a socialisation process concerning participatory community mapping.

Means of verification: reports from meetings/workshops.

### **Activity 2: Documenting customary sustainable management systems (outputs 1, 3)**

This project element has focused on collecting information of customary resource use in traditional territories, such as mapping and/or videoing. It also focussed on the inter-generational transfer of traditional knowledge and practices related to sustainable use of biodiversity. This was identified by the communities as a very important community initiative to maintain the vitality of customary sustainable use, as mainstream education often forces foreign language and cultures on indigenous children, which leads to loss of important biodiversity-related knowledge and language.

#### **Panama:**

FPCI has been conducting formal and informal interviews with various local experts on important issues, such as sacred sites, REDD, and 'good living (well-being)'. Sacred, spiritual sites are called *Galus* in Guna, which are important places for protection and management of Mother Earth, such as breeding sites, food sites, areas with important medicinal plants or minerals, or areas with vulnerable species. A sacred site can be a mountain, a plain, a part of a river, coast or sea, a cemetery, etc. The laws on sacred sites are oral and passed on from generation to generation.

The experts spoke about the possible effects of REDD on the sacred sites. Most concerns were about recognition of land tenure, as none of the new national laws on REDD or international programmes on REDD include land tenure security as a precondition for REDD. REDD at this time could undermine the territorial management model and affect the daily life of the Guna people. It can impact on the Guna's century-old management and adversely influence their food security and spiritual life.

The term 'good life' is a complex cultural concept with different angles. Nabire Gudi Guede is the basis of Guna management of natural resources for the wellbeing of the Guna society, based on Bab Igar (customary laws of the Guna) and Balu Wala, the great sagas. Nabire Gudi Guede refers to identity, how to organise the community and respect Mother Earth. Currently the Nabire Gudi Guede model of development is undermined by capitalist influences from outside. Young people tend to forget or ignore the values of reciprocity and respect for Mother Earth also due to external influences. Nabire Gudi Guede needs to be reinforced and FPCI is helping to do this by studying and analysing internal laws (written or oral) about management of the territory and environment and strengthen these in particular in the light of community resilience to climate change and climate change policies.



Outputs: research has been started on deeper (spiritual) aspects of traditional knowledge in relation to biodiversity and climate change issues with the objective to better understand these aspects and devise a plan to transfer them to younger generations.

Means of verification: notes and documentation of research carried out (if deemed appropriate to be shared with external people).

### **Bangladesh**

Three training sessions were conducted by experienced traditional resource users, who transmitted and shared traditional knowledge and customary practices related to sustainable honey collection, *golpata* collection, and fishing to various members of the communities. The rationale for this training initiative is twofold: it informs (younger) resource users on the vulnerability of places and resources and the current state of the resources, and at the same time strengthens their capacity for improved sustainable resource management (extraction and taking care of resources). Periodically throughout the year, trainings were conducted in all the three forest community cooperatives. Experienced resource persons who were selected by the communities trained the younger resource users on various collection methods of mangrove resources like honey, *golpata*, fish, crab, snails, oyster and wood collection. It is expected that if the younger generation starts applying this traditional knowledge it will lead to overall improved natural resource management in the Sundarbans.

The project has also supported Munda indigenous cultural groups, as a way to promote and protect traditional / cultural knowledge related to the mangrove resources. Valuable knowledge on customary use and traditional cultural practices are often found in traditional songs, poems, folklore, dance, drama, folk-rhyme, ballad, lyric poetry and musical drama. Indeed, the traditional cultural traits and practices of Munda community, the only indigenous community living adjacent to the Sundarbans, have been found to be full of traditional knowledge on customary use of the mangrove resources. But these cultural practices of the Munda community were on the verge of disappearance due to the increasing influence of western cultures and modern technologies. The project has attempted to revive these practices by facilitating the forming of a cultural group in the Munda community and supporting them with musical instrument and dresses, as well as helping them to organize regular cultural programs. This is seen as a contribution towards the protection of cultural heritage and traditions, and it makes forest peoples more aware of customary practices and traditional knowledge that help to sustainably manage the mangrove ecosystem.

Outputs: traditional knowledge and practices and cultural revitalisation of traditional resource users in the Sundarbans has been promoted and strengthened.

Means of verification: Unnayan Onneshan reports of trainings; establishment of cultural team; increasing number of resource users are starting to apply traditional knowledge in mangrove management.

### **Thailand:**

Ongoing activities aimed at the promotion and transfer of traditional knowledge included support for the cultural transmission activities in community cultural centers, the compilation and production of media on indigenous health care and knowledge of medicinal herbs, and organising trainings on the use of VITEK (index on the vitality of traditional ecological knowledge), an innovative methodology to measure the vitality of traditional ecological knowledge.

Outputs: traditional knowledge and practices of Karen and Hmong has been actively transmitted and applied.

Means of verification: IMPECT reporting on cultural transmission activities, visual outcomes such as signs and placards in the communities, meeting reports.

### **Suriname**

Bilingual and intercultural education was promoted in the villages by sharing information and organising discussions with organisations such as the women's organisations. The bilingual math book that was developed under the project is being used in various indigenous schools and the responses are extremely enthusiastic, and the math results of the pupils are improving. KLIM has also distributed poetry books among primary schools in the villages. The poems are written in Dutch as well as in Kaliña. In Marowijne, these education activities fit within the broader project to revive and transmit traditional knowledge and language. One of the goals is to get this new method included in the national maths curriculum. The project has established good contacts with the Ministry of Education. To make intercultural bilingual education a formal part of the national school system, the laws will have to be changed, but the Ministry and the inspection have said they support the initiative.

Outputs: a start has been made with education in indigenous language and culture and a productive relationship with the Ministry of Education has been established.

Means of verification: Kaliña math book; feedback from the teachers about results and enthusiasm.

#### **Indonesia:**

Last year we reported that the indigenous people of Kampong Sanjan had started to carry out research to document the sustainable management of natural resources in their customary forest (Tomawankng Ompu' Sanjan). In 2011 that effort produced the publication of a book on natural resources management based on Sanjan people's local knowledge (available in Bahasa Indonesia and English).

Outputs: a book on natural resources management based on Sanjan people's local knowledge has been published.

Means of verification: book.

### **Activity 3: Developing plans / proposals for community-based management and/or effective co-management (outputs 2,3)**

Community management is important in relation to access and use of resources that indigenous peoples and local communities customarily use. Under this project element, the partners are developing their own resource management plans, or work towards more equitable co-management (with the state or other sectors), and/or are setting up initiatives that can contribute to improved sustainable livelihoods.

#### **Guyana**

In Activity 1 we have described the preparation for the launching of the Wapichan's map and territorial management plan. All this needed a lot of consultation, checking and discussing. The team also made one last long fieldtrip in October to collect additional photographs for the management plan and general use during the launch. In order to prepare for the official presentation and launch of the plan, a lot of organising needed to happen, such as invitations, contacting media and preparing media briefings, press releases and brochures, presentations had to be prepared, and of course the final plan and map needed to be printed.

The detailed territorial plan is titled "*Thinking Together for Those Coming Behind Us*"; it elaborates the customary laws for caring for the land and contains a large number of community agreements to secure community land rights, safeguard and sustainably use valuable livelihood resources and conserve important cultural heritage and wildlife sites under community controlled reserves. The land use agreements in the plan have been validated by all communities and include a proposal to establish a large 1.4 million ha Wapichan Conserved Forest in the eastern and southern parts of the territory as well as numerous plans to protect the sacred sites and local sites important for fish, game animals and wildlife. The plan also contains agreements made among villages on common title boundaries and proposed title extensions. Community rules and principles for dealing with external developments affecting the lands, including rules relating to collective right to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), are also included in the document. The press release and further information about the launch that took place on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2012 are available at <http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/participatory-resource-mapping/news/2012/02/scpda-press-release-wapichan-people-guyana-showca>. The launching was reported by a large number of printed and online media (63 + many social media sites - list available on request). A copy of the summary version of the territorial management plan is available at <http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/customary-sustainable-use/publication/2012/wapichan-people-guyana-make-community-based-agreem>.

Outputs: detailed community map of the Wapichan territory and territorial management plan were finalized. They were launched at a public event in the capital city George Town on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2012.

Means of verification: community map of the Wapichan territory (note: an internal community decision on how widely accessible the map should be has not yet been taken so at the moment it is not publicly available) and territorial management plan, media coverage.

## **Suriname**

The second round of the land management plan workshops took place between 13 and 27 November in each of the 8 villages that are part of the project. Men, women and youth participated in all villages, between 25 and 45 per workshop. People underlined the importance of the process and commended KLIM for the work being done. The Wane Creek management plan is planned for August/September 2012 during the dry season.

As there were some new participants, the land management plan was explained again and new SWOT analyses were done to get a better view of strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the area and the communities. The absence of good governance (strong council or village structure) is seen as an important obstacle in several villages. As a consequence of the workshops, some village councils have been critically addressed by the villagers, and at the same time people are increasingly taking initiatives to revive certain village organisations or establish new ones.

Outputs: a good basis has been established to start work on developing a land management plan in the next project period.

Means of verification: a management plan working group has been established and gained capacity (training reports, materials and evaluations available (in Dutch)); work plan for 2012 and strategy to involve all layers of communities agreed on.

## **Bangladesh**

Developing and up scaling of the 'community mangrove aqua-silvi-culture' (CMAS culture), using mangrove species to supplement traditional resource users' income and reduce their dependency on the Sundarbans' resources remains a central component of the project. As a result, many local resource users have started practicing CMAS culture in their water-logged fallow land and increased their incomes already. The research a cost-benefit analysis of this model is still ongoing. Another activity directed at augmenting community livelihoods has been the setting up of a local outlet in Koyra Bazar to sell honey collected by one of the cooperatives' members.

Outputs: community mangrove aqua-silvi-culture has started to be practiced in several villages, leading to improved livelihoods and reduced dependency on Sundarbans resources.

Means of verification: research data and notes, Unnayan Onneshan updates and reports.

### ***Activity 4: Community-based biodiversity monitoring (CBBM) training and activities (outputs 1, 3)***

Community-based biodiversity monitoring refers to activities of the communities that make use of traditional knowledge of the ecosystems to document status and trends in biodiversity and the related links with the livelihoods of community members.

## **Bangladesh**

### Biodiversity monitoring

Biodiversity monitoring was a key activity in the Sundarbans that carried on from the previous year. Three community monitoring groups were formed comprising experienced traditional resource users (fishers and forest resource users). A set of local indicators for biodiversity monitoring was developed during the year. The groups have continually monitored the status of biodiversity and kept records of its changes (also digitally- through the cooperatives). This information has helped the communities to be better informed about the status of the biodiversity in the area and to take better informed actions to conserve valuable biodiversity spots and species.

### Vulnerability mapping

Three trainings were conducted in project areas concerning communities' vulnerability to climate change. Traditional resource users followed training on vulnerability mapping and participatory research on vulnerabilities to disasters and associated livelihood insecurity, to prepare their own vulnerability maps.

### Research on local adaptation to climate change

The documentation of local best practices in climate change adaptation has also continued and has contributed to increased understanding of available community adaptation options and practices and in identifying the best alternatives. The impact of climate change is a reality in the Sundarbans area. Current indications are that floods and cyclones will become more frequent and become more severe, and that they will also start to occur outside of their “normal seasons”. The study carried out in 2011 investigated the community based adaptation approaches and listed their main features, limitations and opportunities. Two adaptive approaches were particularly studied and documented in-depth: sunflower and crab cultivation, both activities that have been spontaneously developed by the traditional forest users who are noticing the gradual decrease of forest coverage and resources due to climate change and other anthropogenic interventions. In total the study has documented 47 adaptation practices that respond to livelihood and water scarcity and structural scarcity, and created resiliency to tropical cyclones, storm surges and salinity intrusion.

### Research on community ‘aqua-silvi-culture’

The project has also continued the research related to the promotion of locally practiced ‘community mangrove aqua-silvi-culture’ (CMAS culture) which is another community-based adaptation tool and an alternative to conventional shrimp cultivation. Communities affected by natural disasters in coastal areas in Khulna, Satkhira and Bagerhat districts, have attempted to cultivate mangrove species in swampy lands with brackish water that are affected by increased salinity and have become unproductive for food crop production. In this newly developed practice, fish is grown together with mangrove species; therefore the practice has been termed ‘community mangrove aqua-silvi-culture (CMAS)’. This is an entirely new practice in Bangladesh and the project has been the first to conduct an in-depth study about it. The research has documented the cultivation method and associated management practices in detail and developed a ‘model’ to be used as a guide by those interested in practicing it. The research also explored the system’s effectiveness through analysis of all costs and benefits and social and environmental effects and also compared these with the commercial shrimp cultivation culture. The cost-benefit ratio of the CMAS culture was found to be 1:13, which means that it is very profitable. Moreover the CMAS culture’s net benefits appeared to be higher than conventional commercial shrimp cultivation, which has been blamed for severe social and environmental impacts.

### ‘The economics of the Sundarbans’

Inspired by the UN project on ‘the economics of ecosystem and biodiversity (TEEB)’, Unnayan Onneshan has also carried out research on ‘the economics of the Sundarbans’ which intends to lead to enhanced understanding of the contribution of the Sundarbans towards local livelihoods as well as towards the local and national economy. The research has generated some interesting findings, which are available on request.

Outputs: status of fish species has been determined, and vulnerable zones identified and mapped by traditional resource users, which underlined the value of local TK and increased understanding among government departments. Community-based adaptation to climate change is now taken seriously by communities and adaptation techniques are being researched and practiced, including community aqua-silvi-culture. The economics of the Sundarbans research is producing valuable information.

Means of verification: report with fish monitoring outcome; vulnerability maps (photos and details of each mapping workshop available); data on potential adaptation methodologies; data on the economics of the Sundarbans.

### **Suriname**

In October 2011 the second round of interviews was carried out related to the research on climate change impacts and consequences that was started earlier in Galibi. The research has been carried out among various groups: hunters, fishers, men and women who practice agriculture, people who are knowledgeable about birds, people who know the forest very well, elders (to ask about changes in relation to the past), and also shamans and other key figures in the villages. In total 36 people were interviewed. The report is still being compiled at the moment, but already a few interesting common issues came up. The first one is related to the dry and rainy seasons. A common observation is that the seasons seem to be ‘completely disrupted’. As a consequence, people can no longer assess when it is the best time to open up new agricultural plots. This should happen in the dry season, but there is a lot of rain in that season at the moment. People also observed the increased heat and strength of the sun. People are worried about this (in relation to their health as well). FPP and KLIM hope that we can use the information to make a publication that can be shared nationally and internationally. As was recommended earlier, everyone feels the research should be expanded to the whole territory. This will be started in 2012. It was also recommended to KLIM to do more information sharing and awareness raising about climate change in the indigenous villages as many people do not know about it.

Outputs: a start has been made with research on climate change impacts and responses.

Means of verification: notes from initial interviews.

### **Panama**

Several field trips were done that were part of the tours along several communities (see activity 1). These included visits to rivers and forest areas. Particular attention was paid to climate change impacts. In all communities visited during the tour, impacts were visible. Crops, houses and infrastructure were damaged by climate impacts in various zones. Interviews revealed that weather events are getting stronger and more frequent, and more difficult to predict. Seasons are changing and affecting the planting and cultivation. Last year there were exceptionally cold periods, causing heavy rains and overflowing rivers. The planting areas were covered in a layer of stone, mud and water. Farms in areas near the river were devastated. Most affected crops were main crops like banana, corn, coffee and cocoa. Most affected areas were river banks and areas close to the mountains. Changes were also observed in the river systems, including erosion, changes in direction, and huge amounts of sediments. During the second part of the period there was a bigger focus on the strengthening and analysis of crops and species of cultural importance, and the role of traditional knowledge, customary practices in relation to resilience to climate change. Other topics were addressed such as: the relation between article 10(c) (customary use), traditional knowledge and environmental management, traditional crops and sacred sites/protected areas/ICCAs (indigenous and community conserved areas).

The project team followed up on the work carried out on REDD-related issues during the first semester, and conducted a study on the status of forest management models and REDD. It analyses what REDD+ means and identifies and discusses several questions related to indigenous peoples' issues (at national and local level). The study was carried out in the Guna Yala district and presents a few guidelines for the analysis of REDD+ and its possible application in the Guna Yala district; it looked into possible community-level plans on forest management and REDD+. This information will be incorporated in a manual on forest management, traditional knowledge and REDD+ that FPCI plans to publish in 2012.

Outputs: extensive data collected and maps produced on climate change impacts on Guna territory and people. Data collected on the potential implications of REDD in the Guna territory and potential community-based activities on REDD.

Means of verification: interview notes and other research data, maps of vulnerable ecosystems, inventory of flora and fauna in vulnerable ecosystems.

### **Thailand**

The research on knowledge about biodiversity resource management of indigenous people continued; a more in-depth study in the Mae Ya-Mae Pon watershed, complementary to the earlier 10c study, was carried out. Community-based monitoring of biodiversity also continued. An ongoing activity throughout the year has been to promote and support community natural resource and biodiversity management initiatives, such as in the aquatic biodiversity conservation area in Khun Pae and Huoy Puu Ling. Collection of additional information on herbal medicine and health care system of the Karen people was done in the Maepon watershed area. Since July 2011 the project has also focused on the promotion of the use of alternative energy in the communities and alternative occupations (community enterprises & sustainable livelihood initiatives). At the community level, the women network facilitated trainings on product creation (weaving and craft). The project also continued to demarcate and map agricultural land and community forest boundaries in relation to Doi Inthanon National Park.

Outputs: aquatic biodiversity conservation areas supported; data on herbal medicine and health collected; alternative energy sources and community livelihoods promoted.

Means of verification: photos, reports.

**Activity 5: Advocacy: promote policy, legal and institutional reforms for an effective implementation of Article 10(c) (meetings, presentations and workshops with/for governments and other involved parties) (outputs 1,2,3,4)**

**Thailand**

IMPECT runs a continuous media campaign related to natural resource management and indigenous peoples. They have facilitated training on the rights of indigenous peoples and the CBD for 'outsiders' and in particular in the second half of 2012 lobbied with the government regarding government policies and local administrative in relation to community rights and biodiversity management and policy making. Among other activities:

- Two meetings were held at IMPECT's office with the Directors of the Government's Office of Biodiversity and Office of Policy, Planning and Natural Resources and Environment.
- A 2-day meeting with the staff members of International Union for Conservation of Nature - Thailand (IUCN) and the Office of Policy, Planning and Natural Resources and Environment was held to discuss on the future directions in relation to working with indigenous peoples on biodiversity matters in Thailand.
- Meetings were also held with the sub-committee on the revival of Karen livelihoods, to discuss how to push forward the implementation of the Cabinet Resolution on Karen livelihoods (see previous reports).
- A pilot case of the Whakatane Mechanism, a process developed with IUCN to promote best practices in relation to protected areas and indigenous peoples and to address problematic cases (<http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/environmental-governance/international-processes/whakatane-mechanism>), was carried out by IMPECT in collaboration with IUCN Thailand and the Department of National Parks in January-February 2012. This is carried out through a separate FPP project but it is directly relevant to this project.

Outputs: relationship with officers at new municipal government offices has been further strengthened and discussions about customary use and national parks have proceeded positively. Productive relationships have also been established with the CBD focal point and IUCN.

Means of verification: meeting reports with CBD focal point, IUCN and local government agencies.

**Bangladesh**

Two formal dialogues between local government officials and traditional resource users were arranged. During these meetings traditional resource users stated their problems regarding resource collection and demanded a permanent permit to enter into forest to harvest resources sustainably.

One of the projects' research assistants participated in the first forestry congress 2011 which was organized by Bangladesh Forest Department. The congress aimed at bringing together all stakeholders involved in collaborative forest management including community based conservation of forests, in order to identify lessons learned, strengths and weaknesses, and with the goal to develop effective mechanisms for conservation of the forest. The national and international participants stressed that involvement of the traditional forest users should get the highest priority and that giving them incentives for better forest and forest resources management should be seriously taken into account. The knowledge and experience gathered at the forestry congress was later disseminated by the project team among the cooperatives members.

On International Indigenous Day 2011(9<sup>th</sup> August), the Indigenous Munda cooperative organised a one-day programme that was attended by a member of parliament. In addition to cultural ceremonies, discussions were held on the importance of conservation and of plantation of mangrove tree species for maintaining the coastal ecological balance, mitigation of climate change impact and livelihood provisions. Speakers and participants agreed that preservation of customary sustainable practices and use of the mangrove resources is vital for both maintenance of the cultural heritage as well as for ensuring sustainability in the Sundarbans.

On the occasion of International Cooperative Day (on the first Saturday in July) the Harinagar forest peoples' cooperative organized a discussion meeting and one day workshop on co-operative management which was attended by a local government officer who affirmed that he is very open to help the forest people from government side and appreciates their cooperative action.

Outputs: the relationship between forest peoples and government agencies at various levels has greatly improved and collaborative actions are being explored.

Means of verification: Unnayan Onneshan's reports and updates from staff.

## Guyana

On 7 February 2012, more than 50 people attended a public event held at the Umana Yana (traditional meeting house) in the capital of Guyana (Georgetown), where leaders of the Wapichan people presented a community map of their traditional lands alongside a community plan for caring for the natural resources within their territory (see <http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/participatory-resource-mapping/news/2012/02/wapichan-people-guyana-present-territorial-map-an>). In presentations made by the Wapichan communities' Tosaos (leaders) and local organisation, SCPDA, participants heard about the origins of this work and how the map and plan were developed. They also learned about key proposals in the territorial plan and the next steps for its implementation. During an open question and answer session, participants, including government officials, members of parliament, NGOs, international organisations and representatives of the media, congratulated the Wapichan communities on the results of all their hard work over the past decade. Several participants shared their view that the Wapichan land use planning and mapping work has the potential to become a model for other indigenous peoples throughout Guyana and in other countries. At the close of the meeting, Toshao Gomes said that sharing the experience with other indigenous peoples in Guyana and elsewhere is a key part of planned follow up work. In discussing next steps for implementing the territorial plan, he added: *One stage of our task has been completed, but now the work is just beginning. The challenge ahead is to put our plan to work. We wish to work together with government and other allies and friends to have our rights recognised, to finally secure our full land title extensions and to help us realise our vision for Wapichan territory. Let us work to make our plans like our proposal for the Wapichan Conserved Forest come to life.*

After the launch in February a number of meetings have been held between the Wapichan and relevant government agencies to discuss next steps. Although the launching event went well, it is unclear as to whether will recognise and support the demands of the communities.

Outputs: various ministries and government commissions and conservation organisations have been presented with the Wapichan's community mapping, territorial management plan and the communities' aspirations.

Means of verification: meeting reports, media articles and updates from project staff.

## Indonesia

Negotiation with the administration of *Sanggau* District for the recognition of Sanggau customary territory has been ongoing since June 2011. During the second part of 2011 and beginning of 2012 the representatives of the communities participated in a number of meetings, including:

- Separate meetings with the Office of *Sanggau* District Head, the National Land Agency (*Badan Pertanahan Nasional* – BPN), the Law Bureau of *Sanggau* Regional Administration, and the Forestry Office of *Sanggau* District.
- with the Regional Administration of *Sanggau* District to deliver the findings of the assessment on the Participatory Land Use Planning in West Kalimantan (this included international participants such as the universities of Amsterdam, Leiden, Wageningen and Vrij)
- AMAN's MoU with the Central BPN (National Land Agency) at the Office Head of National Land Agency of *Sanggau* and at the National Land Agency of West Kalimantan Province Region.
- With the Office Head of National Land Agency of *Sanggau* to discuss government's support to the mapping on *Sanjan* Hamlet's customary territory.

Outputs: Sanggau District and Regional administration officials have listened to concerns and questions from community in Kampong Sanjan and promised to produce a decree on customary forest as soon as the data on the community forest are completed and submitted.

Means of verification: reports of the meetings.

## Suriname

### National land rights conference

Our partners KLIM and VIDS invested a lot of time preparing for and discussing the national land rights conference, organised by the government on 21-22 October to "solve the land rights problem" in Suriname. National association VIDS and Maroon (tribal) organisations prepared positions for the conference, presenting a joint view and vision on the issue. Unfortunately the conference ended in a disillusion. The president called on all participants to speak freely, but when village leader Lewis from Apoera made a speech on behalf of the VIDS and all Maroon organisations, who had united and presented a joint plan with their desired outcome of the conference (referring to international obligations and the Sarakama judgement), the president decided to end the conference and send everybody home. He felt that the Indigenous and Maroon demands and the government's own proposal for a 'Surinamese

solution to the land rights issue' were too far apart and discussion would be a waste of time. Although our partners in Suriname are very disappointed by the President's attitude everyone was proud of the way in which all 'peoples of the interior' have united and shared their view on the minimum standards that are needed in Suriname. FPP has supported VIDS to create international awareness by posting news on our website and including a lead article on it in our Enews.

Outputs: The 'people of the interior' of Suriname developed a joint common position on the land rights of indigenous and Maroon communities based on agreed international and regional standards. This was seen as a positive aspect even though the government reneged on its pre-election commitments and rejected the people's proposals.

Means of verification: report about the conference.

### **Activity 6: Raising public awareness, both nationally and internationally, of these efforts and outcomes (outputs 1,2,3,4)**

#### **Thailand**

IMPECT organised the following public awareness activities:

- Earth Day celebration on 22<sup>nd</sup> of April at the Central Shopping Center in Chiang Mai and the World Environment Day in Kalayaniwatthana district.
- an exhibition on highland resources management at Inthanon National Park;
- an Indigenous Food Festival in Chiang Mai.

Outputs: wider awareness raised about 10(c) and biodiversity issues in Thailand.

Means of verification: posters, brochures, videos, info briefs.

#### **Bangladesh**

Two digital resource centres were established in Koyra and Uttar Bedkahi on Sundarbans issues which are publicly accessible (computers equipped with e-books, information on Sundarbans, documentary films on customary sustainable use will be provided to each co-operative centre).

Unnayan Onneshan published a book on the initial experiences with co-management of the Sundarbans through the cooperatives and the results of the ParMoRec study (about the identification of the forest users, see last year's report).

A documentary film was also produced on the Sundarbans, focussing on the traditional resource users who depend on the Sundarbans for their livelihoods, and on their collective action for sustainable development in the Sundarbans. The 40-minute documentary shows the various challenges and options relating to the forest management and depicts the process of developing solidarity among the traditional resource users in terms of establishing the community cooperatives and collective decision making.

To create more public awareness and generate public support for sustainable management of the Sundarbans, the project has used the media a lot - both in printed and electronic forms. More than a dozen articles have been written related to the project. The articles were published in the leading English dailies of Bangladesh including The Daily Star, Daily Sun, and The New Age, among which the following:

- Forest Biodiversity: our common future, *New Age* (January 2)
- Save forest biodiversity, save the world, *Daily Sun* (May 23)
- Evaluating the services of the Sundarbans, *The Daily Star* (July 2)
- Aila impact: people suffering endlessly (part I), *Daily Sun* (July 22)
- Aila impact: people suffering endlessly (part II), *Daily Sun* (July 23)
- Aila impact still lingers on people and environments, *The Daily Star* (August 13).
- One article on the occasion of World Environment Day <http://newagebd.com/newspaper1/oped/20605.html> and one on the occasion of World Biodiversity Day <http://www.thedailystar.net/newDesign/news-details.php?nid=192409>

Outputs: wider awareness raised about 10(c) and biodiversity issues in Bangladesh; several articles, a book and a video produced.

Means of verification: articles, book and video.



## **Panama,**

As in previous years, FPCI broadcasted a radio programme to disseminate information related to the project. Themes like customary sustainable use, forest, lands, territories and traditional knowledge are analysed in the programme and are explained in simple and clear terms. In 2012, FPCI wants to record and quantify the number of listeners and make the show even more interactive and dynamic.

A biological inventory of the flora and fauna of the coastal marine systems in Guna Yala which describes some of the most common species in the Guna coastline was published. It contains pictures of the species and simple explanations of the customary use of these species.

As was described above, a video was made about climate change in Guna Yala (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MgKceWMhmes>) and another one on Nabire Guede Gudi (Guna worldview and way of interacting with Mother Nature).

The publication 'Indigenous Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Equitable benefit-sharing' has been a success, the first edition is already 'sold out'- it was distributed in the Guna General Congress. FPCI is planning to print a second edition and hold more workshops to explain and clarify the publication.

Outputs: wider awareness raised about 10(c) and biodiversity issues in Panama through radio programmes, publications and videos.

Means of verification: radio show, videos, publication.

## **Joint**

### Enewsletter

We have regularly posted news items and information on upcoming events related to the FPBP and partners' work on our website. The FPP Enewsletter (sent out every 3 months to a large and diverse audience of over 5000 policymakers, NGO people, academics, indigenous organisations and other interested people) also contained several articles related to the FPBP. Some of them focused on local-level items or news from one of our partners, others looked forward to, or back on, international events that we have attended.

- In June 2011 FPP produced an E-Newsletter Special Edition on Gender, which was distributed to all Enews readers and available online and as pdf file and distributed in hard copies as well. One of the articles focussed on the gender dimensions of indigenous peoples' customary use of biodiversity, which was based on the 10c studies, with case studies from Guyana and Thailand. See <http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/customary-sustainable-use/news/2011/06/gender-dimensions-indigenous-peoples-customary-use-bio>
- In the October 2011 Enewsletter we looked forward to the CBD WG8(j) meeting in November: <http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/convention-biological-diversity-cbd/news/2011/10/upcoming-convention-biological-diversity-mee>
- In the December 2011 Enews, our partners from Suriname (VIDS) published an article on the failure of the national land rights conference: <http://www.forestpeoples.org/region/suriname/news/2011/12/president-suriname-shuts-down-land-rights-conference-following-clear-de> and we reported back on the CBD WG8(j)-7 meeting, in particular the development of the new Action Plan on customary sustainable use: <http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/environmental-governance/news/2011/12/cbd-working-group-agrees-development-new-plan-action-cu>

### Updated 10(c) synthesis report and information pack on customary sustainable use

The 10(c) synthesis report, summarising the country case studies on customary sustainable use and focussing on common aspects in all countries (including threats and proposed solutions, and community initiatives) is continuously evolving and being revised and updated. In preparation for CBD WG8(j)-7, a new version was made and printed and widely distributed at the conference venue and at the side event, in a special information pack containing the 10c synthesis, a flyer about our side event and a glossy sheet with web links to all the country 10c case studies.

### Case study on Article 10(c) as a major component of the Programme of Work on Article 8(j) and related provisions of the CBD

In preparation for the WG8(j) meeting, the IIFB prepared several case studies on important topics to be discussed at the meeting, to help inform indigenous participants and facilitate preparations on the various agenda items. FPP was asked to develop a case study on the development of the new major component

on article 10(c) in the revised Programme of Work on Article 8(j). Our case study provided a summary of the 10c synthesis report, introduced the meeting documents on 10c (WG8j/7/5 and WG8j/7/5/Add1) and their backgrounds, and provided comments and recommendations on the content of the meeting documents. An abstract of this case study was also published in the ECO newsletter of the CBD Alliance, ECO 38(1): <http://www.cbdalliance.org/wg7-8j/>

#### Updating of a guide on Indigenous Peoples in the CBD

FPP updated the old “guide on indigenous peoples in the CBD”, which was originally developed in 2006. We hired an intern who helped us to make this guide completely up-to-date. It is now in draft form and contains all COP9 and COP10 decisions that are relevant for indigenous peoples, organised per topic, with all references and key terms. The draft guide was shared with IIFB in Montreal during the WG8(j) meeting and was met with great enthusiasm and support. It was agreed that the guide will be finalised and published and disseminated as an IIFB publication for use at COP11 in 2012.

#### Other publications

FPP and partners published an article in the Square Brackets Issue 5 (June 2011) on the new focus on customary sustainable use in the CBD: <http://www.cbd.int/ngo/square-brackets/square-brackets-2011-06-en.pdf>

Outputs: wider awareness raised about 10(c) issues in general and joint 10(c) project.

Means of verification: see articles, reports and other media mentioned above (including links).

### ***Activity 7: Linking project activities and outputs to international processes on 10(c) (outputs 1,2,3,4)***

#### **Joint**

FPP, in collaboration with the Red Mujeres Indigenas sobre la Biodiversidad (Indigenous Women and Biodiversity Network) and all the partners involved in this project, submitted a contribution to the CBD Secretariat (SCBD) on 14<sup>th</sup> April in response to the notification on the Programme of Work on Article 8(j) and related provisions - Request for contributions from Parties and stakeholders. The submission was incorporated in the documents prepared by the SCBD for the International Meeting on 10(c).

#### ***International expert meeting on 10(c):***

The International meeting on Article 10 with a focus on Article 10(c) was held in Montreal from 29<sup>th</sup> May to 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2011. This meeting was organised by the CBD secretariat in response to a request by CBD COP10 (October 2010) to organise such a meeting with the objective to provide ‘advice of possible content and implementation of a major new component of work on article 10 with a focus on 10(c)’. The meeting also addressed indicators for traditional knowledge, including refining and operationalising the indicators adopted by COP7 and COP10 and discussion on possible indicators for customary sustainable use and a process to take the matter forward.

FPP participated at the meeting together with the so-called ‘10c team’, which was given ample space to present the work so far carried out on the implementation of Article 10(c). We had a major presentation at the end of the first day (31 May), one focused on providing recommendations at the beginning of the second day (1 June) and one on customary sustainable use indicators on the 3<sup>rd</sup> day (2 June). The first presentation, entitled ‘Implementing 10(c): initiatives and experiences from indigenous peoples and local communities’ included:

- Introduction of project (methodology, communities, locations etc)
- Customary sustainable use practices, rules, laws, spiritual beliefs and relevance to conservation and sustainable use
- Sundarbans’ video on customary resource use
- Key issues and obstacles to implementation of 10(c)
- Recommendations to overcome obstacles
- Community initiatives, local experiences and lessons learned in implementation of 10(c) (including community mapping, Cameroon video on community monitoring of illegal logging, etc).

The presentation lasted for nearly two hours. The response from the participants was good and encouraging: we were told that the presentation was very well organised and the interest level was kept high due to the combination of slides, videos and alternation of presenters. Some participants remarked to us about the good quality of community mapping and the videos as well as the issues and recommendations covered in the presentation.

The second one was entitled 'Linking local initiatives and experiences to the new major component of work on customary sustainable use' and focused on concrete suggestions and recommendations related to the expected main outcomes from the meeting, which were:

- a. Guidance on sustainable use and incentives for indigenous peoples and local communities
- b. Measures to increase the engagement of indigenous and local communities and governments at national and local level in the implementation of Article 10
- c. Strategy to integrate Article 10, with a focus on 10(c), as a cross-cutting issue into the Convention's various programmes of work and thematic areas, beginning with the programme of work on protected areas.
- d. Possible tasks for a new component on 10(c) in the Programme of Work on 8j and Related provisions

This presentation was quite different from the previous one as it was just text with many recommendations to be considered by the meeting. Several of these recommendations were discussed in small working groups during the second day of the meeting and were incorporated into the recommendations produced by the meeting.

The meeting report (with the recommendations to WG8j-7) contained a number of useful paragraphs (available on request) concerning the recognition of, and support for, customary sustainable use, customary law and institutions. We made an effort to link customary sustainable use to land and resource rights and to human rights. The meeting report also contains paragraphs concerning the development of a strategy to integrate 10(c) into the convention's various programmes of work and thematic areas, starting with the programme of work on protected areas (POWPA). The text was then further negotiated at WG8j-7 in October/November 2011, and then transmitted to COP11 (October 2012).

Day 3 of the meeting focused on indicators. In first session, Joji Cariño (Tebtebba) presented the work of the IIFB Working Group on Indicators and work being conducted on the three indicators related to TK so far adopted by the COP:

- Status and trends of linguistic diversity and numbers of speakers of indigenous languages
- Status and trends in land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities;
- Status and trends in the practice of traditional occupations;

This was complemented by a presentation by UNESCO on the language indicator and by FAO on indicators relevant for land-use patterns. In the second session, Maurizio presented the preliminary work that was done on customary sustainable use in 2006 and 2008. The CBD secretariat and the meeting agreed that those outcomes could serve as a basis to proceed with further technical work on customary sustainable use indicators.

In conclusion, we feel that the work done on 10(c) during the past years, along with our thorough preparations, is bearing fruits. The text that was transmitted to the WG8j-7 contained a lot of recommendations that were developed by our partners through their work at the local level, so there is a strong linkage between reality on the ground and international policy. It also contains strong linkages between biodiversity and community rights and livelihoods. The challenge will be to get it adopted at COP11.

#### ***Bush Meat meeting in Nairobi:***

At SBSTTA-14 and COP10 the draft Decision on sustainable use contained an annex with recommendations on 'sustainable bush meat', developed by a conservation-dominated group of NGOs called the bush meat liaison group. Their recommendations were developed without consultation with and input from IP representatives. The recommendations did not recognise customary sustainable use of wild game and did not sufficiently differentiate between poaching and sustainable hunting for self-sufficiency and could have great adverse impacts on the livelihoods of indigenous hunters and gatherers. After various confrontations between indigenous peoples and local communities and the bush meat group, the latter announced to 'make it up' and to organise a meeting, with indigenous peoples, in Kenya in 2011 to revise the recommendations. This happened during a Joint meeting of the CBD Bushmeat Liaison Group and the CITES Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group, 6-10 June 2011, Nairobi, Kenya

On behalf of the 10(c) team, Messe Venant from Cameroon and Louis Biswane from Suriname attended the meeting. They managed to address all the concerns, which were almost completely adopted by the end of the meeting. These included that:

- IPs need to be fully involved in the development of solutions to the so-called bush meat crisis.
- The impact of harvesting of bush meat on the sustainable livelihoods of IPs must be considered as well, not only impacts on biodiversity.
- The meeting had a focus on finding alternatives (alternative income) for bush meat and it was stressed that alternatives must be culturally appropriate and the top-down imposition of income

productive alternative must be avoided – support for community-based initiatives was proposed instead.

- The underlying causes of the bush meat crisis such as construction of roads which allow illegal hunters to enter the lands must also be addressed.
- When protected areas or wildlife reserves are proposed, this must happen with the FPIC of IPs and with their full and effective participation.

The recommendations adopted by the Nairobi meeting were then further negotiated and discussed at the SBSTTA-15 meeting in Montreal in November 2011 and will be adopted by COP11 in 2012.

### **CBD WG8(j)-7**

The main meeting during the second half of 2011 was the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Working Group on Article 8(j) and Related Provisions (WG8(j)-7), which took place in Montreal from 31<sup>st</sup> October to 4<sup>th</sup> November. The most important goal was to engage in the discussions/negotiations on the 'new major component on customary sustainable use' in the Programme of Work on Article 8(j). FPP and partners participated in the internal preparation meeting of the IIFB and the FPP 10c network was appointed to "take the lead" on this agenda item in the IIFB.

#### Main outcomes on 10c:

- Parties felt that more time was needed to discuss the new work component on 10c. It was agreed that a "Plan of Action on customary sustainable use" is going to be developed and a set of 'indicative tasks' was proposed which will guide the development of the Plan of Action. The Executive Secretary will develop the draft Plan of Action based on views that will be submitted by Parties and others in 2012, and the next (= eighth) Working Group on Article 8(j) will review the draft Plan of Action, to be adopted by COP12. Although this means the process will take a bit longer, it will provide us with more time and opportunities to provide well-considered input into the development of the action plan.
- In general, the final recommendation of the Working Group contains several important elements that are relevant to protect and encourage customary sustainable use. The Working Group widely acknowledged the value and importance of customary sustainable use and traditional knowledge in conserving and upholding biodiversity, land- and seascapes, and also protected areas. This is also reflected in the invitation to Parties to address and incorporate CSU and CSU policies in their national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs). The WG has also taken some first steps to integrate 10(c) as a cross-cutting issue throughout the Convention, starting with the programme on protected areas. Specific tasks were formulated to:
  - promote community-based resource management and governance;
  - establish mechanisms to promote CSU that take customary laws, rules, procedures and protocols and the role of traditional authorities into consideration;
  - support community-based initiatives that contribute to the implementation of Article 10(c) and enhance customary sustainable use.

We managed to insert two completely new tasks: one on gender dimensions of customary sustainable use and the other one focuses on the relation between climate change and customary sustainable use.

#### Challenges

Some tasks/issues still provide a challenge and will require further discussion – for instance the tasks dealing with legislation and rights in relation to indigenous peoples' lands, waters, and resources. While the FPP team repeatedly explained that secure rights to lands, waters and resources are fundamental to maintain and carry out customary sustainable practices in indigenous territories, some Parties found these guidelines too 'prescriptive'. The issue will have to be resolved at COP11 in 2012 in India.

#### FPIC and indigenous peoples and local communities

There were continuous debates in the plenary (in relation to various agenda items) about the CBD terminology on 'indigenous peoples and local communities' and FPIC. Parties requested consistency with "accepted CBD language". For IIFB, this was a very hot issue. The UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (PFII) had also made recommendations to the CBD to update the used terminology and use 'indigenous peoples and local communities'. In their opening statement, IIFB addressed the importance of this as well. Despite these efforts the Parties decided to stick to "Indigenous and Local communities" which is now used throughout all L-documents of the meeting, and also agreed on the use of the Nagoya Protocol language: "Prior informed consent or approval and involvement."

### **Side event**

FPP and partners organized a side event on the new major component of work on customary sustainable use in collaboration with the Secretariat in which we linked the key issues and local experiences as documented in the 10c case studies to the proposed new work plan and tasks on customary sustainable use and provided explanations and recommendations. The side event was attended by ca 50 people and during the discussions the audience expressed to be very interested by and inspired in the work done by the team, in particular the community mapping. In general the audience supported the recommendations and identified missing issues by the team. Natural Justice who attended our side event wrote about our side event on their blog spot: <http://natural-justice.blogspot.com/2011/10/forest-peoples-experiences-with.html>

### **In-depth dialogue on ecosystems management, services, and protected areas**

At COP10 it had been decided that each meeting of the WG8(j) should have an in-depth dialogue on a thematic area or cross-cutting issue, an official aspect of the 8(j) meeting in the plenary. For the first in-depth dialogue, the theme "Ecosystem management, ecosystem services and protected areas" had been selected. The envisaged outcome would serve as 'guidance' for Parties to keep in mind when working on this thematic issue. The Secretariat had put together a regionally balanced panel to kick off the discussions, consisting of 4 Parties and 4 ILCs representatives. It was very fortunate that four FPBP partners (Baten, Sakda, Kid and Onel) were selected to be on the panel and present their experiences. It gave our team the opportunity to present our work in the full plenary, thereby reaching many delegates that never attend our side events. Kid, Baten, Sakda and Onel all did very well and had great presentations that impressed the audience and inspired other indigenous participants.

### **Inputs in other processes:**

In May 2011, we provided input to Tebtebba that was invited to write a contribution on Traditional Knowledge for UNEP's GEO5, to be launched at Rio+20. In our contribution, we explained in brief what customary sustainable use is and what role it plays in the CBD; what obstacles indigenous peoples face at local/national level in terms of implementation, and what kind of initiatives they are setting up to support the process from the community level (such as the 10c studies, mapping, developing land management plans).

FPP provided advice and comments to the Swiss Ministry of Environment related to the first bracketed draft of the FAO voluntary guidelines on the responsible governance of tenure of lands, fisheries and forests (July 2011)

FPP also wrote a submission with input and comments in response to the consultation on the draft IUCN Programme for 2013-2016 (October 2011).

FPP participated in the negotiations concerning the rationale and indicators related to the Targets of the CBD 2011-2010 Strategic Plan at the 15<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the CBD SBSTTA, Montreal, November 2011. This work was carried out in collaboration with IIFB and TEBTEBBA.

FPP also submitted comments on the revised IPBES work programme, available online at <http://www.ipbes.net/plenary-sessions/intersessional-process/172-comments-on-the-revised-work-programme-of-ipbes.html>

Furthermore, FPP is on the Steering Committee of the IPSI – the International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative, and continues to be involved in the Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCA) Consortium. FPP attended the 2010 General Assembly in Bogor, Indonesia and part of a strategy retreat in Bali. FPP continues to also be involved in the CBD Alliance by participating in the development of its strategies and contributing articles to ECO.

Outputs: strong and (mostly) rewarding participation at CBD meetings, especially the international meeting on Article 10 and WG8j-7; good opportunities for future input on 10(c) at COP11 and beyond.

Means of verification: (internal) FPP notes and reports of CBD meetings; 10(c) team submissions on Articles 8(j) and 10(c) to the CBD Secretariat.

## **4.2 Progress towards project outputs**

See below

**Note:**

We believe that through the combination of activities described in detail above, good progress has been made towards the four main project objectives (or outputs). We feel that at this point it is slightly difficult to use the original indicators to measure progress towards the outputs, as they are intended to measure the achievement at the end of the project (in 2013), while progress towards the goals and outputs is gradual and strongly varies per country. The important local-level and national-level work that our partners are engaged in – sometimes still in preparatory phases – do not necessarily pay off immediately in the sense of changes in policy and practice.

Nevertheless, we will try to indicate progress following the indicators, and address the means of verification as much as possible. In addition we refer to the previous section in which we have reported on the activities, and also indicated their success and effectiveness, and how this was measured. In this section we will try to summarize how these activities are contributing towards the gradual achievement of the outputs and ultimately the project purpose.

We propose that towards the end of the project we will organise a special workshop with all project partners to review and fill in the log frame per country for a full final assessment.

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p><b>Output 1.</b> The acknowledgement and recognition of (the role of) CSU and traditional knowledge (TK), indigenous languages (IL), customary laws and institutions has increased</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of policies and laws, that recognise TK, CSU and IL</li> <li>- Number and quality of educational policies and programmes that promote indigenous languages and TK.</li> <li>- Number of educational initiatives by communities that are acknowledged and/or supported by government</li> <li>- Number of conservation or sustainable use initiatives that include / incorporate TK and CSU (see also output 3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Process (involvement of communities) and outcomes of development and revision of policies and laws</li> <li>- Education policies</li> <li>- Concrete commitments by government and other outside parties to communities' proposals and initiatives (materials, curricula, projects, other educational activities )</li> </ul>	<p>Community efforts manage to change perception of governments and others</p>
<p><b>Progress:</b></p>	<p>It remains difficult to provide concrete “numbers” at this stage but our local partners do observe gradual positive changes in perception and acknowledgement of TK and CSU among government and other agencies.</p> <p>In Thailand, meetings were held with the sub-committee on the revival of Karen livelihoods to discuss how to implement the Cabinet Resolution on Karen livelihoods of the Ministry of Culture. In Thailand, good progress has also been made in developing productive relationships with the CBD focal point, the Department of National Parks and IUCN concerning the support for customary sustainable use in protected areas.</p> <p>Another example of progress is the support of the Surinamese government (Ministry of Education and National Education Commissions) for the Kaliña peoples' initiatives for bi-lingual and multicultural education, possibly including legal reform in the near future. The government has also adopted the celebration of the international day of mother language (which was originally an initiative of the indigenous organisations in Suriname). Meanwhile, in Indonesia, good progress has been made towards the recognition of customarily-managed forests in spatial planning in Sunggau but its finalisation still depends on government's will.</p> <p>In Bangladesh, various studies conducted by our partners on CSU, climate change adaptation and sustainable livelihoods are being received with interest and support by policy-makers. This is expected to lead to legal and policy support to CSU in the future.</p> <p>The assumption in the last column still holds true. The efforts of the community are crucial to influence the perceptions of the government and others in a positive way as this does not happen automatically. The progress in the last project period is largely due to the communities' own efforts to document information (in reports, video, or presentations, articles) and present and disseminate it at the local and national levels among government officials, conservation organisations, and the general public. Initiatives like community-based biodiversity monitoring, or researching climate change impacts and responses, in which TK plays a significant role (for instance in Bangladesh and Panama), also contribute to a more favourable perception of CSU and TK among policymakers.</p> <p>In the meantime, the community initiatives to maintain and revive traditional knowledge, indigenous languages and skills make sure that TK and CSU remain intact and continue to be applied.</p>		

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p><b>Output 2.</b> Significant progress has been made towards securing land and resource rights of partner communities, including access and control</p>	<p>- Number of project partners who have made progress towards land and resource rights; and extent of progress</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Official and unofficial government communication (oral and written); statements, commitments, discussions &amp; correspondence with communities, newspaper articles, reports</li> <li>- Outcomes, reports and minutes of meetings and workshops with governments</li> <li>- Changes in laws and policies</li> <li>- Land and resource arrangements or agreements</li> <li>- Project report and updates</li> </ul>	<p>Political will of governments</p> <p>Governments are open to input and 'capacity building' from communities</p> <p>Success / pace of dialogue and/or negotiations</p>
<p><b>Progress:</b></p>	<p>As we described in the activities section above, all partners have engaged in advocacy and lobby activities to address and discuss issues related to land and resource rights (access, use and control) with local, district, or national governments. Project reports and reports of these meetings indicate that in most cases (apart from Suriname), government officials are interested and open to receive the information about the communities' initiatives and aspirations, and are willing to have more meetings to discuss the issues in more details.</p> <p>The biggest step towards this output has been taken in Guyana. After many years of painstaking work to produce a very detailed territorial map, collective agreements among 40 communities and a collective territorial management plan, the Wapichan launched the map and management plan in February 2012, calling on the government to recognise their collective land claim. It is still early days to gauge whether this will lead to secure land tenure but a huge step in that direction has been taken by the communities.</p> <p>In Thailand, smaller but steady steps have been taken by continuing the demarcation of agricultural land in individual communities. On the policy side, one of the project's communities, Khun Tae village, was selected for exploring the possibility to recognise collective land titles for indigenous and local communities by the Prime Minister's Office in 2009; this project is still ongoing but has been slowed down by a change of government. .</p> <p>In West-Kalimantan in Indonesia, the Sanggau District and Regional administration officials have attended several meetings with the community in Kampong Sanjan where concerns and questions related to the customary forest were addressed. They and promised to produce a decree on the customary forest as soon as the data on the community forest are completed and submitted.</p> <p>In Bangladesh, many activities that can be considered stepping stones to secure resource rights have been carried out with the approval of government agencies, including the project for the identification and recognition of forest users in the Sundarbans Impact Zones (the ParMoRec study), the establishment of resource users' cooperatives and climate adaptation and livelihoods projects.</p> <p>The country where the government is severely hampering progress on this issue is Suriname, where a national land rights conference did not bear any fruit.</p> <p>The assumptions still very much hold true: it always depends on the political will of governments and on their openness to bottom-up input and capacity building.</p>		



Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p><b>Output 3.</b> Local involvement in biodiversity decision-making and management (including in protected area) has increased and community-based management plans play a significant role in it</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of community members that are involved in official natural resource policy/decision-making and management / governance activities</li> <li>- number of community-based management plans or proposals that are recognised and/or incorporated in biodiversity management and plans</li> <li>- number of indigenous and community conserved areas established by partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Official records</li> <li>- qualitative feedback and reports from community representatives</li> <li>- Local management or co-management agreements</li> <li>- Project report and updates</li> </ul>	<p>Political will Success / pace of dialogue and/or negotiations</p> <p>Natural circumstances and circumstances in communities enable advanced development of community plans or proposals in 3 years time.</p>
<p><b>Progress:</b></p>	<p>Output 3 is closely related to output 2. Partners in several countries (particularly Suriname, Guyana, Panama) are in the process of developing or starting to implement land management plans. We are not yet at the stage of official recognition or formal incorporation in national programmes for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, but preparations are going well. The development of these management plans are combined with capacity building and training for community members about the application and use of these plans and maps in advocacy activities and meetings with governments about increased community involvement and responsibilities.</p> <p>In February 2012, the Wapichan people have launched their territorial management plan, which includes a proposed 1.4 million ha community conserved forest. If accepted by the government, this would provide the Wapichan with a great opportunity to become officially fully involved in biodiversity management and possibly policy-making.</p> <p>The Guna people are already exercising a high degree of self-management in their autonomous territory and are in the process of strengthening their management approaches and addressing the increasing threat of climate change in their islands. In Thailand the Karen people are involved in the joint management of the Ob Luang National Park, an outcome of earlier project phases and mapping and advocacy by IMPECT. The communities are now negotiating to achieve the same in relation to the Doi Inthanon NP.</p> <p>It is hoped that the progress in output 1 (enhanced acknowledgement of the value of CSU and TK) will also lead to enhanced involvement of the communities in decision-making and management of biodiversity. Therefore the community-based research and documentation initiatives, and the activities related to raising more (public) awareness, are very important. Initiatives that involve some formal collaboration with governments or conservation organisations, and/or which highlight the use and value of TK (such as biodiversity monitoring, surveys of flora and fauna, climate change impacts and responses in Bangladesh and Panama) could have this effect as well.</p> <p>All partners are planning to provide input for the new National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plans (NBSAPs) and to advocate for full and effective participation in the process when these are drafted.</p> <p>Also for this output, the assumptions still hold true. The issue of political will and success and pace of dialogues or negotiations are hard to predict. The time that is needed to make a community management plan is hard to predict too – it requires a lot of field work and data collection. National circumstances and political situations and circumstances in the communities play a role as well.</p>		

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p><b>Output 4.</b> Threats and pressures on CSU have decreased, among others through enhanced application of FPIC in matters affecting indigenous peoples' lands and territories</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number and nature of existing threats / pressures that were successfully addressed</li> <li>- Number and nature of new threats / pressures that were prevented</li> <li>- Number and nature of cases where FPIC was applied</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- documentation (reports and official and community feedback) of the threats, actions taken and outcomes</li> <li>- FPIC agreements</li> </ul>	<p>Success of communities' actions towards outside actors and government</p> <p>Project manages to convince / persuade outside parties to accept and apply FPIC</p>
<p><b>Progress:</b></p>	<p>Several partners have addressed threats and/or pressures on their territories and as such on their CSU, but it is still too early to say if these have been successful or not. In this respect, the two assumptions are very valid.</p> <p>Several partners (e.g. Suriname, Guyana, Panama) are internally discussing and strategizing how to deal with and address outside threats on their territories caused by mining projects and REDD/climate change mitigation projects. The traditional authorities in these countries have taken steps to formulate FPIC guidelines. These have not been formally adopted by the governments or applied/followed by companies, but the communities are continuing the process of capacity building and empowerment in terms of enforcement and advocacy.</p> <p>In Panama, Bangladesh and Suriname partners are working hard to demonstrate the uneven and adverse affects from climate change on the livelihoods of the indigenous peoples and local communities and propose solutions that are beneficial for these groups, drawing on traditional ecosystem knowledge. It is hoped that these are approved by the government and that the communities will play a role in initiatives to battle and deal with climate change.</p> <p>In Kampong Sanjan in Indonesia, the community forest is highly vulnerable to the expansion of oil palm plantations and industrial forest plantations because it does not get official recognition from the administration of Sanggau District yet. The Sanjan community has fined palm oil companies several times before for illegal activities on their territory, according to customary law. The advocacy and lobby activities with the administration of Sanggau District are hoped to lead to protection, recognition and ratification of the indigenous community's customary forest territory, and their management system.</p>		

### 4.3 Standard Measures

**Table 1 Project Standard Output Measures**

Code No.	Description	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Year 4 Total	Total to date	Number planned for reporting period	Total planned during the project
Established codes								
6A	Number of people to receive other forms of education/training (which does not fall into categories 1-5 above)	650	150			800		800
6B	Number of training weeks to be provided	25	25			50		75
7	Number of (ie different types - not volume - of material produced) training materials to be produced for use by host country	15	8			23		25
8	Number of weeks to be spent by UK project staff on project work in the host country	15	15			30		45
9	Number of species/habitat management plans (or action plans) to be produced for Governments, public authorities, or other implementing agencies in the host country	4 (in prep)	4 (one final, 3 in prep)			4 (one final, 3 in prep)		4
10	Number of individual field guides/manuals to be produced to assist work related to species identification, classification and recording	2	2			4		6
11A	Number of papers to be published in peer reviewed journals	2	2			4		10
14A	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops to be <b>organised</b> to present/disseminate findings	6	8			14		20
14B	Number of conferences/seminars/ workshops <b>attended</b> at which findings from Darwin project work will be presented/ disseminated.	15	15			30		40

Code No.	Description	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Year 4 Total	Total to date	Number planned for reporting period	Total planned during the project
16A 16B 16C	Number of newsletters to be produced  Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the host country(ies)  Estimated circulation of each newsletter in the UK	4  5000 policy-makers, NGOs, academics, indigenous orgs and other interested persons	4			8		12  5000+
19A	Number of national radio interviews/features in host county(ies)	40 (mostly path of biodiversity Panama)	40			80		100
21	Number of permanent educational/training/research facilities or organisations to be established and then continued after Darwin funding has ceased	3	2			5		6

**Table 2 Publications**

Type (eg journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (eg contact address, website)	Cost £
Report ('10(c) synthesis report')	Customary sustainable use of biodiversity by indigenous peoples and local communities: Examples, challenges, community initiatives and recommendations relating to CBD Article 10(c)  A synthesis paper based on case studies from Bangladesh, Cameroon, Guyana, Suriname, and Thailand.  25 October, 2011	FPP KLIM (Suriname), SCPDA (Guyana), IMPECT (Thailand), OKANI, CED (Cameroon), Unnayan Onneshan (Bangladesh)	<a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org/customary-sustainable-use-studies">http://www.forestpeoples.org/customary-sustainable-use-studies</a>	N/A
Enews article	Gender dimensions in indigenous peoples' customary use of biodiversity  FPP Enewsletter June 2011	FPP and project partners	<a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/customary-use/news/2011/06/gender-dimensions-indigenous-peoples-customary-use-bio">http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/customary-use/news/2011/06/gender-dimensions-indigenous-peoples-customary-use-bio</a>	N/A
Enews article	Upcoming Convention on Biological Diversity meetings with issues of	FPP and project partners	<a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/convention-">http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/convention-</a>	N/A

Type (eg journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (eg contact address, website)	Cost £
	relevance to Indigenous Peoples FPP Enewsletter October 2011		<a href="http://www.biological-diversity-cbd/news/2011/10/upcoming-convention-biological-diversity-mee">biological-diversity-cbd/news/2011/10/upcoming-convention-biological-diversity-mee</a>	
Enews article	President of Suriname shuts down land rights conference following clear demands from indigenous and tribal peoples FPP Enewsletter December 2011	KLIM/VIDS	<a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org/region/suriname/news/2011/12/president-suriname-shuts-down-land-rights-conference-following-clear-de">http://www.forestpeoples.org/region/suriname/news/2011/12/president-suriname-shuts-down-land-rights-conference-following-clear-de</a>	N/A
Enews article	CBD Working Group agrees on development of new Plan of Action on Customary Sustainable Use of biological resources FPP Enewsletter December 2011	FPP and project partners	<a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/environmental-governance/news/2011/12/cbd-working-group-agrees-development-new-plan-action-cu">http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/environmental-governance/news/2011/12/cbd-working-group-agrees-development-new-plan-action-cu</a>	N/A
Square Brackets Newsletter	New focus on customary sustainable use in the CBD By FPP and partners Issue 5 (June 2011)	CBD Secretariat and CBD Alliance, Montreal, Canada	<a href="http://www.cbd.int/ngo/square-brackets/square-brackets-2011-06-en.pdf">http://www.cbd.int/ngo/square-brackets/square-brackets-2011-06-en.pdf</a>	N/A
Article in ECO, journal of the CBD Alliance	Local experiences and lessons learned on customary use and article 10c ECO 38(1), November 2011	CBD Alliance	<a href="http://www.cbdalliance.org/wg7-8j/">http://www.cbdalliance.org/wg7-8j/</a>	N/A
Blog in Eco-agriculture web site	Indigenous resource management systems: A holistic approach to nature and livelihoods Maurizio Farhan Ferrari 14 March 2012		<a href="http://blog.ecoagriculture.org/2012/03/14/forest_peoples_programme/">http://blog.ecoagriculture.org/2012/03/14/forest_peoples_programme/</a>	
Press release	Wapichan people in Guyana showcase community proposal to save tropical forests on their traditional lands	FPP (UK) and SCPDA (Guyana)	<a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/environmental-governance/news/2012/02/press-release-wapichan-people-guyana-showcase-community">http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/environmental-governance/news/2012/02/press-release-wapichan-people-guyana-showcase-community</a>	N/A
Publication	Natural resources management and local people's wisdom	Institut Dayakology, TOMAS, Indonesia		
Publication	<i>Kaimanamana'o, wa zaamatapan, wa di'itapan na'apamnii wa sha'apatan Wapichan wiizi</i>	SCPDA, Guyana	<a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/customary-use/publication/2012/wapichan-people-guyana-">http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/customary-use/publication/2012/wapichan-people-guyana-</a>	

Type (eg journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (eg contact address, website)	Cost £
	<i>Guyana'ao raza.</i>  Thinking Together for those Coming Behind Us - An outline plan for the care of Wapichan territory in Guyana.		<a href="#">make-community-based-agreem</a>	
Newspaper articles in Bangladesh English newspapers	Articles authored or co-authored by Mohd. Abdul Baten, Unnayan Onneshan  Forest Biodiversity: our common future, (January 2)  Save forest biodiversity, save the world (May 23)  Evaluating the services of the Sundarbans (July 2)  Aila impact: people suffering endlessly (part I) (July 22)  Aila impact: people suffering endlessly (part II) (July 23)  Aila impact still lingers on people and environments (August 13).  One article on the occasion of World Environment Day  Evaluating services of Sundarbans (in the occasion of World Biodiversity Day), 2 July	<i>New Age</i>  <i>Daily Sun</i>  <i>The Daily Star</i>  <i>Daily Sun</i>  <i>Daily Sun</i>  <i>The Daily Star</i>  <i>New Age</i>  <i>The Daily Star</i>	<a href="http://newagebd.com/newspaper1/op-ed/20605.html">http://newagebd.com/newspaper1/op-ed/20605.html</a>  <a href="http://www.thedailystar.net/newDesign/news-details.php?nid=192409">http://www.thedailystar.net/newDesign/news-details.php?nid=192409</a>	
Video	Association Okani Participatory Mapping Video, Cameroon  March 2012	OKANI, Cameroon	<a href="http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/rights-land-natural-resources/video/2012/03/association-okani-participatory-mapping-video-cam">http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/rights-land-natural-resources/video/2012/03/association-okani-participatory-mapping-video-cam</a>	N/A
Video	Climate change in Guna Yala	FPCI, Panama	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MgKceWMhmes">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MgKceWMhmes</a>	
Video	Nabire Guede Gudi (Guna worldview and way of interacting with Mother Nature)	FPCI, Panama		

Type (eg journals, manual, CDs)	Detail (title, author, year)	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (eg contact address, website)	Cost £
Video	A documentary film was also produced on the Sundarbans, focussing on the traditional resource users who depend on the Sundarbans for their livelihoods, and on their collective action for sustainable development in the Sundarbans.	Unnayan Onneshan, Bangladesh		

The project also produced many publications intended for internal use (within the communities) or for local/national level use which are written in local languages and are not publicly available or for sale.

Please let us know if you wish to receive a copy of any of these materials.

#### 4.4 Progress towards the project purpose and outcomes

##### Project purpose:

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<b>Purpose.</b> Advanced implementation of Article 10(c) in the 8 host countries by 2013.	Outputs below have been achieved	See below (verification of outputs)	The host countries also make significant efforts towards achieving other biodiversity goals related to the CBD. - Host countries are committed to implement CBD timely and effectively

In the original project application (copied above from the logframe) we have highlighted the link between the achievement of the outputs and the achievement of the eventual project purpose. Progress in meeting the outputs will lead to progress in implementation of article 10(c) in the host countries.

As we have described in section 4.2, progress is observed on all four outputs, and the indicators, means of verification and assumptions are still applicable. Although we feel it is better to make statements on the actual achievements at the end of the project, it is anticipated that if the projects continues in the manner of this project period, implementation of 10(c) will indeed be advanced by the end of 2013.

##### Outcomes:

In the original application we listed eight intended outcomes. We will briefly comment on these below as most of the issues have already been addressed under the activities and/or outputs.

- Increased acknowledgement and recognition of (the role of) CSU and TK, customary laws and institutions (e.g. in policies and laws) in biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and benefit-sharing.

See our report on output 1 in section 4.2.

- Stronger, better organised indigenous and local institutions and/or networks working on implementing 10c and in achieving the objectives of the Convention.

Good progress, see our report on Activity 1 in section 4.1

- Significant progress towards securing land and resource rights and development of community-based sustainable management plans.

See our report on output 2 and 3 in section 4.2 and activity 3 in section 4.1. The progress made by the Wapichan people in terms of community mapping and development of the territorial management plan should be noted.

- Increased local involvement in natural resource decision-making and management (local control or co-management systems), including in protected areas.

See our report on output 3 in section 4.2.

- Increased application of FPIC in matters affecting indigenous peoples' lands and territories.

See our report on output 4 in section 4.2.

- Increased government awareness of international developments and agreements on 10(c) and associated responsibilities.

Progress has been made, see for example our report on activity 5 (advocacy) in section 4.1. However, it would be useful to have regular meetings or workshops in the next project period with governments to inform them about concrete steps to implement 10(c).

- A start will have been made with educational policies and programmes that promote the use and revitalisation of indigenous languages and TK.

These have so far mostly been initiatives by the communities themselves to transfer traditional knowledge, language, and practices and skills to young generations, but what we observe is that these initiatives usually receive interest and approval from governments and can grow into collaboration and joint initiatives. See our report on output 1 in section 4.2 and activity 2 in section 4.1.

- International: new component on 10(c) in the revised MYPOW of the Working Group on Art. 8(j) and Related Provisions reflects recommendations from "10(c) team".

The 10(c) team has made a significant input into the development of the new component on 10(c) (see our report on Activity 7 in section 4.1). However, this work is still ongoing and will continue at COP11 and WG8(j)-8.

#### **4.5 Progress towards impact on biodiversity, sustainable use or equitable sharing of biodiversity benefits**

We believe that enhanced community-based governance and management of ecosystems will be beneficial for conservation and sustainable use of these ecosystems as well as for fairer benefit-sharing of communities.

When communities become more involved in governance and management (either through increased co-management, or through official community management by means of formal recognition of their territories and rights) and receive more responsibilities, these territories and ecosystems are more likely to be well taken care of. Places of special importance to biodiversity will be conserved, other areas and resources will be used sustainably, and damaging activities by outsiders will be kept under control or banned. Naturally, the communities will profit more from the benefits of biodiversity when they are the primary users, managers and protectors.

Most indigenous peoples and local communities have sustainably used and conserved their territories for centuries, and the new and 'modern' management plans that they are developing demonstrate that the communities still aim to continue to practice these systems, which are based on cosmological visions and spiritual values, customary rules and laws about biodiversity, and the desire to conserve the territories for generations to come. The active practice and transfer of traditional knowledge and indigenous language and concepts to the youth underline that these are not just management systems steeped in the past, and moreover communities are incorporating and applying modern technologies (such as GPS) to respond to modern threats and challenges. These plans also show that communities are not only willing, but are also able and ready, to govern and manage their territories and the ecosystems on which their livelihoods depend.

When traditional institutions can play a more formal role and enforce the communities' customary laws and rules, and FPIC is more structurally applied and enforced, they will be better able to keep outside threats and pressures out.



## 5. Monitoring, evaluation and lessons

As we described under question 20 in the original application (monitoring and evaluation plan), we have many ways to monitor progress and these are closely related to the management style of the project and the relationship with our partners.

The two FPP coordinators of the project are in regular contact with all of the partners. Every three months, the partners send us a short up-date. A more detailed mid-term narrative and financial report are submitted to us by the partners mid-way through the year, and at the end of each year, sometimes followed by additional information or clarifications on FPP's request. This process gives us a good overview of how the project proceeds and represents a main monitoring tool (or indicator). Partner organisations hold their own evaluations (pertaining to the main process or a particular activity) with relevant groups, such as leaders or researchers. We meet with our partners at international meetings (such as CBD meetings) and always use this opportunity to discuss progress, share experiences and address challenges. Every two years (depending on financial availability) we organise a partners meeting entirely for evaluation, exchanging experiences, and planning next steps.

Each partner organisation has at least one FPP staff member that spends field-time with each local organisation, e.g. as technical assistant or advisors to the partner, who is involved in workshops, trainings, advocacy work, and other activities. Because of this unique local involvement, we know the partners organisations very well and all the staff personally. During fieldwork periods the progress of the project is monitored in detail. Occasionally, a field evaluation in one of the partner countries is carried out as part of an overall FPP evaluation by one of our major funders. In 2012, it is expected that an evaluation of our collaborative project with IMPECT in Northern Thailand will be evaluated by Oxfam-Novib as part of their overall evaluation of FPP.

FPP's financial department looks at all the financial reports submitted by the partners and tracks the overall financial status. At each FPP Annual General Meeting, we report about the progress of the FPBP project to the board and other staff, and discuss achievements and obstacles and receive advice and feedback from them.

Below is a table with the M&E indicators which we have used to check consistency:

<b>Monitoring activities (from the log frame)</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Ticked if done:</b>
Indicator 1: 3-monthly updates from partners	√
Indicator 2: 6 monthly narrative and financial reports – checking by FPP financial department	√
Indicator 3: regular contact through email and skype	√
Indicator 4: field visits – involvement in local implementation by FPP staff	√
Indicator 5: local evaluations carried out by local partner organisations with relevant groups	√
Indicator 6: evaluation-meetings with partners	√

For measuring output, purpose (outcome) and final goal (impact), we are using the logframe (annex 2) which includes the indicators and means of verification to measure and demonstrate progress and achievements or results.

The log frame is designed in such a way that if the activities are carried out as expected, they will contribute to achieving the outputs, which in turn lead to achieving the project purpose. The purpose is one aspect of the bigger goal of the Darwin Initiative.

**Lessons learned:**

The most important lesson learned during this project period has been that sustained effort is required at the national level in order to have a well-working 2-ways system between the local and international level. All partners feel that good progress has been made at the local level and in the international arena (although negotiations techniques can still be further improved) but progress in legal and policy-making at the national level has been very slow and totally dependent on the political will of the governments and other agencies. If sufficient resources are available, more emphasis should be placed on achieving better progress at the national level during the last year of the project.

**6. Actions taken in response to previous reviews (if applicable)**

N/A

**7. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere**

One overall obstacle encountered this project year (and risk for near future) has been the shortage of funds. In the current financially difficult climate, it is very hard to raise funds for our activities. Some grants to the project have been stopped or reduced.

This means that both FPP and partners have had to choose and prioritize and cut back on activities, staff and office costs. It also means that we participate in international meetings with a smaller team than we would like, and that we cannot afford partners' meetings with a big group. If we could provide our partners with a bigger country budget, activities would be done quicker and more could be done (also with more staff). We are making efforts to identify and raise new funds this year.

**8. Sustainability****Sustainability / exit strategy:**

As we explained under question 15 of our application, this project does not comprise a stand-alone action with a concrete beginning and ending. Most of the activities in this project relate to long-standing objectives of the communities, which require sustained efforts and endurance. All communities have been working on these issues for quite some time. FPP has through the years provided different types of support or assistance, with different sources of funding. However, some of the activities are new and can be considered to be more 'discrete' – such as developing community-based land management plans.

At the community level, we know what we want to and can do in 3 years. However, concerning objectives that (partly) depend on other parties, such as governments, it would be risky to state that all can or will be reached within the project period. Therefore we have aimed to set realistic goals, such as 'make significant progress' in some fields.

Rather than speaking of an "exit strategy", if this project ends and not all goals are fully achieved, our strategy will be to seek new funds to continue the work for as long as needed. Together with our partners we will assess follow-up needs and actions, based on the situation at that time.

**Profile of the project:**

See section 9 below (dissemination) and table 2 (publications) for details on efforts to promote the project, and also our report on Activity 6 (raising public awareness, both nationally and internationally, of efforts and outcomes) for information about how these were received.

**9. Dissemination**

A publications officer and communication officer (both FPP) are involved in this project to support effective outreach and dissemination and produce attractive publications.

**Target audiences are:**

- members of indigenous and local communities in the host countries
- governments (national and local levels)
- international policy-makers
- professionals working in development, conservation, human rights (NGOs, academics)
- journalists
- the general public

We refer to our report on Activity 6 (raising public awareness, both nationally and internationally, of efforts and outcomes) and table 2 (publications) for details.

We anticipate that our collaboration with these partners will continue after the project period (see section 8 above), which includes support with dissemination activities and joint outreach.

## 10. Project Expenditure

**Table 3 project expenditure during the reporting period (1 April 2011 – 31 March 2012)**

Item	Budget (please indicate which document you refer to if other than your project application or annual grant offer letter)	Expenditure	Variance/ Comments
Staff costs specified by individual			
Overhead costs			
Travel and subsistence			
Operating costs			
Capital items/equipment: Video Camera and Recording Equipment			
Office Computer Equipment			
Technical Equipment - Mapping			
Others: Communications			
Others: Publications and Translations			
Others: Media and Web			
TOTAL			

**Comments on Variances:** Field work activity was the main thrust of the work this year, together with attendance at CBD meetings. The technical equipment has been purchased in Guyana by the EU budget so Darwin funds could not be allocated against this item. The computers were purchased in Bangladesh (€1,800) to establish digital community libraries. The other office equipment costs were more general across the board. Publications are mostly done electronically and therefore the publication and translations budget lines have been underspent.

**11. OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements of your project during the reporting period (300-400 words maximum). This section may be used for publicity purposes**

I agree for LTS and the Darwin Secretariat to publish the content of this section (please leave this line in to indicate your agreement to use any material you provide here)

Although good progress has been achieved by all partners in each country, this year we feel that the work by the Wapichan people in Southern Guyana should be highlighted as outstanding achievement.

Under this project and with co-funding from the European Union and other donors, the Wapichan people have completed a landmark project to map their traditional lands and develop a ground-breaking community land use and development plan for their territory. The map, which is based on over 40,000 geo-referenced locations collected by Wapichan mapping teams, shows patterns of traditional land use and occupation, including places with resources of livelihood, cultural, historical and wildlife importance. It is now being used by Wapichan villages as a basis for dialogue with the government on measures needed to legally secure their collective land ownership and management rights over their territory. The related territorial plan, titled "Thinking Together for those Coming Behind Us", is based on more than 100 inter-community agreements among twenty communities on the sustainable use of forest, mountain, savannah and wetland ecosystems and habitats that support a rich biodiversity, including rare and endemic species of plants, animals, birds and fish.

Agreements contained in the innovate plan include a proposal to establish a Wapichan Conserved Forest over 1.4 million ha of old growth rain forest in the Upper Essequibo basin as well as plans to set up a Wapichan Institute to promote recognition of land and resource rights, enable self-determined community development and value traditional environmental knowledge and practices. A chapter on dealing with external development pressures, also puts forward proposals for actions to save Wapichan ancestral lands from destruction by mining, industrial logging, agribusiness and infrastructure developments.

Through their representative South Central and South District Toshias Councils, and with support from their community based NGO SCPDA, the Wapichan people are now seeking allies to help them realise their collective vision for their territory. FPP is currently assisting the Wapichan in seeking donors and partners to help them implement their land use proposals in support of community-based development and the customary use of biological resources.

## Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year 2011-2012

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2011 - March 2012	Actions required/planned for next period
<p><b>Goal:</b> To draw on expertise relevant to biodiversity from within the United Kingdom to work with local partners in countries rich in biodiversity but constrained in resources to achieve</p> <p>The conservation of biological diversity, The sustainable use of its components, and The fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources</p>		<p><b>Contribution towards positive impact on biodiversity or positive changes in the conditions of human communities associated with biodiversity:</b></p> <p>Enhanced community-based governance and management of ecosystems based on customary laws and knowledge related to responsible use of biological resources, which this project is promoting and supporting, will be beneficial for conservation and sustainable use of these ecosystems as well as for fairer benefit-sharing of communities</p>	
<p><b>Original Purpose</b></p> <p>Advanced implementation of Article 10(c) in the 8 host countries by 2013.</p>	<p><b>Original purpose level indicators</b></p> <p>Outputs below have been achieved</p>	<p><b>Progress towards achieving the project purpose</b></p> <p>Progress is observed on all four outputs. It is anticipated that if the projects continues in the manner of this project period, implementation of 10(c) will indeed be advanced by the end of 2013</p>	<p><b>Key actions planned for next period</b></p> <p>We plan to continue and build on the work that was done in this project period</p>
<p><b>Original outputs</b></p> <p><b>Output 1.</b> The acknowledgement and recognition of (the role of) CSU and traditional knowledge (TK), indigenous languages (IL), customary laws and institutions has increased</p>	<p><b>Original output level indicators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of policies and laws, that recognise TK, CSU and IL</li> <li>- Number and quality of educational policies and programmes that promote indigenous languages and TK.</li> <li>- Number of educational initiatives by communities that are acknowledged and/or supported by government</li> <li>- Number of conservation or sustainable use initiatives that include / incorporate TK and CSU (see also output 3)</li> </ul>	<p><b>General progress and appropriateness of indicators:</b></p> <p>The indicators are still appropriate, although at this stage it is very difficult to provide concrete “numbers” already. However, our local partners do observe gradual positive changes in perception and acknowledgement of TK and CSU. In section 4.2 we have provided some examples of changes at the national level and also emphasised that the progress in the last project period is largely due to the communities’ own efforts to document information and present and disseminate it, and also that initiatives like community-based biodiversity monitoring, or researching climate change impacts and responses contribute to a more favourable perception of CSU and TK among policymakers as well.</p>	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2011 - March 2012	Actions required/planned for next period
<p><b>Output 2.</b> Significant progress has been made towards securing land and resource rights of partner communities, including access and control</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of project partners who have made progress towards land and resource rights; and extent of progress</li> </ul>	<p>Measuring progress quantitatively is still hard, but in this annual report we have demonstrated that the communities are doing a lot of very important and useful preparatory work to achieve the output. In section 4.2 we mentioned the capacity building sessions to improve their level of knowledge and skills to advocate for their rights and the collection of the materials that are needed to support their claims. We also described how all partners have engaged in advocacy and lobby activities to address and discuss issues related to land and resource rights (access, use and control) with local, district, or national governments, and that in many cases government officials are interested and open to receive the information about the communities' initiatives and aspirations. As mentioned in section 11, the work carried out by the Wapichan people on community mapping and the production of their territorial management plan, should be noted.</p>	
<p><b>Output 3.</b> Local involvement in biodiversity decision-making and management (including in protected area) has increased and community-based management plans play a significant role in it</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of community members that are involved in official natural resource policy/decision-making and management / governance activities</li> <li>- number of community-based management plans or proposals that are recognised and/or incorporated in biodiversity management and plans</li> <li>- number of indigenous and community conserved areas established by partners</li> </ul>	<p>We described in sections 4.1 and 4.2 that partners in several countries are still in the initial process of developing land management plans, and that these activities are combined with capacity building and training for community members about the application and use of these plans and maps in advocacy activities and meetings with governments about increased community involvement and responsibilities.</p> <p>We mentioned that it is expected that the progress in output 1 (enhanced acknowledgement of the value of CSU and TK) will also lead to enhanced involvement of the communities in decision-making and management of biodiversity. Therefore the community-based research and documentation initiatives, and the activities related to raising more (public) awareness, are very important.</p>	
<p><b>Output 4.</b> Threats and pressures on CSU have decreased, among others through enhanced application of FPIC in matters affecting indigenous peoples' lands and territories</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number and nature of existing threats / pressures that were successfully addressed</li> <li>- Number and nature of new threats / pressures that were prevented</li> <li>- Number and nature of cases where FPIC was applied</li> </ul>	<p>In relation to this indicator and output, we mentioned in section 4.2 that several partners have addressed threats and/or pressures on their territories and as such on their CSU, but that is still too early to say how successful these actions have been.</p> <p>We mentioned that several partners are internally discussing and strategizing how to deal with and address outside threats on their territories caused by mining projects and REDD/climate change mitigation projects. The traditional authorities in these countries have taken steps to formulate FPIC guidelines. Until now these have not been formally adopted by the governments or applied/followed by companies, but the communities are still in the process of capacity building and</p>	

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2011 - March 2012	Actions required/planned for next period
		empowerment in terms of enforcement and advocacy.	In some of the countries partners are also working hard to demonstrate the uneven and adverse affects from climate change on the livelihoods of the indigenous peoples and local communities and propose solutions that are beneficial for these groups, drawing on traditional ecosystem knowledge. Also pressures on traditional lands caused by the establishment of protected areas, oil palm plantations and industrial forest plantations are being addressed under the project.
<b>Original activities relevant to the outputs:</b>		<b>Progress on activities and what will be carried out in the next period:</b>	
Activity 1. Capacity-building activities for local institutions in their capacity to interface with regional, national, and international agencies (governments, NGOs, private and other sectors) in asserting and maintaining their rights (including right to FPIC) ( outputs 2,3,4)		All activities are proceeding well (for details see section 4.1.) and in the next project period, partners will carry on with the work in the same way with the aim to achieve the outputs by the end of the project.	
Activity 2. Documenting customary sustainable management systems (outputs 1,3)			
Activity 3. Developing plans / proposals for community-based management and/or effective co-management (outputs 2,3)			
Activity 4. Community-based biodiversity monitoring (CBBM) training and activities (outputs 1,3)			
Activity 5. Advocacy: promote policy, legal and institutional reforms for an effective implementation of Article 10(c) (meetings, presentations and workshops with/for governments and other involved parties) (outputs 1,2,3,4)			
Activity 6. Raising public awareness, both nationally and internationally, of these efforts and outcomes (outputs 1,2,3,4)			
Activity 7. Linking project activities and outputs to international processes on 10(c) (outputs 1,2,3,4)			

## Annex 2 Project's full current logframe

This is the same as the original logframe

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<b>Goal:</b> Effective contribution in support of the implementation of the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention on Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species (CMS), as well as related targets set by countries rich in biodiversity but constrained in resources.			
<b>Sub-Goal</b> Increased achievement of the three key objectives of the CBD in the 7 host countries through effective protection and encouragement of customary sustainable use (CSU).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of national biodiversity targets achieved with reference to CSU</li> <li>- status and trends in decentralisation of biodiversity management leading to biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and fair and equitable benefit sharing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Countries' national reports to the CBD</li> <li>- independent reports</li> <li>- evaluation of biodiversity projects</li> </ul>	
<b>Purpose.</b> Advanced implementation of Article 10(c) in the 8 host countries by 2013.	Outputs below have been achieved	See below.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The host countries also make significant efforts towards achieving other biodiversity goals related to the CBD.</li> <li>- Host countries are committed to implement CBD timely and effectively</li> </ul>
<b>Output 1.</b> The acknowledgement and recognition of (the role of) CSU and traditional knowledge (TK), indigenous languages (IL), customary laws and institutions has increased	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of policies and laws, that recognise TK, CSU and IL</li> <li>- Number and quality of educational policies and programmes that promote indigenous languages and TK.</li> <li>- Number of educational initiatives by communities that are acknowledged and/or supported by government</li> <li>- Number of conservation or sustainable use initiatives that include / incorporate TK and CSU (see also output 3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Process (involvement of communities) and outcomes of development and revision of policies and laws</li> <li>- Education policies</li> <li>- Concrete commitments by government and other outside parties to communities' proposals and initiatives (materials, curricula, projects, other educational activities )</li> </ul>	Community efforts manage to change perception of governments and others



<b>Project summary</b>	<b>Measurable Indicators</b>	<b>Means of verification</b>	<b>Important Assumptions</b>
<p><b>Output 2.</b> Significant progress has been made towards securing land and resource rights of partner communities, including access and control</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of project partners who have made progress towards land and resource rights; and extent of progress</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Official and unofficial government communication (oral and written); statements, commitments, discussions &amp; correspondence with communities, newspaper articles, reports</li> <li>- Outcomes, reports and minutes of meetings and workshops with governments</li> <li>- Changes in laws and policies</li> <li>- Land and resource arrangements or agreements</li> <li>- Project report and updates</li> </ul>	<p>Political will of governments</p> <p>Governments are open to input and 'capacity building' from communities</p> <p>Success / pace of dialogue and/or negotiations</p>
<p><b>Output 3.</b> Local involvement in biodiversity decision-making and management (including in protected area) has increased and community-based management plans play a significant role in it</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of community members that are involved in official natural resource policy/decision-making and management / governance activities</li> <li>- number of community-based management plans or proposals that are recognised and/or incorporated in biodiversity management and plans</li> <li>- number of indigenous and community conserved areas established by partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Official records</li> <li>- qualitative feedback and reports from community representatives</li> <li>- Local management or co-management agreements</li> <li>- Project report and updates</li> </ul>	<p>Political will</p> <p>Success / pace of dialogue and/or negotiations</p> <p>Natural circumstances and circumstances in communities enable advanced development of community plans or proposals in 3 years time.</p>
<p><b>Output 4.</b> Threats and pressures on CSU have decreased, among others through enhanced application of FPIC in matters affecting indigenous peoples' lands and territories</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number and nature of existing threats / pressures that were successfully addressed</li> <li>- Number and nature of new threats / pressures that were prevented</li> <li>- Number and nature of cases where FPIC was applied</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- documentation (reports and official and community feedback) of the threats, actions taken and outcomes</li> <li>- FPIC agreements</li> </ul>	<p>Success of communities' actions towards outside actors and government</p> <p>Project manages to convince / persuade outside parties to accept and apply FPIC</p>

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p><b>Activities</b> (details in workplan)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Capacity-building activities for local institutions in their capacity to interface with regional, national, and international agencies (governments, NGOs, private and other sectors) in asserting and maintaining their rights (including right to FPIC) ( outputs 2,3,4)</li> <li>2. Documenting customary sustainable management systems (outputs 1,3)</li> <li>3. Developing plans / proposals for community-based management and/or effective co-management (outputs 2,3)</li> <li>4. Community-based biodiversity monitoring (CBBM) training and activities (outputs 1,3)</li> <li>5. Advocacy: promote policy, legal and institutional reforms for an effective implementation of Article 10(c) (meetings, presentations and workshops with/for governments and other involved parties) (outputs 1,2,3,4)</li> <li>6. Raising public awareness, both nationally and internationally, of these efforts and outcomes (outputs 1,2,3,4)</li> <li>7. Linking project activities and outputs to international processes on 10(c) (outputs 1,2,3,4)</li> </ol>			
<p><b>Monitoring activities:</b></p> <p>Indicator 1: 3-monthly updates from partners</p> <p>Indicator 2: 6 monthly narrative and financial reports – checking by FPP financial department</p> <p>Indicator 3: regular contact through email and skype</p> <p>Indicator 4: field visits – involvement in local implementation by FPP staff</p> <p>Indicator 5: local evaluations carried out by local partner organisations with relevant groups</p> <p>Indicator 6: evaluation-meetings with partners</p>			

### **Annex 3 Onwards – supplementary material (optional but encouraged as evidence of project achievement)**

Annex 3.1 – Budget table

All the other materials that we would like to share with LTS/Darwin Secretariat are available online and we have provided the web links in this annual report.

## Checklist for submission

	Check
<b>Is the report less than 5MB?</b> If so, please email to <a href="mailto:Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk">Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk</a> putting the project number in the Subject line.	YES
<b>Is your report more than 5MB?</b> If so, please discuss with <a href="mailto:Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk">Darwin-Projects@ltsi.co.uk</a> about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the Subject line.	NO
<b>Have you included means of verification?</b> You need not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	YES
<b>Do you have hard copies of material you want to submit with the report?</b> If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number.	NO
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	YES
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	YES
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	