

ASSESSING THE POTENTIAL TO EXPAND THE DEDICATED GRANT MECHANISM - THROUGH AN INDIGENOUS LENS



JUNE 2020



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author of this report would like to thank and acknowledge the generosity of all the Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities who shared their stories and their time, without which this report could not be possible. In addition, special thanks to the government officials, staff of multilateral banks, members of civil society organisations and the private sector who provided time and input into this evaluation. Thanks also to the staff of the CIF Administrative Unit and the Evaluation and Learning Initiative, including Joseph Dickman for taking a bold decision to support the use of an Indigenous methodology, Svetlana Negroustoueva and Ines Angulo for their critical expertise and Hanna Schweitzer and Eirini Pitta for their support throughout the preparation of this study. A special acknowledgement to the translators, my Indigenous colleagues and my Indigenous brothers and sisters who continue the struggle for recognition of their rights in the face of climate change. All errors in this report belong to the author.

KA WHA WHAI TONU MATOU!
(the struggle continues)

This publication was commissioned by the Climate Investment Funds (CIF) Evaluation and Learning Initiative, however, the views expressed do not necessarily represent those of the CIF or the World Bank.

While reasonable efforts have been made to ensure that the contents of this publication are factually correct, the CIF and the World Bank do not take responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of its contents and shall not be liable for loss or damage that may be occasioned directly or indirectly through the use of, or reliance on, the contents of this publication.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Abbreviations | 4 |
| Executive Summary | 5 |
| Section 1 – Introduction | 6 |
| 1.1 Purpose – Objectives | 8 |
| 1.2 Synergies with the Itad Learning Review | 9 |
| 1.3 Users - Intended Audience | 10 |
| Section 2 – Methodology | 11 |
| 2.1 Approach | 11 |
| 2.2 Kaupapa Māori approach | 13 |
| 2.2.1. Why use a Kaupapa Māori approach? | 14 |
| 2.3 Country Selection | 15 |
| 2.4 Country Visits – How the Kaupapa Māori approach was applied | 16 |
| Section 3 – Findings from Literature Review and Country Visits | 19 |
| 3.1 Indonesia | 19 |
| 3.1.1 Indigenous Peoples in Indonesia – Analysis of Indigenous Peoples perspective | 19 |
| 3.1.2 DGM Indonesia | 20 |
| 3.1.3 Primary findings from country visit | 22 |
| 3.2 Brazil | 23 |
| 3.2.1 Indigenous Peoples in Brazil – Analysis of Indigenous Peoples perspective | 23 |
| 3.2.2 DGM Brazil | 25 |
| 3.2.3 Primary findings from country visit | 26 |
| 3.3 Noteworthy individual stories from country visits | 29 |
| Section 4 – Summary of Main Findings | 31 |
| Conclusion | 36 |
| References | 38 |
| Appendix 1: Evaluation and Learning Questions | 41 |
| Appendix 2: Interviews Conducted | 42 |
| Appendix 3: How a Kaupapa Māori approach was applied | 44 |
| Appendix 4: Country Sub projects | 46 |
| Glossary | 51 |

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| CAA | Centro de Agricultura Alternativa do Norte de Minas |
| CI | Conservation International |
| CIF | Climate Investment Funds |
| CSO | Civil Society Organisation |
| DGM | Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities |
| DGM Global | DGM Global Learning and Knowledge Exchange Project |
| E&L | Evaluation and Learning |
| FIP | Forest Investment Programme |
| GEA | Global Executing Agency |
| GSC | Global Steering Committee |
| IPs | Indigenous Peoples |
| IPLCs | Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities |
| LCs | Local Communities |
| MDBs | Multilateral Development Banks |
| NEA | National Executing Agency |
| NGO | Non-governmental Organisation |
| NSC | National Steering Committee |
| PPCR | Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience |
| REDD+ | Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation |
| SREP | Scaling Up Renewable Energy Programme |
| TTL | Task Team Leader |
| UNFCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |
| UNPFII | United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues |
| UNDRIP | United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Dedicated Grant Mechanism (DGM) is a unique initiative conceived and designed by Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) and funded by the Climate Investment Funds (CIF) Forest Investment Programme (FIP). The DGM provides Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) with resources to strengthen their participation in the FIP and other Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) processes. The purpose of this report is to review the effectiveness of the DGM through an Indigenous lens and subsequently, determine whether the DGM should be extended to the remaining CIF programs. In addition, the report considers whether the DGM has demonstrated potential for transformational change. In this light, the report complements, and adds value to the 2019 [Learning Review of the DGM](#)¹ that focused on building an understanding of how the DGM evolved and its future potential.

This study employed a mix of orthodox and Indigenous methods to collect and analyse information and findings. While the qualitative methodology was applied to provide background information about the DGM, the Indigenous methodology was applied to the engagement aspects of the DGM, in other words, to ascertain the procedural and substantive effectiveness through an Indigenous or Kaupapa Māori lens. Two country visits were undertaken to Indonesia and Brazil.

The FIP DGM was found to be a successful vehicle and this finding was highlighted when compared to overall FIP projects. Underscoring this success was the inclusive nature of the DGM where IPLCs are intrinsic to the programme achieving a sense of self-determination, by recognising an Indigenous right to lands and territories supported by Indigenous knowledge resulting in community wellbeing. The success or effectiveness of the DGM measured through an Indigenous lens found that the DGM supports an Indigenous identity, a flourishing Indigenous wellbeing and consistency with the fundamental rights articulated in the UNDRIP. Although comprehensive transformational change may not have been achieved due to the newness of the FIP DGM, aspects related to the relevance and sustainability of the DGM indicate that transformational change is being supported through the DGM.

As an innovative mechanism that provides direct funding to IPLCs, the DGM recognises that the IPLCs are instrumental in forest management whilst also vulnerable to climate change. Subsequently, the DGM empowers IPLCs to develop actions against climate change and encourages natural resource management. In Brazil, the ingenious market development for the sale of seeds as an activity associated a FIP DGM sub project is an example of a strategic change. Although it is not currently large-scale, given the relatively early stage of the FIP DGM, it is suggested that with time and greater resourcing, there is potential for transformational change.

In light of the positive and progressive nature of the FIP DGM, it is recommended that the FIP DGM be continued and adequately funded to the extent that greater autonomy is provided. Given the success of the FIP DGM, lessons can be ascertained from the FIP DGM and applied more generally across other programmes within the CIF (i.e. FIP, Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience, and Scaling up Renewable Energy Programme) and beyond, including governments and other international or bilateral development institutions.

1. See Itad (2019).

SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION

*“Tuatahi me tuku nga whakamoemiti ki te runga rawa,
e lo arahi i a tatou kia u ki te tika, ki te pono.
He tika te korero he whanau tahi tatou.
A he tika kia mahi tatou, hei iwi kotahi, i mua i nga whakatatae o te wa.
Ko te pakanga o te wa, ko te panoni o te huarere.
Me whakamahia i o tatou tino rangatiratanga hei tu uruoa i mua tenei wero.
Ma whero ma pango ka oti ai te mahi.” (T Toki)²*

“The challenges associated with climate change are ongoing. Indigenous peoples have come together as one to stand united. The battle is one against climate change. We must use our knowledge and right of self-determination to fight with passion in the face of this challenge”.

The Climate Investment Fund (CIF) was founded with the mandate to serve as a learning laboratory for scaled-up climate finance. The CIF Evaluation and Learning (E&L) Initiative is helping to fulfil this mandate through a range of strategic and demand-driven evaluations covering some of the most important and pressing challenges facing climate finance funders and practitioners. Drawing on experience from across the CIF portfolio of investments in clean energy, forests, and resilience in 72 developing countries, the E&L Initiative uses evaluation to enable learning that is relevant, timely and used to inform decisions and strategies, for both the CIF and the wider climate finance sector. This report was commissioned by CIF’s E&L Initiative to learn about the DGM through an Indigenous Lens.

The Forest Investment Programme (FIP) was established by the CIF in 2009 and provides funding to countries to address the direct and underlying drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. A year later in 2010, the Dedicated Grant Mechanism (DGM), a dynamic mechanism, was written into the FIP. The DGM is an innovative program aimed at enabling the effective participation of IPLCs in the design and implementation of projects and activities that will result in reducing deforestation and forest degradation at the local, national and global levels.

The purpose of the DGM is to enhance the capacity of IPLCs and support their on-the ground activities. Although the DGM model is applied to all DGM countries, the priorities and activities are adapted to the specific country context. The national DGM is determined by IPLC representatives in conjunction with the World Bank. The DGM is comprised of a National Steering Committee (NSC) and a National Executing Agency (NEA). These entities are supported and complemented by Advisers and World Bank staff (TTL). The 2018 DGM Annual Report noted that there is now 67 million USD allocated across 13 DGM pilot countries, 10 National Steering Committees (NSC), 8 National Executing Agencies (NEA), and 207 approved sub projects (out of 1,346 proposals received).³

The DGM is funded by the global community and anticipated to be an exceptional climate initiative.⁴ This world-leading mechanism constitutes an additional operational layer that empowers IPLCs to

2. Oral citation from T Toki Ngapuhi, Ngatiwai, Te Reo (Māori language) speaker.

3. DGM Annual Report (2018).

4. Myers et. al. (2018), 322.

set priorities and implement programs aimed at conserving their natural environment. For example, in Peru, Sunderlin et. al. (2018) notes that the Saweto DGM project, funded by FIP, is one of the most significant developments to date, in terms of empowering Indigenous Peoples. This \$5.5 million project includes funds for the recognition of 310 native communities, and for the demarcation and titling of almost 1 million hectares of native lands.⁵

To gain a deeper understanding of the DGM, this report reviewed components of DGM sub projects through an Indigenous lens. Consequently, this report combined an Indigenous methodology, guided by Kaupapa Māori, with a qualitative methodological approach. To measure the DGM's efficacy from an Indigenous perspective, this Kaupapa Māori approach was complemented by the rights and standards contained in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). For example, this report analysed how the DGM engages with Indigenous peoples and implementing partners and how (if at all) the DGM provided for Indigenous self-determination.

This report consists of three main sections followed by a conclusion. The remainder of Section One provides an overview of the objectives and the intended audience of this report. Section Two examines the approach, including the study methodology and country selection process. Section Three presents the findings from the literature review and country visits, as well as an analysis of the data and findings. Considering the preceding sections, Section Four provides overarching learning, followed by some concluding remarks.



5. Sunderlin et. al. (2018).

1.1 Purpose - Objective

The primary purpose of this report is to review the DGM's effectiveness in capturing and incorporating Indigenous knowledge and perspectives. In addition, this report seeks to examine whether the DGM should be extended to two of the remaining three programs of the CIF. These are the Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience (PPCR) and Scaling up Renewable Energy Programme (SREP). More specifically, this study seeks to assess the potential for the DGM to foster and improve the capability and outcomes of CIF programs from an Indigenous perspective.

This report also considers whether the DGM has demonstrated potential for transformational change. The orthodox understanding of transformational change involves a shift in the culture of an organisation resulting from a change in processes or strategy.⁶ The CIF Transformational Change Learning Partnership (TCLP) developed the following working definition of transformational change:

“Strategic changes in targeted markets and other systems, with large-scale, sustainable impacts that shift and/or accelerate the trajectory toward low-carbon and climate-resilient development.”⁷

According to this definition, four dimensions must be in place (to a greater or lesser extent) for transformational change to be considered both real and lasting.⁸ These are relevance, systemic change, scale, and sustainability. These dimensions are reflected upon in Section Four of this report.

To identify whether transformational change is being supported, Mapfum et. al. (2017) suggest that a shift in thinking is required, moving from focusing primarily on the outcomes that may result from, or be achieved by, transformational change towards a deeper understanding or examination of the social responses, participation and processes through which transformational change can be achieved. The shift in focus from outcomes to social participation as a way to achieve transformational change is informative for this study, as many DGM subprojects require a high degree of community participation.

Subsequently, this report aims to provide a reflection on:

- 1 The DGM's effectiveness in capturing and incorporating Indigenous knowledge and perspectives – a significant contribution to knowledge in itself – to assist stakeholders including Governments, Non-Government Organisations (NGOs), and Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) in better understanding the role the DGM plays within the wider CIF community and how it supports the CIF's goals.
- 2 The potential of expanding the DGM to other CIF programs (complementing the 2019 work undertaken by Itad on the [Learning Review of the DGM for IPLC in the FIP of the CIF](#)).
- 3 Whether the DGM has demonstrated potential to lead to transformational change.

6. See Chapman, J. (2002), where she notes that in assessing an alternative to a traditional or orthodox transformational change approach 'emphasis is placed on attitudes, beliefs and values as the key change levers in an organisational transformation'.

7. Climate Investment Funds (2019).

8. Climate Investment Funds (2020).

1.2 Synergies with the Itad Learning Review

In 2019, a [Learning Review of the DGM](#)⁹ was conducted by Itad focused on documenting the experiences from early stage implementation of the DGM. The learning review sought to explore and capture the FIP DGM's experience in encouraging greater involvement of IPLCs in financial and policy processes that relate to forests. By better understanding the DGM's history and its early outcomes, the review provided early lessons and insights that may guide current and future implementation within the CIF and for replication by others.

While the 2019 Learning Review of the DGM sought to identify the benefits of the DGM and any potential areas for improvement, this report takes a narrower view and specifically seeks to explore how well the DGM is (or could) perform in its capacity as a vehicle for bringing Indigenous knowledge and perspectives into CIF programmes, such as the FIP but also the PPCR and SREP.

This study complements the work of Itad and is of particular interest given the Itad report highlighted engagement as a key issue for Indigenous peoples. For example, in response to the FIP Investment Plan in Indonesia, the Solidaritas Perempuan-AKSI-Ulu Foundation (NGO) noted that the Government's online public consultation process 'had obviously marginalised Indonesian people who do not have, or have limited, access to the Internet, particularly the affected group (local community; indigenous people, especially the affected women)'.¹⁰ In response the Government of Indonesia responded that the 'IP are posted online for at least 2 weeks to receive public feedback' and 'the time available for public feedback was more than 6 months if the posting of earlier draft on 10 March is taken into consideration'.¹¹ In addition, the Government of Indonesia responded that consultation was conducted in various forms including meetings and field visits, so online was only one channel used. However, the response did not explicitly address how the marginalised and affected groups such as Indigenous Peoples and women were consulted and whether, or how, cultural perspectives were included in the consultation process.

Therefore, in comparison to Itad's 2019 Learning Review of the DGM, this study used an Indigenous methodology when consulting with and/or interviewing groups in 'deep dives', which assisted in identifying the relevant groups for consultation, engaging appropriately with these groups and interpreting and analysing the data. In addition, this study developed an Indigenous methodological approach to consultation that was focused on:

- The procedures of engagement
- Which Indigenous Peoples were consulted
- How and why they are consulted
- If and how their perspectives were processed/incorporated

9. Itad (2019).

10. Response of the Government of Indonesia on the Investment Plan of Indonesia (2013), 4.

11. Response of the Government of Indonesia on the Investment Plan of Indonesia (2013), 4.

1.3 Users - Intended Audience

The key intended audience of this report includes the DGM partnership (i.e. the CIF and FIP Focal Points), Governments, MDBs, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and other Stakeholders.

Stakeholder groups can use the knowledge from this report to understand how projects can be more effectively fashioned, implemented and operated, in the areas of their interest, to ameliorate the effects of climate change in a sustainable way. This will in turn improve design, implementation strategies and outcomes. For instance, Government agencies (e.g. ministries that are implementing programs or projects) can use this knowledge and approach to help improve design and implementation of investment plans, projects and strategies, while promoting inclusiveness and participation of relevant stakeholders for a better outcome.

International/local NGOs, umbrella organisations and community-based organisations (CBOs) can also use the learning to advocate for better policy and design to enhance collaboration with governments to redesign strategies and plans. It can also be used to monitor and provide inputs during the implementation phase.

Secondary users of the findings from this report could include additional stakeholders, such as policy and normative reference groups including peers or colleagues. This could lead to changes in policy planning documents and with consideration from reference groups, changes, more generally, in environmental understanding and approaches.

This report can also assist these stakeholders to understand how the DGM can facilitate the development of projects that alleviate the effects of climate change. Implicit in this process is the achievement and understanding of how Indigenous knowledge can contribute positively towards mitigating climate change, as it would relate to a project. It could be that the recommendations from this study could apply equally to governments and international or bilateral development institutions.



Photo 2 – Rio Sao Francisco - Brazil

SECTION 2 – METHODOLOGY

2.1 Approach

This study employed a mix of orthodox and Kaupapa Māori methods to collect and analyse information and findings. A qualitative approach was first used to gain an understanding of the effectiveness of the DGM through an Indigenous lens. This orthodox qualitative methodology, which included a comprehensive literature review and thematic analysis followed by interviews from two country visits, helped develop a general theoretical analysis framework. To ensure that this analysis remained closely tied to the specific observations and accounts of Indigenous Peoples, the study then incorporated an Indigenous (Kaupapa Māori) methodology (employed when conducting the interviews). While the qualitative methodology was applied to provide background information about the DGM, the Indigenous methodology was applied to the engagement aspects of the DGM, in other words, to ascertain the procedural and substantive effectiveness through an Indigenous or Kaupapa Māori lens.

This study's mixed method approach consisted of the following three main stages.

>> **STAGE 1** of this study employed an orthodox qualitative methodology, to provide background on the DGM from an Indigenous perspective, as well as to identify specific research questions, the most relevant countries and projects to examine and the most appropriate stakeholders to interview.

This involved a targeted literature review of the relevant literature (books, articles, conference papers, reports, policies, etc.). To avoid overlap with the 2019 Itad Learning Review of the DGM, this literature review specifically sought material that provided an Indigenous perspective of the DGM. In addition, during this stage, the country portfolios for FIP, PPCR and SREP were examined to identify the most suitable countries and sub projects to investigate.

The literature was disappointingly sparse which is a reflection of both the relative 'newness' of the DGM program and also the lack of knowledge of the DGM or reviews of the DGM. Many sources were factual rather than analytical or evaluative.¹² In addition, very few were peer reviewed¹³ and of those that were peer reviewed most were also factual rather than analytical.¹⁴ There were a few that provided some analysis¹⁵; however, none provided an Indigenous perspective, highlighting the potential value of this report.

Despite these limitations/gaps, the literature review did help to generate specific research questions (see Appendix 1) and supported the development and refinement of best practice evaluation tools. In addition, it provided evidence and examples of suitable qualitative, culturally-based research methods to be used in this report (to complement the Kaupapa Māori methodologies) since the collection of data should be undertaken accurately and truthfully whilst being mindful of the responsibility to others.¹⁶ This approach helped to identify a conceptual framework for the presentation, dissemination and implementation of the project's findings.

12. See the raft of MENA Reports including MENA (2016) and MENA (2015).

13. Most published journal articles are subject to a peer review process, for example Sunderlin et. al. (2018), whereas reports, for example MENA Reports (2016) and (2015), do not tend to attract the same level of review.

14. See Brobbey et. al. (2019), 19-31 and Recio, M. (2018), 277-299.

15. See Sunderlin et. al. (2018) and Kansanga & Luginaah (2019).

16. For example, oral story telling is recognised as a culturally based research method, complementary to not only a Kaupapa Māori approach but also an Indigenous methodological approach more generally.

Lastly, from the literature and portfolio review of the DGM, within two selected countries, the most appropriate participants and stakeholders (e.g. Indigenous Peoples, civil society organisations, etc.) to be interviewed were also identified at this stage.

>> **STAGE 2** comprised of a set of interviews with stakeholders using a *Kaupapa Māori* methodology to ensure culturally appropriate approaches were used where necessary. Ethical issues were considered and managed, while ethics approval was obtained from the University of Waikato prior to undertaking any interviews or consultations. See Appendix 2 for a list of the individuals interviewed.

>> **STAGE 3** employed a mix of *Kaupapa Māori* and orthodox methods. This involved the analysis of all the information gathered (from the literature review, portfolio review, and interviews) to ascertain the effectiveness of the DGM and subsequently, the potential of the DGM assessed through an Indigenous lens.



Photo 3– Traditional Community – Brazil

2.2 Kaupapa Māori approach

For Māori, traditional knowledge is derived from Te Ao Māori (the Māori world) that is based on concepts such as reciprocity, caring (manaakitanga), achieving balance (aim of traditional knowledge/tikanga) and connectedness (whanaungatanga).¹⁷ An Indigenous or Kaupapa Māori methodology is a methodology that is consistent with traditional customs (tikanga) and knowledge (mātauranga). This approach is founded on a praxis (Kaupapa Māori) that is concerned with the intergenerational transfer of knowledge, supporting an Indigenous (Māori) identity, restoration of balance and flourishing Indigenous wellbeing.¹⁸

This study adhered to a Kaupapa Māori methodology, a methodology that breaks away from the orthodox Western dominated methodological research paradigm and focuses on an Indigenous methodological approach. Kaupapa Māori methodology is derived from very different epistemological and metaphysical foundations, providing a distinctiveness, when compared to Western philosophies.¹⁹ Linda Tuhiwai Smith describes Kaupapa Māori as an approach that exists within a minority culture, a counter-hegemonic approach to Western forms of research that currently exists on the margins and is often misrepresented within antagonistic colonial discourses.²⁰

Very simply, Kaupapa Māori methodology and research seeks to understand Māori forms of knowledge in Māori terms and values,²¹ in order to conceptualise Māori knowledge.²² It can define what needs to be studied and what questions ought to be asked.²³ However, Kaupapa Māori methodology can also build on existing values and knowledge.²⁴ Indigenous Peoples have adapted some of the theory developed in the social sciences²⁵ to assist in developing Indigenous research tools. Much of the ideology underlying these areas is similar to an Indigenous worldview in that it challenges the outlook of mainstream society.²⁶

Although the Kaupapa Māori approach continues to grow and evolve, there is still the issue of researchers from outside the community “studying” Indigenous problems personifying the misunderstanding of Kaupapa Māori methodology. No matter how objective they claim themselves and/or their methods to be, these researchers bring their own set of Eurocentric biases with them.²⁷ In addition, this Eurocentric approach focuses on problems, and often imposes outside solutions, rather than appreciating and expanding upon the resources available within Indigenous communities.²⁸

A Kaupapa Māori methodology is holistic in its approach to problem solving (rather than a strict problem-solution focus) that applies to processes (i.e. procedures) as well as outcomes (i.e. substance). Its solutions are derived from within the Māori Indigenous world, although the tenets from which it draws upon are universal Indigenous values. As a principle-based methodology derived from an Indigenous or holistic world, a Kaupapa Māori approach can be applied to both procedural aspects of a

17. Mead, H. (2003).

18. Smith, L. (2012).

19. Nepe, T. (1991).

20. Smith, L. (2012), 191.

21. Smith, L. (2012).

22. Nepe, T. (1991), 15.

23. Smith, L. (2012), 191, 193.

24. Smith, L. (2012), 193.

25. Miller et. al. (2015).

26. Wilson, S. (2008), 16.

27. Smith, L. (2012)

28. Wilson, S. (2008), 16.

project and the substantive nature of a project. Further, a Kaupapa Māori approach can apply at a macro level against the general principles and foundations of a project. Equally, a Kaupapa Māori approach can apply to individual tenets and be used as a framework or benchmark to measure others against.

The spiritual and cultural worldview that underpins Kaupapa Māori is consistent with an Indigenous worldview generally. Subsequently, as a principle-based approach, Kaupapa Māori can be adapted within and across other Indigenous jurisdictions that adhere to an Indigenous methodology, a methodology that recognises Indigenous worldviews, knowledge and realities.²⁹

2.2.1. Why use a Kaupapa Māori approach?

It makes sense to measure the efficacy of funding systems from the perspective of the recipients, as well as from the perspective of the donors, for the simple reason that the goals and objectives of those funding schemes may not be realised if the benefits are not also felt and live up to the systems and standards within those recipient communities. As Indigenous Peoples are recipients of funding from the DGM, it therefore follows that the efficiency and efficacy of the DGM be measured according to an Indigenous worldview. To achieve this goal, integrity requires that an Indigenous methodology be used to measure the DGM's efficacy. As mentioned, a Kaupapa Māori approach is a unique application of an Indigenous methodology. Although it is specific to Māori communities, its application is of much broader appeal and relevance.

For completeness, this Kaupapa Māori approach was supplemented by the rights and standards of the UNDRIP, the international instrument and benchmark, which articulates fundamental human rights for Indigenous Peoples and complements an Indigenous or Kaupapa Māori methodology in application.

Although the World Bank Group maintains a degree of independence (since it is not listed as a UN Agency), it is a member of the Inter Agency Support Group, a group established to support and promote the mandate of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. A Kaupapa Māori approach has never been applied to a UN report and thus, this report is unique. Specifically, the incorporation of intergenerational knowledge can assist meaningfully to achieving transformational change. For clarity, a Kaupapa Māori approach should not be seen as the only Indigenous methodological approach to research. However, it is a representative approach which captures key elements of other Indigenous Peoples. This is because all Indigenous approaches share common elements regarding research and inquiry.³⁰ In light of the accepted use of a Kaupapa Māori approach, the existing scholarship within this area,³¹ and the author's familiarity with using this framework,³² this Indigenous lens was applied in this report.

29. Mead, H. (2003).

30. Mead, H. (2003).

31. Toki, V. (2017).

2.3 Country Selection

As mentioned, the literature review helped identify the most relevant countries and projects to examine. See Table 1 below, which outlines which countries were considered (in Africa³³, Asia³⁴, and Latin America³⁵). There are currently 13 countries within the FIP that have a DGM, as indicated below. Also presented is a cross-reference of FIP DGM countries against PPCR and SREP countries, and those that were targeted for primary data collection by Itad.³⁶

TABLE 1 Countries considered for study

| FIP DGM countries | Country participates in | | DGM project under implementation (as of May 2018) | Countries researched under the Learning Review of the DGM by Itad | Countries selected for this report |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| | PPCR | SREP | | | |
| Brazil | | | | X doc review | X |
| Burkina Faso | | | X | X visited | |
| Congo (Republic of the) | | | | X doc review | |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | | | X | | |
| Cote d'Ivoire | | | | X doc review | |
| Ecuador | | | | | |
| Ghana | | X | X | X doc review | |
| Guatemala | | | | | |
| Indonesia | | | X | X visited | X |
| Mexico | | | X | X doc review | |
| Mozambique | X | | X | X doc review | |
| Nepal | X | X | | | |
| Peru | | | X | X visited | |

32. Toki, V. (2017).

33. Of the 6 DGM countries in Africa (Burkina Faso, Congo, DR Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Mozambique), 6 National Steering Committees have been established and 4 National Executive Agencies have been selected with 29.5 million US dollars allocated. 53 sub projects have been approved from 777 proposals received (DGM Annual Report, 2018, 4).

34. Of the 2 DGM countries in Asia (Indonesia and Nepal), only 1 National Steering Committee has been established and 1 National Executive Agency has been selected with 11 million US dollars allocated for 21 sub projects from 209 proposals received (DGM Annual Report, 2018, 14).

35. Of the 5 DGM countries in Latin America (Brazil, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico and Peru), 3 National Steering Committees have been established and 3 National Executive Agencies have been selected with 27 million US dollars allocated. 133 sub projects have been approved from 360 proposal received (DGM Annual Report, 2018, 18).

36. Itad (2019).

In the end, the selection of countries to visit for this study did not include a PPCR and/or SREP program. Only three FIP DGM countries also participate in the PPCR and/or SREP: Nepal, Mozambique and Ghana. Of these three, Nepal is the only country that participates in all three programs however, the Nepal DGM project is still under development. Mozambique and Ghana were not chosen as both were covered by the document review conducted by Itad. Although both Indonesia and Brazil had been visited and were covered under the document review by Itad, these countries (Indonesia and Brazil) offered a potentially richer source of material for a DGM comparative study.

Therefore, it was proposed that Brazil be visited. Although Brazil does not participate in the PPCR or SREP, Brazil has a well-developed FIP DGM program with 45 sub projects approved and 19 pending (DGM Annual Report 2018). In addition, Indonesia was also selected because in contrast to the DGM Brazil, the DGM Indonesia was relatively new and would provide a helpful comparison.

Once the two countries were selected, the following process was followed for both countries:

- Conduct initial background research (which included an analysis of the FIP project portfolio to identify relevant projects).
- Identify the FIP DGM National team (i.e. NSC/NEA).
- Identify any FIP, PPCR or SREP country focal points.
- Establish contact and arrange meetings, interviews and visit dates.
- Meet with DGM NSC/NEA team members (i.e. introduce report, conduct interviews and visit sub project site).
- Depart country to analyse data.
- Disseminate data to NSC/NEA team.

2.4 Country Visits - How the Kaupapa Māori approach was applied

Kaupapa Māori methodology was applied procedurally and substantively – as well as directly and indirectly; implicitly and explicitly. When and how this methodology was applied very much depended on the context.

Procedurally, all face-to-face interviews (kanohi ki te kanohi) were undertaken with respect and mindfulness of cultural protocol where relevant. When a face-to-face approach was unavailable, telephone interviews, with a local interpreter, were employed and guided by the same principle of cultural respect and mindfulness. Employing a local interpreter assisted with understanding the cultural protocol. The cultural interaction and respect prior to engaging in the interview provided cultural ‘safety’ for the dialogue that followed. This is akin to what a ‘prayer’ (karakia) seeks to achieve. In this context the interviewee felt at ease to provide the necessary data for the project.

Substantively, the intrinsic connection Indigenous peoples have with their environment was taken into account to assist and guide, for example, the underpinning philosophy to achieve Indigenous wellbeing. The fundamental rights articulated in the UNDRIP supports this approach. The UNDRIP subsequently provides measures and benchmarks to assess the effectiveness of the DGM, such as,

whether the project provides for a form of self-determination for Indigenous Peoples or whether the project recognises, or is consistent with, an Indigenous right to traditional lands and territories. This information was gathered during the interviews.

The success or effectiveness of the DGM was measured through an Indigenous lens to understand whether the DGM could support an Indigenous identity, a flourishing Indigenous wellbeing and consistency with the fundamental rights articulated in the UNDRIP. Further, whether or not the DGM supported transformational change and, importantly, the potential of the DGM to be extended to other CIF programs was measured against these benchmarks and consistency with the tenets of Indigenous knowledge.

The Kaupapa Māori approach ensured and respected the authority of the interviewee and that the interview process was culturally respectful and appropriate. Prior to each interview, culture greetings/ prayers were exchanged, and all answers were listened to with respect. Although all interviewees answered all the set questions, the use of a Kaupapa Māori approach encouraged the interviewees to freely and frankly contribute more than asked, as the interviewee felt they were in a culturally safe environment. Subsequently, at the beginning of each interview, the interviewees elaborated on their specific knowledge of the DGM, vision for the DGM and how an Indigenous lens or perspective was important. Each interview lasted for an hour and longer. After each interview, a small gift of food was presented, consistent with the cultural tenet of reciprocity.

In Indonesia, the interviewees were a useful mix of Indigenous peoples, women's representatives, NGO, NSC as well as World Bank representatives. In Brazil, the interviewees were also a useful mix of Indigenous peoples, Quilombola community, NGOs, women's representatives, NSC and NEA representatives. This mix was important to provide credibility and vigour to this report.

Two approaches were taken to the interviews. Firstly, on a structured one-on-one basis with a fixed set of questions and secondly, on a community basis with a more fluid question regime. The community based interviews were less structured but provided an opportunity for all the members to contribute their thoughts on the sub project. One particular question was asked to the community relating to any additional benefits or impacts of the project (in addition to the expected benefits). Although questions were at times rephrased, all



Photo 3– Traditional Community – Brazil

interviewees found the questions easy to understand and answer. Some questions were more fully answered depending on the experience and knowledge of the interviewee.

The interviews were not confidential and the processing of the data collected was consistent with a Kaupapa Māori approach (i.e. with respect and measured against the rights articulated in the UNDRIP). All data collected contributed to the project. The insights gathered from the people interviewed within each region were helpful.

SECTION 3 – FINDINGS FROM LITERATURE REVIEW AND COUNTRY VISITS

Two FIP countries that have a DGM were chosen to visit: Indonesia and Brazil. The country visit to Indonesia was undertaken between November 1 – November 7, 2018. The country visit to Brazil was undertaken between May 19 – May 26, 2019.

Indonesia was selected as a relatively new jurisdiction that has entered the DGM programme, while Brazil as a jurisdiction with a more established record of DGM sub projects. In addition, these countries represent two developing regions in the world, Asia and Latin America, that also have significant Indigenous populations. Indonesia and Brazil are also acknowledged as rising global economies. The following section summarises the information found during the literature review and country visits for both countries.

3.1 Indonesia

3.1.1 Indigenous Peoples in Indonesia - Analysis of Indigenous Peoples perspective

It is acknowledged that forest management in most tropical countries has dispossessed, excluded and marginalised forest people.³⁷ Governments have often placed forests under state ownership and established centralised forestry departments to manage them. Political decision-making has often excluded forest people from meaningful participation and state forestry programmes have been neither equitable nor effective.³⁸ Indonesia is no different.

The population of Indonesia is estimated to be approximately 266 million. The government has recognised 1128 'ethnic' groups in Indonesia.³⁹ Many people self-identify as Indigenous. The Ministry of Social Affairs identifies some Indigenous communities and government legislation that refers to Indigenous Peoples. For instance, Article 18b-2 of the Constitution recognises Indigenous peoples and there is implicit recognition of Indigenous Peoples (masyarakat adat) in Act No.5/1960 on Basic Agrarian Reform and Act No. 27/2007 on Management of Coastal and Small Islands.⁴⁰ The national Indigenous Peoples' organisation Alliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara (AMAN) estimates the number of Indigenous Peoples to be between 50 – 70 million people.⁴¹

In May 2013, the Constitutional Court affirmed the constitutional rights of Indigenous Peoples to their land and territories, including their collective rights over customary forests.⁴² The importance of land to Indigenous Peoples is fundamental, together with their practices to manage the lands sustainably. Subsequently, the acknowledgement of this right for Indigenous Peoples is pivotal within the DGM context.

37. Sunderlin et. al. (2018).

38. Sunderlin et. al. (2018).

39. Mikkelsen, C. (2014), 263.

40. Mikkelsen, C. (2014).

41. Mikkelsen, C. (2014).

42. Mikkelsen, C. (2014).

3.1.2 DGM Indonesia

Although the FIP is relatively new to Indonesia, the FIP DGM sub projects are more advanced than the FIP projects funded under the FIP Investment Plan. The FIP portfolio in Indonesia has less than two years of actual implementation on the ground, which is reflected in the low rate of disbursement (13 percent).⁴³ In addition, Indonesia is the last of the original eight FIP countries still pending approval of all funds under its endorsed investment plan.⁴⁴

Indonesia is the largest country archipelago. As such, configuring a DGM is challenging, not only on a practical geographical sense but also in terms of reach and inclusion of all Indigenous Peoples' groups. This challenge is met with the representation of 7 key regions on the National Steering Committee (NSC) to facilitate the requirement of addressing the direct and underlying drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. The inclusion of all Indigenous groupings on a national level adds to the robust nature of the DGM.

The DGM Indonesia's NSC consists of 11 members, of which 2 are observers from the National Forestry Council and the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, who have a non-voting capacity. The 9 voting members include 2 women's positions, one from the local community and one Indigenous. The remaining 7 members are from the widespread Indigenous communities in Indonesia (Java, Papua, Sumatera, Kalimantan, Maluku, Sulawesi, Bali-Nusa) ensuring good community and national representation.

The National Executing Agency (NEA) is Samdhana. Established in 2003, Samdhana is an Asian centre for social and environmental renewal, underpinned by a commitment of reciprocity, giving back to the next generation, bringing skills together and delivering strength and sustainability. Samdhana provides technical support to the DGM by reviewing projects against environmental safeguards, holding coaching clinics with the project holders and facilitating conflict when necessary. Albertus Pramono, who holds the role as a Senior Social and Local Community Development Specialist with the World Bank, acts in an Advisory capacity for the DGM project in Indonesia. Albertus has a background in mapping and geography. As most of the projects focus on land tenure and land mapping, Albertus is helpful in providing input into the proposals, concept notes and projects.

The activities supported by the first call for DGM sub projects included securing land tenure and land mapping. This is consistent with the emerging rights agenda in forestry that identifies the transfer and return of tenure rights to forest and Indigenous Peoples as a key strategy to overcome people's exclusion from forest management and the first of three approaches to recognise forest people's rights.⁴⁵ The second approach promotes Indigenous Peoples' participation in political processes and rights to political and cultural self-determination.⁴⁶ The third approach emphasises the relevance of human rights to forestry.⁴⁷

43. See FIP Investment Report (2019), para 74.

44. See FIP Investment Report (2019), para 34. See also para 1 which notes that the FIP started with eight countries (Brazil, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Mexico and Peru). In 2015, the FIP added six new countries (Congo Republic, Cote d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mozambique and Nepal) with an indicative envelope of resources of USD 24 million each plus USD 4.5 million for the DGM for IPLC, and nine additional countries with no funding envelope (Bangladesh, Cambodia, Cameroon, Guyana, Honduras, Rwanda, Tunisia, Uganda, and Zambia).

45. Sunderlin et. al. (2018).

46. Campese et. al. (2009).

47. Campese et. al. (2009).

The first call for proposals approved 21 sub projects for the DGM Indonesia. Of these 21 sub projects, the majority revolved around mapping, titling, land tenure, capacity building and a focus on indigenous communities. A few examples of approved sub projects are noted in Table 2 below.

TABLE 2 Examples of Approved Sub Projects for the DGM Indonesia

| Sub Project | Description | Location | Indigenous Communities |
|---|--|-------------------------------|--|
| NHU (Consortium of LBH Pekanbaru & AMAN Indragiri Hulu) | Aimed 'to encourage a policy to ensure rights and Access to Customary Areas for Improving Governance for Sustainability of the Livelihoods of the Talang Mamak Customary Community in Indragiri Hulu.' | Indragiri Hulu, Sumatra | 3: Cenaku, Kelayang, Siberida |
| Papua Arrow Association Recognition and Protection of Customary Legal Communities | Focused on the 'landscapes Lowland Tropical Forest Ecosystems in the Sebyar and Moskona Tribal Areas, Teluk Bintuni'. | Teluk Bintuni, Papua | 2: Sebyar and Moskona |
| Indonesian Young Foresters (RMI) | Focused on the 'advocacy and improvement of the livelihoods of Kasepuhan Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities through Customary Forests and Forestry Partnerships.' | Lebak, Banten and Bogor, Java | 2 in Lebak: Kasepuhan Pasir Eurih and Kasepuhan Cibarani 3 in Bogor: Ciwaluh Lengkong and Cipeucang |
| West Sulawesi Social Forestry Consortium (Kopasos) | Focused on the 'Protection of Legal and Formal Rights and Access of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities towards Forest areas in Mamuju District West Sulawesi'. | Mamuju, Sulawesi | 6: Kondobulo, Batu Makkada, Makkaliki, Rantedoda, Kopeang and Bela |
| Institute for Research and Development of Resources and the Environment (LPPSLH) | Aimed to 'improve Village Community Access and Control over Forests through Implementation of Social Forestry in the Work Area of Perhutani Public Corporation.' | Banyumas, Java | 1: Gerduren |

The activities of these subprojects (e.g. mapping) are consistent with the first approach taken to recognise an Indigenous Peoples' rights to their forestry. It builds on the premise that the redistribution of forest tenure is necessary to redress people's historical dispossession. The transfer of tenure to forestland and connected resources is the key strategy to overcome people's exclusion from forest management.⁴⁸

48. Sunderlin et. al. (2018).

It is anticipated that the second call for proposals for the DGM Indonesia will build on the base line activities from the first call and support sub projects that involve harvesting activities in order to provide a more visual understanding of the projects. This could include, for instance, moving from land tenure to ‘harvesting’ projects, which could be considered as a step towards cultural, economic and social self-determination. During this second stage the traditional knowledge associated with which species to plant, when to plant, and why will be more evident. It is anticipated that a wider purview of traditional knowledge will be applied consistent with the activities from the second stage subprojects.

3.1.3 Primary findings from Country Visit

All responses to the research questions⁴⁹, although to different degrees, indicated that the DGM Indonesia does consider Indigenous knowledge and that this consideration was intrinsic to the activity associated with the subproject. A few responses exhibiting this finding are noted below.

*“Indigenous Peoples (IP) and Indigenous Knowledge is involved in DGM design
– power to IPLC – this is good!”*

*“In terms of knowledge in managing forest Indigenous Peoples are very advanced
– as it is what they do day to day”*

*“DGM – project is good because it has a project development objective and framework that is able to
accommodate Traditional Knowledge and Indigenous Peoples knowledge on forests and land”*

The report found that the members of the NSC provided details and examples of how Indigenous knowledge is considered by their respective regions. Further, as Indigenous knowledge does not exist in isolation or in silos, sub projects provided additional benefits to the anticipated outcomes. As one respondent noted:

*“Replanting of two types of Indigenous trees is beneficial for Indigenous Peoples
– Traditional bags are made from these trees – it is a long-term project
– Women also plant roots that can be eaten – improves food security – 18 months”*

All responses indicated that Indigenous knowledge had made a difference and more funding is needed for the activities. For example, a respondent stated that IPLC need capacity building to understand their own rights regarding forest land use, which is what the DGM does.

Another person stated that funding for the DGM should be increased because the Indonesian Government needs to ensure IPLCs are involved in projects. Lastly, a respondent stated that they only support Indigenous based projects, highlighting the importance of DGM projects.

All interviewees, for different reasons, suggested that the DGM should be extended to the PPCR and SREP. A respondent noted that the DGM could be extended to the SREP through projects related to wind, hydro, and solar power. Another respondent believes that the DGM is beneficial and ‘should be extended to

49. See Appendix 1.

other CIF programs because it is a helpful mechanism for Indigenous Peoples, since decisions are made by villages and people on the ground’.

Of particular interest were the responses that indicated that first, the DGM should be mainstreamed within the SREP and PPCR, and secondly, given that some FIP projects have not progressed when compared to the FIP DGM sub projects, the FIP and FIP DGM should collaborate when and where possible/relevant to achieve progress. This is with the expectation that progress will be achieved. A respondent found that if a FIP project is on or near Indigenous lands, then the DGM should be used. Another reflected on how the process for FIP is different from FIP DGM since they rely on government networks and therefore a challenge going forward will be how the FIP and FIP DGM can collaborate.

Overall, there was wide support for the DGM to the extent that it should not only be extended to the SREP and PPCR, but also to the broader FIP projects. There are two areas where there is an overlap between FIP DGM and FIP projects: Kalimantan and Sumbawa. It was suggested that the FIP projects could take a DGM approach to progress the FIP projects. As there is a government representative on the FIP DGM, this could be helpful in terms of extrapolating and/or sharing the approach and benefits from the FIP DGM to the wider FIP projects, particularly in these two overlap regions. It is noted that the government representative on the FIP DGM holds no voting rights, however, this does not limit the progression of discussions to synergise the FIP and FIP DGM.

3.2 Brazil

“Our dream is to recover the Cerrado area”

3.2.1 Indigenous Peoples in Brazil - Analysis of Indigenous Peoples perspective

The Indigenous lands in Brazil are represented in 654 areas totalling 115,499.953 hectares or 13.56 percent of the national territory. The majority is located within the Amazon region (417 areas; 113,822.141 hectares), with the remaining 1.39 percent divided between the northeast, south east, south and centre west.⁵⁰

Recent statistics indicate that 0.42 percent of the national population identify as Indigenous, with the Amazon region containing the highest proportion of Indigenous Peoples. There are 305 different ethnic groups speaking 274 Indigenous languages.⁵¹

Brazil has adopted the UNDRIP, UN Declaration of Human Rights and ratified the UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, UN Economic Cultural and Social Covenant and ILO Convention 169. Despite this, the government’s lack of commitment to demarcating Indigenous territories is a source of tension between landowners and Indigenous Peoples.⁵²

50. Mikkelsen, C. (2014).

51. Mikkelsen, C. (2014).

52. Mikkelsen, C. (2014).

The struggle of Indigenous Peoples in Brazil for physical and cultural survival continues to affect their daily lives. Reliable information to understand the extent of these struggles is lacking, however it is suggested that knowledge generated should become the basis to achieve equity in the health and wellbeing for Indigenous Peoples of Brazil.⁵³

In addition, the lack of engaging Indigenous People in free prior and informed consent⁵⁴ with projects on or near Indigenous territories has resulted in instances such as the Belo Monte Dam where none of the collective agreements with Indigenous Peoples were kept. This demonstrates that in pursuit of development, the State will deny Indigenous peoples their rights of self-determination, restrict their right to property and threaten their right to life.⁵⁵ This colonising attitude does not progress the protection and recognition of Indigenous rights and the continued peaceful occupation of their lands and territories.⁵⁶ The 2019 fires in the Amazon that were mostly triggered by developers clearing the rainforest for cattle rearing and soya production is a further example of the threat to the survival of the Indigenous communities who have little safeguards.



Photo 5 – Quilombola Community, Brazil

53. Carlos et. al. (2004), 102.

54. Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) is a fundamental right articulated in the UNDRIP that provides for the participation and consultation of Indigenous Peoples before a project is undertaken on or near traditionally owned land.

55. Jaichand, V. & Sampaio, A. (2013).

56. Jaichand, V. & Sampaio, A. (2013).

3.2.2 DGM Brazil

The DGM Brazil is coordinated with a NSC comprised of Indigenous Peoples, Quilombolas and traditional communities' representatives recognised within the Brazilian Cerrado region. The NSC consists of 12 members, of which 6 represent Indigenous communities, 4 represent traditional communities, and the remaining 2 represent the Quilombolas (Afro Brazilian descendants).

The Centro de Agricultura Alternativa do Norte de Minas (CAA) is the National NEA, which provides invaluable technical support to the DGM. This includes reviewing projects against environmental safeguards, holding coaching clinics and workshops with the sub project holders and community groups, and facilitating conflict when necessary.

There are currently 64 sub projects that aim to achieve the sustainable development of territories and cultures of Indigenous Peoples, traditional communities and Quilombolas of Cerrado (the second largest biome in the country, known as the "birthplace of waters"). The sub projects aim to 1) replenish the Cerrado biome with native species and 2) promote its sustainable management.

These sub project objectives are achieved through:

- Recovering springs and degraded areas (15)
- Agroecological production (11)
- Small agroindustries, processing and marketing of products from the Cerrado socio-biodiversity (15)
- Territorial and environmental management and surveillance (11), strengthening craft production (5)
- Community-based tourism (3)
- Institutional strengthening of representative and support organisations for Indigenous peoples, Quilombola communities and traditional communities (4)

At the completion of the 64 sub projects, it is anticipated that:

- 34,780 beneficiaries would have been involved, of which 11,041 are adult women, 9,925 young people and 3,326 elders
- 102 hectares recovered
- 74 springs protected
- 238,089 hectares of area would be under community surveillance
- 786 training activities undertaken (exchanges, seminars, workshops), of which 322 are specific for women (e.g. food security for 527 families).

This will result in 6,582,106 hectares of protected area belonging to the Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities of the Cerrado supported for sustainable landscape and land use managements, of which 6,478,115 are Indigenous lands; 68,689 of Quilombola territories and 35,302 of traditional communities.

During the June 2019 FIP Subcommittee meeting, it was stated that four of the existing FIP projects within the Cerrado that were funded under the FIP Investment Plan have been delayed due to a Constitutional amendment that limited the fiscal space for government-managed public expenditure. In addition, during the FIP Subcommittee meeting it was noted that two projects are under risk, falling within the second tier risk level⁵⁷. More specifically it was reported that the Brazilian government is preparing a request to restructure and partially cancel the 'Environmental Regularisation of Rural Lands in the Cerrado of Brazil' project.

In comparison, the situation is quite different for the FIP DGM sub projects in the Cerrado. All the FIP DGM sub projects observed were successful and completed. An anecdotal measure of success is the desired call for an expanded call for proposals.

In 2018, the second call for proposals from DGM Brazil received 106 expressions of interest. In all, 10 indigenous initiatives, 4 quilombolas and 4 from traditional communities were pre-selected.

3.2.3 Primary findings from country visit

The Brazil DGM sub projects are more progressed than the projects in Indonesia and thus provided helpful 'on the ground' data from developed or matured sub projects.

It was observed that the CAA was well integrated, with some CAA members having held previous roles on the NSC and some NSC members holding a role on the CAA. It was also observed that the CAA often goes above and beyond what is expected by a NEA with regard to supporting sub project applications and facilitating workshops. The 'on the ground' community knowledge of the CAA is invaluable to the successful execution and completion of the respective sub projects. Not only does the CAA understand the idiosyncrasies of the community but the CAA ensures sub projects are efficacious.

Considering this positive relationship, it is recommended that the CAA play a more substantial role and develop a closer working relationship with the World Bank. This will, however, require the World Bank to be receptive to the expert advice of the CAA with respect to community understanding. Given the success of the FIP DGM, when compared to the FIP, this would appear warranted.

Regarding the difficulty around land tenure specifically for the Quilombola peoples, it would seem prudent that, as in Indonesia, securing land tenure and land mapping sub projects be prioritised. This would then provide certainty and support for activities already funded. In addition, due to the need exhibited by communities, it is suggested that more of a cross-benefit approach be considered where one sub project, for instance handicraft, could possibly include Indigenous communities, traditional communities and Quilombola communities as a collective.

57. FIP public sector projects within 15 months of closing with less than 50 percent of approved funds disbursed.

As mentioned, the DGM Brazil is coordinated by a NSC composed of Indigenous, Quilombolas and traditional community representatives recognised in the Brazilian Cerrado region, as well as representatives of the Government. This group is responsible for the final decisions regarding the DGM in Brazil. Based on the interviews, this 'mix' of representatives presents an opportunity to share lessons from the FIP DGM sub projects with the government, increase the number of FIP DGM sub projects and explore the possibility of sub project collaboration.



Photo 6 – Entering Cerrado Sub project

Although in different degrees, all responses from the individual interviews indicated that the DGM does consider Indigenous knowledge. One interviewee even noted that the question of whether the DGM considered traditional knowledge was a tautology. This is important as traditional knowledge is a pivotal right recognised in the UNDRIP (article 31). One respondent noted that traditional knowledge is compatible with DGM projects, since they are sustainable and seek to address climate change, and thus the inclusion of the traditional knowledge within the DGM sub projects is positive and necessary.

The nature of the DGM supports a degree of self-sufficiency, enabling a degree of control and management over the sub project. This in turn allows the community to exercise a degree of self-determination, as their traditional knowledge can be utilised within the sub project to achieve sustainability. This is consistent with their cultural norms and with the key right of self-determination articulated in the UNDRIP (article 3).

Respondents noted that although the local communities have the knowledge and will to achieve sustainability, they lack the resources. The DGM can allow these communities to have autonomy to create and manage their own projects, by listening to local communities' demands. Also, DGM enables a degree of self-determination. Respondents noted that the DGM could be extended to additional areas to include access to health (e.g. cover costs to keep vaccines cold) and access to energy.

Indigenous Peoples and local communities are often subject to the whim of political decisions; however, the DGM is not as vulnerable to these political whims. Given the benefits the DGM can provide for Indigenous Peoples and local communities, it is important that the DGM continue in new areas in Brazil as noted by the respondents.

In addition to the expected benefits of the DGM sub project activities, there was a strong sense that well-being and identity were achieved from community meetings. This supplementary benefit is beyond the intended outputs from DGM sub projects. However, through an Indigenous lens, a sense of well-being and identity is an anticipated outcome of any activity. For example, one respondent noted that through the DGM project in the Gerais, the community is now more positive about their identity (compared to before when it was linked to low esteem), which has empowered the community (e.g. by selling seeds).

It was also found that the DGM assisted with community cohesiveness, collectiveness and the value of intergenerational knowledge, as the statements below highlighted.

“Helped with collective work – prior to the DGM we felt isolated – now there is a reinvigorated collective nature of work – social capital required – to complete the tasks required”

*“Importance of our youth – coming from the community now
– they are involved in the community issues – in the workshops”*

*“Helped in becoming more helpful for the future – increases our value
– people look at us differently in a positive way”*

*“Despite the challenges e.g. traveling to Monte Claros for workshops
– we have kept the faith and are now successful”*

“Planting water to harvest the headwaters”

*“At first suspicious about the project and WB – but once known and understand
– increase in involvement”*



Photo 7 – Photo Collage of Interviewees

3.3 Noteworthy individual stories from country visits

Three particular stories from the community visits were of note:



Photo 8: Neuzita

A. Neuzita

Neuzita is a young woman from a traditional community in Minas Gerais, Brazil. As a child she collected Indigenous fruit and Indigenous seeds for replanting. This activity was part of her culture. She noticed that over time the number of pique trees (a culturally important tree) had reduced as a direct result of deforestation and replanting of eucalyptus trees. When eucalyptus trees are planted to replace natives, the eucalyptus gradually destroy the native biome.⁵⁸

This sparked a raft of protests against the company planting eucalyptus trees due to the adverse effect on the plants and people. In 2011 there was a protest by women and children to stop the machines, which was the first time such a protest had taken place in Brazil. In 2015, the people from Cerrado embarked on a hunger strike. After political pressure a reservation and Board was created.

58. Overbeek, W. (2013).

Neuzita and her community are now, in addition to the main project objective of recovering the headwaters, planting Indigenous plants around this area, gathering the seeds, establishing a seed bank, and selling these seeds to companies that are also embarking in similar activities.

Overall, the DGM has provided both tangible and intangible benefits for Neuzita's community. The tangible benefits include recovery of the head waters; replanting the Cerrado with traditional plants (e.g. piqui trees); and harvesting the seeds from these plants not only for replanting but also for selling to companies wishing to promote and contribute to the replanting process and activities. The intangible benefits include the recovery of her culture and practices of gathering traditional fruit and seeds; a reminder of their identity and a sense of wellbeing; and the ability to stay in the community and not have to relocate to the cities. The DGM has crystallised her dreams by providing resources to help recover her culture, which has empowered the community.



Photo 9: Francesca

B. Francesca

Francesca is a 19 year old female from a local community in Minas Gerais, Brazil. Prior to the DGM sub project, she had no interest in her culture or becoming involved in the activities. However, once the sub project commenced, she actively sought involvement. Following her participation, Francesca now feels reconnected with the environment and the community. To continue and complement this traditional knowledge, she has undertaken an internship to learn about the practicalities, economics and all related activities that are attached to the collection and distribution of seeds. She now has a sense of well-being, identity and connection with her traditions.



Photo 10: Fabriciane

C. Fabriciane

Fabriciane is a young, talented and educated female who graduated as a forest engineer. She has returned to her community with this knowledge to realise the importance of the traditional knowledge that her parents hold.

This nexus provides the potential to synergise her technical expertise with the traditional knowledge to achieve a 'new' knowledge that will assist her community. For example, Fabriciane takes her technical and scientific knowledge of grafting plants and contextualises this with the traditional knowledge of collective planting and the traditional understanding of the water supply. This results in planting technically grafted plants in a traditionally 'collective' manner in an area where traditional knowledge dictates water supply. This will subsequently benefit the community. She is already teaching this 'new' knowledge in the local schools, which is quite clearly an example of the exercise of self-determination.

SECTION 4 – SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS

Conceived and designed by IPLCs, the DGM is a unique and innovative initiative that seeks to promote and ensure the participation of IPLCs in FIP and other REDD+ processes. This report sought to review the DGM's effectiveness from an Indigenous perspective. Specifically, it reflects on 1) the DGM's effectiveness in capturing and incorporating Indigenous knowledge and perspectives; 2) the potential of expanding the DGM to other CIF Programs (PPCR and SREP) and 3) whether the DGM has the potential to lead to transformational change. The main findings related to these objectives are summarized below.

DGM's Effectiveness on Indigenous Knowledge and Perspectives

This study assessed the effectiveness of the DGM in capturing and incorporating Indigenous knowledge and perspectives, in order to assist stakeholders (such as Governments, NGOs, and MDBs) better understand the role the DGM plays.

From an Indigenous lens, 'success' factors of the FIP DGM include the ability for a sub project to:

- Deliver an internal form of self-determination
- Recognise key rights such as an Indigenous right to lands, territories and resources
- Support transformational change
- Address the drivers of deforestation
- Achieve a sense of community wellbeing

This is reflected by sub projects that support the ability of Indigenous Peoples to use their traditional knowledge; mapping sub projects and sub projects that seek to recover head waters.

To signify how effective the FIP DGM is in recognizing and cultivating Indigenous knowledge and perspectives, the report notes that the best method is to compare the progress of FIP DGM sub projects to general FIP projects. It was found that sub projects under the FIP DGM that are on or near Indigenous lands and territories are comparatively more successful and advanced than mainstream FIP projects. The difference in progress speaks volumes regarding how successful a community stakeholder driven programme is compared to those that are not. This finding is not surprising, given that FIP DGM sub projects align with or respect an Indigenous lens and thus include, for example, the active participation from Indigenous Peoples (while FIP projects are government-led and do not enjoy the same level of Indigenous participation). Thus, this report suggests that success could be achieved by taking a FIP DGM approach, in relevant FIP projects.

In addition, collaboration or 'lesson learning' between FIP and FIP DGM should be encouraged, to enhance projects to contribute to reducing the adverse effects of deforestation.⁵⁹ For example, a government

59. Note that political influence hinders progress. The World Bank, although not completely immune, is well placed to navigate this hindrance by supporting collaboration between the FIP DGM and the FIP.

representative is part of the NSC of the Indonesian FIP DGM. Although this representative has no voting rights, this government representative could be helpful in terms of extrapolating and/or sharing the approach and benefits from the Indonesian FIP DGM to the wider FIP projects. This is particularly true in the two regions where the FIP and FIP DGM sub projects overlap (Sumbawa and Kalimantan).

In addition, this approach and potential for the DGM to foster and improve the capability and outcomes of CIF programs could equally be applied to governments and other international development institutions in terms of scaling up and call to action.



DGM and other CIF Programs

The study also reflected on the potential of expanding the DGM to other CIF programs, such as the PPCR and SREP. This was achieved by ascertaining, from an Indigenous perspective, the potential for the DGM to foster and improve the capability and outcomes of CIF programs.

Extrapolating this to the PPCR, Indigenous knowledge can aid in identifying areas in which to rebuild, for example, by signalling areas where the risk of future natural disasters may be higher or lower, based on customary/Indigenous knowledge and not state planning documents. This knowledge will reduce future financial risk and exposure as well as increase the project's likelihood of success. Involving IPLCs also has a positive social impact in establishing a continuing relationship for Indigenous peoples and giving recognition to their traditional knowledge.

Extrapolating this to the SREP, Indigenous knowledge can assist to detect renewal energy sources, for example, traditional geothermal sites. In such instances, this traditional knowledge will have a

historical association and understanding as to the depth and availability of the resource, potentially reducing any prospecting risks. This will assist to not only maintain but sustainably develop the resource. The involvement of IPLCs in the design and maintenance of the activity will not only be positive for the community but will provide opportunities associated with the benefits of a consistent electricity supply.

DGM and Transformational Change

The CIF Transformational Change Learning Partnership (TCLP) developed the following working definition of transformational change:

“Strategic changes in targeted markets and other systems, with large-scale, sustainable impacts that shift and/or accelerate the trajectory toward low-carbon and climate-resilient development.”⁶⁰

Underpinning this working definition are four dimensions of transformation: relevance, systemic change, scale and sustainability. Relevance relates to the strategic focus of CIF investments – whether they impact low-carbon and climate-resilient development, with sustainable development co-benefits. Systemic change relates to fundamental shifts in system structures and functions. Scale relates to contextually large-scale transformational processes and impacts. Lastly, sustainability relates to the robustness and resilience of changes. For transformational change to be considered both real and lasting, all four dimensions must be in place (to a greater or lesser extent).⁶¹

In terms of relevance, the strategic focus of the FIP DGM is on low carbon and climate resilient developments with sustainable development co-benefits, reflected by the aims and achievements of the sub projects. The DGM recognises that the IPLCs are vulnerable to, and bear the brunt of, climate change. Subsequently, the DGM empowers IPLCs to develop actions against climate change and encourages natural resource management. IPLCs, subsequently, play a leading role in the management and conservation of forests. Since it was found that FIP DGM sub projects can be more effective/successful than comparable FIP projects, this study suggests that part of the reason could be related to the participation of IPLCs in the FIP DGM. By empowering Indigenous People, the DGM is more relevant to achieve the FIP goal of addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. For example, one of DGM Indonesia’s main focus is improved clarity and security of land rights for IPLCs. Also, in Brazil a sub project is aimed at permanent preservation areas recovered with agroforestry systems. Further, in Brazil, the resourceful market development for the sale of seeds as an activity associated with a FIP DGM sub project is an example of a strategic change that achieves sustainable co-benefits.

Regarding systemic change, the very nature of the FIP DGM processes requires a shift in system structures and procedures. Specifically, the ability for IPLCs to lead, propose and be the decision-makers in the FIP DGM process and sub projects is distinct to the other FIP-funded projects that are led by government and thus demonstrates a shift in system structures. However, it is important to note that governments are often reticent to embrace meaningful policy reform or systemic change that would lead to IPLC having more direction in their sub projects, which may impact systemic change.

60. Climate Investment Funds (2019).

61. Climate Investment Funds (2020).

In terms of scale, the DGM is only a pilot mechanism and there is a clear need for more funding. The DGM is not adequately resourced and more funding is required in order to scale it up. An indicator for this is the limited number of sub projects that the DGM country projects have been able to fund in comparison to the large number of proposals received. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that the DGM is an innovative financing mechanism, whereby funding is provided directly to IPLCs.

Regarding sustainability, the FIP DGM sub projects demonstrate robustness and resilience as a result of community participation and contribution. The FIP DGM does not fall prey to the “entrenched incentives and interests counter to FIP’s goals, and the long timelines required to secure positive change” that Savage et. al. (2019) identify as restricting the ability to reach sustainability.⁶² Instead, in a DGM project, there is more ownership from IPLCs than a traditional government-led project would have, since the DGM empowers IPLCs to successfully develop and implement their own actions. Further, it is in the interest of IPLCs that sub projects achieve sustainability since IPLCs often bear the brunt of the adverse effects of climate change.

This all could be an indication of better potential for the sustainability of results to reduce deforestation and forest degradation and promote natural resource management.



Photo 12 – Indigenous Community, Brazil

62. Climate Investment Funds (2019).

In addition, the 2019 Independent Evaluation of Transformational Change in the Climate Investment Funds (CIF)⁶³ found that for the FIP, a focus on carbon was not in itself sufficient to drive transformational change, rather transformation could be supported through coordinated multi-level efforts, including strengthening policy, social, and governance frameworks; using concessional finance to create economic and financial incentives; and changing mindsets among key constituencies.⁶⁴ This study's finding that the FIP DGM achieves self-determination, a sense of community well-being and allows Indigenous Peoples to contribute and participate in the FIP DGM's sub project design aligns with strengthening policy, social and governance frameworks.

Further, as the FIP DGM sub projects, when compared to relevant FIP projects, are more successful in terms of outcomes and completion, it is suggested that a realistic working relationship between FIP and FIP DGM be encouraged. This can only be achieved through the elimination or minimalisation of political influence and a common goal of maintaining sustainable development principles.

Overall, this study found that based on the CIF's TCLP's dimensions of relevance systemic change and sustainability, there is an indication that the DGM can be transformational (i.e. that transformational change can be supported through the DGM).

63. Savage et. al. (2019).

64. Climate Investment Funds (2019).

CONCLUSION

The DGM is unique and ground breaking in that it provides an opportunity for IPLCs to participate in, design and implement programs that will assist in addressing the deforestation of their traditional lands and territories. This report sought to review the DGM's effectiveness from an Indigenous perspective, by reflecting on the DGM's effectiveness in capturing and incorporating Indigenous knowledge and perspectives; the potential of expanding the DGM to other CIF Programs (PPCR and SREP) and whether the DGM has demonstrated potential for transformational change. This was achieved by reviewing components of DGM sub projects through an Indigenous lens, using a mixed methods approach which combined a qualitative and Indigenous (Kaupapa Māori) methodology. The reflections from this report are based on the DGM experiences in Brazil and Indonesia, gathered from a literature review and country visits. This report complements the 2019 Learning Review of the DGM conducted by Itad by focusing specifically on the procedures of engagement with IPLCs, which Indigenous Peoples were consulted, how and why they were consulted and if and how their perspectives were incorporated into the design of the project.

The success or effectiveness of the DGM measured through an Indigenous lens found that the DGM supports an Indigenous identity, a flourishing Indigenous wellbeing and consistency with the fundamental rights articulated in the UNDRIP. The report found that the DGM provided for an 'internal form' of self-determination, recognising an Indigenous right to lands and territories supported by Indigenous knowledge resulting in community wellbeing.

Although comprehensive transformational change may not have been achieved due to the newness and small scale of the FIP DGM, aspects related to the relevance, systemic change and sustainability of the DGM indicate that transformational change can be supported through the DGM. As the recognition that IPLCs bear the brunt of the adverse effects of climate change is increasing, there could be more opportunities for innovative financing mechanisms, such as the DGM, that provide direct funding to IPLCs empowering them to successfully develop and implement their own actions to reduce deforestation and forest degradation and promote natural resource management. In that case, it is only a matter of time before transformational change can be achieved.

In light of the positive and progressive nature of the FIP DGM, it is recommended that first, a FIP DGM approach be applied to relevant FIP projects, which can be achieved through the integration of the FIP with the FIP DGM, NSC and NEA committees. In addition, it is recommended that a more holistic approach to the projects and sub projects be taken through a more meaningful understanding and consideration of the NEA and NSC (who are 'on the ground' to assist and support the success of each sub project). Lastly, it is recommended that the DGM be extended to the SREP and PPCR, given the success of this innovative approach.

This study supports the continuation and expansion of the DGM. The DGM is an incredibly positive mechanism for IPLC to address the adverse effects of climate change. With small changes to the FIP and CIF program, comparatively, large gains can be achieved. In addition, these recommendations and call to action in terms of scaling up could equally be applied to governments and other international or bilateral development institutions. What is required is the (political) will.



Photo 13: Traditional Community, Brazil.

REFERENCES⁶⁵

Brobbe, L.; Hansen, C.; Kyereh, B.; and Pouliot, M. (2018). *The economic importance of charcoal to rural livelihood: Evidence in key charcoal producing area on Ghana*. *Forest Policy and Economics* 101.

CAA/NM Centro de Agricultura Alternativa do Norte de Minas *Dedicated Grant Mechanism Propostas selecionadas edital no 2* https://dgmbrasil.org.br/media/publicacoes/propostas_aprovadas2018.pdf

Campese, Jessica; Sunderland, Terry; Greiber, Thomas and Oviedo, Gonzalo. (2009). *Rights based approached Exploring issues and opportunities for conservation* (IUCN Indonesia).

Carlos E.A; Coimbra Jr and Santos, R. (2004). Emerging health needs and epidemiological research in Indigenous Peoples in Brazil in Francisco Salzano and A Magdalena Hurtado (eds) *Lost Paradises and the ethics of research and publication* (OUP, USA).

Chapman, Judith. (2002). *A framework for transformational change in organisations* Leadership & Organisation Development Journal ISSN: 0143-7739, Publication date: 1 February 2002.

Climate Investment Funds (2019). *Transformational Change in the Climate Investment Funds - Summary of Findings from an Independent Evaluation and Evidence Synthesis*. CIF Evaluation & Learning Initiative. Transformational Change Learning Partnership.

Climate Investment Funds (2020). *The Transformational Change Learning Partnership*. CIF Evaluation & Learning Initiative.

Dedicated Grant Mechanism (2018). *The Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities: 2018 Annual Report*.

FIP Investment Report (2019) FIP/SC.22/3 May 9, 2019.

Harmsworth, Garth; Barclay-Kerr, Kim; Reedy, Tamati. (2002). *Māori Sustainable Development in the 21st century, the importance of Māori values, Strategic Planning and Information Systems* He Puna Korero Journal of Māori and Pacific Development Vol 3 Issue 2 (Sept 2002).

Irwin, Kathy. (1994) *Māori Research Methods and Practices* (1994) Sites 28 (Autumn).

Itad (2019). *A Learning Review of the Dedicated Grant Mechanism (DGM) for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities in the Forest Investment Program (FIP) of the Climate Investment Funds (CIF)*.

Jaichand, Vinodh; Sampaio, Alexandre Andrade. (2013). *Dam and Be Damned: The Adverse Impacts of Belo Monte on Indigenous Peoples in Brazil*, 35 Hum. Rts. Q. 408.

Kansanga, M.; and Luginaah, I. (2019). *Agrian Livelihoods under siege: Carbon forestry, tenure*

65. During the literature review process, a great number more were screened for relevance, however as noted the literature germane to the area was sparse.

constraints and the rise of capitalist forest enclosures in Ghana World Development 113.
Mapfumo, Paul; Onyango, Mary; Honkponou, Saïd K; El Mzouri, El Houssine; Githeko, Andrew;
Rabeharisoa, Lilia; Obando, Joy; Omolo, Nancy; Majule, Amos; Denton, Ayers, Jessica & Agrawal, Arun.
(2017). *Pathways to transformational change in the face of climate impacts: an analytical framework*
Journal Climate and Development Volume 9 - Issue 5.

Mead, Hirini. (2003). *Tikanga Māori Living by Māori Values* (Huia Publishing, Wellington).

Mena Report (2016). Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Local Communities;
London (Sept 8, 2016) <<https://search-proquest.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/docview/1817694182/733EEDC9A2BC4BEEPQ/4?accountid=17287>>

Mena Report (2015). Peru: Saweto Dedicated Grant Mechanism in Peru; London (Sep 24, 2015).
<<https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/docview/1716088240/733EEDC9A2BC4BEEPQ/5?accountid=17287>>

Mikkelsen, Caecille (ed). (2014). *The Indigenous World 2014* (IWGIA, Copenhagen).

Miller, A; Massey, P; Judd J; Kelly J; Durrhein; Clough A; Speare, R; Siggers. S. (2015). *Using a Participatory Action Research Framework to Listen to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in Australia about Pandemic Influenza Rural and Remote Health* 15 <<http://www.rrh.org.au>>.

Myers, Rodd; Larson, Anne; Ravikumar, Ashwin; Kowler, Laura F; Yang, Anastasia; Trench, Tim (2018). *Messiness of forest governance: How technical approaches suppress politics in REDD+ and conservation projects* Global Environmental Change Volume 50, May 2018, Pages 314-324 <<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2018.02.015>>

Nepe, T. (1991). *E Hao Nei e Tenei Reanga: Te Toi Huarewa Tipuna: Kaupapa Māori, an Educational Intervention System* (MA Thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland).

Overbeek, Winnie. (2013). 'Brazil: Threat of monoculture eucalyptus plantation expansion in the Northeast' World Rainforest Movement May 30, 2013 Bulletin 190 <<https://wrm.org.uy/articles-from-the-wrm-bulletin/section2/brazil-threat-of-monoculture-eucalyptus-plantation-expansion-in-the-northeast/>>

Recio, M. (2018). *Transnational REDD+ Rule Making: The Regulatory Landscape for REDD+ Implementation in Latin America*. Transnational Environmental Law 7:2 pp 277-299. Cambridge University Press.

Response of the Government of Indonesia on the Investment Plan of Indonesia (2013) February 12, 2013, p 4. <https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/sites/cif_enc/files/Investment_Plan_for_Indonesia_response_Gol.pdf>

Savage, M.; McPherson, S.; Kyle, J.; Polvi, J.; and Larson, T. (2019). *Evaluation of Transformational Change in the Climate Investment Funds*. Itad in association with Ross Strategic and ICF.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. (2012). *Decolonising Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (2nd ed, Otago University Press, Dunedin).

Sunderlin, William; de Sassi, Claudio; Sills, Erin; Duchelle, Amy; Larson, Anne; Resosudarmo, Ida; Pradnja, Aju; Abdon Awono, Kweka, Demetrius; Huynh, Thu Ba. (2018). Creating an appropriate tenure foundation for REDD+: The record to date and prospects for the future World Development, June 2018, Vol.106, pp.376-392.

Toki, V. (2017). *Indigenous Courts, self-determination and criminal justice* (Routledge, UK).

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods* (Fernwood Publishing, Winnipeg, Manitoba).

APPENDIX 1: EVALUATION AND LEARNING QUESTIONS

Given the urgency of the climate change crisis, the challenge is to better understand what promotes transformational change at the nexus of social, economic and environmental domains. Thus, increasing the ability of these systems to mitigate and adapt to climate change as it unfolds is vital. Indigenous or traditional knowledge is often linked to an ability to live sustainably and can provide important insights into understanding, managing and preventing climate change. Furthermore, gaining support from local communities is essential to embed change. The following interview questions were formulated to evaluate the DGM, framed from a Kaupapa Māori approach with the objectives of the project in mind.

- 1 Is Indigenous knowledge considered by the DGM?
- 2 If so, in which projects? Please elaborate.
- 3 When Indigenous knowledge is incorporated into the sub projects has it made a difference?
A. How?
- 4 Has the DGM empowered Indigenous Peoples organisations to use their Indigenous knowledge to further their agendas, and look broader than FIP?
a. If so, how?
- 5 What is the potential for the DGM? Should the DGM be extended to other initiatives such as access to energy, education, etc?
- 6 How were the National Steering Committee (NSC) members selected?
- 7 Does the Grievance Redress Mechanism apply a traditional lens/custom?
- 8 How does the DGM work with Indigenous People, Local Communities?
- 9 Is there a Gender perspective?

APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

OVERARCHING INTERVIEWS:

| Type of Interview | Name | Association and Role/Region |
|-------------------|----------------|---|
| Face to Face | Ben Murphy | Itad – Author of the 2019 Learning Review of the DGM |
| Face to Face | Grace Balawag | Tebtebba – Past Co-chair of the DGM |
| Face to Face | Deborah Pierce | World Bank FIP Team |
| Face to Face | Jean Viliamu | Government of Samoa – Department of Finance |
| Face to Face | Jacob Ekinye | Government of Papua New Guinea - Climate Change and Development Authority |
| Face to Face | Anna Henry | Government of Papua New Guinea - Climate Change and Development Authority |
| Face to Face | Mirnal Tripura | Maleya Organisation - Indigenous Peoples Observer |
| Face to Face | Johnson Cerda | DGM Global Steering Committee |

INTERVIEWS IN INDONESIA:

| Type of Interview | Name | Association and Role/Region |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Telephone | Debby Rambu Kasuatu | National Steering Committee - Local Community Women's Representative |
| Telephone | Def Tri Hamri | National Steering Committee - Sumatera Region |
| Telephone | George Weyasu | National Steering Committee - Papua Region |
| Face to Face | Surti Handayani | National Steering Committee - Indigenous Women's Representative |
| Face to Face | Dinesh Aryal | World Bank - Team TTL |
| Face to Face | Tini Gumartini | World Bank - Team TTL |
| Face to Face | Fajar Argo Djati | World Bank - Team TTL |
| Face to Face | David Fairman | Consensus Building Institute (CBI) |
| Face to Face | Patti Rahayu | National Executing Agency - Samdhana |
| Face to Face | Martua T Sirait | National Executing Agency – Samdhana |
| Face to Face | Wijiana | National Executing Agency - Samdhana |
| Face to Face | Albertus Pramono | Adviser - Senior Social and Local Community Development Specialist with the World Bank |
| Face to Face | Abdon Nababan | Alliance of Indigenous Peoples of the Archipelago (AMAN) |

| Type of Interview | Name | Association and Role/Region |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
| Question and answer session | Álvaro Alves Carrara Wullison, Monica, Paula Lanza, Claudio, Carla, Adveral, Cristovino Ferreira Neto | National Executing Agency - Centro de Agricultura Alternativa do Norte de Minas (CAA) |
| Face to face | Anália Tuxá | APOIMNE – Indigenous Representative |
| Face to face | Cristovino Ferreira Neto | Articulação Rosalino - Traditional Communities Representative (Geraizeiro) |
| Face to face | Braulio Benito Buezo Caal | National Executing Agency - Centro de Agricultura Alternativa do Norte de Minas (CAA) |
| Face to face | Adveral | National Executing Agency - Centro de Agricultura Alternativa do Norte de Minas (CAA) |
| Face to face | Francesca | Community Member |
| Community group meeting | Hernene | Advisor for the DGM |
| Community group meeting | Neuzita | Community member |
| Community group meeting | Myumi | ICMBO – Institute Chico Mendes |
| Community | | Quilombola |
| Face to face | Belo | Community member |
| Face to face | Hilario | Community member |
| Face to face | Fabriciane Oliveira | Community member |
| Face to face | Family members | Community member |

APPENDIX 3: HOW A KAUPAPA MĀORI APPROACH WAS APPLIED

Stage 1 – Project Conception

During this stage the following methods were identified as relevant:

- 1 The inclusion of oral story telling as a recognised culturally based research method. This is complementary to not only a Kaupapa Māori approach but also an Indigenous methodological approach generally.
- 2 The collection of data will be undertaken accurately and truthfully whilst being mindful of the responsibility to others this is complementary to a Kaupapa Māori approach.
- 3 The evaluation of the DGM will be measured by Indigenous standards of effectiveness. The UNDRIP will provide a ‘common’ Indigenous standard or benchmark to measure this effectiveness.

The key point is that it was recognised that there was a need to use an approach which:

- Engages with the voices and experiences of Indigenous peoples
- Places emphasis on the social, historical and political contexts
- Recognises Indigenous worldviews, realities, social mores
- Respects, is relevant to, and consistent with the ideas and values of reciprocity and responsibility
- Recognises the fundamental rights articulated in the UNDRIP as a benchmark to measure activity and projects against

Stage 2 – Interviews

Interviews with stakeholders were undertaken using a Kaupapa Māori methodology to ensure culturally appropriate approaches that were followed were necessary.

Procedure:

- 1 All interviews would be face to face (ideally) – if not then a telephone interview with an interpreter to assist with cultural protocols
- 2 Understand the culture of the interviewees – allow the interviewee to provide a cultural greeting/prayer and also a closing prayer or similar if appropriate
- 3 Respect the culture of the interviewees by
 - a. Approaching the interviews with cultural sensitivity and respect – allowing them to define their own space and terms if required – being flexible and responsive – acknowledging connections
 - b. Reviewing questions for cultural appropriateness
 - c. If relevant employ the use of a cultural guide

- d. Allowing adequate time for responses
 - e. Listening with respect – not trampling the ‘mana’ of the interviewee
- 4 Consistent with the principle of reciprocity an offer of food or similar, where possible, is made available to the interviewee at the conclusion.

Stage 3 – Data Analysis

A mixed method approach was taken to the collection of data, a mix of Kaupapa Māori and orthodox methods. It is anticipated that a complex grounded theory approach could be taken for the data analysis to move towards a collection of theoretical outcomes. More generally, however, to measure the effectiveness of the DGM, a Kaupapa Māori approach was followed.

APPENDIX 4: COUNTRY SUB PROJECTS

Indonesia

Sub project Information

In ascertaining which projects to support the NSC set the following priorities, that the proposals;

- Have or at least have started the area mapping work
- Have started, prepared or started the process of applying for a permit for Customary Forest and / or Social Forestry
- Include communities that live in areas such as peat areas, areas that are vulnerable to forest fires, remote islands or areas that are vulnerable to industrial stresses such as mining or plantations

Both the Adviser and the NEA assist the NSC reviewing the concept note and project proposals. Of the 209 proposals received, in the first call, 21 projects were approved representing three projects in each of the seven regions in Indonesia i.e.

- **Java** (3 projects)
- **Bali and Nusa Tenggara** (3 projects)
- **Sumatra** (3 projects)
- **Kalimantan** (3 projects)
- **Sulawesi** (3 projects)
- **Maluku** (3 projects) and
- **Papua** (3 projects)

The 21 projects include the following Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities within each region:

Java

- 6 local communities including Ngrimpak Village in Temanggung and Ngrandu Village in Trenggalek, Gerduren Village and Civaluh Village, Lengkong Village and Cipeucang Village in Bogor.
- 2 Indigenous Communities Kasepuhan Pasir Eurih and Kasepuhan Cibarani in Lebak.

Bali and Nusa Tenggara

22 Indigenous Communities including Rindi-Rindi and Villages in the Watu Puda-Umalulu District, Umbu Pabal Village and Napu Village-Haharu District in East Sumba District, Praikaroku Djangga Village in Central Sumba District, Dokakaka Village-Loli District in West Sumba Regency, Wairasa-Umbu Subdistrict and Ratu Nggay Barat Village in Central Sumba Regency.

Sumatra

- 8 Indigenous Communities including Bangun Jaya, Tengah Kepungut, Matobe, Rokot, Goiso'Oinan, Cenaku, Kelayang and Siberida and Siberida
- 1 local community Babakan Baru

Kalimantan

10 Indigenous Communities including Indigenous Peoples in the West Rungan District, Gunung Mas Regency, Indigenous Peoples in Manuhing Raya District, Indigenous Peoples in West Lahi District - North Barito District, Jumetn, Indigenous community of Kutai Barat, Iban, Punan Uheng, Rasau Sebau, Jawatn't, Koman, and De'sa, Mualang.

Sulawesi

19 Indigenous Communities including Watutau, Rompo, Kolori-Lelio, Kageroa, Tuare and Tampemador in the Poso District, Lonca, Winatu and Tangkulowi in Sigi Regency, Sidole in Parigi Moutong Regency, Kaluppini, Kadinge, Kondobulo, Batu Makkada, Makkaliki, Rantedoda, Kopeang and Bela.

Maluku

3 Indigenous Communities including Desa Arui Das, Fritu, and Negeri Piru

Papua

4 Indigenous Communities including Nambloung, Huwula, Sebyar and Moskona

Of these 21 projects, the majority revolve around land tenure and capacity building and focus on Indigenous Communities;

e.g. NHU (Consortium of LBH Pekanbaru & AMAN Indragiri Hulu)

This project is 'to encourage a policy to ensure rights and Access to Customary Areas for Improving Governance for Sustainability of the Livelihoods of the Talang Mamak Customary Community in Indragiri Hulu.' It involves 3 Indigenous communities Cenaku, Kelayang, Siberida and situated in Indragiri Hulu, Sumatra

e.g. Papua Arrow Association Recognition and Protection of Customary Legal Communities.

This project is around the 'landscapes Lowland Tropical Forest Ecosystems in the Sebyar and Moskona Tribal Areas, Teluk Bintuni'. It involves 2 Indigenous communities Sebyar and Moskona. The specific area is Teluk Bintuni in Papua

e.g. Indonesian Young Foresters (RMI).

This project is for the 'advocacy and improvement of the livelihoods of Kasepuhan Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities through Customary Forests and Forestry Partnerships.' It involves 2 Indigenous Communities, Kasepuhan Pasir Eurih and Kasepuhan Cibarani in Lebak and 3 Local Communities, Ciwaluh Village, Lengkong Village and Cipeucang Village in Bogor, Java.

e.g. West Sulawesi Social Forestry Consortium (Kopasos): Bantaya & Understanding Society.

This project is the 'Protection of Legal and Formal Rights and Access of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities towards Forest areas in Mamuju District West Sulawesi'. It involves 6 Indigenous communities, Kondobulo, Batu Makkada, Makkaliki, Rantedoda, Kopeang and Bela and situated in Mamuju, Sulawesi.

e.g. Institute for Research and Development of Resources and the Environment (LPPSLH)

This project is to 'improve Village Community Access and Control over Forests through Implementation of Social Forestry in the Work Area of Perhutani Public Corporation.' It involves one local community, Gerduren Village and situated in Banyumas, Java.

Brazil

Sub project Information

Sub project 56 – Water of Gerais - Answers to Immediate Threats faced by the Geraizeiros that continue the fight to preserve life.

Project description

In the 1970s the government policy of bringing “progress” to the Minas Gerais region resulted in widespread deforestation and planting of eucalyptus trees within the chapada region, a region considered to be “retarded”. Subsequently, the Geraizeiros had to relocate to small land tracts.

The eucalyptus drastically transformed the region. This change in land use adversely affected the natural resources that had previously guaranteed food security for the Geraizeiros. However the main impact was water scarcity as many rivers, streams and springs that were perennial became intermittent or had dried up. This scarcity of water triggered community battles for territory with water.

The communities Água Boa II, Riacho de Areia, Roça do Mato, Vale do Guará, Água Fria, Buracos and many others faced deforestation in the region. These communities realised that their struggles were common and that together they could agitate for a reserve to protect their territories. After more than 12 years of struggle, the “Nascentes Geraizeiras” Sustainable Development Reserve (SDS) was created in 2014, with approximately 38,177 ha, in the municipalities of Montezuma, Rio Pardo de Minas and Vargem Grande do Rio Pardo. However, even after the creation of the SDS, water remained the main concern of the communities, since many headwaters remained vulnerable.

Main objective

Contribute to improving the management and use of water resources by communities.

Description of the area

The São Modesto Community is located in the municipality of Montezuma, state of Minas Gerais. The location of the project is the Nascentes Geraizeiras Sustainable Development Reserve (SDR), covering the municipalities of Montezuma, Vargem Grande do Rio Pardo and Rio Pardo de Minas.

Expected results

- Members of the management board of the SDR and 4 communities trained in water recovery, protection and management, this seeks to bridge the gap between the technical knowledge and traditional knowledge
- Permanent preservation areas recovered with agroforestry systems
- Native vegetation recovered in recharge areas
- Riverheads surrounded with fences
- Diagnosis of the micro-basins of the Nascentes Geraizeiras RDS carried out

- Build rainwater catchment basins.
- Project management performed.

Sub project: 47 - Extractivism of the Xakriabá People: source of income, food safety and protection of the Cerrado

Description

Our Xakriabá Indigenous Land has its 32 villages and 46.414,9242 hectares (ha) of extension, located in the Cerrado, the Caatinga (transition region of the Biomes) and the Mata Seca (Dry Forest). Traditionally, the Indigenous peoples have accessed food and medicines in these areas, such as sour coconut, mangaba, buriti, pequi, cagaita, umbu, pakari, favela, jatobá and others. Indigenous peoples consider traditional Xakriabá agro-extractivism to be an activity of great cultural and socio-environmental importance, since it enables the sustainable use of the Cerrado and Mata Seca (Dry Forest) areas, cultural strengthening, income generation and distribution, agricultural autonomy, access to medicines and good quality food to maintain our health.

Over the past decades, traditional agricultural and agro-extractivist activities have been declining in Xakriabá Indigenous territory, causing residents to consume more processed products. The diversity of fruit existing in Indigenous territory makes it possible to create an alternative for generating income for the population, as well as encouraging the resumption of traditional foods into the diet and supporting the extractive practice with the implementation of a unit for processing fruit pulp.

This project also responds to the need to collect and transport the fruit and help in the transportation of medicinal herbs, medicine and other services.

Main objective

The project aims to strengthen the practice of agroextractivism and increase income in the four Xakriabá villages (Sumaré I, Sumaré II, Sumaré III and Peruaçu) through the reform of a fruit processing unit and pulp production, in addition to the purchase of a vehicle. Awareness-raising and training activities are also planned for the young people of the Bukinuk State Indigenous School in the Sumaré II village.

Area description

The project will take place in the Xakriabá Indigenous Land, Minas Gerais, in the municipality of São João das Missões, in the Sumaré II village, where the fruit processing point is located. All villages, especially Sumaré I, Sumaré III and Peruaçu, will provide the fruit and labor for the project.

- Structure a small extractive fruit processing plant in Sumaré village
- To have held an awareness workshop on the sustainable use of natural resources in the Cerrado of the xakriabá territory with a guaranteed a healthier diet.
- Have carried out the management and monitoring of the project

Detailed results

- To have structured a small extractive fruit processing plant in the Sumaré II village.
- Reform of pulp processing unit; Unit: Location: São João das Missões, Xakriabá Indigenous Land Village: Sumaré II
- Vehicle purchase; Unit 1: Location: São João das Missões, Xakriabá Indigenous Land Village: Sumaré II
- Awareness-raising workshop on the sustainable use of natural resources in the Cerrado in our xakriabá territory was held and a healthier diet was guaranteed.
- An environmental education workshop for about 60 students of the Indigenous state school Bukinuk on extraction, environmental preservation, quality and food safety, valuing the fruits of the cerrado, caatinga and dry forest.
- To have carried out the management and monitoring of the project

GLOSSARY

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Aroha | Love, affection for others |
| Hui | Gathering together of people for discussion, or to socialise |
| Iwi | A tribe which traces descent from a common ancestor or ancestors |
| Kai | Food |
| Kaitiaki | Caretaker or guardian |
| Kanohi ki te kanohi | Face to face, in person, in the flesh |
| Karakia | To recite ritual chants, say grace, pray, recite a prayer, chant |
| Kaumatua | Male elders |
| Kaupapa | Floor, stage, platform, layer; topic, policy, matter for discussion, plan, proposal, agenda, subject, initiative |
| Kawa | Symbol, sign, protocol |
| Kuia | Female elders |
| Korero | Talk or speak |
| Mana | Prestige, authority, power or psychic force |
| Manaakitanga | Hospitality, kindness, generosity, support; the process of showing respect, generosity and care for others |
| Pakeha | Person of English descent; also used in earlier times as reference to traders, settlers, missionaries |
| Rangatira | Leader, person of senior lineage |
| Rangatiratanga | Leadership authority |
| Tangata whenua | A person of the land or people belonging to a tribal region; hosts as distinct from visitors |
| Te Reo | Māori language |
| Tikanga | Principles, truth, customary practice |
| Tino Rangatiratanga | Self-determination, sovereignty, autonomy, self-government, domination, rule, control, power |
| Wairua | Spirit, spirituality |
| Whakapapa | Layer; family tree |
| Whanau | To be born or to give birth; family or an extended family |
| whanaungatanga | Relatedness |



Photo 14: Sunset over the Cerrado, Brazil.