



1818 H Street, N.W.,
Washington D.C., 20433 USA
Tel: 202 473 4054; Fax: 202 522 1691
E-mail: gefevaluation@thegef.org

Approach Paper

Evaluation of GEF Engagement with Indigenous Peoples (IPs)

2 February 2017

Contact:
Baljit Wadhwa
Senior Evaluation Officer
bwadhwa@thegef.org

Introduction

1. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) provides support to address global environmental concerns related to biodiversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation, the ozone layer, and persistent organic pollutants. Since its inception in 1991, the GEF has provided developing countries and countries with economies in transition US \$ 15 billion in grants. These grants are implemented on ground through a network of 18 accredited agencies. The GEF receives its funds through a four-year replenishment cycle.
2. The GEF Independent Evaluation Office (GEF IEO) has a central role in ensuring the independent evaluation function within the GEF. The GEF IEO is based in Washington DC. It is administered by the World Bank but is independent of its management as well as the management of the GEF. Its Director reports directly to the GEF Council, the GEF governing body. All contracts with the IEO are World Bank contracts. More information about the GEF IEO can be found at Office's website: <http://www.gefio.org/>.
3. The IEO undertakes independent evaluations on issues relevant to GEF's overall performance. These cover issues related to GEF policies and processes, and projects and programs funded by the GEF. The GEF IEO is undertaking the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation (OPS6) to inform the replenishment process for the GEF-7 period.
4. This note presents the conceptual framework for preparing a formative evaluation of GEF's engagement with Indigenous Peoples. This assessment of GEF's approaches to engage with Indigenous Peoples aims to identify good practices and lessons learned. The study will also review of evaluative evidence from engagement by similar entities and a broad literature review on the subject. The final report will present lessons for future consideration.

Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF (OPS6)

5. The overall purpose of the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF is to provide solid evaluative evidence to inform the negotiations for the seventh replenishment of the GEF¹. The objective of OPS6 is to assess the extent to which the GEF is achieving its objectives as laid down in the GEF Instrument and reviews by the Assembly, as developed and adopted by the GEF Council in operational policies and programs for GEF financed activities, and to identify potential improvements going forward. In addition, OPS6 will also assess the relevance of the GEF objectives in this changing external landscape. The audience for the Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation comprises replenishment participants, the GEF Council, the GEF Assembly, members of the GEF and external stakeholders.
6. To prepare OPS6, the GEF IEO will draw from the evaluations that it has conducted, and also from targeted reviews that it will undertake to gather additional evidence. Among the cross-cutting areas being studied for OPS6 is an evaluation of GEF Engagement with Indigenous Peoples.

¹ Sixth Comprehensive Evaluation of the GEF Approach Paper - <http://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/OPS6%20Approach%20Paper.pdf>

Background

7. According to United Nations estimates there are more than 370 million Indigenous Peoples worldwide in some 90 countries². Indigenous groups make valuable contributions to the world's heritage with their in-depth, varied and locally rooted traditional knowledge and their understanding of ecosystem management. This knowledge of ecosystem management practices is important for environmental conservation, sustainable development and climate adaptation
8. A common challenge they face is ensuing legal recognition, ownership and control over customary land and resources and the sustainable utilization of land, territories and other renewable resources. Communities can consider themselves indigenous to the locality but may not define themselves as Indigenous Peoples. This is especially so in Africa and Asia. Other Indigenous Peoples can adopt this definition based on other grounds, such as having close attachments to geographically distinct ancestral territories and have spiritual, cultural, social and economic relationships with these traditional lands³.
9. IPs are overrepresented among the poor, constituting about 4 percent of the world's population but accounting for 10 percent of the world's poorest people⁴. IPs are also expected to be among the most threatened by the impacts of climate change and global development⁵. Their traditional indigenous lands encompass up to 22 percent of the world's surface, and coincide with areas that contain up to 80% of the planet's biodiversity, and 11 percent of world forest lands are legally owned by Indigenous Peoples and communities. The high convergence of biodiversity-areas and indigenous territories provide opportunities and challenges to expand biodiversity-conservation efforts beyond National Parks⁶. According to the World Bank *Role of Indigenous Peoples in Biodiversity Conservation*, IPs-owned territories have been better conserved than the adjacent lands in Brazil, Columbia, Nicaragua, etc., and their participation in results in more comprehensive and cost-effective conservation of biodiversity worldwide⁶.
10. The maintenance of IPs' cultural and spiritual relationship with traditional lands is also vital to biodiversity conservation.⁷ In many indigenous cultures, species of plants and animals are protected because of their spiritual and religious value⁸. At the international level, a number of mechanisms and frameworks have been established to monitor rights and issues for IPs, for example the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous

² Department of the Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations (2009). [State of the World's Indigenous Peoples](#).

³ The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) is a fundamental framework used to review IPs matters. The declaration is the product of almost 25 years of deliberation by U.N. member states and Indigenous groups. The first of the UNDRIP's 46 articles declares that "Indigenous peoples have the right to the full enjoyment, as a collective or as individuals, of all human rights and fundamental freedoms as recognized in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human rights law." The Declaration goes on to guarantee the rights of Indigenous Peoples to enjoy and practice their cultures and customs, their religions, and their languages, and to develop and strengthen their economies and their social and political institutions. Significantly, in Article 3 the UNDRIP recognizes Indigenous peoples' right to self-determination, which includes the right "to freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development." Article 4 affirms Indigenous peoples' right "to autonomy or self-government in matters relating to their internal and local affairs," and Article 5 protects their right "to maintain and strengthen their distinct political, legal, economic, social and cultural institutions." Article 26 states that "Indigenous peoples have the right to the lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used or acquired," and it directs states to give legal recognition to these territories. The Declaration does not override the rights of Indigenous peoples contained in their treaties and agreements with individual states, and it commands these states to observe and enforce the agreements. [Extracted from <http://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/> on Jan 7, 2017

⁴ World Bank. 2011. [Still among the poorest of the poor](#). Indigenous Peoples country brief. Washington, DC: World Bank.

⁵ Macchi, M. IUCN Issues Paper, Indigenous and Traditional Peoples and Climate Change, 2008.

⁶ The World Bank, [Role of Indigenous Peoples in Biodiversity Conservation](#)

⁷ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report, Chapter 5

⁸ Conservation International, [Indigenous Peoples and Conservation from Rights to Resource Management](#)

Peoples Issues (UNPFII) established in 2000 and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) adopted in 2007. Internationally, there is also increasing appreciation of the knowledge held by IPs and their potential to contribute to overall sustainable development. Hence, the importance of ensuring the rights of IP and preventing exploitation of resources and lands from traditional territories is reflected in the requirement of the UNDRIP for prior and informed consent of all Indigenous Peoples to any development that affects their lands and territories.

GEF and Indigenous Peoples

11. GEF is the financial mechanism for multiple global environmental conventions several of which consider the engagement of Indigenous Peoples in their official articles. Since 1996, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) has announced eleven policy decisions to address different issues related to participations of indigenous and local communities⁹. CBD requires each contracting Party respect and preserve knowledge and practices of indigenous communities for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, promote wider application of indigenous knowledge with approval, and encourages the sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge innovations. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) adopts decisions to enhance action on adaptation by incorporating traditional and indigenous knowledge¹⁰, to address the needs of local and indigenous communities when reduce emissions from deforestation in developing countries, and has also promoted safeguards to respect for the knowledge and rights of Indigenous Peoples¹¹.
12. Since 2003, the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) has been advising on the exploitation of indigenous knowledge systems to address local problems¹² and reinforces integration traditional and modern knowledge as a strategy to effectively combat desertification¹³. The Minamata Convention on Mercury¹⁴ and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands¹⁵ also have published guidelines to strength Indigenous Peoples' participation in the wetlands/mercury management.
13. As key partners and stakeholders to these conventions, the GEF has put in place the following modalities to address its obligations and ensure that IPs are incorporated into all relevant aspects of GEF-supported work. In 1996 the GEF created its Public Involvement Policy¹⁶ supporting the effective involvement of civil society, including provisions for local communities and Indigenous Peoples. This was the initial and major guiding policy document for GEF's relations with IPs.
14. In recent years, GEF has launched a process to strengthen its partnership with IPs in various ways. In 2011, the GEF adopted the *Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards*¹⁷. This

⁹ Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Article 8(j) Decisions

¹⁰ UNFCCC, [Report of the Conference of the Parties on its 13th sessions](#)

¹¹ UNFCCC, [Report of the Conference of the Parties on its sixteenth sessions](#)

¹² UNCCD, [Information and advice provided by the Global Mechanism \(P. 31\)](#)

¹³ UNCCD, [Identification of perceived gaps between biophysical, socio-economic and cultural knowledge and activities to combat desertification, their causes and ways of eliminating them](#)

¹⁴ Minamata Convention on Mercury, [Text and Annexes](#)

¹⁵ The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar), [Guidelines for establishing and strengthening local communities' and indigenous people's participation in the management of wetlands](#)

¹⁶ GEF, [Policy on Public Involvement in GEF Projects](#)

¹⁷ GEF, [GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards](#)

Policy establishes minimum standards on environmental and social safeguards that all GEF Partner Agencies are expected to meet in order to receive GEF funds. Relying on Agency systems for consultation with Indigenous Peoples, GEF requires that such free prior informed consultations result in broad community support for GEF projects/programs.

15. Also, in July 2011 and in consultations with Indigenous Peoples, the GEF established the Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group (IPAG). IPAG was established on the eve of Rio+20 meetings and in response to calls from Indigenous Peoples at GEF meetings for a distinct policy to recognize contributions of Indigenous Peoples. The IPAG's first task was the development of an "Issues Paper"¹⁸ to inform the GEF Secretariat for deliberations on a future policy. Since its establishment, the IPAG has continued to contribute to GEF policy and issues papers.
16. Based on the Issues Paper, in 2012 the GEF *Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples*¹⁹ were issued. They guide GEF Agencies and other partners on engagement matters demonstrating that project results can be enhanced when IPs are appropriately integrated into projects that involve or have an impact on Indigenous Peoples; and guide on inadvertent environmental and social impacts that may arise from GEF projects highlighting GEF's safeguard policies needed to be in place to ensure IPs sustainable involvement in GEF projects.²⁰
17. The GEF also has substantial engagement with Indigenous Peoples through its Small Grants Programme (SGP). The GEF SGP is an initiative aimed at increasing IPs access to funding to enhance capacity building through programmatic and policy development. Since 1992, the SGP has awarded more than 16,000 grants in 137 countries, approximately 15% of them were directed toward Indigenous Peoples²¹. According to its 2014 Annual Monitoring Report, 192 SGP projects were completed with Indigenous Peoples' organizations, and at least 140 IPs projects were completed in year 2015²².

Evaluation Objectives and Key Questions

18. The main objective of the evaluation is to:
 - a. **Identify lessons and good practices of GEF's engagement with Indigenous Peoples at the policy/program/project level and identify key issues for improvement.**
19. The evaluation will be guided by the following key questions:
 - i. **To what extent are GEF Strategies and Policies for engagement with Indigenous Peoples in alignment with guidance from conventions and in line with international standards and protocols?**
 - ii. **To what extent has GEF engaged with IPs in GEF projects (are IPs being consulted and offering support as intended by GEF policies? what are the IPs main areas of contribution (design, implementation, monitoring?) and how have they benefited? (governance, policy, land rights)?**

¹⁸ [Issue Paper on Indigenous Peoples. Prepared by the Indigenous Peoples Task Force to the GEF.](#)

¹⁹ GEF, [Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples](#)

²⁰ GEF, Council Document GEF/C.41/Rev.1, [GEF Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards](#), page 25

²¹ GEF. [Partnership in Practice – Engagement with Indigenous Peoples](#)

²² GEF SGP, Small Grants Programme [Annual Monitoring Report 2014-2015](#)

- iii. **How have these projects performed and what are some best practices and lessons learned? What has been done in an innovative way? To what extent has GEF engagement with IPs contributed to achievement of GEBs?**
- iv. **How effective has GEF been in knowledge management concerning Indigenous Peoples issues?**

Approach, Methodology and Limitations

20. The evaluation's key questions will be analyzed as indicated in Table 1 below. Traditional evaluation methods such as interviews, focus groups, portfolio review (full-size, medium-size and small grant projects) and document review will be deployed to address the evaluation's key questions. The office will also a rapid literature review and utilize earth observation spatial data available through open sources to overlay GEF projects with known boundaries for IPs current territories.
21. A main limitation of this evaluation is that its scope is limited primarily to desk review largely drawing on project documents, relevant literature and previous evaluations. The quality and availability of information specific to Indigenous Peoples' issues in the available documents will vary. Furthermore, the extent to which the evaluation can gather feedback from both Indigenous Peoples and the Partnership given that stakeholders are distributed globally across all regions and scope of GEF projects involving IPs includes all of full, medium and small grant projects. Moreover, the GEF Partnership includes GEF Agencies, Governments, STAP, the GEF Secretariat, the CSO Network with its Indigenous Peoples focal points and other stakeholders. Representative samples from each stakeholder group will be contacted for feedback to the evaluation.
22. Another limitation is the current lack of a portfolio monitoring from the stakeholder lens of IPs. Without a system of aggregated metrics, concerning IPs, it will be challenging to infer the contributions and linkages between IPs inputs, participation and GEF results.
23. This evaluation will also be limited by a relatively short timeframe and limited budget to take extensive site visits. The IEO will address these limitations through close collaborations with representatives from GEF's Partnerships with Indigenous Peoples to maximize engagement and feedback through teleconference services.

Table 1: GEF Engagement with Indigenous Peoples Evaluation Matrix.

Key Evaluation Questions	Example Sub-Evaluation Questions	Information Sources	Approaches/Methods
<p>i. To what extent are GEF Focal Area Strategies and Policies for engagement with Indigenous Peoples in alignment with guidance from conventions and international standards and protocols?</p>	<p>a. To what extent has the GEF aligned its strategies and policies for Indigenous Peoples' inclusion? b. Have IPs contributed to shaping the GEF agenda (getting relevant issues on the GEF agenda, policies incorporated by the Council)? c. Has the GEF Partnership adjusted to meet changing IPs needs and priorities?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GEF6 policy and program documents - Convention guidance - Data / Results from Surveys, Interviews, and other primary sources (e.g. workshops) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (Online) Assessment - Interviews and Focus Groups/Focused meetings with key stakeholders
<p>ii. To what extent has GEF engaged with IPs in GEF projects (are IPs being consulted and offering support as intended by GEF policies? what are the IPs main areas of contribution (design, implementation, monitoring?) and how have they benefited? (governance, policy, land rights)? How have IPs contributed to achievement of GEBs?</p>	<p>d. How is GEF assessing benefits of IPs engagement? e. To what extent has GEF effectively monitored IPs engagement in design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of GEF projects? f. To what extent is the implementation of GEF IPs-related policies, including safeguards, monitored at the country level? g. What implications are there for the future evolution of the current GEF Minimum Standards? h. Are there clear signals of development of IPs capacity? (male/female disaggregated) i. Are there intended/unintended impacts on IPs as a result of this engagement?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Council and GEF SEC Documents - GEF Project Documents - SGP Strategy and Policy Documents - SGP Portfolio - GEF CSO Network documents - Agency evaluations on IPs engagement (e.g. IFAD, WB, etc.) OPS6 Study on Gender 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document review - Interviews and Focus Groups/Focused meetings with key stakeholders - Site visits - Portfolio Review - Comparative analysis - Earth observation analysis
<p>iii. How have these projects performed and What are some best practices and lessons learned? What has been done in an innovative way? To what extent has GEF engagement with IPs contributed to achievement of GEBs?</p>	<p>j. What is the relative importance/value-add of GEF Agency policies on IPs with GEF policies concerning IPs? k. To what extent have the 2012 GEF Principles & Guidelines resulted in greater effectiveness/efficiency of GEF projects? l. To what extent has GEF mainstreamed gender considerations into projects that involve/concern IPs?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document review Data / Results from Interviews, and other primary sources - OPS6 Study Evaluating GEF Policy on Minimum Standards for E&S Safeguards - Agency evaluations on IPs engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews and Focus Groups/Focused meetings with key stakeholders - Surveys
<p>iv. How effective has GEF been in knowledge management concerning Indigenous Peoples issues?</p>	<p>m. To what extent are best practices and lessons learned integrated into design of subsequent GEF projects? n. What GEF-relevant information (knowledge products, presentations, reports, etc.) is flowing through the IPs networks or among multi and bilateral concerning IPs engagement? o. What mechanisms are in place for IPs coordination and communications and are these coordination and communication structures efficient and effective?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GEF Documents - Agency evaluations on IPs engagement (e.g. IFAD, WB, etc.) OPS6 Study on Gender - Interviews and Focus Groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document review - Interviews and Focus Groups/Focused meetings with key stakeholders - Surveys

10. Based on initial desk review of GEF documents and literature review, the evaluation team will assess the level of information available and identify data gaps. Accordingly, the team will then selectively use an appropriate combination of tools. The final decisions on which tools and methodologies to use will take place after the initial phase of document review.

11. A mixed methods approach is proposed, relying on both primary and secondary sources for data collection. Gender and Knowledge Management considerations will be mainstreamed in methodology and conclusions. Evaluation activities will be drawn from the following:

- **Document review:** Further review of documentation to include additional literature on: the subject of evaluating IPs engagement; GEF Council documents; Secretariat's policies and documents; and relevant Agency documents.
- **Portfolio Review:** The evaluation will verify and build on the portfolio of projects involving IPs as shared by GEFSEC and review performance indicators such as ratings for outcomes, sustainability and progress to impact (completed projects).
- **Surveys:** Surveys will be delivered in focus groups and online to capture the perspectives of IPs and relevant stakeholders, including the GEF Secretariat, GEF Council Members, GEF Agencies, STAP, GEF OFPs and other relevant government departments.
- **Meta-Analysis:** Review of evaluative evidence from the evaluation offices of GEF Agencies, or by other national or international evaluation departments, Agencies or organizations.
- **Interviews, Focus Groups, Focused Meetings with key stakeholders:** In-depth interviews and/or Focus Group or Focused Meeting sessions will be conducted with a selection of relevant stakeholders including GEF Secretariat staff, GEF Agencies, GEF CSO Network Central Focal point and Coordination Committee members CSO Network members and CSO organizations. Some stakeholder will be selected on their attendance at relevant, ongoing activities of the GEF Secretariat, for example Extended Constituency Workshops (ECWs).
- **Site Visits:** A sample of projects may be selected on a strategic basis for possible visit for verification of outcomes and progress to impact as well as review of engagement with local IPs for intended/unintended impacts (positive and negative).

Knowledge Management and Communications

12. Key stakeholders of this evaluation, including IPAG, will be identified and consulted with adequate time at the beginning, during and at the end of the evaluation process. This will ensure the appropriate level of engagement using relevant channels. The evaluation findings will be presented to the GEF Council and subsequently disseminated to the key stakeholders and broader audiences through knowledge and learning events hosted by the IEO.

Management of the Evaluation

13. The evaluation will be task managed by Ms. Baljit Wadhwa, Senior Evaluation Officer with oversight from the Chief Evaluation Officer and Director of the IEO. The Manager will lead a team comprised of GEF IEO staff and

consultants. The consultants will be hired to undertake specific elements such as analysis of portfolio information, meta-analysis of external and GEF documents, key informant interviews, etc.

- **First Phase:** Phase 1 includes pre-evaluation activities such as upstream consultations with GEF and Indigenous People’s groups and drafting the Approach Paper. The first phase is expected to be completed by November 2016.
- **Second Phase:** The second phase is comprised of desk review activities to gather information and identify data gaps. It will start in November and will be completed by December 2016.
- **Third Phase:** The third phase will use an appropriate combination of methods to gather and analyze additional information. These could include data collected from spatial analysis, site visits, interviews, focus groups, and other stakeholder meetings that may occur. To the extent possible, the IEO will use existing and planned Office activities as well as possibly international gatherings, such as meetings of Conference of Parties to multilateral environmental agreements. This phase will be completed April 2016. Key Deliverable: Analysis of primary data.
- **Fourth Phase:** The fourth phase consists of triangulation, verification and gap analysis of data from all sources and preparation of the preliminary findings. The synthesis of information from the various sources is expected to begin March 2016 with preliminary portfolio findings for the first report to the GEF-7 replenishment committee towards the middle of March. Key deliverable: Preliminary Findings Report.
- **Fifth Phase:** Stakeholders will be given an opportunity to provide comments to the preliminary findings. Feedback will be sought to the greatest extent possible through in-person meetings as well as written responses. All comments will be considered for the final evaluation report that will be shared with the GEF Council Spring 2017. Key deliverable: Final Evaluation Report and knowledge products.

Time Frame

Table 2: Proposed Schedule for Evaluation of GEF Engagement with Indigenous Peoples

Evaluation Phase	Time Frame (2017)
1. Pre-evaluation desk review, upstream consultations & Approach Paper	January
2. Further desk review; identification of data gaps; finalize methods selection	February
3. Application of appropriate methods/tools for additional data gathering and analysis 4. Triangulation, verification, gap analysis and preparation of preliminary findings for OPS6 report	February-March
5. Preliminary portfolio findings Final Evaluation shared with GEF Council Evaluation Conclusions & Recommendation presented at GEF Council meeting Knowledge products and dissemination activities	March April 2017 May 2017 September-December 2017