

## **Systematising of the IWGIA screening regarding experiences/information on Indigenous Peoples, Gender and Natural Resource Management.**

### **I. First Questionnaire (quantitative information)**

Approximately 28 questionnaires were sent out to IWGIA indigenous partner organisations in Latin America, Africa and Asia as well as to non indigenous support organisations based in Europe and working worldwide. 12 organisations filled out and returned the questionnaire. Another 10 questionnaires were sent by the Kenyan expert we have contacted, to organisations in East Africa, who also answered.

Of the 22 answers received in total, all confirmed to be working with indigenous men and women as well as with natural resource management and thus qualified for the second questionnaire with a view to obtain more qualitative information. The 22 organisations were from the following countries:

Africa: Kenya (12), Uganda (1), Tanzania (1), Namibia (1)

Asia: Philippines (1), Malaysia (2), Thailand (1) and India (1)

Europe/international: 2

The result of the 22 returned questionnaires has been systematised in excel according to the questions asked in the questionnaire (see annex 1.)

The questionnaire was divided in four sections dealing with the following topics:

- (i) Issues related to indigenous peoples (IP)
- (ii) Issues related to gender
- (iii) Issues related to natural resource management (NRM)
- (iv) Issues related to documentation of experiences

The presentation of the summary result will follow the same sections and topics.

#### **1) Issues related to IP:**

All the organisations confirm working with IP.

A long list of different ethnic/indigenous groups involved in the organisations' work was provided in the answers, especially from Asian and to a lesser extent Africa. A detailed list can be found in Annex 2.

The organisations work mainly within development projects (16), advocacy (16), information work (16) and gender/women's rights (16) – i.e. 72% - while 15 (68%) work environmental projects, and 14 (63%) with and IP rights.

The organisations see their core areas of work as being IP (16 – or 72%) and gender/women's issues (16 – 72%) while NRM comes in as no. 2 with 15 organisations (68%) . More than half of the organisations (12 or 54%) confirm that the activities with IP have a special focus on NRM, while the remaining organisations have a special focus on gender/women. 11 or 50% of the organisations mention that both NRM and gender/women's issues are important in their work with IP.

In Summary: IP are involved in all the organisations' work mainly in environmental projects as well as development projects. However, the percentage of organisations working with IP and gender/women's issues is slightly higher (72%) than that of those working with NRM.

## **2) Issues related to gender:**

All 22 organizations confirm working with both women and men and 19 confirm having a women's group involved in the work. However, it should be noted that these groups are sometimes established in relation to specific projects/activities and not necessarily institutionalised within the organisation as such.

17 organizations (77%) indicate that they have a gender strategy and one indicates that such a strategy is being developed. 19 (86%) work on the basis of a gender perspective; 4 work from both a gender and a women's perspective and only 2 work from a women's perspective only. The earliest year mentioned for working on the basis of a women's and gender perspective is 1990 (Malaysia) and the latest is 2001 (East Africa) but this may have to do with the date of inception of the organisation. However, for most organisations, it started in the mid 90s – in many cases at the same time as the organisations were set up.

21 out of 22 organisations confirm including gender/women aspects in the activities related to natural resource management as well as in activities related to indigenous peoples. 16 (72 %) organizations confirm working with gender disaggregated data.

In summary: Men and women are claimed to be involved in all the organizations' work and the large majority (18 out of 22) indicate having a gender strategy. We should, however, be cautious regarding the interpretation of the answers to this question. Having a gender strategy may not necessarily mean having a *written, formally adopted and institutionalised* strategy, but should maybe be understood in a much broader sense as an implicit way of working. Unfortunately, we have not directly asked under section 4. Documentation whether there was a written gender strategy – only a strategy. To that question (4.2) only 4 organisations respond positively (and 5 to the question of having a policy). However, the fact that quite a large number (16) work with gender disaggregated data, seems to indicate that there is in fact a strong gender perspective.

## **3) Issues related to Natural Resource Management:**

Only 15 organizations (68%) work explicitly with NRM as a core area. They are all involved in activities related to sustainable use of natural resources and information work. 14 have activities related to development projects, indigenous use of natural resources, advocacy, NRM research; 13 are involved in NRM education and 11 organizations confirm being involved in conservation. Only 9 are involved in consultancies. In relation to the kind of natural resources involved in the activities, 11 organizations mention river and lakes; 10 tropical forests – and 7 “other forests”; 9 watersheds; 8 savannahs, and 5 mention deserts/grasslands and coastal areas. 4 organisations specify under “others”: semi-deserts (3) and biodiversity conservation (1)

For 12 organisations education/training in NRM is the main activity.

Looking at NRM activities directly related to nature, 10 organisations are involved with forestry, 9 with agriculture, 8 with agroforestry and 8 with gathering/foraging. Ranging, fishing and hunting, on the other hand, are only mentioned by very few (4, 3 and 2 organisations). “Others” include pastoralism and wildlife management.

As for NRM derived activities, land titling involves 9, ecotourism 9 and handicraft production 9 – or less than 50%. Few organisations are involved in the other activities: organisation (7), marketing (4) and processing (1).

Most of the organizations confirm that their NRM activities include IP (19), local authorities (16), national authorities (14) and international organizations (14).

In summary: Contrary to the case of WWF, some of the organisations interviewed do not consider NRM as a core area, but will rather tend to focus on indigenous peoples/indigenous women.

As a large number of the interviewed organisations work with pastoralists (14 in East Africa), it seems therefore surprising that only 4 of them are involved in ranging. It might be due to the use of the word “ranging” instead of “grazing/pastoralism” which may be a more commonly used expression, and which is included under “others”..

Fishing and hunting activities are also underrepresented but this might be due to the fact that these activities are not part of the organisations’ planned activities/concern.

Regarding the involvement of stakeholders, it would be interesting to know what has been understood by “international organisations” being included. It may have been interpreted to mean that International Organisations are funding the organisations’ NRM activities.

#### **4) Issues related to documentation:**

Documentation on the three issues together is available from 20 organisations –under the form of project reports (19), conference papers (13), published articles (11), monographs (7), periodicals (5), and electronic files (3) and homepage (7) – which probably amount more or less to the same thing. Policy and strategy account for 5 and 4 respectively.

10 organizations (67%) mention having written documentation available on IP and NRM, 8 on gender and NRM, and 7 on IP-gender and IP-gender-NRM. 5 organizations (or less than 25%) mention having information available on the internet.

In summary: Although the majority of the organizations claim to have relevant documentation on the three issues together, very little has been forwarded to IWGIA. Our Kenyan expert claims however to have received from 7 of the organisations surveyed.