

K.U.L.U. – Women and Development, Denmark

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

Not surprisingly, women's organisations working with Indigenous Peoples (IP) and Natural Resource Management (NRM), consider gender approach and/or women's perspective extremely important if not essential for sustainable results in development work. Some responders have already found out, that in practice, understanding and thus implementing gender and women's perspective needs commitment and resources; as expressed in a comment from IUCN Tropical Rainforest Programme in Questionnaire 1: "our donor insisted on a more formal training of all the staff, which was very helpful".

I. First Questionnaire (quantitative information)

Approximately 118 questionnaires were sent out by the time this systematisation is been finalised, although both requests and responses had arrived later on. Firstable, around 30 of them were sent to KULU's organisations members, and partners including those with a particular knowledge on gender and environment. Secondly, 88 were sent to collaborating organisations, institutions and researcher around the world, when invited to request it by e-mail, trough different women organisation's information channels such as newsletters and networks list servers. KULU received a total of 19 questionnaires with answers by e-mail. The demand and interest in knowing about the Network is proved by the amount of e-mails requesting the questionnaire and/or additional information about the project. As it was an invitation to collaborate, the 19 returned questionnaires confirmed to include indigenous peoples and men and women in their natural resource management work. However, not all of them qualified for the second questionnaire with a view to obtain more qualitative information, since they did not have a clear intersection between the three issues.

Trying to reach again those women's organisations with specific knowledge in these areas, 25 organisations and research institutions have received the second questionnaire, including those answering the first questionnaire, although only 4 have responded to it. It is important to notice, that not all women organisations work specifically around the issue of environment/NRM but in many cases is one of their many tasks or areas of work and it is also worth to mention, that when reminded again to collaborate, they explicitly referred to the load of work/ bad timing faced by those on charge or with knowledge within the organisations, underlying that it was not due to lack of interest.

The responders/organisations are divided according to regions as follows:

Europe:	Azerbaijan, Italy, The Netherlands, United Kingdom, and Switzerland
Africa:	Kenya and Cameroon
Asia:	India, Pakistan, Nepal and China
The Pacific:	New Zealand, Indonesia (West Papua)
Latin America:	The Caribbean (Islands of Belize, St. Vincent, Suriname, Guyana, Dominica), Mesoamerica (Mexico, Guatemala, Caribbean Coast of Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Panama) and South America

The result of the 19 returned questionnaires has been systematised in 'excel' (Annex 1) according to the questions asked in the questionnaire No. 1. Annex 2 has details of IP's and their location.

The 19 responders are classified as 11 Non-governmental Organisations (NGO's), 2 NGO with Community Based Organisations (CBO) members and 1 self-defined NGO/Network. Of them, 5 are also donors/funders of projects or programmes with IP; additionally a United Nations (UN) agency and 3 research institutions and finally one international inter-governmental research institution.

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

- 1) Issues related to indigenous peoples (IP)
- 2) Issues related to gender
- 3) Issues related to natural resource management (NRM)
- 4) Issues related to documentation of experiences

1) Issues related to IP:

Summary: IP are involved in all the organisations' work mainly in advocacy and lobby, IP's rights and development projects. To some extent, less than half of the responders' IP activities do also include environmental, research and gender/women's issues. Almost four-fifths of them have NRM as a core area of work, and particularly three-quarters - most of them actually also mention IP as a core area together with gender and women's issues (74% each).

All the organisations confirm working with IP, especially in advocacy and lobby (68%) and in indigenous peoples' rights (58%) as well as development projects (53%). Environmental projects, gender/women's rights and research were equally confirmed by less than half of the answers (47% each). Information, capacity building and consultancies are part of their work (42%, 11% and 5% respectively).

As previously mentioned the list of different ethnic/indigenous groups involved in the organisations' work provided in the answers are to be found in the detailed list of Annex 2, included in the systematisation.

In terms of the core areas of work for the organisations, most answers mentioned that NRM was a priority (84%); follow by IP and gender/women's issues (74% each) showing to be very important parts of their work.

As expected, many of the answers (74%) pointed out that that both NRM and gender/women's issues are important in the work with IP. The activities with IP having special focus on NRM were confirmed by large part of the answers (84%), followed by answers (74%) mentioning gender/women's issues as a special focus related to IP activities.

2) Issues related to gender:

*Summary: Men and women are claimed to be involved in all the organisations' work and many confirm having a gender strategy *, although no gender strategy has been included in the materials forwarded, few- four of them pointed out where to find them on the Internet and of those, two are in Dutch. Three-quarters of responders work on the basis of a gender perspective, less than half on a women's perspective, followed also by less than half of answers responding working on both. Almost three-quarters of the organisations work with gender-disaggregated data, acknowledging that they do that when possible and in some cases can't because of lack of data. ** ((Annex 1 */**))*

All responders confirm working with both women and men, except one organisation, which work is basically around lobby for indigenous rights. Many of them also confirm having a women's group involved in their work (79%). Although many (74%) confirm having a gender strategy, only few

pointed out to a web site where to find it, and none attached it as a document to the questionnaire. Of four found on Internet, two are in Dutch.

It is interesting to notice that 42% organisations/institutions are working on the basis of both a women's perspective and a gender perspective. 84 % confirm working on the basis of a gender perspective and 47% confirm working on the basis of a women's perspective. The earliest year mentioned for working on the basis of a women's perspective is 1970 (UN agency: FAO) and the latest is 2003 (China). For working on the basis of a gender perspective the earliest year mentioned is 1980 (Researcher/The Netherlands) and the latest is 2004 (Nepal). Some organisations comment this questions answering under other perspectives: Indigenous Perspective, emphasis women's perspective within the gender approach, believe that women's empowerment is necessary to address gender discrimination and subordination and finally one remarks that this is a hard question, as they work with several dispossessed, marginalised groups, but as they are all –until recently- women workers in small organisations, they tend to look for the women's angle all the time.

74 % of the answers both confirm including gender/women aspects in activities related to natural resource management and in activities related to indigenous peoples. However, if compared to previous answers of 84% of them working on the basis of a gender perspective, there is an incoherence pointing out a misunderstanding. Of the high percent 58% (11 organisations) that confirm working with gender disaggregated data, many recognise that it is done when possible, and additionally one from Indonesia admits that it is not existent, showing the difficulties when trying to do so.

There seems to be some confusion in the definition of gender and women's perspectives which is shown in the incoherence between the 84% answering working on the basis of a gender perspective and the 74% answering that they are including gender/women aspects in the activities related to both NRM and IP. Some organisations claim to work with men and women, but make remarks regarding indigenous approach, emphasis on women within the gender approach and have difficulties in the frame of the question. The disaggregated data was not part of the work of many organisations.

Although 74 % responders include gender/women's aspects in activities with NRM and the same percent 74% in activities with IP, few attached written or electronic documentation of experiences with NRM, IP and gender. Nevertheless, the articles and specific documentation on gender – IP and on IP-NRM that have been mentioned to KULU seem of absolute relevancy to the project and will be mentioned in the systematisation of Questionnaire No. 2.

3) Issues related to Natural Resource Management:

Summary: Advocacy and lobbying together with education and training, not surprisingly for organisations working with gender/women's perspective are mentioned by a majority of organisations. The kind of natural resources mainly involved in the NRM activities mentioned are mostly tropical forests and other forests followed by watersheds. It is interesting to compare the incoherence with detailed activities given in answers under IP issues (section 1), which do not correspond to the same percentage under NRM, as is the case of development projects. Likewise it is interesting that although most organisations confirm that their NRM activities involve IP, only 53% include local authorities, while 58% include national authorities, relegating international organisations to a less important place with less than the half of the answers (47%).

The answers confirm that most organisations/institutions are being involved in activities of Advocacy, lobbying (74%) differing from (68%) answers given previously in issues related to IP

(section 1), followed by activities related to sustainable use of natural resources (53%), information work (47 %), indigenous use of natural resources and NRM education (both 42%) and research (37%). Conservation and development projects are confirmed by 5 organisations each (26%), which reflect again and incoherence with the core work of the answers given previously (53% in development under IP issues-section 1) and organisations confirming being involved in consultancy are more than the percentage given previously, also under IP issues f section 1 (21%). Others as capacity building coincide with previously given answers (11%). There is an indication of different sorting out of projects according to the questions under Indigenous Issues (section 1) -what kind of work, and under NRM (section 3) - type of NRM in which the organisation is involved. (See Annex 1 for the questions or Questionnaire 1 posted on IGNAMR's website: www.cdr.dk/genderres)

In relation to the kind of natural resources involved in the activities, 58 % of the answers pointed out tropical forests, 47% other forests, and 37% watersheds. Additionally, 32% mention both coastal areas and rivers and lakes. Deserts, grasslands and others have all 16% and finally both savanna and tundra are mentioned by 11%. Others include environmental protection of mountain regions, wetlands, agrodiversity and solar energy.

Education and training is mentioned by majority of answers 68%, followed by agroforestry 58% and agriculture 53%, as activities that the NRM involve. Under half of answers, forestry is mentioned by 47% and gathering/foraging, processing, marketing and organisation are all mentioned by 37%. Ecotourism and land titling are mentioned both by 32%, followed by handicraft production 26%. Hunting, fishing (both when part of conservation programmes) and others – decision-making, plant tenures, home gardening and mining capacity building- are given the same priority (11% each). Ranging is mentioned by 1 organisation, which is 5%.

Most responders confirm that their NRM activities include IP (79%), followed by national authorities (58%), while local authorities (53%) and international organisations (47%) accordantly are secondary. One organisation (5%) mention –others: funders/NGOs.

4) Issues related to documentation:

Summary: Although the majority of the organisations claim to have relevant documentation on the three issues together, few of these have been forwarded to KULU – Women and Development, Denmark. Some of them are written in Dutch; and Indian and Chinese sources have been mentioned. Nevertheless, the articles and documentations forwarded seem absolute relevant and contribute to understand the intersectionality of the three issues.

Many affirmative answers (58%) confirm that documentation on the three issues together is available, with published articles (53%) followed by conference presentations/papers (43%), and project reports (37%). Monographs (21%), followed by the same number of organisations mentioning electronic files. Websites and policy (3 corresponding to the 16%) are mentioned as the kind of available documentation. Likewise 3 organisations (16%) confirm having documentation in other form, specifying grant agreements. Finally 2 responders indicate having strategies (2%). 8 responders (42%) mention having written documentation available on IP and NRM, 6 (32%) responders mention available documentation on gender-NRM, and 5 (26%) mention documentation on both IP-gender and on IP-gender and NRM. gender. 6 organisations (32%) mention having information available on the internet, and the rest have not answered the question. Documentation from 6 responders have been either pointed out (web-link or written details) or attached as an electronic file. The systematisation of Questionnaire 2 include details of documentation.