

Systematising of Questionnaire 1 of the WWF screening regarding experiences/information on Indigenous Peoples, Gender and Natural Resource Management.

I. First Questionnaire (quantitative information)

Approximately 122 questionnaires were sent out to WWF offices and associated organisations around the world. 22 of those answered and returned the questionnaire to WWF-DK. Of those 22 answers 14 confirmed to include indigenous peoples and men and women in their natural resource management work and thus qualified for the second questionnaire with a view to obtain more qualitative information. The 14 WWF organisations that received the second questionnaire are divided according to continent as follows:

Africa: Nigeria, South Africa

Asia: Indian, Pakistan, Mongolia, Nepal

The Pacific: Solomon Islands, Philippines

Latin America: Chile, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Peru, Colombia

The remaining 8 answers to the first questionnaire confirmed not to include women/gender and/or indigenous peoples in their work and thus did not qualify for the second questionnaire.

Additionally a new non WWF project initiative was included in the survey, i.e. the “Gender and Decision-making processes in Arctic fisheries resource management”. It is a two-years research project supported by the Arctic Council (consisting of eight circumpolar nations) with the objective of studying the democratic representation in regulatory fishery management bodies to see whether women (indigenous and non-indigenous) are participating, what mechanisms may prevent them from doing so and how it affects their lives. The research project takes place simultaneously in Canada, Norway, Greenland, Iceland and Sweden.

The result of the 15 returned questionnaires (14 from the WWF system and 1 from the Arctic Project) has been systematised in excel according to the questions asked in the questionnaire. It can be found in 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, especially in environmental projects (100%) and in development projects (60%). A little more than half of the organisations confirm working on research related to IP and 40% confirm working with information as well as with gender/women’s rights.

Only four organisations (27%) confirm including IP rights in their work.

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

In terms of the core areas of work for the organisations, all of them mentioned that NRM was a priority, half of them that IP was also a priority and only two organisations mentioned gender/women's issues to be important in their work.

Almost all the organisations (93%) confirm that the activities with IP have a special focus on NRM where as only 2 organisations (13%) mention gender/women's issues as a special focus related to IP activities. Only the Arctic project mentioned that both NRM and gender/women's issues are important in the work with IP.

In Summary: IP are involved in all the organisations' work mainly in environmental projects as well as development projects. To some extent the organisations' IP activities do also include research and gender/women's issues. Naturally all the organisations have NRM as a core area of work being part of the WWF system, but half of them actually also mention IP as a core area. Gender and women's issues are given low priority in relation to the core activities, although 40% of the organizations confirm working with gender/women's rights.

2) Issues related to gender:

All organizations confirm working with both women and men and a little less than half of them also confirm having a women's group involved in the work. Six organizations (40%) confirm having a gender strategy, but two of them state that this strategy only applies to projects and the operative level.

60 % confirm working on the basis of a gender perspective and 20% 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 1991 (Arctic Norway) and the latest is 1995 (Solomon Islands). For working on the basis of a gender perspective the earliest year mentioned is 1990 (Pakistan) and the latest is 2003 (Arctic Canada).

80 % of the answers confirm including gender/women aspects in the activities related to natural resource management and 87 % confirm including gender/women aspects in activities related to indigenous peoples. However, only 33 % (5 organizations) confirm working with gender disaggregated data.

In Summary: Men and women are claimed to be involved in all the organizations' work and a little less than half confirm having a gender strategy *, although no gender strategy has been included in the materials forwarded to WWF. More than half of the organizations work on the basis of a gender perspective, 1/5 on a women's perspective and 1/5 on neither one. However, 1/3 of the organizations work with gender disaggregated data **.

There seems to be some confusions as to the definition of gender and women's perspectives. Some organisations claim to work with men and women, but do not know what gender/women's perspective and gender disaggregated data mean. It is interesting that 80 % include gender/women's aspects in activities with NRM and 87 % include the same in activities with IPs. Nevertheless, no written or electronic documentation of experiences with NRM, IP and gender has been forwarded to WWF-DK. Some articles on gender – IP and on IP-NRM have been mentioned and forwarded to WWF-DK.

* Pakistan, Nepal, Arctic, Solomon Island, Philippines, Ecuador, Nicaragua

** India, Pakistan, Nepal, Arctic, UK (sometimes), Philippines, Ecuador

*** Arctic, UK, Solomon Islands, Pakistan, Colombia

3) Issues related to Natural Resource Management:

14 organizations (93 %) confirm being involved in activities related to sustainable use of natural resources, 11 (73 %) confirm being involved in activities related to conservation, indigenous use of natural resources, NRM education and research. 10 organizations confirm being involved in information work and 8 (53 %) confirm being involved in advocacy / lobbying and development activities.

In relation to the kind of natural resources involved in the activities, 73 % of the organizations mention coastal areas, 67 % mention watersheds and tropical forests, 60 % mention rivers / lakes, grassland and other forests and the rest below 33 % mention savannah, desert and tundra.

87 % of the organisations mention forestry and education/training as activities that the NRM activities involve, followed by ecotourism (80 %), organisation, gathering/foraging, fishing (67 %), handicraft production (60 %) and agriculture, agroforestry, marketing (53 %). Hunting, ranging, processing, land titling and alternative energy are all mentioned by 40 % of the organizations or less.

All organizations confirm that their NRM activities include IP, local authorities, national authorities and international organizations.

In summary: Taking into account that the organizations that answered the questionnaire are all but one belonging to the WWF system, it is not surprising that the kind of natural resources mainly involved in the NRM activities are mentioned to be coastal areas, watershed, tropical forests, rivers/lakes and grassland. What is rather surprising is that 13 organisations (87) mention that their NRM activities involve training / education. Activities related to forestry is given the same priority, which is not very surprising, but it is interesting to note that ecotourism is an activity mentioned by 12 organisations (80 %) followed by fishing, gathering/foraging and organisation. Likewise it is interesting that all organizations confirm that their NRM activities involve all stakeholders from IP to the international level.

4) Issues related to documentation:

13 organizations confirm that documentation on the three issues together is available and the same number of organizations mention project reports as the kind of available documentation. Published articles are mentioned by 53%, followed by conference papers and electronic files (33% and 27% respectively). 10 organizations (67%) mention having written documentation available on IP and NRM, 5 *** mention available documentation on IP-gender-NRM and 4 mention documentation on gender and NRM. Only 2 organizations mention having documentation on IP and gender. 6 organizations (40%) mention having information available on the internet, 2 organizations do not and 7 (47%) have not answered the question. 4 organizations have included some form of documentation, but the only one including all three issues is an overview of a Pakistan project.

In Summary: Although the majority of the organizations claim to have relevant documentation on the three issues together, very little have been forwarded to WWF-DK. Except for the project overview from Pakistan, none of the received documentation included the three issues.

* Pakistan, Nepal, Arctic, Solomon Island, Philippines, Ecuador, Nicaragua

** India, Pakistan, Nepal, Arctic, UK (sometimes), Philippines, Ecuador

*** Arctic, UK, Solomon Islands, Pakistan, Colombia